



# Some stability results for frictionless contact problems in elastodynamics formulated with Nitsche's method

Franz Chouly, Hao Huang, Nicolas Pignet

## ► To cite this version:

Franz Chouly, Hao Huang, Nicolas Pignet. Some stability results for frictionless contact problems in elastodynamics formulated with Nitsche's method. 2026. <hal-04670133v2>

**HAL Id: hal-04670133**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04670133v2>**

Preprint submitted on 29 Jan 2026

**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.



HAL Authorization

# Some stability results for frictionless contact problems in elastodynamics formulated with Nitsche's method

Franz Chouly<sup>1</sup>, Hao Huang<sup>2,3</sup>, and Nicolas Pignet<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centro de Matemática (CMAT), IRL-2030 CNRS IFUMI, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de la República, 11400 Montevideo, Uruguay

<sup>2</sup>EDF Lab Paris-Saclay, 7 boulevard Gaspard Monge, 91120 Palaiseau, France

<sup>3</sup>Institut de Mathématiques de Bourgogne, Université de Bourgogne, 21078 Dijon, France

December 26, 2025

## Abstract

This work focuses on the numerical performance of the Nitsche-based Finite Element Method for dynamic unilateral contact problems combined with two implicit one-step time-marching schemes. The non-linear contact boundary conditions cause irregularities, which may lead to unstable performance and potential divergence during simulations. By focusing on the discontinuities inherent in dynamic contact problems, we provide new stability results for the proposed methods.

*Key words:* Time-marching scheme; Nitsche's method; unilateral contact; finite element method; elastodynamics.

## 1 Introduction

Contact and friction in elastodynamics are usually solved using the method of lines, combining the Finite Element Method (FEM) in space and a Finite Difference Method (FDM) as a time-marching scheme [53, 58]. This paper is focused on this aforementioned approach and investigates more in depth some aspects for a particular class of FEM-FDM approximation methods. Notably, for frictionless elastodynamic contact, practical challenges are to avoid spurious oscillations on the displacement, velocity and stress, and to preserve the mechanical energy of the system [38]. For the sake of exhaustibility, let us mention a few alternatives, like space-time discretization techniques [4, 43, 55], techniques from non-smooth rigid bodies dynamics [2, 3, 60] or smoothed particle hydrodynamics [21, 59]. For the space semi-discretization of contact, the FEM can be substituted with other discrete variational methods such as Boundary Element methods [8, 9], Isogeometric methods [36, 50], Discontinuous Galerkin methods [44, 64, 65], Virtual Element methods [6, 34, 39, 47, 56, 70, 71, 72, 73] or Hybrid High Order (HHO) methods [22, 24].

Originally devised for the Dirichlet boundary conditions [23, 62, 67], Nitsche's method has been introduced in [26] for Signorini's problem in elastostatics, and later on extended to elastodynamics [29, 30]. It has been combined with various time-marching schemes, first the families of  $\theta$ -scheme, of Newmark schemes and a new hybrid scheme in [30]. Later on it has been combined with the explicit Verlet scheme [33], implicit-explicit IMEX schemes (the implicit term being linear) [16] and to the Hilber-Hughes-Taylor HHT- $\alpha$  scheme and Bathe TR-BDF2 scheme [51].

Signorini contact in elastodynamics, when discretized in space with a standard finite element method, leads to an ill-posed differential inclusion with multiple solutions [52]. If this differential inclusion is combined with a standard time-marching scheme like Crank-Nicolson, this ill-posedness leads to poor numerical results, with spurious oscillations and no energy conservation. Notably, this effect is more important when the time-step is reduced. This ill-posedness at the semi-discrete level can be fixed using a specific treatment of contact, such as the modified mass method, a penalty/regularization or Nitsche's method [29, 38, 52]. Moreover, these methods allows to preserve a semi-discrete counterpart of the mechanical energy. However, even in this situation, standard time-marching schemes such as Crank-Nicolson do not preserve a fully discrete energy, due to the Signorini contact conditions, and some special numerical schemes can be designed to remedy to this issue, see for instance [48] for penalty or [30] for Nitsche.

In this work, we study the mathematical properties of two families of time-marching schemes combined with Nitsche-based finite element method for frictionless unilateral contact problems. Namely, we consider theta-schemes and Newmark schemes. The enforcement of contact conditions is carried out with the symmetric Nitsche method. Initially introduced by J.A. Nitsche in [62] (see also [23, 67]), the Nitsche method has been extended in [26, 31] for the Signorini problem (unilateral contact problem in elastostatics), and then [28, 29, 30] for elastodynamics. For the derivation of Nitsche formulation in the context of inequalities and the link with other methods, see, e.g., [13, 18, 20, 25, 31, 32, 50]. Nitsche's method is closely related to stabilized mixed methods, specifically to the Barbosa-Hugues stabilization [10, 11, 12, 49]. However it does not introduce a Lagrange multiplier as an extra




Figure 1: Elastic body occupying the domain  $\Omega$ , with the boundary  $\partial\Omega$ .

unknown conversely to mixed/mortar methods [1, 14, 69] or Augmented Lagrangian technologies [5, 19, 66]. It differs also from penalty techniques [27, 37, 40, 45, 53, 54, 63] because it preserves consistency and is more robust with respect to the numerical parameters.

Particularly we revisit stability results provided in [29, 30]. We take advantage of a new semi-discrete energy proposed by E. Burman, M.A. Fernandez and Stefan Frei in [17], that we will call BFF energy for the sake of conciseness. This discrete energy has the remarkable property of being always nonnegative whatever the values of the discretization parameters are, notably the Nitsche parameter that does not need to be large. In [17] a stability bound has been proven at the semi-discrete level. We propose an adaptation of this energy at the fully discrete level and provide new bounds for the evolution of energy for the aforementioned fully discrete methods. We complement this stability study with some new numerical experiments.

We first introduce the definition of several discrete energies in Sec. 2, then we define the time-marching schemes used in Sec. 3. In Sec. 4, we present a stability analysis of fully discrete schemes considered previously. Finally, we provide some numerical illustrations in Sec. 5.

## 2 Nitsche-based finite element method for elasto-dynamic unilateral contact problems

We consider an elastic body  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $d \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , see Fig. 1. On the boundary  $\partial\Omega := \Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_N \cup \Gamma_C$  of  $\Omega$ , Dirichlet, Neumann, and Signorini boundary conditions are applied respectively on the disjoint subsets  $\Gamma_D$ ,  $\Gamma_N$ , and  $\Gamma_C$ .

We seek the displacement field  $\mathbf{u} : \Omega \times (0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $T > 0$  is the final time, verifying the equations (1):

$$\begin{aligned}
 \rho \ddot{\mathbf{u}} - \operatorname{div}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u})) &= \mathbf{f}, \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), & \text{(i)} \\
 \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) &= \lambda \operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{u})) \mathbf{I} + 2\mu \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{u}), \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), & \text{(ii)} \\
 \mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{on } \Gamma_D \times (0, T), & \text{(iii)} \\
 \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n} &= \mathbf{f}_N, \quad \text{on } \Gamma_N \times (0, T), & \text{(iv)} \\
 u_n \leq 0, \quad \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}) \leq 0, \quad u_n \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}) &= 0, \quad \text{on } \Gamma_C \times (0, T), & \text{(v)} \\
 \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{n} &= \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{on } \Gamma_C \times (0, T), & \text{(vi)} \\
 \mathbf{u}(\cdot, 0) &= \mathbf{u}_0, \quad \dot{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot, 0) = \dot{\mathbf{u}}_0, \quad \text{in } \Omega. & \text{(vii)}
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The equations (i) - (iv) describe the problem of elastodynamics in small deformation, where  $\rho$  is the mass density,  $\mathbf{f}$  is the volumetric source term,  $\mathbf{f}_N$  is the surface charge,  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  are Lamé coefficients,  $\operatorname{tr}(\cdot)$  denotes the trace of a matrix,  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\cdot) := \frac{1}{2} (\nabla(\cdot) + \nabla^T(\cdot))$  is the small deformation tensor and  $\mathbf{I}$  is the identity matrix of dimension  $d$ . The equations (v) and (vi) denote Signorini's condition for frictionless contact, where  $u_n = \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}$ ,  $\sigma_n(\mathbf{u}) = (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n}) \cdot \mathbf{n}$  are respectively the normal displacement and the contact pressure at boundary  $\Gamma_C$ . The initial conditions at the time  $t = 0$  on the initial displacement and velocity fields are given in equation (vii). We also introduce the bilinear and linear forms

$$\begin{aligned}
 a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) &:= (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}), \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{v}))_{\Omega}, \\
 l(t)(\mathbf{v}) &:= (\mathbf{f}(t), \mathbf{v})_{\Omega} + (\mathbf{f}_N(t), \mathbf{v})_{\Gamma_N},
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where the notation  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_{\Omega} := \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\Omega$  and  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_{\Gamma_F} := \int_{\Gamma_F} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\Gamma$  are the  $L^2$ -products defined on  $\Omega$  and  $\Gamma_F$  respectively, with  $\Gamma_F \in \{\partial\Omega, \Gamma_D, \Gamma_N, \Gamma_C\}$ . The associated norms are denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_{\Omega} := (\cdot, \cdot)_{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\Gamma_F} := (\cdot, \cdot)_{\Gamma_F}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

The total mechanical energy associated with the solution  $\mathbf{u}$  of dynamic Signorini Problem (1) is:

$$E(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{2} a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}), \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (3)$$

Moreover, with the persistency condition [7, 48, 57]  $(\sigma(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n}) \cdot \dot{\mathbf{u}} = 0$  on  $\Gamma_C$ , and when  $l(t)$  vanishes, the energy is conserved:

$$\frac{d}{dt} E(t) = 0.$$

## 2.1 Space discretization and enforcement of contact conditions

Let  $\mathbf{V}^h$  be the Lagrange finite element space to discretize the displacement, of degree one or two ( $k = 1$  or  $2$ ), and based on a mesh  $\mathcal{T}^h$  of the domain  $\Omega$ :

$$\mathbf{V}^h := \left\{ \mathbf{v}^h \in (\mathcal{C}^0(\bar{\Omega}))^d : \mathbf{v}|_{\Gamma_D} = \mathbf{0}; \mathbf{v}|_T = \mathbb{P}_k(T), \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}^h \right\}. \quad (4)$$

The enforcement of contact conditions is introduced at the semi-discrete level (semi-discretization in space). We focus on the symmetric Nitsche approximation of contact and follow [32]. We define the space-discrete weak formulation of the Nitsche-FEM method. First, we introduce the linear discrete operator

$$P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N} : \begin{array}{ll} \mathbf{V}^h & \rightarrow L^2(\Gamma_C) \\ \mathbf{v}^h & \mapsto \Theta_N \sigma_n(\mathbf{v}^h) - \gamma_N v_n^h \end{array}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\Theta_N \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$  is a fixed parameter and  $\gamma_N$  is a positive function independent of  $\mathbf{v}$ , such that

$$\gamma_N|_{T \cap \Gamma_C} = \frac{\gamma_0}{h_T}, \quad (6)$$

so for each triangle  $T$  intersected with  $\Gamma_C$ , where  $h_T$  is the diameter of the triangle  $T$  and  $\gamma_0$  is a positive constant (the Nitsche parameter). The primal discrete problem is as follows:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Seek } \mathbf{u}^h : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbf{V}^h, \text{ s.t.} \\ \left( \rho \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h(t), \mathbf{v}^h \right)_{\Omega} + a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(t), \mathbf{v}^h) + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P_{1, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(t))]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} = l(t)(\mathbf{v}), \quad \forall \mathbf{v}^h \in \mathbf{V}^h, \end{array} \right. \quad (7)$$

where  $a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{v}^h) := a(\mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{v}^h) - \left( \frac{\Theta_N}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n(u^h), \sigma_n(v^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C}$ . The notations  $[\cdot]_{\mathbb{R}^-} := \min(0, \cdot)$  and  $[\cdot]_{\mathbb{R}^+} := \max(0, \cdot)$  denote the projection on the half-line formed by negative or positive real numbers. Also, in static (or when  $\rho = 0$ ), it is convergent and well-posed for  $\gamma_0$  large enough. Subsequently, by using Riesz's representation theorem, the mass operator  $\mathbf{M} : \mathbf{V}^h \rightarrow \mathbf{V}^h$  and the nonlinear operator  $\mathbf{B}_N : \mathbf{V}^h \rightarrow \mathbf{V}^h$  are defined such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{v}^h), \mathbf{w}^h)_{\Omega} &= (\rho \mathbf{v}^h, \mathbf{w}^h)_{\Omega}, \quad \forall \mathbf{w}^h \in \mathbf{V}^h, \\ (\mathbf{B}_N(\mathbf{v}^h), \mathbf{w}^h) &= a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h, \mathbf{w}^h) + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P_{1, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{w}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C}, \quad \forall \mathbf{w}^h \in \mathbf{V}^h. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The vector  $\mathbf{L}(t) \in \mathbf{V}^h$  is then defined such that

$$(\mathbf{L}(t), \mathbf{w}^h)_{\Omega} = l(t)(\mathbf{w}^h), \quad \forall \mathbf{w}^h \in \mathbf{V}^h. \quad (9)$$

Then, the compact form of (7) is

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Seek } \mathbf{u}^h : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbf{V}^h, \text{ s.t.} \\ \mathbf{M}(\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h(t)) + \mathbf{B}_N(\mathbf{u}^h(t)) = \mathbf{L}(t), \\ \mathbf{u}^h(0) = \mathbf{u}_0^h, \quad \dot{\mathbf{u}}^h(0) = \dot{\mathbf{u}}_0^h, \end{array} \right. \quad (10)$$

which is a system of Lipschitz differential equations and its well-posedness has been proven in [29]. Note that, though the standard convergence analysis in the static case requires, for technical reasons, extra regularity assumptions [31], there is no extra regularity required to write a Nitsche method (and the assumptions in [31] can be weakened in fact, see [42, 46]).

## 2.2 Preliminary results

The following two properties are classical for the negative part:

$$[a]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \leq a, \quad a[a]_{\mathbb{R}^-} = [a]_{\mathbb{R}^-}^2, \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (11)$$

$$([a]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [b]_{\mathbb{R}^-})(a - b) \geq ([a]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [b]_{\mathbb{R}^-})^2 \geq 0, \quad \forall a, b \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (12)$$

The following lemma is helpful as an intermediate result.

**Lemma 2.1.** For  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ , the following inequality holds:

$$0 \leq -[a]_{\mathbb{R}^+}[b]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \leq \frac{1}{4}(a-b)^2. \quad (13)$$

*Proof.* When  $a \leq 0$  or  $b \geq 0$ , we have  $-[a]_{\mathbb{R}^+}[b]_{\mathbb{R}^-} = 0 \leq 1/4(a-b)^2$ . For the case  $a > 0$  and  $b < 0$ , it leads to  $-[a]_{\mathbb{R}^+}[b]_{\mathbb{R}^-} = |a| \cdot |b| > 0$ . With the relation

$$(|a| + |b|)^2 - 4|a| \cdot |b| = (|a| - |b|)^2 \geq 0, \quad (14)$$

we can conclude that for this case:

$$-[a]_{\mathbb{R}^+}[b]_{\mathbb{R}^-} = |a| \cdot |b| \leq \frac{1}{4}(|a| + |b|)^2 = \frac{1}{4}(a-b)^2. \quad (15)$$

□

Another useful property is the following:

**Lemma 2.2.** For  $a : t \mapsto a(t)$  a differentiable function the following equality holds:

$$[a]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \frac{d[a]_{\mathbb{R}^-}}{dt} = [a]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \frac{da}{dt}. \quad (16)$$

*Proof.* First if  $a(t) = 0$ , then the equality 16 holds. Suppose that  $a(t) \neq 0$ . We introduce  $H(\cdot)$  the Heaviside function: for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$H(x) = 0 \text{ if } x < 0, \quad H(x) = 1 \text{ if } x \geq 0.$$

Since  $[a(t)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} = H(-a(t))a(t)$ , we use the chain rule and there holds

$$[a(t)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \frac{d[a]_{\mathbb{R}^-}}{dt}(t) = [a(t)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \frac{d}{dt}(H(-a(t))a(t)) = [a(t)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \left( H(-a(t)) \frac{da}{dt}(t) + a(t) \frac{dH(-a)}{dt}(t) \right). \quad (17)$$

We finally use the properties  $dH(-a)/dt = 0$  and  $[a]_{\mathbb{R}^-} H(-a) = [a]_{\mathbb{R}^-}$ :

$$[a(t)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \frac{d[a]_{\mathbb{R}^-}}{dt}(t) = [a(t)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} H(-a(t)) \frac{da}{dt}(t) = [a(t)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \frac{da}{dt}(t). \quad (18)$$

This ends the proof. □

We need the following inequalities for the space discretization. The first discrete trace inequality has been proven in [31] (see alternatively [68, Lemma 2.1] for the scalar case).

**Lemma 2.3** (First discrete trace inequality). *There exists  $C_{tr} > 0$ , independent of the parameter  $\gamma_0$  and of the mesh size  $h$ , such that:*

$$\left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n(\mathbf{v}^h) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \leq C_{tr} \gamma_0^{-1} \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}^h \in \mathbf{V}^h. \quad (19)$$

The inverse inequality below is proven for instance in [41, Cor. 1.141, Rm. 1.143, P. 76-77].

**Lemma 2.4** (Inverse inequality). *Suppose that the mesh  $\mathcal{T}^h$  is quasi-uniform, then there exists  $C_{inv} > 0$  independent of the mesh size  $h$ , such that:*

$$\|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C_{inv} h^{-1} \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{\Omega}, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}^h \in \mathbf{V}^h. \quad (20)$$

We finally prove a second discrete trace inequality.

**Lemma 2.5** (Second discrete trace inequality). *Suppose that the mesh  $\mathcal{T}^h$  is quasi-uniform, then there exists  $C > 0$ , independent of  $\gamma_0$  and  $h$ , such that:*

$$\left\| \gamma_N^{\frac{1}{2}} v_n^h \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \leq C \frac{\gamma_0}{h^2} \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{\Omega}^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}^h \in \mathbf{V}^h, \quad (21)$$

and that:

$$\left\| \gamma_N^{\frac{1}{2}} v_n^h \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \leq C \frac{\gamma_0}{h} \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}^h \in \mathbf{V}^h. \quad (22)$$

*Proof.* We use [15, Thm. 1.6.6] and inverse inequality (20) to have the first inequality:

$$\left\| \gamma_N^{\frac{1}{2}} v_n^h \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \leq \frac{\gamma_0}{h} \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{\partial\Omega}^2 \leq C \frac{\gamma_0}{h} \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{\Omega} \leq C \frac{\gamma_0}{h^2} \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{\Omega}^2. \quad (23)$$

Moreover, we use the relation  $\|\cdot\|_{\Omega} \leq \|\cdot\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$  to prove the second inequality

$$C \frac{\gamma_0}{h} \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{\Omega} \leq C \frac{\gamma_0}{h} \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2. \quad (24)$$

□

We can also bound the operator  $P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}$  as follows.

**Lemma 2.6** (Bounds on the operator  $P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}$ ). *Suppose that the mesh  $\mathcal{T}^h$  is quasi-uniform, and that  $\gamma_0$  is large enough, then there exists  $C > 0$ , independent of  $\gamma_0$  and  $h$ , such that:*

$$\left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \leq C \frac{\gamma_0}{h^2} \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{\Omega}^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}^h \in \mathbf{V}^h, \quad (25)$$

and that:

$$\left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \leq C \frac{\gamma_0}{h} \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}^h \in \mathbf{V}^h. \quad (26)$$

*Proof.* We start with the triangular inequality:

$$\left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \leq 2 \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n(\mathbf{v}^h) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + 2 \left\| \gamma_N^{\frac{1}{2}} v_n^h \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2,$$

then we use the first and second discrete trace inequalities (2.3), (2.5), and the fact that  $\gamma_0$  is large enough, to conclude the proof.  $\square$

We finally have the coercivity of the bilinear form  $a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}$ :

**Lemma 2.7** (Coercivity of the bilinear form  $a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}$ ). *Suppose that the mesh  $\mathcal{T}^h$  is quasi-uniform then there exists  $C > 0$ , independent of  $h$ , such that:*

$$a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h, \mathbf{v}^h) \geq (C_a - \Theta_N C_{tr} \gamma_0^{-1}) \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}^h \in \mathbf{V}^h. \quad (27)$$

Moreover, for  $\gamma_0$  large enough if  $\Theta_N = 1$  or  $\gamma_0 > 0$  if  $\Theta_N = 0$  or  $\Theta_N = -1$ , then there exists  $C > 0$ , independent of  $h$  (and also independent of  $\gamma_0$  for  $\Theta_N = 0$  or  $\Theta_N = -1$ ).

$$a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h, \mathbf{v}^h) \geq C \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}^h \in \mathbf{V}^h. \quad (28)$$

*Proof.* Since the operator  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$  is coercive (i.e.,  $\exists C_a \geq 0$ , s.t.  $a(\mathbf{v}^h, \mathbf{v}^h) > C_a \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2$ , for all  $\mathbf{v}^h \in \mathbf{V}^h$ ), using the definition of  $a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}$  and the first discrete trace inequality (19), we have

$$a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h, \mathbf{v}^h) = a(\mathbf{v}^h, \mathbf{v}^h) - \Theta_N \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n(\mathbf{v}^h) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \geq (C_a - \Theta_N C_{tr} \gamma_0^{-1}) \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2, \quad (29)$$

Hence, for  $\gamma_0$  large enough, i.e.,  $\gamma_0 > \Theta_N C_{tr} C_a^{-1}$ , we have  $C_a - \Theta_N C_{tr} \gamma_0^{-1} > 0$ .  $\square$

### 2.3 Discrete energy notations

Let us define the discrete energy as follows:

$$E^h(t) := \frac{1}{2} \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^h(t) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{2} a(\mathbf{u}^h(t), \mathbf{u}^h(t)), \quad (30)$$

which is associated to the solution  $\mathbf{u}^h(t)$  of Problem (7). Note that this is the direct transposition of the mechanical energy  $E(t)$  of the continuous system. Set also

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\Theta_N}^h(t) &:= E^h(t) - \frac{\Theta_N}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(t)) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \frac{\Theta_N}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P_{1, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(t))]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\ &:= E^h(t) - \Theta_N R^h(t), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

which corresponds to a modified energy (also called augmented energy) in which a consistent term is added. This term denoted  $R_N^h(t)$  represents, roughly speaking, the nonfulfillment of the contact condition (1)-(v) by  $\mathbf{u}^h(t)$  [25, 29]. When  $l(t) = 0$  and  $\Theta_N = 1$ , we can prove that this modified energy is conserved:  $E_{\Theta_N}^h(t) = E_{\Theta_N}^h(0)$ , see, e.g., [29, Theorem 2.10, Corollary 2.11].

**Remark** (modified energy as an energy). *The aforementioned energy  $E_{\Theta_N}^h(t)$  is positive for  $\gamma_0$  large enough, by direct application of the discrete trace inequality (19). For an arbitrary value of  $\gamma_0$ , there is no guarantee this energy remains positive. See [33, Proposition 8] for more details.*

The BFF (Burman-Fernández-Frei) energy is a non-negative energy, irrespectively of the value of the Nitsche parameter  $\gamma_0$  and even for small values of this parameter. It has been recently introduced by E. Burman, M. Fernández and S. Frei in [17] for Nitsche-based fluid-structure-contact interaction problems. The BFF energy is defined as follows:

$$E_{BFF}^h(t) := E^h(t) + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2. \quad (32)$$

We observe that this energy is also augmented with a consistent term. We expect that these supplementary terms vanish under mesh refinement. This can be proven in the static case when the solution is regular enough (in  $H^s(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $s > 3/2$ ). In the dynamic case, and from the theoretical viewpoint, we do not know if this property still holds and under which assumption on the solution. However, in practice, we can at least observe these supplementary terms are small (see the numerical section below).

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let  $\mathbf{u}$  be a solution of Problem 7 with  $l(t) = 0$ ,  $\Theta_N = 1$ , and assume that  $\gamma_0 \geq 4C_{tr}C_a^{-1}$ , then the BFF energy remains bounded for  $t \in (0, T)$ :*

$$\frac{1}{2} E_{BFF}^h(t) \leq E_{BFF}^h(0) + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(0)), ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(0))]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(0))) \right)_{\Gamma_C}. \quad (33)$$

*Proof.* We adapt the proof of [17] to our problem where there is no fluid. Firstly using the definition of  $P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}$  multiple times and  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \|a\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 = 2(a, \dot{a})_{\Gamma_C}$ , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} - \left( \frac{\Theta_N}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h), \sigma_n(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\ &= \left( \frac{\Theta_N}{\gamma_N} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)), \sigma_n(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \gamma_N \dot{\mathbf{u}}^h \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\ &= \left( \frac{\Theta_N}{\gamma_N} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)), \sigma_n(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{1,\gamma_N}(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) - \sigma_n(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\ &= \left( \frac{\Theta_N}{\gamma_N} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)), \sigma_n(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \partial_t(P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h) - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\ &= \left( \frac{\Theta_N}{\gamma_N} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)), \sigma_n(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \partial_t([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\ &= \left( \frac{\Theta_N}{\gamma_N} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)), \sigma_n(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\ &\quad + (\sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h), \partial_t([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)))_{\Gamma_C} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h), [P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{\Theta_N - 1}{\gamma_N} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)), \sigma_n(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where Lemma 2.2 has been used in the fifth line.

Secondly, testing (7) with  $\mathbf{v}^h = \dot{\mathbf{u}}^h$ , integrating in time on  $(0, t) \subset (0, T]$  and using previous equality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_0^t (\rho \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h, \dot{\mathbf{u}}^h)_{\Omega} dt + \int_0^t a(\mathbf{u}^h, \dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) dt - \int_0^t \left( \frac{\Theta_N}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h), \sigma_n(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^h \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \right]_0^t + \frac{1}{2} [a(\mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{u}^h)]_0^t - \int_0^t \left( \frac{\Theta_N}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h), \sigma_n(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^h \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \right]_0^t + \frac{1}{2} [a(\mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{u}^h)]_0^t + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \right]_0^t \\ &\quad + \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h), ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \right]_0^t \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left( \frac{\Theta_N - 1}{\gamma_N} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h)), \sigma_n(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

For the symmetric version ( $\Theta_N = 1$ ), the last term vanished and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{BFF}^h(t) &= E_{BFF}^h(0) + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(0)), ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(0))]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(0))) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\ &\quad - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(t)), ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(t))]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(t))) \right)_{\Gamma_C}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the Young's inequality, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(t)), ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(t))]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(t))) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \right| \\ &\leq \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(t)) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \frac{1}{4} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(t))]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(t))) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Using the first discrete trace inequality (19), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{BFF}^h(t) &\leq E_{BFF}^h(0) + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(0)), ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(0))]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(0))) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\ &\quad + C_{tr} \gamma_0^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}^h(t)\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{4} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(t))]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(t))) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

From the definition of the BFF energy, the coercivity of the bilinear form  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$  and under the assumption that  $\gamma_0 \geq 4C_{tr}C_a^{-1}$ , the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} 2E_{BFF}^h(t) &= a(\mathbf{u}^h(t), \mathbf{u}^h(t)) + \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^h(t) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(t))]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(t))) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\ &\geq a(\mathbf{u}^h(t), \mathbf{u}^h(t)) + \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(t))]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(t))) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\ &\geq C_a \|\mathbf{u}^h(t)\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(t))]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(t))) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\ &\geq 4C_{tr} \gamma_0^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}^h(t)\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(t))]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(t))) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Combining (38) and (39), we have

$$\frac{1}{2} E_{BFF}^h(t) \leq E_{BFF}^h(0) + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(0)), ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h(0))]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h(0))) \right)_{\Gamma_C}. \quad (40)$$

The right hand-side terms depends only on the initial condition and thus, the BFF energy  $E_{BFF}^h(t)$  remains bounded.  $\square$

### 3 Time discretization

In this work, we focus on two time-marching schemes: the  $\theta$ -scheme and the Newmark scheme. Let  $\Delta t > 0$  be the time-step and consider a uniform discretization of the time interval  $[0, T] : (t^0, \dots, t^N)$ , with  $t^n = n\Delta t, n = 0, \dots, N$ . The schemes consist of solving a nonlinear problem for each time instant  $t^{n+1}$  using the displacement  $\mathbf{u}^{h,n}$ , velocity  $\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}$ , and acceleration  $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}$  of instant  $t^n$  as known variables, where  $\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1}$ ,  $\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1}$ , and  $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1}$  are the displacement, velocity, and acceleration to be solved, and  $\mathbf{L}^{n+1} = \mathbf{L}(t^{n+1})$ . The initial conditions are  $\mathbf{u}^{h,0} = \mathbf{u}_0^h$ ,  $\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,0} = \dot{\mathbf{u}}_0^h$ ,  $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,0} = \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_0^h$ . We note that the initial acceleration is calculated by the relation  $\mathbf{M}\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,0} + \mathbf{B}_N(\mathbf{u}^{h,0}) = \mathbf{L}^0$ .

#### 3.1 $\theta$ -scheme

The fully discrete formulation for Problem (7) is such that:

$$\begin{cases} \text{Seek } \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1}, \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1}, \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} \in \mathbf{V}^h \text{ s.t.} \\ \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} = \mathbf{u}^{h,n} + \Delta t((1-\theta)\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} + \theta\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1}), & \text{(i)} \\ \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} = \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} + \Delta t((1-\theta)\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} + \theta\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1}), & \text{(ii)} \\ \mathbf{M}\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} + \mathbf{B}_N(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1}) = \mathbf{L}^{n+1}. & \text{(iii)} \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

with the parameter  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ . The two classical schemes are forward, respectively backward, Euler schemes for value  $\theta = 0$ , respectively  $\theta = 1$ . We recall that  $\Theta_N$  is the parameter for the Nitsche's variant.



### 3.2 Newmark scheme

The Newmark scheme [61] is another classical scheme for elastodynamic problems. Its fully discrete formulation reads:

$$\begin{cases} \text{Seek } \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1}, \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1}, \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} \in \mathbf{V}^h \text{ s.t.} \\ \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} = \mathbf{u}^{h,n} + \Delta t \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} + \frac{\Delta t^2}{2} ((1-2\beta)\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} + 2\beta\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1}), & \text{(i)} \\ \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} = \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} + \Delta t ((1-\zeta)\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} + \zeta\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1}). & \text{(ii)} \\ \mathbf{M}\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} + \mathbf{B}_N(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1}) = \mathbf{L}^{n+1}. & \text{(iii)} \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

The parameters  $(\beta, \zeta)$  determine the numerical performance of the method, including the stability, accuracy, and damping properties.  $\beta = 0, \zeta = \frac{1}{2}$  yields an explicit central difference scheme; Crank-Nicolson scheme is obtained by taking  $\beta = \frac{1}{4}, \zeta = \frac{1}{2}$  (which is equivalent to  $\theta$ -scheme with  $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ ). The parameters  $(\beta, \zeta)$  are used here. The Crank-Nicolson scheme is unconditionally stable and has a second-order accuracy for linear elastodynamic (without contact conditions). However, in the presence of contact, it can be more complicated and can introduce additional oscillations and numerical energy [30]. The Newmark scheme could be seen as the case of  $\alpha = 0$  for the HHT- $\alpha$  scheme (Hilber-Hughes-Taylor- $\alpha$  scheme).

The well-posedness of Problem (41) ( $\theta$ -scheme), respectively Problem (42) (Newmark scheme), has been proven in [29] under the condition  $(1 + \Theta_N)^2 \gamma_0^{-1} \leq C_{wp} \left(1 + \frac{\rho h^2}{\theta^2 \Delta t^2}\right)$  with  $C_{wp}$  a positive constant, respectively  $(1 + \Theta_N)^2 \gamma_0^{-1} \leq C_{wp} \left(1 + \frac{\rho h^2}{\beta \Delta t^2}\right)$ .

**Remark.** In the literature of the Newmark scheme, most of the time, the parameters used are  $(\beta, \gamma)$ , but to avoid confusion with Nitsche's parameter  $\gamma_N$ ,  $\gamma$  is replaced by  $\zeta$  here.

## 4 Energy estimates and stability

The mechanical energy  $E(t)$  is conserved for a zero external force (for continuous case only). However, this property no longer holds for the fully discrete formulations (41) and (42). Let us define the fully discrete mechanical energy associated with the solution  $\mathbf{u}^{h,n}$ :

$$E^{h,n} := \frac{1}{2} \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{2} a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n}), \quad (43)$$

the fully discrete modified energy:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n} &:= E^{h,n} - \frac{\Theta_N}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \right\|_{0,\Gamma_C}^2 + \frac{\Theta_N}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n})]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{0,\Gamma_C}^2 = E^{h,n} - \Theta_N R^{h,n} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{2} a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \frac{\Theta_N}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n})]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{0,\Gamma_C}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

and the fully discrete counterpart of the BFF energy:

$$E_{BFF}^{h,n} := E^{h,n} + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n})]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^{h,n})) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2. \quad (45)$$

Note that these energies  $E^{h,n}$ ,  $E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n}$  and  $E_{BFF}^{h,n}$  are the fully discrete version of the energies introduced in Sec. 3. The evolution of the modified energy for the  $\theta$ -scheme (and Newmark scheme) and its unconditional stability for  $\theta = 1$  (and  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\zeta = 1$ , respectively) has been proven in [30]. Here, we complete the analysis of the evolution of the BFF energy.

### 4.1 Properties of discrete acceleration

In order to simplify the notations, the following conventions are used:  $P^n = P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n})$ ,  $\sigma_n^n = \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^{h,n})$  for all  $n \geq 0$ . The following two Lemma will be used for the analysis of the boundedness of the discrete energies.

**Lemma 4.1.** Assume that the mesh  $\mathcal{T}^h$  is quasi-uniform and  $\mathbf{u}^h$  is the solution of Problem (7), then there exists  $C$  independent of  $\gamma_0$ ,  $h$  and  $\Delta t$ , such that the following inequality holds:

$$\left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h \right\|_{\Omega} \leq C \frac{\gamma_0}{h^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left\| \mathbf{u}^h \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \quad (46)$$

*Proof.* This proof is a rearranging of [33, Prop. 15 and 21]. Taking  $\mathbf{v}^h = \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h$  in (7), we have:

$$\left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h \right\|_{\Omega}^2 = -a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h, \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h) - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P_{1,\gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C}. \quad (47)$$

Then, we use the continuity of  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ , the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the first discrete trace inequality (19), and the inverse inequality (20) to bound the first term:

$$\begin{aligned}
|a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h, \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h)| &\leq |a(\mathbf{u}^h, \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h)| + |\Theta_N| \left| (\gamma_N^{-1} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h), \sigma_n(\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h)) \right|_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\leq C \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + |\Theta_N| \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^h) \right\|_{\Gamma_C} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n(\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right\|_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\leq Ch^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h\|_{\Omega} + |\Theta_N| C_{tr} \gamma_0^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\
&\leq Ch^{-1} (1 + \gamma_0^{-1}) \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h\|_{\Omega}.
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Similarly, for the second term, we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the boundedness of the operator  $P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}$  (25) - (26):

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P_{1, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right) \right|_{\Gamma_C} &\leq \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P_{1, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h)]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right\|_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\leq \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_{1, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^h) \right\|_{\Gamma_C} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h) \right\|_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\leq C \frac{\gamma_0}{h^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h\|_{\Omega}.
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

We combine the previous inequalities to deduce the following one:

$$\rho \|\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h\|_{\Omega}^2 \leq C \left( h^{-1} + \gamma_0^{-1} h^{-1} + \gamma_0 h^{-\frac{3}{2}} \right) \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h\|_{\Omega} \leq C \frac{\gamma_0}{h^{\frac{3}{2}}} \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^h\|_{\Omega}. \tag{50}$$

where we have used that  $\gamma_0$  is large enough.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** Assume that the mesh  $\mathcal{T}^h$  is quasi-uniform and  $0 \leq n < N$ ,  $\mathbf{u}^{h,n}$  is the solution of (41)-(iii) or (42)-(iii), then there exists  $C$  independent of  $\gamma_0$ ,  $h$  and  $\Delta t$ , such that the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega} \\
&\leq \frac{C}{h} \left( (1 + \gamma_0^{-1}) \|\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \gamma_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Taking  $\mathbf{v}^h = \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}$  in (41)-(iii) or (42)-(iii):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \\
&= -a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1}, \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad + a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\leq |a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n})| \\
&\quad + \left| \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right) \right|_{\Gamma_C}.
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Proceed as in the previous Lemma (4.1), we have :

$$|a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n})| \leq Ch^{-1} (1 + \gamma_0^{-1}) \|\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}\|_{\Omega}, \tag{52}$$

and we continue with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the boundedness of the operator (25):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right) \right|_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\leq C \frac{\gamma_0}{h} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C} \|\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}\|_{\Omega}.
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Combining these two terms concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 4.2 Stability of $\theta$ -scheme

The evolution of the modified energy for the  $\theta$ -scheme and its unconditional stability for  $\theta = 1$  has been proven in [30]. We complete here the study of the conditional boundedness of the modified energy in the case  $\theta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ .

**Proposition 4.3** (Boundedness of the modified energy for  $\theta$ -scheme). *Suppose that  $\mathbf{L}^n = \mathbf{0}, 0 < n \leq N$ ,  $\Theta_N = 1$ ,  $\theta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ , and  $\gamma_0$  large enough such that the following condition holds*

$$0 < C \frac{(1-\theta)\theta^4}{\theta - \frac{1}{2}} \frac{\Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \leq \gamma_0^{-2} \leq C_{wp}^2 \left(1 + \frac{\rho h^2}{\Delta t^2}\right)^2, \quad (54)$$

with  $C > 0$  independent of  $\theta$ ,  $\gamma_0$ ,  $h$  and  $\Delta t$ . Then, the modified energy  $E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n}$  remains bounded, i.e., for all  $0 \leq n < N$  such that

$$E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n+1} \leq \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{C(\theta - \frac{1}{2})(1-\theta)}{\theta^4}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{(\theta - \frac{1}{2})(1-\theta)^3}{C} \frac{\gamma_0}{h}}\right)\right) E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n}. \quad (55)$$

*Proof.* According to (41), we have

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} + \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} = \frac{2}{\Delta t} (\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + (1-2\theta)(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}), \quad (56)$$

and

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} = \theta \Delta t \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} + (1-\theta) \Delta t \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}. \quad (57)$$

Firstly, using the definition of  $E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n}$  and (56), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n+1} - E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\rho(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}), \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} + \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n})_{\Omega} + \frac{1}{2} a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} + \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\Delta t} (\rho(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}), \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n})_{\Omega} + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \theta\right) \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} + \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Then, we use (57) with (41)-(iii) and  $P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^{h,n}) = P^n$  for  $\Theta_N = 1$ , to have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\rho(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}), \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n})_{\Omega} \\ &= \theta (\rho(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}), \Delta t \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1})_{\Omega} + (1-\theta) (\rho(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}), \Delta t \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n})_{\Omega} \\ &= -\Delta t \theta \left( a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P^{n+1} - P^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} \right) \\ & \quad - \Delta t (1-\theta) \left( a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P^{n+1} - P^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n+1} - E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n} \\
&= -\theta \left( a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P^{n+1} - P^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} \right) \\
&\quad - (1-\theta) \left( a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P^{n+1} - P^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} \right) \\
&\quad + \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta \right) \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} + \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta \right) \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \right) \\
&\quad - \theta \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), P^{n+1} - P^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P^{n+1} - P^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Since, we have  $P^n [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} = [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}^2$ ,  $P^n = [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} + [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^+}$ , and  $[P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^+} = 0$ , we get finally

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n+1} - E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n} \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta \right) \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \right) \\
&\quad - \theta \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \theta \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^+} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad - \theta \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right)_{\Gamma_C} - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta \right) \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\theta \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^+} \right)_{\Gamma_C}}_{\leq 0} + (\theta - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right)_{\Gamma_C}.
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

The last term is bounded using the inequality (13), the boundedness of operator  $P$  (Lemma 2.6) and the definition of the  $\theta$ -scheme (41)

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\theta - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\leq \frac{(1-\theta)}{4} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (P^{n+1} - P^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
&\leq C(1-\theta) \frac{\gamma_0}{h^2} \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \\
&= C(1-\theta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{h^2} \left\| \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} + \Delta t \theta (1-\theta) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} + \Delta t \theta^2 (\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \\
&\leq C(1-\theta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{h^2} \left( \left\| \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \Delta t^2 \theta^2 (1-\theta)^2 \left\| \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \Delta t^2 \theta^4 \left\| \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Now, using Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2 and the triangular inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\theta - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
& \leq C(1 - \theta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{h^2} \left( \|\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2 \theta^2 (1 - \theta)^2}{\rho^2 h^3} \|\mathbf{u}^{h,n}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + C(1 - \theta) \theta^4 \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \left( (1 + \gamma_0^{-1})^2 \|\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \gamma_0 \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

Hence, using previous inequality, Lemma (2.7) and condition (54) for  $\gamma_0$  large enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n+1} - E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n} \\
& \leq \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta \right) \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \\
& \quad + C(1 - \theta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{h^2} \left( \|\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2 \theta^2 (1 - \theta)^2}{\rho^2 h^3} \|\mathbf{u}^{h,n}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + \left( \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta \right) + C \gamma_0^2 (1 - \theta) \theta^4 \frac{\Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
& \quad + \gamma_0^{-1} \left( \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta \right) (C_a \gamma_0 - C_{tr}) + C(1 + \gamma_0^{-1})^2 \gamma_0^2 (1 - \theta) \theta^4 \frac{\Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \right) \|\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \leq C(1 - \theta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2 \theta^2 (1 - \theta)^2}{\rho h^3} \|\mathbf{u}^{h,n}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

Then, the modified energy is bounded using its definition

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n+1} & \leq E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n} + C(1 - \theta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \theta^2 (1 - \theta)^2 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^3} \|\mathbf{u}^{h,n}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \leq \left( 1 + C(1 - \theta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \theta^2 (1 - \theta)^2 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^3} \right) \right) E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n},
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

we conclude the proof using again (54) □

**Remark.** The left part of the condition (54) can be seen as a CFL condition since it implies an upper bound to  $\frac{\Delta t}{\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} h}$ . The right part is the well-posedness condition.

**Remark** (Unconditional stability). From (55), we conclude that we have no unconditional stability except for  $\theta = 1$  (see above Corollary) however taking  $\gamma_0$  small enough limits the augmentation of the modified energy between two time-steps (though it needs to be large enough to ensure well-posedness).

**Remark** ( $h$ -dependency). The constant in (55) depends on  $h$ , hence the time discretization error is influenced by the space discretization. This dependency comes from Lemma 4.1 which has a factor  $h^{\frac{3}{2}}$ . This is suboptimal and improving this result remains an open question.

The unconditional stability of the backward Euler scheme ( $\theta$ -scheme with  $\theta = 1$ ) proven in [30] is recovered here

**Corollary 4.4** (Unconditional stability of backward Euler scheme). Assume that  $\mathbf{L}^n = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $0 \leq n < N$ , and  $\gamma_0$  is large enough (to ensure well-posedness). Then, with  $\theta = 1$  and  $\Theta_N = 1$ , the solution of Problem (41) is unconditionally stable in the sense of the modified energy, i.e.,

$$E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n+1} - E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n} \leq 0, \quad \forall n > 0. \tag{66}$$

*Proof.* It follows directly from

$$\left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{C(\theta - \frac{1}{2})(1 - \theta)}{\theta^4}} \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{(\theta - \frac{1}{2})(1 - \theta)^3}{C}} \frac{\gamma_0}{h} \right) \right) = 1 \tag{67}$$

□

Then, we state the evolution of the BFF energy for  $\theta$ -scheme.

**Proposition 4.5** (Evolution of the BFF energy for  $\theta$ -scheme). *Suppose that  $\mathbf{L}^n = \mathbf{0}$  and that Problem (41) is well-posed. The following identity holds for all  $n \geq 0$ :*

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} - E_{BFF}^{h,n} \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta \right) \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \right) \\
&+ \left( \frac{1}{2} + \Theta_N \theta \right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + (\Theta_N + 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n^n, (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&+ (1 - \Theta_N) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} (\theta [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} + (1 - \theta) [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&+ \theta \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^+} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + (\theta - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&- \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^{n+1} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^n \right)_{\Gamma_C}.
\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

*Proof.* The definition of  $E_{BFF}^{h,n}$  gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} - E_{BFF}^{h,n} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} (\rho (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} + \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}), \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n})_{\Omega} + \frac{1}{2} a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} + \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n^{n+1}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Then, we use (56), (57), and the fact that  $P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h) = P_{1, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h) + (\Theta_N - 1)\sigma_n(\mathbf{v}^h)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} - E_{BFF}^{h,n} \\
&= \frac{1}{\Delta t} (\rho (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}), \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n})_{\Omega} + \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta \right) \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} + \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^{n+1} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^n \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
&- \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^{n+1} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta \right) \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \right) \\
&+ \Theta_N \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} (\theta \sigma_n^{n+1} + (1 - \theta) \sigma_n^n), (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^{n+1} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^n \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
&- \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} (\theta [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} + (1 - \theta) [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^{n+1} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta \right) \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \right) \\
&+ \left( \frac{1}{2} + \Theta_N \theta \right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + (\Theta_N + 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n^n, (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&- (1 - \Theta_N) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} (\theta [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} + (1 - \theta) [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&+ \theta \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^+} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + (\theta - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&- \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^{n+1} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^n \right)_{\Gamma_C}.
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

□

For the symmetric Nitsche's method ( $\Theta_N = 1$ ), we state a boundedness result for the  $\theta$ -scheme.

**Proposition 4.6** (Boundedness of the BFF energy for  $\theta$ -scheme). *Suppose that  $\mathbf{L}^n = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $0 \leq n < N$ ,  $\Theta_N = 1$ ,  $\theta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ , and  $\gamma_0$  large enough such that the following condition holds*

$$0 < C \frac{2(1-\theta)\theta^4}{\theta - \frac{1}{2}} \frac{\Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \leq \gamma_0^{-2} \leq C_{wp}^2 \left(1 + \frac{\rho h^2}{\Delta t^2}\right)^2, \quad (71)$$

with  $C > 0$  independent of  $\theta$ ,  $\Theta_N$ ,  $\gamma_0$ ,  $h$  and  $\Delta t$ . Then,  $E_{BFF}^h$  remains bounded, i.e., for all  $0 \leq n < N$ ,

$$E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} \leq \left(1 + C \left(1 + \left(\frac{\theta + \frac{3}{2}}{2\theta - 1}\right) \gamma_0^{-1} + \sqrt{\frac{(\theta - \frac{1}{2})(1-\theta)}{2C\theta^4}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{(\theta - \frac{1}{2})(1-\theta)^3}{2C}} \frac{\gamma_0}{h}\right)\right)\right) E_{BFF}^{h,n}. \quad (72)$$

*Proof.* In what follows, we denote  $C > 0$  a generic constant that can change at each occurrence. According to Prop. 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} - E_{BFF}^{h,n} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \theta\right) \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \right) \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{2} + \theta\right) \left( \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \theta \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^+} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + (\theta - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \right. \\ &+ 2 \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n^n, (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^{n+1} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \theta\right) \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \right) \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{2} + \theta\right) \left( \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + (\theta - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \right. \\ &- \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n^n, ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right)_{\Gamma_C}}_{I_1} - \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C}}_{I_2} \\ &- \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} ([P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n^n), (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C}}_{I_3} + \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n^n, (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C}}_{I_4}. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

where we have used that  $\theta \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^+} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \geq 0$ . Then, we use Young's inequality to bound the module of the last four terms, with positive constants  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| &\leq \frac{C_1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^n \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \frac{1}{2C_1} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\ |I_2| &\leq \frac{C_2}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \frac{1}{2C_2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2, \\ |I_3| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2, \\ |I_4| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^n \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Then, we continue with the inequality (13), the boundedness of operator  $P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}$  (Lemma 2.6), the definition of the  $\theta$ -scheme (41) and the triangular inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\theta - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\ &\leq \frac{(1-\theta)}{4} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (P^{n+1} - P^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\ &\leq C(1-\theta) \frac{\gamma_0}{h^2} \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \\ &= C(1-\theta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{h^2} \left\| \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} + \Delta t \theta (1-\theta) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} + \Delta t \theta^2 (\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \\ &\leq C(1-\theta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{h^2} \left( \left\| \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \Delta t^2 \theta^2 (1-\theta)^2 \left\| \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \Delta t^2 \theta^4 \left\| \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

Now, using Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2 and the triangular inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\theta - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
& \leq C(1 - \theta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2 \theta^2 (1 - \theta)^2}{\rho h^3} \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + C(1 - \theta) \theta^4 \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \left( (1 + \gamma_0^{-1})^2 \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \gamma_0 \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

Then, combining (73), (74), (76) and using the first discrete trace inequality (19), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} - E_{BFF}^{h,n} \\
& \leq \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta \right) \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \right) \\
& \quad + \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta + \frac{1}{2C_1} + \frac{1}{2C_2} + C(1 - \theta) \theta^4 \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
& \quad + \left( \frac{3}{2} + \theta + \frac{C_2}{2} \right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + C(1 + \gamma_0^{-1})^2 (1 - \theta) \theta^4 \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + C(1 - \theta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
& \quad + \left( C(1 - \theta)^3 \theta^2 \frac{\gamma_0^3 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^5} + \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{C_1}{2} \right) C_{tr} \gamma_0^{-1} \right) \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

Now, the first three lines of (77) are bounded using the fact that  $\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n = \sigma_n(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n})$ , the first discrete trace inequality (19) and the coercivity of the bilinear form  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta \right) \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} (\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \right) \\
& \quad + \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta + \frac{1}{2C_1} + \frac{1}{2C_2} + C(1 - \theta) \theta^4 \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
& \quad + \left( \frac{3}{2} + \theta + \frac{C_2}{2} \right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + C(1 + \gamma_0^{-1})^2 (1 - \theta) \theta^4 \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \leq \left( \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta \right) C_a + \left( \frac{3}{2} + \theta + \frac{C_2}{2} \right) C_{tr} \gamma_0^{-1} + C(1 + \gamma_0^{-1})^2 (1 - \theta) \theta^4 \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \right) \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + \left( \frac{1}{2} - \theta + \frac{1}{2C_1} + \frac{1}{2C_2} + C(1 - \theta) \theta^4 \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
& = \gamma_0^{-1} \left( C(1 + \gamma_0^{-1})^2 \gamma_0^2 (1 - \theta) \theta^4 \frac{\Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} - \left( \theta - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( C_a \gamma_0 - C_{tr} \left( 1 + \frac{1 + 2(\theta - \frac{1}{2})}{(\theta - \frac{1}{2})^2} \right) \right) \right) \\
& \quad \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + \left( C \gamma_0^2 (1 - \theta) \theta^4 \frac{\Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \theta - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \leq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

where we have taken  $\frac{1}{2C_1} = \frac{1}{2C_2} = \frac{1}{4}(\theta - \frac{1}{2})$  and used the condition (71) to conclude. It remains to bound the last two lines of (77) as follows using the coercivity of  $a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}$  (Lemma 2.7) and the definition of  $E_{BFF}^{h,n}$

$$\begin{aligned}
& C(1 - \theta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
& \quad + \left( C(1 - \theta) \theta^2 \frac{\gamma_0^3 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^5} + \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{C_1}{2} \right) C_{tr} \gamma_0^{-1} \right) \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \leq C \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\theta + \frac{3}{2}}{2\theta - 1} \right) \gamma_0^{-1} + (1 - \theta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left( 1 + \theta^2 (1 - \theta)^2 \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^3} \right) \right) E_{BFF}^{h,n}.
\end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

Hence, combining previous terms gives :

$$E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} \leq \left( 1 + C \left( 1 + \left( \frac{\theta + \frac{3}{2}}{2\theta - 1} \right) \gamma_0^{-1} + (1 - \theta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left( 1 + \theta^2 (1 - \theta)^2 \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^3} \right) \right) \right) E_{BFF}^{h,n}. \tag{80}$$

We conclude using again (72).  $\square$



**Remark** (backward Euler scheme). *Contrary to the modified energy, we did not manage to prove that the BFF energy yields an unconditionally stable method for  $\theta = 1$ . However, a larger value of  $\gamma_0$  increases the stability since the constant becomes  $(1 + C(1 + \frac{7}{2}\gamma_0^{-1}))$ .*

### 4.3 Stability of Newmark scheme

We state the conditional boundedness of the discrete energy for the Newmark scheme.

**Proposition 4.7** (Boundedness of the modified energy for Newmark scheme). *Suppose that  $\mathbf{L}^n = \mathbf{0}, 0 \leq n < N$ ,  $\Theta_N = 1$ ,  $\zeta = 2\beta, \zeta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ , and  $\gamma_0$  large enough such that the following condition holds*

$$0 < C \frac{(1-\zeta)\gamma^2}{4\zeta-2} \frac{\Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \leq \gamma_0^{-2} \leq C_{wp}^2 \left(1 + \frac{2\rho h^2}{\zeta \Delta t^2}\right)^2, \quad (81)$$

with  $C > 0$  independent of  $\zeta, \gamma_0, h$  and  $\Delta t$ . Then, the modified energy  $E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n}$  remains bounded, i.e., for all  $0 \leq n < N$  such that

$$E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n+1} \leq \left(1 + C(1-\zeta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^3}\right)\right) E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n}. \quad (82)$$

*Proof.* Using the definition of the modified energy  $E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n+1} - E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \zeta\right) \left(a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}}([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2\right) \\ & \quad + \zeta \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^+}\right)_{\Gamma_C} + (\zeta - 1) \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}\right)_{\Gamma_C} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \zeta\right) \left(a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}}([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2\right) \\ & \quad + (\zeta - 1) \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}\right)_{\Gamma_C}. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

The last term can be bounded using the inequality (13), the boundedness of operator  $P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}$  (Lemma 2.6) and the scheme (42) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & (\zeta - 1) \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}\right)_{\Gamma_C} \\ &\leq \frac{(1-\zeta)}{4} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}}(P^{n+1} - P^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\ &\leq C(1-\zeta) \frac{\gamma_0}{h^2} \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \\ &= C(1-\zeta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{h^2} \left\| \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} + \Delta t \frac{\zeta}{2} (\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \\ &\leq C(1-\zeta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{h^2} \left( \left\| \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{\Delta t^2}{4} \left\| \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \Delta t^2 \frac{\zeta^2}{4} \left\| \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Using Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2 and the triangular inequality, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\zeta - 1) \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}\right)_{\Gamma_C} \\ &\leq C(1-\zeta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{h^2} \left( \left\| \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2}{\rho^2 h^3} \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + C \frac{(1-\zeta)\zeta^2}{4} \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \left( (1 + \gamma_0^{-1})^2 \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \gamma_0 \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}}([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

The evolution of the modified energy becomes then

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n+1} - E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n} \\
& \leq \left( \frac{1}{2} - \zeta \right) \left( a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}}([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + C(1 - \zeta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^3} \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + C \frac{(1 - \zeta) \zeta^2}{4} \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \left( (1 + \gamma_0^{-1})^2 \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \gamma_0 \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}}([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

Using Lemma 2.7 and the condition (81) on  $\gamma_0$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n+1} - E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n} \\
& \leq \gamma_0 \left( C(1 + \gamma_0^{-1})^2 \frac{(1 - \zeta) \zeta^2}{4} \frac{\Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} - \left( \zeta - \frac{1}{2} \right) (C_a \gamma_0 - C_{tr}) \right) \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + \gamma_0^2 \left( C \frac{(1 - \zeta) \zeta^2}{4} \frac{\Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} - \left( \zeta - \frac{1}{2} \right) \gamma_0^{-2} \right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}}([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
& \quad + C(1 - \zeta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^3} \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \leq C(1 - \zeta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^3} \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

Finally, using the definition of the modified energy

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n+1} & \leq E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n} + C(1 - \zeta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left( \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^3} \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \leq \left( 1 + C(1 - \zeta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^3} \right) \right) E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n},
\end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

and we conclude the proof using condition (4.7).  $\square$

Contrary to the linear case, where we have the unconditional stability of the Newmark scheme for a range of parameters, we have in the non-linear case only the unconditional stability for the following parameter  $\Theta_N = 1, \beta = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\zeta = 1$ . This is proved in the following Corollary and this case coincides with [30, Cor. 3.5].

**Corollary 4.8.** *Assume that  $\mathbf{L}^n = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $0 \leq n < N$ , and  $\gamma_0$  is large enough (to ensure well-posedness). Then, with  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}, \zeta = 1$  and  $\Theta_N = 1$ , the solution of Problem (42) is unconditionally stable in the sense of the modified energy, i.e.,*

$$E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n+1} - E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n} \leq 0, \quad \forall n > 0. \tag{89}$$

*Proof.* This is a direct application of Proposition 4.7 with  $\gamma = 1$  and  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$  since in this is case:

$$\left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{C(4\zeta - 2)(1 - \zeta)}{\zeta^2}} \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{4\zeta - 2}{C(1 - \zeta)\zeta^2} \frac{\gamma_0}{h}} \right) \right) = 1. \tag{90}$$

$\square$

Similarly to the modified energy (Lemma 4.5), we study the evolution of BFF energy during the simulation:

**Lemma 4.9** (Evolution of the BFF energy of Newmark scheme). *Assume that  $\mathbf{L}^n = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\forall n > 0$  and that Problem (42) is*

well-posed. Then, the following property holds for all  $n > 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} - E_{BFF}^{h,n} \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2} - \zeta \right) a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left( \frac{1}{2} + \zeta \Theta_N \right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
&+ \left( \frac{1}{2} - \zeta \right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
&+ \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \zeta [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^+} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + (\zeta - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&+ (1 + \Theta_N) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n^n, (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^{n+1} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&+ (1 - \Theta_N) \zeta \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} + (1 - \Theta_N) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&+ \frac{\Delta t}{2} (2\beta - \zeta) a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \\
&+ \frac{\Delta t}{2} (2\beta - \zeta) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right)_{\Gamma_C}.
\end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{v}^h \in \mathbf{V}^h$ . Firstly, from equations (42)-(i) and (ii), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\rho(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} + \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}), \mathbf{v}^h)_{\Omega} \\
&= \frac{2}{\Delta t} (\rho(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}), \mathbf{v}^h)_{\Omega} + \Delta t (\zeta - 2\beta) (\rho(\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \ddot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}), \mathbf{v}^h)_{\Omega}.
\end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

Then, we use (42)-(iii) (applied for time  $t^n$  and  $t^{n+1}$ ) to have

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\rho(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} + \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}), \mathbf{v}^h)_{\Omega} \\
&= \frac{2}{\Delta t} (\rho(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}), \mathbf{v}^h)_{\Omega} + \Delta t (\zeta - 2\beta) a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{v}^h) \\
&+ \Delta t (\zeta - 2\beta) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C}.
\end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

Similarly, using (42)-(ii) and (iii), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\rho(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}), \mathbf{v}^h)_{\Omega} = \Delta t (\zeta - 1) \left( a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{v}^h) + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \right) \\
&- \Delta t \zeta \left( a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1}, \mathbf{v}^h) + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

According to the definition of BFF energy and using (93) and (94), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} - E_{BFF}^{h,n} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} (\rho(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} + \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}), \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n})_{\Omega} + \frac{1}{2} a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} + \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^{n+1} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^n \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
&- \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^{n+1} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^n \right)_{\Gamma_C}
\end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} - E_{BFF}^{h,n} \\
&= (\zeta - 1) \left( a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) - \Theta_N \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n^n, (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \right) \\
&\quad + (\zeta - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad - \zeta \left( a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) - \Theta_N \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n^{n+1}, (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \right) \\
&\quad - \zeta \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\frac{\Delta t}{2} (2\beta - \zeta) a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n})}_{T_1} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\frac{\Delta t}{2} (2\beta - \zeta) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n+1} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n}) \right)_{\Gamma_C}}_{T_2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} + \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^{n+1} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^{n+1} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^n \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

Then, we rearrange and use the relation  $P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h) = P_{1, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{v}^h) + (\Theta_N - 1)\sigma_n(\mathbf{v}^h)$  to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{BF}^{h,n+1} - E_{BF}^{h,n} \\
&= -\zeta a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \zeta \Theta_N \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
&\quad - \zeta \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \right)_{\Gamma_C} + T_1 + T_2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \Theta_N \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n^n, (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^{n+1} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^n \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
&\quad - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^{n+1} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2} - \zeta \right) a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \zeta \Theta_N \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
&\quad - \zeta \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), P_{1, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad - \underbrace{\zeta (\Theta_N - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C}}_{T_3} \\
&\quad + \Theta_N \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n^n, (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, P_{1, \gamma_N}(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad - \underbrace{(\Theta_N - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C}}_{T_4} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^{n+1} \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_n^n \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
&\quad - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^{n+1} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} + T_1 + T_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

Finally, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{BF}^{h,n+1} - E_{BF}^{h,n} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \zeta\right) a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \zeta \Theta_N \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \zeta\right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
&\quad + \zeta \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^+} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + (\zeta - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + (\Theta_N + 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n^n, (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^{n+1} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad + T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4.
\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

□

As previously, we study to which extend the BFF energy is bounded.

**Proposition 4.10** (Boundedness of the BFF energy of Newmark scheme). *Suppose that*

$$\mathbf{L}^n = \mathbf{0}, \quad 0 \leq n < N, \quad \Theta_N = 1, \quad \zeta = 2\beta, \quad \zeta \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right],$$

and  $\gamma_0$  large enough such that the following condition holds

$$0 < C \frac{(1-\zeta)\gamma^2}{2\zeta-1} \frac{\Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \leq \gamma_0^{-2} \leq C_{wp}^2 \left(1 + \frac{2\rho h^2}{\zeta \Delta t^2}\right), \tag{99}$$

with  $C > 0$  independent of  $\zeta$ ,  $\gamma_0$ ,  $h$  and  $\Delta t$ . Then, the BFF energy  $E_{BFF}^{h,n}$  remains bounded, i.e., for all  $0 \leq n \leq N$ , there holds

$$E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} \leq \left(1 + C \left(1 + \left(\frac{\zeta + \frac{3}{2}}{2\zeta - 1}\right) \gamma_0^{-1} + \sqrt{\frac{C(2\zeta - 1)(1 - \zeta)}{\zeta^2}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{2\zeta - 1}{C(1 - \zeta)\zeta^2}} \frac{\gamma_0}{h}\right)\right)\right) E_{BFF}^{h,n}. \tag{100}$$

*Proof.* Using Lemma 4.9 and simplifying with assumptions on the parameters, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} - E_{BFF}^{h,n} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \zeta\right) \left( a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \zeta\right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + \zeta \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^+} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + (\zeta - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad + 2 \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n^n, (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C} - \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^{n+1} \right)_{\Gamma_C} + \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}, \sigma_n^n \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \zeta\right) \left( a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}) + \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \zeta\right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + (\zeta - 1) \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} [P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^+}, [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} \right)_{\Gamma_C} \\
&\quad - \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n^n, ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right)_{\Gamma_C}}_{I_1} - \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}), (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C}}_{I_2} \\
&\quad - \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} ([P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n^n), (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C}}_{I_3} + \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{\gamma_N} \sigma_n^n, (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right)_{\Gamma_C}}_{I_4}.
\end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

The terms  $I_1, I_2, I_3$  and  $I_4$  are treated in the same way that in Prop. 4.6, so we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} - E_{BFF}^{h,n} \\
& \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \zeta\right) (a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n})) \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \zeta + \frac{1}{2C_1} + \frac{1}{2C_2} + C \frac{(1-\zeta)\zeta}{2} \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4}\right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{3}{2} + \zeta + \frac{C_2}{2}\right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + C \frac{(1-\zeta)\zeta}{2} \frac{\gamma_0(1+\gamma_0^{-1})^2 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + C(1-\zeta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
& \quad + \left( C(1-\zeta) \frac{\gamma_0^3 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^5} + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{C_1}{2}\right) C_{tr} \gamma_0^{-1} \right) \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{102}$$

with  $C_1 > 0$  and  $C_2 > 0$ . The following part of this proof is similar to Prop. 4.6. Tacking  $\frac{1}{2C_1} = \frac{1}{2C_2} = \frac{1}{4}(\zeta - \frac{1}{2})$  and using the first discrete trace inequality (19), the coercivity of  $a(\cdot, \cdot)$  and the condition (99), the first three lines are negative:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{1}{2} - \zeta\right) (a(\mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n}, \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n})) \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \zeta + \frac{1}{2C_1} + \frac{1}{2C_2} + C \frac{(1-\zeta)\zeta^2}{4} \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4}\right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{3}{2} + \zeta + \frac{C_2}{2}\right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\sigma_n^{n+1} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 + C \frac{(1-\zeta)\zeta^2}{4} \frac{\gamma_0(1+\gamma_0^{-1})^2 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \leq \left( \left(\frac{1}{2} - \zeta\right) C_a + \left(\frac{3}{2} + \zeta + \frac{C_2}{2}\right) C_{tr} \gamma_0^{-1} + C \frac{(1-\zeta)\zeta^2}{4} \frac{\gamma_0(1+\gamma_0^{-1})^2 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} \right) \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \zeta + \frac{1}{2C_1} + \frac{1}{2C_2} + C \frac{(1-\zeta)\zeta^2}{4} \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4}\right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
& = \gamma_0 \left( C \frac{(1-\zeta)\zeta^2(1+\gamma_0^{-1})^2}{4} \frac{\Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} - \left(\zeta - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left( C_a \gamma_0 - C_{tr} \left(1 + \frac{1+2(\zeta - \frac{1}{2})}{(\zeta - \frac{1}{2})^2}\right) \right) \right) \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \quad + \gamma_0^2 \left( C \frac{(1-\zeta)\zeta^2}{4} \frac{\Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^4} - \frac{1}{2} \left(\zeta - \frac{1}{2}\right) \gamma_0^{-2} \right) \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^{n+1}]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - [P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-}) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 < 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

The last two lines are always bounded as follows using the coercivity of  $a_{\Theta_N, \gamma_N}$  and the definition of  $E_{BFF}^{h,n}$

$$\begin{aligned}
& C(1-\zeta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left\| \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \dot{\mathbf{u}}^{h,n} \right\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma_N^{-\frac{1}{2}} ([P^n]_{\mathbb{R}^-} - \sigma_n^n) \right\|_{\Gamma_C}^2 \\
& \quad + \left( C(1-\zeta) \frac{\gamma_0^3 \Delta t^4}{\rho^2 h^5} + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{C_1}{2}\right) C_{tr} \gamma_0^{-1} \right) \left\| \mathbf{u}^{h,n} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
& \leq C \left( 1 + \left(\frac{\zeta + \frac{3}{2}}{2\zeta - 1}\right) \gamma_0^{-1} + (1-\zeta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^3} \right) \right) E_{BFF}^{h,n}.
\end{aligned} \tag{104}$$

Hence, we have:

$$E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} - E_{BFF}^{h,n} \leq C \left( 1 + \left(\frac{\zeta + \frac{3}{2}}{2\zeta - 1}\right) \gamma_0^{-1} + (1-\zeta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^3} \right) \right) E_{BFF}^{h,n}. \tag{105}$$

So,

$$E_{BFF}^{h,n+1} \leq \left( 1 + C \left( 1 + \left(\frac{\zeta + \frac{3}{2}}{2\zeta - 1}\right) \gamma_0^{-1} + (1-\zeta) \frac{\gamma_0 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^2} \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 \Delta t^2}{\rho h^3} \right) \right) \right) E_{BFF}^{h,n}. \tag{106}$$

We conclude using condition (99).  $\square$

## 5 Numerical results

This section presents the numerical simulations of an unidimensional elastic Signorini problem. Both  $\theta$ -scheme and Newmark scheme are used for the benchmark with the symmetric Nitsche variant ( $\Theta_N = 1$ ). An initial acceleration field is needed and

computed from the initial displacement and velocity fields, using the relation  $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}^0 = \mathbf{M}^{-1}(\mathbf{L}^0 - \mathbf{B}_N(\mathbf{u}^0))$ . We consider the test-case proposed in [35, Sec. 5], which is described by the following dynamic problem:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Seek } u(x, t) : [0, 1] \times (0, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ s.t.} \\ \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} = 0, \\ u(1, t) = 0, \\ u(0, t) \geq 0, \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}(0, t) \leq 0, \quad u(0, t) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}(0, t) = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{x}{2}, \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(x, 0) = 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (107)$$

The problem admits a unique periodic analytical solution.

## 5.1 $\theta$ -scheme

For the  $\theta$ -scheme, we present in Fig. 2, the simulations with different mesh sizes and a fixed ratio  $\frac{\Delta t}{h} = 1$ , with Nitsche's parameter  $\Theta_N = 1$ ,  $\gamma_0 = 15$ , and  $\theta \in \{0.51, 0.7, 1\}$ . We observe important oscillations for  $\theta = 0.51$ , particularly with the coarse mesh ( $h = 0.1$ , as shown in Fig. 2a and 2b), due to its lower dissipative properties compared to the other variants. We note that using  $\gamma_0 = 5$  can improve the performance and reduce oscillations for  $\theta = 0.51$  (see purple line in Fig. 3). The case  $\theta = 1$  gives smoother results, but the energy loss is important. The numerical results confirm that the different energies (mechanical, modified, BFF) are strictly dissipative. The case  $\theta = 0.7$  corresponds to a balance between dissipation and oscillations.

Prop. 4.6 shows that the scheme with  $\theta = 0.51$  is stable, but the boundedness of the discrete energy is highly dependent on the value of the parameter  $\gamma_0$  (for  $\frac{\Delta t}{h} = 1$  fixed). We illustrate the influence of  $\gamma_0$  with  $h = \Delta t = 0.025$  in Fig. 3. It can be observed that for  $\theta = 0.51$ , a larger value of  $\gamma_0$  introduces more oscillations during impacts, so moderate value of  $\gamma_0$  is needed to prevent them and decreasing energy ( $\gamma_0$  must be sufficiently large to ensure well-posedness), however for  $\theta = 0.7$  or  $\theta = 1$  there is almost no dependency to  $\gamma_0$ .

Simulations using a fixed mesh size of  $h = 0.05$ ,  $\gamma_0 = 50$ , and different time-steps are plotted in Fig. 4. For the case  $\theta = 1$ , we note that smaller time-steps give a better accuracy by reducing energy loss without introducing additional oscillations as expected. A zoom on the first impact in Fig. 5 illustrates the evolution of the BFF, modified, and mechanical energies. It confirms that the modified energy remains non-increasing, contrary to the mechanical and BFF energy. Moreover the differences between the three different energies are of small magnitude.

## 5.2 Newmark scheme

Next, we present the simulations of the Newmark scheme in Fig. 6 for different mesh sizes and a fixed ratio  $\frac{\Delta t}{h} = 1$ .  $\gamma_0 = 50$  is used for the highly dissipative scheme ( $\beta = \frac{1}{2}, \zeta = 1$ ) and  $\gamma_0 = 5$  for the other two schemes: the Crank-Nicolson scheme and the scheme  $\beta = 0.3, \zeta = 0.6$ . Even if the schemes are well-posed, energy can be amplified between two time-steps by a factor proportional to  $\gamma_0^3$ , resulting in increased parasitic oscillations with larger  $\gamma_0$ , as discussed in Prop. 4.7 and 4.10. The case of  $\beta = 0.3, \zeta = 0.6$  produces smoother results than the Crank-Nicolson scheme as the parameters  $\beta$  and  $\zeta$  help dissipate a part of the high-frequency oscillations. This represents a potential compromise between reducing parasitic oscillations and minimizing energy loss. The case of  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}, \zeta = 1$  ensures unconditional stability, similar to the  $\theta$ -scheme with  $\theta = 1$ , but it dissipates less energy than the  $\theta$ -scheme.

We also show the influence of the parameter  $\gamma_0$  for the Newmark scheme in Fig. 7, with  $h = \Delta t = 0.025$ . Notably, the Crank-Nicolson scheme is conservative for linear elastodynamics, but with the presence of Signorini's conditions, its numerical stability is not ensured: from Fig. 7a and 7b, we can observe important oscillations during the simulation, especially after several impacts. Using a dissipative scheme improves accuracy and gives smoother results (see Fig. 7 middle and bottom). We also note that compared to the  $\theta$ -scheme, the Newmark scheme with  $\zeta = 2\beta$  and  $\zeta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$  preserves more kinetic energy, see Fig. 3 and 7.

Similarly to the  $\theta$ -scheme, we examine the dissipative Newmark scheme ( $\beta = \frac{1}{2}, \zeta = 1$ ) with a fixed mesh size of  $h = 0.05$  and a variable time-steps ( $\gamma_0 = 50$ ), as shown in Fig. 8. As with the  $\theta$ -scheme, smaller time-steps result in better accuracy. Additionally, Fig. 9 demonstrates that the modified energy does not increase, while there is an observable increase for the BFF energy at the first impact. As previously, the difference between the mechanical energy, the modified energy and the BFF energy are of small magnitude.









Figure 2:  $\theta$ -scheme with  $\gamma_0 = 15$  and (top)  $h = \Delta t = 0.1$ ; (middle)  $h = \Delta t = 0.05$ ; (bottom)  $h = \Delta t = 0.025$ . Left: displacement, velocity and contact stress. Right: energies (mechanical, modified, BFF).














Figure 3:  $\theta$ -scheme using different values of  $\gamma_0$  ( $h = \Delta t = 0.025$  fixed), with (top)  $\theta = 0.51$ ; (middle)  $\theta = 0.7$ ; (bottom)  $\theta = 1$ . Left: displacement, velocity and contact stress. Right: energies (mechanical, modified, BFF).




(a)




(b)




(c)



(d)




(e)




(f)


Figure 4:  $\theta$ -scheme using  $h = 0.05$ ,  $\gamma_0 = 50$  and different  $\Delta t$ , with (top)  $\theta = 0.51$ ; (middle)  $\theta = 0.7$ ; (bottom)  $\theta = 1$ . Left: displacement, velocity and contact stress. Right: energies (mechanical, modified, BFF).



(a)



(b)



(c)

Figure 5: The energy evolution at the beginning of the first impact for  $\theta$ -scheme with  $\theta = 1$ . (a) BFF energy; (b) Modified energy; (c) mechanical energy.









Figure 6: Newmark scheme with (top)  $h = \Delta t = 0.1$ ; (middle)  $h = \Delta t = 0.05$ ; (bottom)  $h = \Delta t = 0.025$ . Left: displacement, velocity and contact stress. Right: energies (mechanical, modified, BFF).









Figure 7: Newmark scheme using a variable value of  $\gamma_0$ , with (top) Crank-Nicolson; (middle)  $\beta = 0.3$ ,  $\zeta = 0.6$ ; (bottom)  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\zeta = 1$ . Left: displacement, velocity and contact stress. Right: energies (mechanical, modified, BFF).












Figure 8: Newmark scheme using  $h = 0.05$  and a variable  $\Delta t$ , with (top) Crank-Nicolson; (middle)  $\beta = 0.3$ ,  $\zeta = 0.6$ ; (bottom)  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\zeta = 1$ . Left: displacement, velocity and contact stress. Right: energies (mechanical, modified, BFF).



(a)



(b)



(c)

Figure 9: The energy evolution at the beginning of the first impact for Newmark scheme with  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}, \zeta = 1$ . (a) BFF energy; (b) Modified energy; (c) mechanical energy.

## 6 Conclusion

In this study, we investigated the stability and performance of the  $\theta$ -scheme and Newmark's scheme using symmetric Nitsche's method. Moreover, we have realized a series of numerical simulations providing insights into the behavior of these schemes under different parameter values which confirms theoretical results. Our main findings can be summarized as follows:

- The backward Euler scheme ( $\theta$ -scheme with  $\theta = 1$ ) and Newmark's scheme with  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\zeta = 1$  demonstrate unconditional stability. This means that the modified energy  $E_{\Theta_N}^{h,n}$  is non-increasing, ensuring that these schemes are both dissipative and non-amplifying.
- For both modified energy and BFF energy, the  $\theta$ -scheme with  $\theta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and the Newmark scheme with  $\zeta = 2\beta$ ,  $\zeta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  satisfy a property analogous to the discrete Gronwall lemma.
- For highly dissipative schemes, i.e,  $\theta \simeq 1$  or  $\zeta \simeq 1$ , using a larger value of  $\gamma_0$  increase stability.
- For low dissipative schemes, a moderate value of  $\gamma_0$  helps to reduce parasitic oscillations and improve stability. However,  $\gamma_0$  must be large enough to ensure well-posedness.
- Smaller time-steps generally improve numerical accuracy and reduce energy loss without increasing oscillations (this confirms particularly the results of [30] and [33]).

In conclusion, the  $\theta$ -scheme and Newmark's schemes are effective for stable and accurate simulations of elastodynamic Signorini problems discretized with finite elements and Nitsche's method with carefully chosen parameters.

## References

- [1] M. ABBAS, G. DROUET, AND P. HILD, *The local average contact (LAC) method*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 339 (2018), pp. 488–513.
- [2] V. ACARY, *Energy conservation and dissipation properties of time-integration methods for nonsmooth elastodynamics with contact*, ZAMM. Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik, 96 (2016), pp. 585–603.
- [3] V. ACARY AND B. BROGLIATO, *Numerical methods for nonsmooth dynamical systems. Applications in mechanics and electronics*, vol. 35 of Lecture Notes in Applied and Computational Mechanics, Berlin: Springer, 2008.
- [4] A. AIMI, G. DI CREDICO, AND H. GIMPERLEIN, *Space-time boundary elements for frictional contact in elastodynamics*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 427 (2024), p. 25. Id/No 117066.
- [5] P. ALART AND A. CURNIER, *A mixed formulation for frictional contact problems prone to Newton like solution methods*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 92 (1991), pp. 353–375.
- [6] F. ALDAKHEEL, B. HUDOBIVNIK, E. ARTIOLI, L. BEIRÃO DA VEIGA, AND P. WRIGGERS, *Curvilinear virtual elements for contact mechanics*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 372 (2020), p. 19. Id/No 113394.
- [7] F. ARMERO AND E. PETŐCZ, *Formulation and analysis of conserving algorithms for frictionless dynamic contact/impact problems*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 158 (1998), pp. 269–300.
- [8] L. BANZ, H. GIMPERLEIN, A. ISSAOUI, AND E. P. STEPHAN, *Stabilized mixed hp-BEM for frictional contact problems in linear elasticity*, Numerische Mathematik, 135 (2017), pp. 217–263.
- [9] L. BANZ AND E. P. STEPHAN, *On hp-adaptive BEM for frictional contact problems in linear elasticity*, Computers & Mathematics with Applications, 69 (2015), pp. 559–581.
- [10] H. J. C. BARBOSA AND T. J. R. HUGHES, *Boundary Lagrange multipliers in finite element methods: error analysis in natural norms*, Numerische Mathematik, 62 (1992), pp. 1–15.
- [11] —, *Circumventing the Babuška-Brezzi condition in mixed finite element approximations of elliptic variational inequalities*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 97 (1992), pp. 193–210.
- [12] —, *Circumventing the Babuška-Brezzi condition in mixed finite element approximations of elliptic variational inequalities*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 97 (1992), pp. 193–210.
- [13] L. BEAUDE, F. CHOULY, M. LAZIRI, AND R. MASSON, *Mixed and Nitsche's discretizations of Coulomb frictional contact-mechanics for mixed dimensional poromechanical models*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 413 (2023), p. 116124.



- [14] F. BEN BELGACEM, P. HILD, AND P. LABORDE, *Extension of the mortar finite element method to a variational inequality modeling unilateral contact*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 9 (1999), pp. 287–303.
- [15] S.-C. BRENNER AND L.-R. SCOTT, *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*, vol. 15 of Texts in Applied Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2007.
- [16] É. BRETIN AND Y. RENARD, *Stable IMEX schemes for a Nitsche-based approximation of elastodynamic contact problems. Selective mass scaling interpretation*, The SMAI Journal of Computational Mathematics, 6 (2020), pp. 159–185.
- [17] E. BURMAN, M. A. FERNÁNDEZ, AND S. FREI, *A Nitsche-based formulation for fluid-structure interactions with contact*, ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis, 54 (2020), pp. 531–564.
- [18] E. BURMAN, P. HANSBO, AND M. G. LARSON, *The penalty-free Nitsche method and nonconforming finite elements for the Signorini problem*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 55 (2017), pp. 2523–2539.
- [19] —, *Augmented Lagrangian finite element methods for contact problems*, ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis, 53 (2019), pp. 173–195.
- [20] —, *The augmented Lagrangian method as a framework for stabilised methods in computational mechanics*, Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering, (2023), pp. 1–26.
- [21] J. CAMPBELL, R. VIGNJEVIC, AND L. LIBERSKY, *A contact algorithm for smoothed particle hydrodynamics*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 184 (2000), pp. 49–65.
- [22] K. L. CASCAVITA, F. CHOULY, AND A. ERN, *Hybrid high-order discretizations combined with Nitsche’s method for Dirichlet and Signorini boundary conditions*, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis, 40 (2020), pp. 2189–2226.
- [23] F. CHOULY, *A review on some discrete variational techniques for the approximation of essential boundary conditions*, Vietnam Journal of Mathematics, 54 (2026), pp. 73–115.
- [24] F. CHOULY, A. ERN, AND N. PIGNET, *A hybrid high-order discretization combined with Nitsche’s method for contact and Tresca friction in small strain elasticity*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 42 (2020), pp. A2300–A2324.
- [25] F. CHOULY, M. FABRE, P. HILD, R. MLIKA, J. POUSIN, AND Y. RENARD, *An overview of recent results on Nitsche’s method for contact problems*, Geometrically Unfitted Finite Element Methods and Applications, (2017), pp. 93–141.
- [26] F. CHOULY AND P. HILD, *A Nitsche-based method for unilateral contact problems: numerical analysis*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 51 (2013), pp. 1295–1307.
- [27] —, *On convergence of the penalty method for unilateral contact problems*, Applied Numerical Mathematics, 65 (2013), pp. 27–40.
- [28] F. CHOULY, P. HILD, V. LLERAS, AND Y. RENARD, *Nitsche method for contact with Coulomb friction: existence results for the static and dynamic finite element formulations*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics, 416 (2022), p. 114557.
- [29] F. CHOULY, P. HILD, AND Y. RENARD, *A Nitsche finite element method for dynamic contact: 1. Space semi-discretization and time-marching schemes*, ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis, 49 (2015), pp. 481–502.
- [30] —, *A Nitsche finite element method for dynamic contact: 2. Stability of the schemes and numerical experiments*, ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis, 49 (2015), pp. 503–528.
- [31] —, *Symmetric and non-symmetric variants of Nitsche’s method for contact problems in elasticity: theory and numerical experiments*, Mathematics of Computation, 84 (2015), pp. 1089–1112.
- [32] —, *Finite element approximation of contact and friction in elasticity*, vol. 48 of Adv. Mech. Math., Cham: Birkhäuser, 2023.
- [33] F. CHOULY AND Y. RENARD, *Explicit Verlet time-integration for a Nitsche-based approximation of elastodynamic contact problems*, Advanced Modeling and Simulation in Engineering Sciences, 5 (2018), pp. 1–38.
- [34] M. CIHAN, B. HUDOBIVNIK, J. KORELC, AND P. WRIGGERS, *A virtual element method for 3D contact problems with non-conforming meshes*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 402 (2022), p. 18. Id/No 115385.
- [35] F. DABAGHI, A. PETROV, J. POUSIN, AND Y. RENARD, *A robust finite element redistribution approach for elastodynamic contact problems*, Applied Numerical Mathematics, 103 (2016), pp. 48–71.

- [36] L. DE LORENZIS, P. WRIGGERS, AND T. J. R. HUGHES, *Isogeometric contact: a review*, GAMM-Mitteilungen, 37 (2014), pp. 85–123.
- [37] I. DIONE, *Optimal convergence analysis of the unilateral contact problem with and without Tresca friction conditions by the penalty method*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 472 (2019), pp. 266–284.
- [38] D. DOYEN, A. ERN, AND S. PIPERNO, *Time-integration schemes for the finite element dynamic Signorini problem*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 33 (2011), pp. 223–249.
- [39] J. DRONIOU, A. HAIDAR, AND R. MASSON, *Analysis of a VEM-fully discrete polytopal scheme with bubble stabilisation for contact mechanics with Tresca friction*, European Series in Applied and Industrial Mathematics (ESAIM): Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis, 59 (2025), pp. 1043–1074.
- [40] A. EPALLE, I. RAMIÈRE, G. LATU, AND F. LEBON, *Parallel simulation and adaptive mesh refinement for 3D elastostatic contact mechanics problems between deformable bodies*, Advances in Applied Mechanics, 61 (2025), pp. 287–345.
- [41] A. ERN AND J.-L. GUERMOND, *Theory and practice of finite elements*, vol. 159 of Applied Mathematical Sciences, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.
- [42] A. ERN AND J.-L. GUERMOND, *Abstract nonconforming error estimates and application to boundary penalty methods for diffusion equations and time-harmonic Maxwell’s equations*, Computational Methods in Applied Mathematics, 18 (2018), pp. 451–475.
- [43] H. GIMPERLEIN, F. MEYER, C. ÖZDEMİR, AND E. P. STEPHAN, *Time domain boundary elements for dynamic contact problems*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 333 (2018), pp. 147–175.
- [44] T. GUDI, K. PORWAL, AND T. WADHAWAN, *Higher order discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods for the contact problems*, Advances in Applied Mechanics, 60 (2025), pp. 1–55.
- [45] T. GUSTAFSSON AND R. STENBERG, *Finite element methods for elastic contact: penalty and Nitsche*, Rakenteiden Mekaniikka (Journal of Structural Mechanics), 58 (2025), pp. 46–58.
- [46] T. GUSTAFSSON, R. STENBERG, AND J. VIDEMAN, *On Nitsche’s method for elastic contact problems*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 42 (2020), pp. B425–B446.
- [47] W. HAN, F. FENG, F. WANG, AND J. HUANG, *Numerical analysis of variational-hemivariational inequalities with applications in contact mechanics*, Advances in Applied Mechanics, 60 (2025), pp. 113–178.
- [48] P. HAURET AND P. LE TALLEC, *Energy-controlling time integration methods for nonlinear elastodynamics and low-velocity impact*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 195 (2006), pp. 4890–4916.
- [49] P. HILD AND Y. RENARD, *A stabilized Lagrange multiplier method for the finite element approximation of contact problems in elastostatics*, Numerische Mathematik, 115 (2010), pp. 101–129.
- [50] Q. HU, F. CHOULY, P. HU, G. CHENG, AND S. P. A. BORDAS, *Skew-symmetric Nitsche’s formulation in isogeometric analysis: Dirichlet and symmetry conditions, patch coupling and frictionless contact*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 341 (2018), pp. 188–220.
- [51] H. HUANG, N. PIGNET, G. DROUET, AND F. CHOULY, *HHT- $\alpha$  and TR-BDF2 schemes for dynamic contact problems*, Computational Mechanics, 73 (2024), pp. 1165–1186.
- [52] H. B. KHENOUS, P. LABORDE, AND Y. RENARD, *Mass redistribution method for finite element contact problems in elastodynamics*, European Journal of Mechanics-A/Solids, 27 (2008), pp. 918–932.
- [53] N. KIKUCHI AND J. T. ODEN, *Contact problems in elasticity: a study of variational inequalities and finite element methods*, vol. 8 of SIAM Studies in Applied Mathematics, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1988.
- [54] N. KIKUCHI AND Y. J. SONG, *Penalty-finite-element approximation of a class of unilateral problems in linear elasticity*, Quarterly Applied Mathematics, 39 (1981), pp. 1–22.
- [55] V. A. KOVTUNENKO, A. PETROV, AND Y. RENARD, *Space-time FEM solution of dynamic contact problem with discontinuous velocity for multiple impact of deformed bar using PDAS method*, Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences, (2025). Available online. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mma.70370>.
- [56] M. LAAZIRI AND R. MASSON, *VEM-nitsche fully discrete polytopal scheme for frictionless contact-mechanics*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 63 (2025), pp. 81–102.

- [57] T. LAURSEN AND V. CHAWLA, *Design of energy conserving algorithms for frictionless dynamic contact problems*, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering, 40 (1997), pp. 863–886.
- [58] T. A. LAURSEN, *Computational contact and impact mechanics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002.
- [59] S. MENG, L. TADDEI, M. AL-KHALIL, AND S. ROTH, *SPH-based simulation of micro-impacts in human-tissue surrogate: A preliminary study on multilayered structure*, Mechanics of Advanced Materials and Structures, 29 (2022), pp. 5059–5068.
- [60] J. J. MOREAU, *Unilateral contact and dry friction in finite freedom dynamics*. Nonsmooth mechanics and applications, CISM Courses Lect. 302, 1-82 (1988)., 1988.
- [61] N. M. NEWMARK, *A method of computation for structural dynamics*, Journal of the Engineering Mechanics Division, 85 (1959), pp. 67–94.
- [62] J. NITSCHKE, *Über ein variationsprinzip zur lösung von dirichlet-problemen bei verwendung von teilräumen, die keinen randbedingungen unterworfen sind*, in Abhandlungen aus dem mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg, vol. 36, Springer, 1971, pp. 9–15.
- [63] J. T. ODEN AND N. KIKUCHI, *Finite element methods for constrained problems in elasticity*, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering, 18 (1982), pp. 701–725.
- [64] K. PORWAL AND T. WADHAWAN, *Unified analysis of discontinuous Galerkin methods for frictional contact problem with normal compliance*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics, 434 (2023), p. 25. Id/No 115350.
- [65] ———, *Quadratic discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods for the unilateral contact problem*, Computational Methods in Applied Mathematics, 25 (2024), pp. 189–213.
- [66] Y. RENARD, *Generalized Newton’s methods for the approximation and resolution of frictional contact problems in elasticity*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 256 (2013), pp. 38–55.
- [67] R. STENBERG, *On some techniques for approximating boundary conditions in the finite element method*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics, 63 (1995), pp. 139–148.
- [68] V. THOMÉE, *Galerkin finite element methods for parabolic problems*, vol. 25 of Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.
- [69] B. I. WOHLMUTH, *Variationally consistent discretization schemes and numerical algorithms for contact problems*, Acta Numerica, 20 (2011), pp. 569–734.
- [70] P. WRIGGERS, W. T. RUST, AND B. D. REDDY, *A virtual element method for contact*, Computational Mechanics, 58 (2016), pp. 1039–1050.
- [71] B. WU, F. WANG, AND W. HAN, *The virtual element method for a contact problem with wear and unilateral constraint*, Applied Numerical Mathematics, 206 (2024), pp. 29–47.
- [72] W. XIAO AND M. LING, *Virtual element method for a history-dependent variational-hemivariational inequality in contact problems*, Journal of Scientific Computing, 96 (2023), p. 21. Id/No 82.
- [73] B.-B. XU, F. PENG, AND P. WRIGGERS, *Stabilization-free virtual element method for 3D hyperelastic problems*, Computational Mechanics, 75 (2025), pp. 1687–1701.