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FURTHER RESULTS ON A SPACE-TIME FOSLS FORMULATION OF PARABOLIC PDES
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Abstract. In [2019, Space-time least-squares finite elements for parabolic equations, arXiv:1911.01942] by Führer and Karkulik, well-posedness of a space-time First-Order System Least-Squares formulation of the heat equation was proven. In the present work, this result is generalized to general second order parabolic PDEs with possibly inhomogeneous boundary conditions, and plain convergence of a standard adaptive finite element method driven by the least-squares estimator is demonstrated. The proof of the latter easily extends to a large class of least-squares formulations.
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1. Introduction

Currently, there is a growing interest in simultaneous space-time methods for solving parabolic evolution equations originally introduced in [2, 3], see e.g., [1, 16, 18, 20, 22, 23, 26, 28, 30, 33, 34, 40, 41]. Main reasons are that, compared to classical time marching methods, space-time methods are much better suited for a massively parallel implementation, are guaranteed to give quasi-optimal approximations from the trial space that is employed, have the potential to drive optimally converging simultaneously space-time adaptive refinement routines, and they provide enhanced possibilities for reduced order modelling of parameter-dependent problems. On the other hand, space-time methods require more storage. This disadvantage however vanishes for problems of optimal control or data assimilation, for which the solution is needed simultaneously over the whole time interval anyway.

The common space-time variational formulation of a parabolic equation results in a bilinear form that is non-coercive. For the heat equation \( \partial_t u - \Delta_x u = f \), \( u(0, \cdot) = u_0 \) on a time-space cylinder \( I \times \Omega \), where \( I := (0, T) \) and \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d \), with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, the corresponding operator is a boundedly invertible linear mapping between \( X \) and \( Y' \times L^2(\Omega) \), where \( X := L_2(I; H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; H^{-1}(\Omega)) \) and \( Y := L_2(I; H_0^1(\Omega)) \). As a consequence of the non-coercivity, it requires a careful selection of the test space to arrive at a stable Petrov–Galerkin system whose solution is a quasi-best approximation from the trial space. To relax the conditions on the test space, a minimal residual Petrov–Galerkin discretization was introduced in [1]. It has an equivalent interpretation as a Galerkin discretization of an extended self-adjoint, indefinite mixed
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system, with the Riesz lift of the residual of the primal variable from the “trial space” being an additional variable from the “test space”. In [38], uniform inf-sup stability was demonstrated for both trial and test space being finite element spaces of comparable dimensions, w.r.t. general partitions of the space-time cylinder into prismatic elements, which however must be decomposable into “time-slabs”. The latter means that a possibly non-uniform partition of the time interval must be global in space, which does not align with the aim to permit fully-flexible local refinements in space and time.

In the recent work [18] by Führer and Karkulik, for the aforementioned heat equation with forcing term \( f \in L^2(I \times \Omega) \) and initial condition \( u_0 \in L^2(\Omega) \), it was proven that with \( \overline{U}_0 := \{ u \in X \times L^2(I \times \Omega)^d : \text{div} \, u \in L^2(I \times \Omega) \} \) equipped with the graph norm,

\[
\arg\min_{u=(u_1, u_2) \in \overline{U}_0} \| u_2 + \nabla_x u_1 \|^2_{L^2(I \times \Omega)^d} + \| \text{div} \, u_2 - f \|^2_{L^2(I \times \Omega)} + \| u(0, \cdot) - u_0 \|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}
\]

is a well-posed First-Order System Least-Squares (FOSLS) formulation for the pair of the solution \( u = u_1 \) and (minus) its spatial gradient \( -\nabla_x u = u_2 \). This formulation can already be found in [4] without a proof of its well-posedness though.

The FOSLS formulation from [18] has major advantages. The Euler–Lagrange equations resulting from the minimization problem correspond to a symmetric, coercive bilinear form on \( X \), well-posedness though. A disadvantage of the FOSLS method from [18] is that the graph norm on \( \overline{U}_0 \) is considerably stronger than the \( X \)-norm for the error in \( u_1 \). This appears from the low convergence rates reported in [18] for the adaptive routine with standard Lagrange finite element spaces applied to non-smooth solutions, e.g., as those that result from a discontinuity in the transition of initial and boundary data. Furthermore, as far as we know, an open problem is the development of optimal preconditioners for the space \( \overline{U}_0 \), which is an important issue in view of the fact that with space-time methods, a PDE posed on a \((d+1)\)-dimensional domain has to be solved.

In the current work, we contribute to a further development of the FOSLS method from [18]. In particular,

- we show that \( \overline{U}_0 \) is isomorphic to \( U_0 := \{ u \in L^2(I ; H^1_0(\Omega)) \times L^2(I \times \Omega)^d : \text{div} \, u \in L^2(I \times \Omega) \} \) equipped with the graph norm (Prop. 2.1), which circumvents the dual norm incorporated in the definition of \( X \). It is a key ingredient in the derivation of most of the other results from this work;
- we show that the FOSLS method applies to general parabolic equations of second order with homogeneous Dirichlet, homogeneous Neumann, or mixed homogeneous Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions (Thm. 2.3 and Prop. 2.5);
- we extend the FOSLS method to forcing functions \( f \notin L^2(I \times \Omega) \) (Prop. 2.5);
- by appending an additional term to the least-squares functional measuring the squared error in the boundary data, we extend the FOSLS method to inhomogeneous Dirichlet (Thm. 2.8) or Neumann data (Thm. 2.9), where, however, the norms in which these errors are measured are not of \( L^2 \)-type;
- finally, using the framework developed by Siebert [32], which particularly allows for relatively general marking strategies (Rem. 3.2), we prove plain convergence (Thm. 3.3) of the adaptive FOSLS method (Alg. 3.1) for homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions driven by the least-squares estimator. This convergence proof...
generalizes to a large class of least-squares formulations (Rem. 3.7), including, e.g., the aforementioned FOSLS formulation of the Poisson model problem. Independently, Führer and Praetorius [19] have recently used a similar proof idea to derive convergence of various least-squares formulations, excluding however the considered space-time FOSLS.

The remainder of the current section fixes some notation (Sect. 1.1), recalls abstract parabolic evolution equations (Sect. 1.2), and introduces the particular instance of parabolic PDEs of second order (Sect. 1.3) that will be considered throughout the manuscript.

1.1. Notation

In this work, by $C \lesssim D$ we will mean that $C$ can be bounded by a multiple of $D$, independently of parameters on which $C$ and $D$ may depend. Obviously, $C \geq D$ is defined as $D \lesssim C$, and $C \approx D$ as $C \lesssim D$ and $C \gtrsim D$.

For normed linear spaces $E$ and $F$, we will denote by $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$ the normed linear space of bounded linear mappings $E \to F$, and by $\text{Lis}(E, F)$ its subset of boundedly invertible linear mappings $E \to F$. We write $E \leftrightarrow F$ to denote that $E$ is continuously embedded into $F$. For simplicity only, we exclusively consider linear spaces over the scalar field $\mathbb{R}$.

For a Hilbert space $W$ that is densely and continuously embedded in a space of type $L_2(\Sigma)$, we mostly use the scalar product on $L_2(\Sigma)$ to denote its unique extension to the duality pairing on $W' \times W$.

1.2. Abstract parabolic evolution equation

Let $V$ and $H$ be separable Hilbert spaces such that $V \hookrightarrow H$ with dense and compact embedding. Identifying $H$ with its dual, we obtain the Gelfand triple $V \hookrightarrow H \approx H' \hookrightarrow V'$. For almost all $t \in I := (0, T)$, let $a(t; \cdot, \cdot)$ be a bilinear form on $V \times V$ such that for any $\mu, \lambda \in V$, $t \mapsto a(t; \mu, \lambda)$ is measurable on $I$, and such that for some constant $\bar{g} \geq 0$, for a.e. $t \in I$, and all $\mu, \lambda$,

$$|a(t; \mu, \lambda)| \lesssim \|\mu\|_V \|\lambda\|_V \quad (\text{boundedness}),$$

$$a(t; \mu, \mu) + \bar{g} \|\mu\|^2 \gtrsim \|\mu\|^2_\lambda \quad (\text{Gårding inequality}).$$

With $(A(t)\cdot)(\cdot) := a(t; \cdot, \cdot)$, we consider the parabolic initial value problem of finding $u: I \to V$ such that

$$
\begin{cases}
\frac{du}{dt}(t) + A(t)u(t) = g(t) & \text{for a.e. } t \in I, \\
u(0) = u_0.
\end{cases}
$$

A proof of the following result is found in [29], see also Chapter IV, Section 26 of [42] and Chapter XVIII, Section 3 of [15].

**Theorem 1.1.** With $X := L_2(I; V) \cap H^1(I; V')$, $Y := L_2(I; V)$,

$$(Bu)(v) := \int_I (\partial_t u(t, \cdot))(v(t, \cdot)) + a(t; u(t), v(t))dt,$$

and $\gamma_0 := u \mapsto u|_{t=0}$, it holds that

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
B \\
\gamma_0
\end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{L}(X, (Y \times H)'),
$$

with upper bounds for the norm of the operator and that of its inverse only dependent on upper bounds for the boundedness constant, the reciprocal of the constant in the Gårding inequality, and $\bar{g}$.

So for $(g, u_0) \in Y' \times H$, a well-posed variational formulation of the parabolic problem reads as finding $u \in X$ such that $(Bu, \gamma_0 u) = (g, u_0)$. 
1.3. Parabolic equations of second order

For a bounded Lipschitz domain \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) with outer normal \( n_\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^d \), relatively open subsets \( \Gamma_D \) and \( \Gamma_N \) of \( \partial \Omega \) with \( \Gamma_D \cap \Gamma_N = \emptyset \) and \( \Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_N = \partial \Omega \), \( b \in L_\infty(I \times \Omega)^d \), \( c \in L_\infty(I \times \Omega) \), and \( A = A^T \in L_\infty(I \times \Omega)^{d \times d} \) uniformly positive definite, we consider the problem of finding \( u : I \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \) that for given data \( f, \phi, u_D \), and \( u_0 \) satisfies

\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t u - \operatorname{div}_x A \nabla_x u + b \cdot \nabla_x u + cu &= f & \text{ on } I \times \Omega, \\
(A \nabla_x u) \cdot n_\Omega &= \phi & \text{ on } I \times \Gamma_N, \\
u &= u_D & \text{ on } I \times \Gamma_D, \\
u(0, \cdot) &= u_0 & \text{ on } \Omega.
\end{aligned}
\] (1.1)

Taking until Section 2.2 a homogeneous Dirichlet datum \( u_D = 0 \), a variational formulation of (1.1) leads to a problem as in Theorem 1.1, where \( V := H^1_D(\Omega) = \{ u \in H^1(\Omega) : u|_{\Gamma_D} = 0 \} \) and \( H := L_2(\Omega) \), so that

\[
X = L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; H^1_D(\Omega)'), \quad Y = L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega)),
\]

the bilinear form reads as

\[
a(t; \mu, \lambda) := \int_\Omega A(t, x) \nabla \mu(x) \cdot \nabla \lambda(x) + (b(t, x) \cdot \nabla \mu(x) + c(t, x) \mu(x)) \lambda(x) \, dx,
\]

and the forcing term reads as

\[
g(v) := \int_{I \times \Omega} f v \, dx \, dt + \int_{I \times \Gamma_N} \phi v \, ds.
\] (1.2)

As follows from Theorem 1.1, this variational problem is actually well-posed for any \( g \in Y' \). For a discussion in which sense the solution of the variational problem can be interpreted as a solution of (1.1), we refer to [15], pages 524–528.

Concerning the bilinear form \( a \), both its boundedness constant, the reciprocal of the constant in the Gårding inequality, and \( \phi \) can be bounded in terms of upper bounds for \( \|b\|_{L_\infty(I \times \Omega)^d}, \|c\|_{L_\infty(I \times \Omega)}, \|A\|_{L_\infty(I \times \Omega)^{d \times d}}, \) and \( \|A^{-1}\|_{L_\infty(I \times \Omega)^{d \times d}} \).

2. Formulation as a first-order system

2.1. Homogeneous boundary conditions

For the case that \( g \in L_2(I \times \Omega) \), we will derive a system for \( u = (u_1, u_2) = (u, -A \nabla_x u) \) with \( u \) being the solution of the variational problem \((Bu, \gamma_0 u) = (g, u_0)\) from Section 1.3. Recall that such a problem arises from (1.1) when besides \( u_D = 0 \), it holds that \( f \in L_2(I \times \Omega) \) and \( \phi = 0 \). Generally at the expense of having to solve an additional (elliptic) PDE, general \( g \in Y' \) (i.e., \( f \notin L_2(I \times \Omega) \) and/or Neumann datum \( \phi \neq 0 \) will be handled as well.

Let

\[
U := \{ u = (u_1, u_2) \in L_2(I; H^1(\Omega)) \times L_2(I \times \Omega)^d : \text{ div } u \in L_2(I \times \Omega) \}
\]

equipped with graph norm

\[
\|u\|^2_U := \|u_1\|^2_{L_2(I; H^1(\Omega))} + \|u_2\|^2_{L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)^d)} + \|\text{div } u\|^2_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}.
\] (2.1)

Knowing that \( \text{div} : L_2(I \times \Omega)^{d+1} \ni \text{dom}(\text{div}) \to L_2(I \times \Omega) \) is a closed linear operator (a necessary condition for \( H(\text{div}; I \times \Omega) \) being a Hilbert space), from \( L_2(I; H^1(\Omega)) \times L_2(I \times \Omega)^d \hookrightarrow L_2(I \times \Omega)^{d+1} \), it follows that \( \text{div} : L_2(I; H^1(\Omega)) \times L_2(I \times \Omega)^d \ni \text{dom}(\text{div}) \to L_2(I \times \Omega) \) is a closed linear operator. Together with the facts that \( L_2(I; H^1(\Omega)) \times L_2(I \times \Omega)^d \) and \( L_2(I \times \Omega) \) are Hilbert spaces, this shows that \( U \) is a Hilbert space.
With \( n = (n_t, n_x) \) denoting the outer normal vector on the boundary of \( I \times \Omega \), using that \( u \mapsto u_{|I \times \Gamma_N} \cdot n \in L(H(\text{div}; I \times \Omega), H^1_0(I \times \Gamma_N))' \) we define the closed subspace \( U_0 \) of \( U \) by

\[
U_0 := \{ u \in L_2(I; H^1_0(\Omega)) \times L_2(I \times \Omega)^d : \text{div} \, u \in L_2(I \times \Omega), u_{|I \times \Gamma_N} \cdot n = 0 \}.
\]

We start with showing that \( U_0 \) is isomorphic to a seemingly smaller space that was employed in [18].

**Proposition 2.1.** It holds that

\[
U_0 \cong \tilde{U}_0 := \{ u \in X \times L_2(I \times \Omega)^d : \text{div} \, u \in L_2(I \times \Omega), u_{|I \times \Gamma_N} \cdot n = 0 \},
\]

equipped with the graph norm

\[
\| u \|_{\tilde{U}_0}^2 := \| u_1 \|^2_{L_2(I; H^1(\Omega))} + \| \partial_t u_1 \|^2_{L_2(I; H^1(\Omega))} + \| u_2 \|^2_{L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)^d)} + \| \text{div} \, u \|^2_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}.
\]

This proposition is a direct consequence of the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.2.** For \( u \in H_{0,I \times \Gamma_N}(\text{div}; I \times \Omega) := \{ u \in H(\text{div}; I \times \Omega) : u_{|I \times \Gamma_N} \cdot n = 0 \} \), it holds that \( \partial_t u_1 \in L_2(I; H^1_0(\Omega)) \) with

\[
\| \partial_t u_1 \|_{L_2(I; H^1_0(\Omega))} \leq \sqrt{2} \| u \|_{H(\text{div}; I \times \Omega)}.
\]

**Proof.** For smooth \( u \in H_{0,I \times \Gamma_N}(\text{div}; I \times \Omega) \) (for which \( u \cdot n \) is defined in the classical pointwise sense), we have \( \text{div} \, u = \partial_t u_1 + \text{div}_x u_2 \). For smooth \( v \in L_2(I; H^1_0(\Omega)) \), we have

\[
\int_{I \times \Omega} u_2 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt = -\int_{I \times \Omega} v \, \text{div}_x u_2 \, dx \, dt + \int_{I \times \Gamma_N} u_2 \cdot n_x \, v \, ds = -\int_{I \times \Omega} v \, \text{div}_x u_2 \, dx \, dt + \int_{I \times \Gamma_N} u \cdot n \, v \, ds = -\int_{I \times \Omega} v \, \text{div}_x u_2 \, dx \, dt.
\]

Since the set of such \( v \) is dense in \( L_2(I; H^1_0(\Omega)) \), we conclude

\[
\| \partial_t u_1 \|_{L_2(I; H^1_0(\Omega))} \leq \| \text{div} \, u \|_{L_2(I; H^1_0(\Omega))} + \| \text{div}_x u_2 \|_{L_2(I; H^1_0(\Omega))} \leq \| \text{div} \, u \|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)} + \| u_2 \|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)^d} \leq \sqrt{2} \| u \|_{H(\text{div}; I \times \Omega)}.
\]

Since the set of such \( u \) is dense in \( H_{0,I \times \Gamma_N}(\text{div}; I \times \Omega) \), the proof is completed. For \( \partial(I \times \Omega) \) instead of \( I \times \Gamma_N \), the corresponding density result is well-known. The proof of Theorem 2.6 from [21] easily generalizes to \( I \times \Gamma_N \) using that the term \( l_{d+2} \in H^1(I \times \Omega) \) from there additionally satisfies that \( l_{d+2}|_{\partial(I \times \Omega)} = 0 \) as \( l_{d+2}|_{\partial(I \times \Omega)} \) is orthogonal to \( u \cdot n \) for all smooth \( u \in H_{0,I \times \Gamma_N}(\text{div}; I \times \Omega) \).

The following theorem generalizes [18], see Remark 2.6 for a discussion.

**Theorem 2.3** (Homogeneous Dirichlet). It holds that

\[
G: (u_1, u_2) \mapsto (u_2 + A \nabla_x u_1, \text{div} \, u - b \cdot A^{-1} u_2 + cu_1, u_1(0, \cdot)) \\
\in \text{Lis}(U_0, L_2(I \times \Omega)^d \times L_2(I \times \Omega) \times L_2(\Omega)).
\]

**Remark 2.4.** Analogously, one can prove the same result for \( (u_1, u_2) \mapsto (u_2 + A \nabla_x u_1, \text{div} \, u + b \cdot \nabla_x u_1 + cu_1, u_1(0, \cdot)) \).
Proof. Boundedness of $G$ follows from the definition of $U_0$, and the fact that $X \hookrightarrow C(I; L_2(\Omega))$ ([24], Chap. 1, Thm. 3.1) in combination with Proposition 2.1.

As we have seen in the proof of Lemma 2.2, for $u \in U_0$ and $v \in L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega))$, it holds that $(-\nabla_x u_2)(v) = \int_{I \times \Omega} v \text{div}_x u_2 \, dx \, dt$. From Theorem 1.1 we infer that

$$
\|u_1\|_{L_2(I; H^1(\Omega))} \leq \|u_1\|_X \lesssim \|Bu_1\|_{L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega)')} + \|u_1(0, \cdot)\|_{L_2(\Omega)},
$$

where

$$
\|Bu_1\|_{L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega)')} = \|\partial_t u_1 + \nabla_x A \nabla_x u_1 + b \cdot \nabla_x u_1 + cu_1\|_{L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega)')} \\
\leq \|\partial_t u_1 - \nabla_x u_2 + b \cdot \nabla_x u_1 + cu_1\|_{L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega)')} + \|\nabla'(u_2 + A \nabla_x u_1)\|_{L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega)')} \\
\lesssim \|\text{div} u + b \cdot \nabla_x u_1 + cu_1\|_{L_2(I; \Omega)} + \|u_2 + A \nabla_x u_1\|_{L_2(I; \Omega)}.
$$

From

$$
\|u_2\|_{L_2(I; \Omega)} \leq \|u_2 + A \nabla_x u_1\|_{L_2(I; \Omega)} + \|\text{div} u - b \cdot A^{-1} u_2 + cu_1\|_{L_2(I; \Omega)} + \|u_1\|_{L_2(I; H^1(\Omega))},
$$

and

$$
\|\text{div} u\|_{L_2(I; \Omega)} \lesssim \|\text{div} u - b \cdot A^{-1} u_2 + cu_1\|_{L_2(I; \Omega)} + \|u_1\|_{L_2(I; \Omega)^{d+1}},
$$

we conclude that $\|u\|_U \lesssim \|Gu\|_{L_2(I; \Omega)^d \times L_2(I; \Omega) \times L_2(\Omega)}$, and thus in particular that $G$ is injective.

Given $(q, h, u_0) \in L_2(I \times \Omega)^d \times L_2(I \times \Omega) \times L_2(\Omega)$, let $u_1 \in X$ be the solution of

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
B \\
\gamma_0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
u_1
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
u \mapsto \int_{I \times \Omega} (h + b \cdot A^{-1} q)v + q \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt
\end{bmatrix}_{u_0} \in L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega)') \times L_2(\Omega),
$$

so that for $v \in L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega))$

$$
\int_{I \times \Omega} \partial_t u_1 v + A \nabla_x u_1 \cdot \nabla_x v + b \cdot \nabla_x u_1 v + cu_1 v \, dx \, dt \\
= \int_{I \times \Omega} (h + b \cdot A^{-1} q)v + q \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt,
$$

and thus for $u_2 := q - A \nabla_x u_1 \in L_2(I \times \Omega)^d$

$$
\int_{I \times \Omega} \partial_t u_1 v - u_2 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt = \int_{I \times \Omega} (h + b \cdot A^{-1} u_2 - cu_1) v \, dx \, dt.
$$

For $v \in H^1(I \times \Omega)$ that vanish at $\partial(I \times \Omega) \setminus \overline{T \times \Gamma_N}$, one has $\int_{I \times \Omega} \partial_t u_1 v \, dx \, dt = -\int_{I \times \Omega} u_1 \partial_t v \, dx \, dt$, and therefore $\int_{I \times \Omega} \partial_t u_1 v - u_2 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt = -\int_{I \times \Omega} u \cdot \nabla v \, dx \, dt$, which shows $\text{div} u = \tilde{h}$. Moreover, for such $v$, it holds that

$$
\int_{I \times \Gamma_N} u \cdot n v \, ds = \int_{I \times \Omega} \text{div} u + u \cdot \nabla v \, dx \, dt = \int_{I \times \Omega} \tilde{v} \tilde{h} + u_1 \partial_t v + u_2 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt
$$

$$
= \int_{I \times \Omega} \tilde{v} \tilde{h} - (\partial_t u_1 v - u_2 \cdot \nabla_x v) \, dx \, dt = 0,
$$

which proves that $u|_{I \times \Gamma_N} \cdot n = 0$, and so $u \in U_0$. We conclude that $Gu = (q, h, u_0)$, i.e., $G$ is surjective, which completes the proof.

\[\square\]
Next, using Theorem 2.3, we show that the well-posed standard variational formulation of the parabolic problem discussed in Sections 1.2 and 1.3, thus with homogeneous Dirichlet datum \( u_D = 0 \), has an equivalent formulation as a well-posed first-order system. As a preparation, we note that any forcing term \( g \in L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega))' \) can (non-uniquely) be written in the form

\[
g(v) = \int_{I \times \Omega} g_1 v + g_2 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt \quad \text{for all } v \in L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega)),
\]

for some \( g_1 \in L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)) \) and \( g_2 \in L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)^d) \). Take, e.g., \( g_1 = w \) and \( g_2 = \nabla_x w \) with \( w \in L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega)) \) being the Riesz lift of \( g \) defined by

\[
\int_{I \times \Omega} w v + \nabla_x w \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt = g(v) \quad \text{for all } v \in L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega)).
\]

**Proposition 2.5.** With a splitting of \( g \in L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega))' \) as in (2.2), where \( (g_1, g_2) \in L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)) \times L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)^d) \), and \( u_0 \in L_2(\Omega) \), it holds that \( u_1 \in X = L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega)) \cap H^1(I; H^1_D(\Omega))' \) solves \( (Bu_1, \gamma_0 u_1) = (g, u_0) \) and \( u_2 = -A \nabla_x u_1 + g_2 \) if and only if \( u = (u_1, u_2) \in U_0 \) solves

\[
Gu = (g_2, g_1 - b \cdot A^{-1} g_2, u_0).
\]

**Proof.** With \( u_2 = -A \nabla_x u_1 + g_2 \), i.e., \( (Gu)_1 = g_2 \), the equation \( Bu_1 = g \), i.e.,

\[
\int_{I \times \Omega} (\partial_t u_1 + b \cdot \nabla_x u_1 + cu_1) v + A \nabla_x u_1 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt = g(v) \quad (v \in L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega))),
\]

is equivalent to

\[
\int_{I \times \Omega} \partial_t u_1 v - u_2 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt = \int_{I \times \Omega} \left( b \cdot A^{-1}(u_2 - g_2) - cu_1 + g_1 \right) v \, dx \, dt \quad (v \in L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega))).
\]

As we have seen in the last paragraph of the proof of Theorem 2.3, (2.4) implies \( \text{div } u = \tilde{g} \), i.e., \( (Gu)_2 = g_1 - b \cdot A^{-1} g_2 \), and \( u|_{I \times \Gamma_N} = 0 \).

Conversely, let \( u \in U_0 \) satisfy \( Gu = (g_2, g_1 - b \cdot A^{-1} g_2, u_0) \). Then, Proposition 2.1 shows that \( u_1 \in X \). Since \( \text{div } u = \tilde{g} \), it remains to show that

\[
\int_{I \times \Omega} \partial_t u_1 v - u_2 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt = \int_{I \times \Omega} \text{div } u \, dx \, dt \quad (v \in L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega))).
\]

The latter relation is already valid for arbitrary \( u \in H^1_{0, I \times \Gamma_N}(\text{div}; I \times \Omega) \) and \( v \in L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega)) \). Indeed, for smooth \( u \) and \( v \) in these spaces, it follows by integration by parts, and so by using Lemma 2.2, it follows by the density of the sets of those functions in these spaces.

When \( f \in L_2(I \times \Omega) \) and \( \phi = 0 \) in (1.1), one has \( g = f \in L_2(I \times \Omega) \) and one obviously takes \( (g_1, g_2) = (g, 0) \) in the previous proposition. For \( g \in L_2(I; H^1_D(\Omega))' \setminus L_2(I \times \Omega) \) (i.e., \( f \notin L_2(I \times \Omega) \) and/or \( \phi \neq 0 \)) generally the splitting of \( g \) requires solving (2.3). For the case that \( \Gamma_N = \partial \Omega \), an alternative approach for inhomogeneous Neumann datum \( \phi \neq 0 \) will be presented in Theorem 2.9.

**Remark 2.6.** Theorem 2.3 extends the crucial result from [18]. For the case that \( A = \text{Id}, b = 0 = c \), and \( \Gamma_D = \partial \Omega \), there it was shown that the harmlessly different operator \( \tilde{G} : u \mapsto G(u, -u_2) : \tilde{U}_0 \mapsto L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)^d) \times L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)) \times \tilde{L}_2(\Omega) \) is in \( \mathcal{L}(\tilde{U}_0, \text{ran } \tilde{G}) \), and that ran \( \tilde{G} \supseteq \{0\} \times L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)) \times L_2(\Omega) \). We showed that \( G \), and thus \( \tilde{G} \), is also surjective. Notice that for well-posedness of a least-squares formulation, this surjectivity is not required. Indeed, bounded invertibility of the operator between its domain and its range is equivalent to
boundedness and coercivity of the bilinear form corresponding to the Euler–Lagrange equations resulting from the least-squares functional.

Our motivation to replace \( \mathbf{u}_2 \) by \( -\mathbf{u}_2 \) is that \( \partial_t u_1 + \text{div}_x \mathbf{u}_2 \) is the divergence of the vector field \( \mathbf{u} : I \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \). When imposing, as we do, that the latter divergence is in \( L_2(I \times \Omega) \), we know that \( \mathbf{u} \) has a normal trace at \( \partial(I \times \Omega) \), which allowed an easy extension to homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions. Furthermore, in Proposition 2.1, we made the observation that \( \tilde{U}_0 \approx U_0 \), which freed ourselves from the dual norm which is part of the definition of \( \tilde{U}_0 \). This will also play an essential role in the proofs of Theorem 2.8 and 2.9 dealing with inhomogeneous boundary conditions, and that of Theorem 3.3 concerning plain convergence of a standard adaptive algorithm.

### 2.2. Inhomogeneous boundary conditions

We extend the first-order formulation to cover both inhomogeneous (pure) Dirichlet boundary conditions and inhomogeneous (pure) Neumann boundary conditions, the latter now without the need to compute a Riesz lift of the boundary datum.

The following lemma is essentially a slight generalization of Theorem 2.1 from [36]. Thinking of \( S \) as being a trace operator, it shows how to append (essential) inhomogeneous boundary conditions to an equation that is well-posed for the corresponding homogeneous boundary conditions.

**Lemma 2.7.** Let \( \mathcal{X} \) and \( \mathcal{Y}_2 \) be Banach spaces, and \( \mathcal{Y}_1 \) be a normed linear space. Let \( S \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}_2) \) be surjective, let \( F \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}_1) \) be such that with \( \mathcal{X}_0 := \{ x \in \mathcal{X} : Sx = 0 \} \), \( F|_{\mathcal{X}_0} \in \text{Lis}(\mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{Y}_1) \). Then, \( \left[ \begin{array}{c} F \\ S \end{array} \right] \in \text{Lis}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2) \).

**Proof.** Knowing that \( S \) maps the open unit ball of \( \mathcal{X} \) onto an open neighborhood of \( 0 \in \mathcal{Y}_2 \) (according to the open mapping theorem), there exists a constant \( r > 0 \) such that for any \( y \in \mathcal{Y}_2 \) there exists an \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) with \( Sx = y \) and \( \|x\|_\mathcal{X} \leq r\|y\|_\mathcal{Y}_2 \). Denoting this mapping \( \gamma \mapsto x \) by \( E \), from \( \text{ran}(S) \subseteq \mathcal{X}_0 \) we have for \( x \in \mathcal{X} \)

\[
\|x\|_\mathcal{X} \leq \|ESx\|_\mathcal{X} + \|(Id - ES)x\|_\mathcal{X} \lesssim \|Sx\|_\mathcal{Y}_2 + \|F(Id - ES)x\|_\mathcal{Y}_1
\]

\[
\leq \|Sx\|_\mathcal{Y}_2 + \|Fx\|_\mathcal{Y}_1 + \|FESx\|_\mathcal{Y}_1 \lesssim \|Sx\|_\mathcal{Y}_2 + \|Fx\|_\mathcal{Y}_1 \lesssim \|x\|_\mathcal{X}.
\]

Given \( (y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \), let \( x_2 \in \mathcal{X} \) be such that \( Sx_2 = y_2 \), and \( x_0 \in \mathcal{X}_0 \) be such that \( Fx_0 = y_1 - Fx_2 \). Then, \( \left[ \begin{array}{c} F \\ S \end{array} \right] (x_0 + x_2) = \frac{y_1}{y_2} \) showing that \( \left[ \begin{array}{c} F \\ S \end{array} \right] \) is surjective, which completes the proof.

In combination with Theorem 2.3, Lemma 2.7 allows to prove the following theorem for inhomogeneous pure Dirichlet boundary conditions.

**Theorem 2.8 (Inhomogeneous (pure) Dirichlet).** It holds that

\[
G_D : \mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2) \mapsto (u_2 + A \nabla_x u_1, \text{div} \mathbf{u} - b \cdot A^{-1} \mathbf{u}_2 + cu_1, u_1|_{I \times \partial \Omega})
\]

\[
\in \text{Lis} \left( U, L_2(I \times \Omega)^d \times L_2(I \times \Omega) \times L_2(\Omega) \times (L_2(I; H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial \Omega)) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(I; L_2(\partial \Omega))) \right).
\]

**Proof.** An application of Lemma 2.2 for \( \Gamma_N = \emptyset \) shows that for \( \mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2) \in U \),

\[
\|u_1\|_{L_2(I; H^{1}(\Omega)) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(I; H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega))} \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}\|_U.
\]  

(2.5)

We will combine this observation with the fact that

\[
L_2(I; H^{1}(\Omega)) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(I; H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow C (\bar{I}; L_2(\Omega)) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(I; L_2(\Omega)),
\]

which follows from \( [H^{-1}(\Omega), H^{1}(\Omega)]_{\frac{1}{2}} = L_2(\Omega) \), see, e.g., [15], pages 480 and 494. As shown in Chapter 4, Theorem 2.1 of [25],

\[
u_1 \mapsto u_1|_{I \times \partial \Omega} \in \mathcal{L} \left( L_2(I; H^{1}(\Omega)) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(I; L_2(\Omega)), L_2(I; H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial \Omega)) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(I; L_2(\partial \Omega)) \right).
\]

\[
u_1 \mapsto u_1|_{I \times \partial \Omega} \in \mathcal{L} \left( L_2(I; H^{1}(\Omega)) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(I; L_2(\Omega)), L_2(I; H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial \Omega)) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(I; L_2(\partial \Omega)) \right).
\]
Together with (2.5) and (2.6), it shows that $G_D$ is bounded.

Since in the current case of $\Gamma_D = \partial \Omega$, we have $\{u \in U : u_1|_{\partial \Omega} = 0\} = U_0$, knowing the result of Theorem 2.3, Lemma 2.7 shows that the proof will be completed once we have shown that\footnote{Equation (2.7) in the original text.}

\[ U \to L_2(I; H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial \Omega)) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(I; L_2(\partial \Omega)) : u \mapsto u_D := u_1|_{\partial \Omega} \text{ is surjective.} \tag{2.7} \]

As shown in Theorem 2.9 from [14], the mapping

\[ u_1 \mapsto (h, u_D) := \left(v \mapsto \int_{I \times \Omega} \partial_t u_1 + \nabla_x u_1 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt, u_1|_{\partial \Omega}\right) \in \mathcal{L}(L_2(I; H^1(\Omega)) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{00,\{0\}}(I; L_2(\Omega)), \mathcal{L}(L_2(I; H^1_0(\Omega)) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{00,\{0\}}(I; L_2(\Omega)))', \]

where, with $H^1_{00,\{0\}}(I) := \{w \in H^1(I) : w(0) = 0\}$, $H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{00,\{0\}}(I) := [L_2(I), H^1_{00,\{0\}}(I)]^\frac{1}{2}$, with a similar definition of $H^{\frac{1}{2}}_{00,\{0\}}(I)$. For given $h$ and $u_D$, the corresponding $u_1$ is in $L_2(I; H^1(\Omega))$. Taking $h \in L_2(I; L_2(\Omega))$ (e.g., $h = 0$) and $u_2 = -\nabla_x u_1 \in L_2(I \times \Omega)^d$, from $\int_{I \times \Omega} \partial_t u_1 v - u_2 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt = \int_{I \times \Omega} hv \, dx \, dt$ for $v \in \mathcal{D}(I \times \Omega)$, it follows that $\text{div} u = h \in L_2(I \times \Omega)$, i.e., (2.7) is valid.

Using Theorem 2.8, we formulate the parabolic problem with inhomogeneous pure Dirichlet boundary conditions as a well-posed first-order system. Let $(g_1, g_2) \in L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)) \times L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)^d)$, $u_0 \in L_2(\Omega)$, and $u_D \in L_2(I; H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial \Omega)) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(I; L_2(\partial \Omega))$, and set $g := v \mapsto \int_{I \times \Omega} g_1 v + g_2 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt \in L_2(I; H^{-1}(\Omega))$. Then the solution $u = (u_1, u_2) \in U$ of

\[ G_D u = (g_2, g_1 - b \cdot A^{-1} g_2, u_0, u_D), \tag{2.8} \]

satisfies

\[ (Bu_1, \gamma_0 u_1, u_1|_{\partial \Omega}) = (g, u_0, u_D), \]

i.e., $u_1$ satisfies the parabolic PDE in standard variational form and both the initial and Dirichlet boundary condition. Indeed, knowing $u_2 + A \nabla_x u_1 = g_2$, the second equation in (2.8) is equivalent to $\int_{I \times \Omega} (\partial_t u_1 + b \cdot \nabla_x u_1 + c u_1) v + A \nabla_x u_1 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt = g(v)$ for all $v \in L_2(I; H^1_0(\Omega))$.

Analogously to the case of inhomogeneous pure Dirichlet boundary conditions, the combination of Theorem 2.3 and Lemma 2.7 allows to prove the following theorem for inhomogeneous pure Neumann boundary conditions.

**Theorem 2.9 (Inhomogeneous (pure) Neumann).** It holds that

\[ G_N : u = (u_1, u_2) \mapsto (u_2 + A \nabla_x u_1, \text{div} u - b \cdot A^{-1} u_2 + c u_1, u_1(0, \cdot), u_1|_{\partial \Omega} \cdot n) \in \mathcal{L}(U, L_2(I \times \Omega)^d \times L_2(I \times \Omega) \times L_2(\Omega) \times (L_2(I; H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial \Omega)) \cap H^{\frac{1}{2}}(I; L_2(\partial \Omega)))'). \]

**Proof.** Clearly, the first two components of $G_N$ are continuous. Recall from (2.5) and (2.6) that also the third one is bounded, and that $\|u_1\|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}}(I; L_2(\Omega))} \lesssim \|u\|_U$. To see boundedness of the fourth one, we first remark that for smooth $u$ and $v$ on $I \times \Omega$, integration by parts shows that

\[ \int_{I \times \partial \Omega} u \cdot n \, v \, ds = \int_{I \times \Omega} u_2 \cdot \nabla_x v + \text{div} u \, v - \partial_t u_1 \, v \, dx \, dt. \tag{2.9} \]
As we have seen in the proof of Theorem 2.8, \( v \in L_2(I; H^\frac{1}{2}(\partial\Omega)) \cap H^\frac{1}{2} (I; L_2(\partial\Omega)) \) has a bounded extension to a \( v_1 \in L_2(I; H^1(\Omega)) \cap H^\frac{1}{2}_{00,\Omega}(I; L_2(\Omega)). \) Equally well it has a bounded extension to a \( v_2 \in L_2(I; H^1(\Omega)) \cap H^\frac{1}{2}_{00,\Omega}(I; L_2(\Omega)). \) Taking a smooth \( \chi : I \to [0,1] \) with \( \chi \equiv 1 \) in a neighborhood of 0 and \( \chi \equiv 0 \) in a neighborhood of \( T, \) and \( v_3(t,x) := \chi(t)v_1(t,x) + (1 - \chi(t))v_2(t,x), \) we obtain a bounded extension to a \( v_3 \in L_2(I; H^1(\Omega)) \cap H^\frac{1}{2}_{00,\Omega}(I; L_2(\Omega)), \) where \( H^\frac{1}{2}_{00,\Omega}(I) : = [L_2(I), H^\frac{1}{2}_{00,\Omega}(I)]_{\frac{1}{2}}. \) Given such an extension of \( v \in L_2(I; H^\frac{1}{2}(\partial\Omega)) \cap H^\frac{1}{2} (I; L_2(\partial\Omega)), \) for \( u \in U \) the right-hand side of (2.9) can be bounded by a multiple of \( \| u \|_{H^\frac{1}{2}(\partial\Omega) \cap H^\frac{1}{2} (I; L_2(\partial\Omega))} \) where the term \( \int_{I\times\Omega} \partial_t u_1 v_3 \, dx \, dt \) is bounded via interpolation as follows

\[
\left| \int_{I\times\Omega} \partial_t u_1 v_3 \, dx \, dt \right| \lesssim \| u_1 \|_{H^\frac{1}{2}(I; L_2(\Omega))} \| v_3 \|_{H^\frac{1}{2}_{00,\Omega}(I; L_2(\Omega))} \approx \| u_1 \|_{H^\frac{1}{2}(I; L_2(\Omega))} \| v_3 \|_{H^\frac{1}{2}_{00,\Omega}(I; L_2(\Omega))} \lesssim \| u \|_{U} \| v \|_{L_2(I; H^\frac{1}{2}(\partial\Omega) \cap H^\frac{1}{2} (I; L_2(\partial\Omega))}).
\]

By a standard mollification argument as in the original proof of Meyers–Serrin, one sees that the set of smooth \( u \in U \) is dense in \( U. \) This yields that \( G_N \) is bounded.

Since in the current case of \( \Gamma_N = \partial\Omega, \) we have \( \{ u \in U : u|_{I\times\partial\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \} = U_0, \) knowing the result of Theorem 2.3, Lemma 2.7 shows that the proof will be completed once we have shown that

\[
U \to \left( L_2(I; H^\frac{1}{2}(\partial\Omega)) \cap H^\frac{1}{2} (I; L_2(\partial\Omega)) \right)' : u \mapsto u|_{I\times\partial\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{n} \text{ is surjective.} \tag{2.10}
\]

In Corollary 3.17 of [14], it has been shown that for any \( \psi \in (L_2(I; H^\frac{1}{2}(\partial\Omega)) \cap H^\frac{1}{2} (I; L_2(\partial\Omega)))' \) there exists a \( u_1 \in L_2(I; H^1(\Omega)) \cap H^\frac{1}{2}_{00,\Omega}(I; L_2(\Omega)) \) with \( \partial_t u_1 - \Delta u_1 = 0 \) on \( I \times \Omega, \) and \( (\nabla_x u_1)|_{I\times\partial\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{n} = -\psi. \) Taking \( u_2 = -\nabla_x u_1, \) it means \( \text{div} \ u = 0 \) and \( u|_{I\times\partial\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \psi, \) so that \( u \in U \) and (2.10) is valid. \( \square \)

Using Theorem 2.9, we formulate the parabolic problem with inhomogeneous pure Neumann boundary conditions as a well-posed first-order system. Let \( (g_1, g_2) \in L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)) \times L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)^d) \) with \( g_2|_{I\times\partial\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{n} \in L_2(I; H^\frac{1}{2}(\partial\Omega)) \cap H^\frac{1}{2} (I; L_2(\partial\Omega))', \) \( u_0 \in L_2(\Omega), \) and \( \phi \in L_2(I; H^\frac{1}{2}(\partial\Omega)) \cap H^\frac{1}{2} (I; L_2(\partial\Omega))', \) and set \( g := v \mapsto \int_{I\times\Omega} g_1 v \, g_2 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt \in L_2(I; H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega)). \) Then, the solution \( u = (u_1, u_2) \in U \) of

\[
G_N u = (g_2, g_1 - \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{-1} g_2, u_0, g_2|_{I\times\partial\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{n} - \phi), \tag{2.11}
\]

satisfies

\[
(Bu_1, g_0 u_1, \mathbf{A} \nabla_x u_1)|_{I\times\partial\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{n} = (g, u_0, \phi),
\]

i.e., \( u_1 \) satisfies the parabolic PDE in standard variational form and both the initial and Neumann boundary condition. Indeed, knowing \( u_2 + \mathbf{A} \nabla_x u_1 = g_2, \) it holds that \( \mathbf{A} \nabla_x u_1|_{I\times\partial\Omega} : \mathbf{n} = (g_2 - u_2)|_{I\times\partial\Omega} : \mathbf{n} = \phi, \) and the second equation in (2.11) is equivalent to \( \int_{I\times\Omega} (\partial_t u_1 + \mathbf{b} \cdot \nabla_x u_1 + cu_1) v + \mathbf{A} \nabla_x u_1 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt = g(v) \) for all \( v \in L_2(I; H^\frac{1}{2}(\Omega)). \)

3. Plain Convergence of Adaptive Algorithm for Homogeneous Pure Dirichlet Boundary Conditions

Consider the setting of Section 1.3 with \( \Gamma_D = \partial\Omega \) and homogeneous Dirichlet datum \( u_D = 0. \) Let \( (f_1, f_2) \in L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)) \times L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)^d), \) \( f := v \mapsto \int_{I\times\Omega} f_1 v \, f_2 \cdot \nabla_x v \, dx \, dt \in L_2(I; H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega)) \) and \( u_0 \in L_2(\Omega). \) Since no Neumann boundary conditions are present, \( g \) from (1.2) coincides with \( f. \) Then, with \( u \) being the solution \( u \) of (1.1), Proposition 2.5 states that \( u = (u, -\mathbf{A} \nabla_x u) \in U_0 \) is the unique solution of

\[
G u = f,
\]
where
\[ f := (f_2, f_1 - b \cdot A^{-1} f_2, u_0) \in L := L_2(I \times \Omega)^d \times L_2(I \times \Omega) \times L_2(\Omega). \]

For an arbitrary discrete subspace \( U_0^\delta \subset U_0 \), the corresponding least-squares approximation \( u^{\delta} \in U_0^\delta \) of \( u \) is given by
\[ u^{\delta} := \arg\min_{v \in U_0^\delta} \| f - Gv \|_L^2. \] (3.1)
The resulting Euler–Lagrange equation reads as
\[ (Gu^{\delta}, Gv)_L = (f, Gv)_L \quad \text{for all } v \in U_0^\delta. \] (3.2)
As \( G \) is a linear isomorphism, the left-hand side defines an elliptic bilinear form and the Lax–Milgram lemma indeed guarantees unique solvability of (3.1) and (3.2).
Throughout the remainder of this section, for \( p \in \mathbb{N} \) some fixed polynomial degree we consider discrete spaces of the form
\[ U_0^\delta := S_p^p(\mathcal{T}^\delta) \times S_p^p(\mathcal{T}^\delta)^d \subset U_0 \]
for conforming simplicial meshes \( \mathcal{T}^\delta \) of \( I \times \Omega \), where
\[ S_p^p(\mathcal{T}^\delta) := \{ u \in C(I \times \Omega) : u|_K \text{ polynomial of degree } p \text{ for all } K \in \mathcal{T}^\delta \}, \]
\[ S_p^p(\mathcal{T}^\delta) := \{ u \in S_p^p(\mathcal{T}^\delta) : u|_{I \times \partial \Omega} = 0 \}. \]
In particular, we consider such meshes that can be created by newest vertex bisection [35] starting from a given initial partition \( \mathcal{T}^0 \).
Finally, we define the reliable and efficient \textit{a posteriori} error estimator
\[ \eta(f, u^{\delta}) := \| f - Gu^{\delta} \|_L \approx \| u - u^{\delta} \|_U, \] (3.3)
with corresponding error indicators
\[ \eta(K; f, u^{\delta}) := \| f - Gu^{\delta} \|_{L(K)} \quad \text{for all } K \in \mathcal{T}^\delta, \] (3.4)
where
\[ L(\omega) := L_2(\omega)^d \times L_2(\omega) \times L_2(\partial_0 \omega) \quad \text{for all measurable } \omega \subseteq I \times \Omega. \]
Here and throughout the remainder of this section, we use the notation \( \partial_0 \omega := \partial \omega \cap \{0\} \times \Omega \).
We consider the following adaptive algorithm.

**Algorithm 3.1. Input:** Right-hand side \( f \in L \), initial mesh \( \mathcal{T}^0 = \mathcal{T}^\delta_0 \), marking function \( M : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty) \) that is continuous at 0 with \( M(0) = 0 \).

**Loop:** For each \( \ell = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \), iterate the following steps (i)–(iv):

(i) Compute least-squares approximation \( u^{\ell} = u^{\delta_\ell} \) of \( u \).
(ii) Compute error indicators \( \eta(K; f, u^{\ell}) \) for all elements \( K \in \mathcal{T}^{\ell} = \mathcal{T}^{\delta_\ell} \).
(iii) Determine a set of marked elements \( M^{\ell} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^{\ell} \) with the following marking property
\[ \max_{K \in \mathcal{T}^{\ell} \setminus M^{\ell}} \eta(K; f, u^{\ell}) \leq \max_{K \in M^{\ell}} \eta(K; f, u^{\ell}). \]
(iv) Generate refined conforming simplicial mesh $\mathcal{T}^{\ell+1}$ by refining at least all marked elements $\mathcal{M}^\ell$ via newest vertex bisection.

**Output:** Refined meshes $\mathcal{T}^\ell$, corresponding exact discrete solutions $u^\ell$, and error estimators $\eta(f, u^\ell)$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

**Remark 3.2.** The criterion (iii) is satisfied for standard marking strategies:

- Suppose that the Dörfler criterion is used for fixed $0 < \theta \leq 1$, i.e.,
  $$\theta \eta(f, u^\ell)^2 \leq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{M}^\ell} \eta(K; f, u^\ell)^2.$$

While this does not directly imply (iii), with the aim to realize optimal rates, the set $\mathcal{M}^\ell$ is constructed in practice via sorting of the indicators such that also

$$\max_{K \in \mathcal{T}^\ell \setminus \mathcal{M}^\ell} \eta(K; f, u^\ell) \leq \min_{K \in \mathcal{M}^\ell} \eta(K; f, u^\ell),$$

see [27]. Then, (iii) holds with $M(t) := t$.

- Suppose the maximum criterion is used for fixed $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, i.e.,
  $$\mathcal{M}^\ell := \left\{ K \in \mathcal{T}^\ell : \eta(K; f, u^\ell) \geq (1 - \theta) \max_{K' \in \mathcal{T}^\ell} \eta(K'; f, u^\ell) \right\}.$$

Then, (iii) holds with $M(t) := t$. To see this, let $K \in \mathcal{T}^\ell \setminus \mathcal{M}^\ell$ and note that

$$\eta(K; f, u^\ell) < (1 - \theta) \max_{K' \in \mathcal{T}^\ell} \eta(K'; f, u^\ell) \leq \min_{K' \in \mathcal{M}^\ell} \eta(K'; f, u^\ell).$$

The following theorem states convergence of Algorithm 3.1. For the heat equation with $A = \text{Id}$, $b = 0$, and $c = 0$, the performance of the algorithm has been numerically investigated in [18].

**Theorem 3.3** (Convergence for homogeneous (pure) Dirichlet). There holds plain convergence of the error

$$\|u - u^\ell\|_U \to 0 \quad \text{as } \ell \to \infty. \quad (3.5)$$

As the considered estimator (3.3) is equivalent to the error, convergence to zero also transfers to the estimator.

**Proof.** It suffices to verify that the considered problem fits into the abstract framework of [32], which gives sufficient conditions for error convergence. This will be done in the following three steps.

**Step 1.** Define another equivalent norm on $U$

$$\|v\|_{U(I \times \Omega)}^2 := \|v_1\|_{L_2(I; H^1(\Omega))}^2 + \|v_2\|_{L_2(I; L_2(\Omega)^d)}^2 + \|\nabla v_1\|_{L_2(I \times \Omega)}^2 + \|v_1(0, \cdot)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2$$

for all $v = (v_1, v_2) \in U$. Moreover, define the following semi-norms for all measurable subsets $\omega \subseteq I \times \Omega$

$$\|v\|_{U(\omega)}^2 := \|v_1\|_{L_2(\omega)}^2 + \|\nabla v_1\|_{L_2(\omega)}^2 + \|v_2\|_{L_2(\omega)}^2 + \|\nabla v_1\|_{L_2(\partial \omega)}^2 + \|v_1|_{\partial \omega}\|_{L_2(\partial \omega)}^2.$$n

The additional term $\|v_1|_{\partial \omega}\|_{L_2(\partial \omega)}^2$ will be required to prove local stability (3.11). The semi-norms are additive as well as absolutely continuous in the sense of Section 2.1 from [32], i.e.,

$$\|v\|_{U(\omega_1 \cup \omega_2)}^2 = \|v\|_{U(\omega_1)}^2 + \|v\|_{U(\omega_2)}^2 \quad \text{for all } v \in U, \omega_1, \omega_2 \subseteq I \times \Omega \text{ with } \omega_1 \cap \omega_2 = \emptyset; \quad (3.6)$$

as well as

$$\lim_{|\omega| \to 0} \|v\|_{U(\omega)}^2 = 0 \quad \text{for all } v \in U. \quad (3.7)$$
Remark 3.4. For this proof step it was essential that we got rid of the dual norm in Proposition 2.1, see also Remark 2.6.

Step 2. We next show a local approximation property in the sense of Section 2.2.2 from [32], i.e., existence of a dense subspace $W \subseteq U_0$ equipped with additive semi-norms $\| \cdot \|_{W(\omega)}$, $\omega \subseteq I \times \Omega$, such that $\| \cdot \|_{W(I \times \Omega)} = \| \cdot \|_W$, and a corresponding $\Pi^0 \in \mathcal{L}(W, U_\delta)$ with

$$\|v - \Pi^0 v\|_{U(K)} \lesssim |K|^\frac{3}{d+1} \|v\|_{W(K)}$$

for all $v \in W, K \in T^\delta$, (3.8)

where $q > 0$ is some fixed exponent. For $k := \min\{k' \in \mathbb{N} : k' \geq p + 1, k' > \frac{d+1}{q} \}$, let

$$W := \{ v = (v_1, v_2) \in H^k(I \times \Omega) \times H^k(I \times \Omega)^d : v_1|_{I \times \partial \Omega} = 0 \} \subset U_0,$$

and let $I^\delta \in \mathcal{L}(H^k(I \times \Omega), S^p(T^\delta))$ be the standard point-wise interpolation operator, which is well-defined because of $k > \frac{d+1}{q}$. Then, the operator $\Pi^0 := I^d_{d+1} := (I^1, \ldots, I^d)$ (of length $d+1$) is in $\mathcal{L}(W, U_\delta)$, and with $I^d$ defined analogously, it holds that

$$\|v - \Pi^0 v\|^2_{U(K)} = \|v_1 - I^\delta v_1\|^2_{L_2(K)} + \|\nabla_v (v_1 - I^\delta v_1)\|^2_{L_2(K)} + \|(v_1 - I^\delta v_1)|_{\partial \Omega K}\|^2_{L_2(\partial K)}$$

$$+ \|v_2 - I^\delta v_2\|^2_{L_2(K)} + \|\text{div}(v - I^\delta v)\|^2_{L_2(K)}$$

$$\lesssim \|(v_1 - I^\delta v_1)|_{\partial \Omega K}\|^2_{L_2(\partial K)} + \|v_1 - I^\delta v_1\|^2_{H^1(K)} + \|v_2 - I^\delta v_2\|^2_{L^2(\partial K)}.$$

A standard trace inequality ([5], Eq. (10.3.8)) further shows that

$$\|(v_1 - I^\delta v_1)|_{\partial \Omega K}\|^2_{L_2(\partial K)} \lesssim \|v_1 - I^\delta v_1\|^2_{L_2(K)} + \|v_1 - I^\delta v_1\|^2_{H^1(K)}.$$

To finish the proof, we show for $m \in \{0, 1\}$ and $v \in H^k(I \times \Omega)$ that

$$\|v - I^\delta v\|_{H^m(K)} \lesssim |K|^\frac{p+1-m}{p+1} \|v\|_{H^k(K)}.$$

While this is standard if $p + 1 > (d + 1)/2$, i.e., $k = p + 1$, it is not evident if $p + 1 \leq (d + 1)/2$, and we thus provide a short proof. We first assume that $K$ is the reference simplex, i.e., the convex hull of the canonical basis vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Let $\tilde{v} \in P^{k-1}$ be the best approximation of $v$ with respect to $\| \cdot \|_{H^k}$ in the space of polynomials of degree $k - 1$, and let $\tilde{v} \in P^p$ be the best approximation of $\tilde{v}$ with respect to $\| \cdot \|_{H^k}$ in the space of polynomials of degree $p$. The projection property as well as continuity of $I^\delta$ on $H^k(K)$ show that

$$\|v - I^\delta v\|_{H^m(K)} = \|(I\text{d} - I^\delta)(v - \tilde{v})\|_{H^m(K)}$$

$$\lesssim \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{H^m(K)} \leq \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{H^k(K)} + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^k(K)}.$$

Equivalence of norms on finite-dimensional spaces and two applications of the Bramble–Hilbert lemma further yield that

$$\|v - \tilde{v}\|_{H^k(K)} + \|\tilde{v}\|_{H^k(K)} = \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{H^k(K)} + \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{H^{p+1}(K)}$$

$$\lesssim \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{H^k(K)} + \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{H^k(K)} + \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{H^{p+1}(K)} + |v|_{H^{p+1}(K)}$$

$$\leq 2\|v - \tilde{v}\|_{H^k(K)} + |v|_{H^{p+1}(K)} \lesssim |v|_{H^k(K)} + |v|_{H^{p+1}(K)}.$$

If $K$ is arbitrary, the fact that we use newest vertex bisection allows to apply a standard scaling argument, which yields that

$$\|v - I^\delta v\|_{H^m(K)} \lesssim |K|^{\frac{k-m}{d+1}} |v|_{H^k(K)} + |K|^{\frac{p+1-m}{d+1}} |v|_{H^{p+1}(K)} \lesssim |K|^{\frac{p+1-m}{d+1}} |v|_{H^k(K)}.$$

Overall, we thus conclude (3.8) with $q = p$. 
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Step 3. With the patch $\omega^\delta(K) := \bigcup\{K' \in T^\delta : K \cap K' \neq \emptyset\}$ of an element $K \in T^\delta$, we finally show that the employed error estimator is locally stable as in Section 2.2.3 from [32], i.e.,

$$\eta(K; f, u^\delta) \lesssim \|u^\delta\|_{U(\omega^\delta(K))} + \|D\|_{\tilde{W}(\omega^\delta(K))} \quad \text{for all } K \in T^\delta$$

(3.9)

for a suitable $D$ depending only on the data in a normed space $\tilde{W}$ equipped with additive and absolutely continuous semi-norms $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{W}(\omega)}$, $\omega \subseteq I \times \Omega$, such that $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{W}(I \times \Omega)} = \|\cdot\|_{\tilde{W}}$; as well as strongly reliable as in Section 2.2.3 from [32]

$$(f - Gu^\delta, Gv)_L \lesssim \sum_{K \in T^\delta} \eta(K; f, u^\delta) \|v\|_{U(\omega^\delta(K))} \quad \text{for all } v \in U_0.$$  

(3.10)

Remark 3.5. Actually, [32] assumes that $\tilde{W} = L_2(I \times \Omega)$. It is, however, straightforward to see that our mildly relaxed assumption is already sufficient for the convergence proof. Indeed, local stability is only employed in the elementary ([32], Lem. 3.5).

Local stability (3.9) follows from the triangle inequality

$$\eta(K) = \eta(K; f, u^\delta) = \|f - Gu^\delta\|_{L(K)} \leq \|f\|_{L(K)} + \|Gu^\delta\|_{L(K)}$$

and the following local stability of $G$

$$\|Gu^\delta\|_{L_2(K)} \lesssim \|u^\delta\|_{L^2(K)} + \|\nabla u^\delta\|_{L^2(K)} + \|\text{div } u^\delta\|_{L^2(K)} + \|u^\delta\|_{W^1_2(K)} + \|u^\delta\|_{W^1_2(K)}$$

(3.11)

Strong reliability (3.10) follows from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality together with the previous local stability of $G$

$$\langle f - Gu^\delta, Gv\rangle_L \leq \sum_{K \in T^\delta} \eta(K; f, u^\delta) \|Gv\|_{L(K)} \lesssim \sum_{K \in T^\delta} \eta(K; f, u^\delta) \|v\|_{U(K)},$$

which concludes the proof. □

Remark 3.6. Together with the Céa lemma and with $h_{\text{max}}^\delta := \max\{|K|^{1/(d+1)} : K \in T^\delta\}$, Step 2 from the proof particularly yields the a priori estimate

$$\|u - u^\delta\|_U \lesssim \inf_{v \in U^\delta} \|u - v\|_U \lesssim \|u - \Pi^\delta u\|_U \lesssim (h_{\text{max}}^\delta)^p \|u\|_{H^k(I \times \Omega) \times H^k(I \times \Omega)^d}$$

whenever the solution $u$ satisfies the additional regularity $u \in H^k(I \times \Omega) \times H^k(I \times \Omega)^d$, where $k = \min\{k' \in \mathbb{N} : k' \geq p + 1, k' > \frac{d+1}{2}\}$. Instead of the standard interpolation operator $I^\delta$, one can also consider the Scott–Zhang operator $\tilde{I}^\delta$ from [31] which preserves homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. Then, Equation (4.3) of [31] gives an alternative local bound for the resulting operator $\tilde{\Pi}^\delta$

$$\|v - \tilde{\Pi}^\delta v\|_{U(K)} \lesssim |K|^{\frac{2}{d+2}} \|v\|_{H^{p+1}(\omega^\delta(K)) \times H^{p+1}(\omega^\delta(K))}$$

for all $v \in H^{p+1}(I \times \Omega) \times H^{p+1}(I \times \Omega)^d$ with $v|_{I \times \partial\Omega} = 0$ and all $K \in T^\delta$. In particular this yields the a priori estimate

$$\|u - u^\delta\|_U \lesssim \|u\|_{H^{p+1}(I \times \Omega) \times H^{p+1}(I \times \Omega)^d}$$

(3.12)

under the milder assumption that $u \in H^{p+1}(I \times \Omega) \times H^{p+1}(I \times \Omega)^d$. We mention that Theorem 14 of [18] already proved the latter inequality in the lowest-order case $p = 1$ under even weaker assumptions on $u$. However, their proof is restricted to simplicial meshes that directly result from a tensor-product mesh ([18], Sect. 4.1.2).
Remark 3.7. (a) We stress that the proof of Theorem 3.3 is relatively abstract in the sense that it generalizes to a large class of least-squares formulations: Suppose that \( U \) (instead of \( U_0 \)) and \( L \) are arbitrary Hilbert spaces. Consider the equation

\[
Gu = f \quad \text{for given } G \in \mathcal{L}(U, L) \text{ and } f \in L.
\]

Moreover, suppose that \( U \) as well as \( L \) are equipped with additive and absolutely continuous (see (3.6) and (3.7)) semi-norms \( \| \cdot \|_{U(\omega)}, \| \cdot \|_{L(\omega)} \) for all measurable subsets \( \omega \) of some set \( \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) being the union of an initial conforming simplicial mesh \( T^0 \). To any conforming simplicial mesh \( T^\delta \) of \( \Omega \), we associate a finite-dimensional subspace \( U^\delta \subseteq U \) such that \( U^\delta \subseteq U^\delta \) for all refinements \( T^\delta \) of \( T^\delta \). We define the least-squares approximation \( u^\delta \) as in (3.1) and (3.2) and the error estimator \( \eta(f, u^\delta) \) with indicators \( \eta(K; f, u^\delta) \) as in (3.3) and (3.4). In this setting, Algorithm 3.1 can be applied. Then, the (analogous) local approximation property of Step 2 (where one could also allow for \( W((\omega^\delta)^m(K)) \) for fixed \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) instead of \( W(K) \) in (3.8)) and local stability of \( G \) as in (3.11) (where again \( U(K) \) could be replaced by \( U((\omega^\delta)^m(K)) \)) yield error and estimator convergence

\[
\|u - u^\ell\|_U \approx \eta(f, u^\ell) \to 0 \quad \text{as } \ell \to \infty.
\]  

(3.13)

Independently, it has also been recently observed in [19] that the given abstract assumptions yield (3.13) for least-squares methods. However, we stress that Theorem 3.3 is not available in [19].

(b) The setting of (a) is for instance satisfied for a standard least-squares formulation of the Poisson model problem ([4], page 56), the Helmholtz problem [8], the linear elasticity problem [10], and the Stokes problem [9], see also Chapter 3 of [39] for a brief overview of all these formulations. The involved spaces \( H^1(\Omega) \) and \( H(\text{div}; \Omega) \) can be discretized by usual finite element spaces, \textit{i.e.}, continuous piecewise polynomial and Raviart–Thomas functions, respectively. The required corresponding approximation properties (3.8) are well-known, see, \textit{e.g.}, [17], Section 1.5.

Only for the Stokes problem [9], one requires a special interpolation operator on (a dense subspace of) \( \{v \in H(\text{div}; \Omega)^d : \int_\Omega \text{tr}(v) \, dx = 0\} \), where \( \text{tr} \) denotes the trace of square matrices. Since \( S^2(T^\delta)^d \) is contained in the Raviart–Thomas space of order \( \geq 1 \) (excluding the lowest-order case), such an operator can be defined component-wise as an integral-preserving \( J^\delta \in \mathcal{L}(H^2(\Omega), S^1(T^\delta)) \) with a local approximation property, \textit{i.e.}, 

\[
\int_\Omega v \, dx = \int_\Omega J^\delta v \, dx
\]

for all \( v \in H^2(\Omega), K \in T^\delta \), and some fixed \( m \in \mathbb{N}_0 \). The operator \( J^\delta \) is for instance constructed as follows: Inspired by Section 4.1 of [37] and given the nodal Lagrange basis \( \{\phi_i : i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\} \) with corresponding local dual basis \( \{\psi_i : i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\} \) in [31], one first defines

\[
\tilde{\psi}_i := \frac{\phi_i + \int_\Omega (1 - \phi_i) \phi_i \, dx \psi_i - \sum_{j \neq i} \left( \int_\Omega \phi_i \phi_j \, dx \psi_j \right)}{\int_\Omega \phi_i \, dx}
\]

for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \). This provides a second local dual basis in the sense that \( \text{supp}(\tilde{\psi}_i) \subset \text{supp}(\phi_i) \) and \( \int_{\text{supp}(\tilde{\psi}_i)} \phi_i \psi_j \, dx = \delta_{ij} \) for all \( i, j \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \). Moreover, from \( \sum_i \phi_i = 1 \), one verifies that \( \sum_i (\int_\Omega \phi_i \, dx) \psi_i = 1 \) meaning that this dual basis has (lowest-order) approximation properties. Defining

\[
J^\delta : H^1(\Omega) \to S^1(T^\delta), \quad v \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\text{supp} \tilde{\psi}_i} v \tilde{\psi}_i \, dx \phi_i,
\]

the latter property implies that this biorthogonal projector is integral-preserving, and the desired approximation property (3.14) with \( m = 2 \) follows as in [31].
Moreover, Führer and Praetorius [19] verify the setting of (a) for another least-squares formulation of the Stokes problem as well as the Maxwell problem. (c) Optimal convergence of adaptive least-square finite element methods driven by an equivalent weighted error estimator has been already proved for the Poisson problem in [11,12], the linear elasticity problem [7], and the Stokes problem [6]. However, apart from the very recent and independent work [19], convergence for adaptive algorithms driven by the natural estimator is only known for the Poisson problem if Dörfler marking with a sufficiently large bulk parameter is used, see [13], where $Q$-linear convergence has been demonstrated.
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