



The University of  
**Nottingham**

UNITED KINGDOM • CHINA • MALAYSIA

Congreve, Scott and Houston, Paul and Wihler, Thomas P. Two-grid hp-version discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods for second-order quasilinear elliptic PDEs. *Journal of Scientific Computing* . ISSN 0885-7474 (Submitted)

**Access from the University of Nottingham repository:**

[http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/1493/1/congreve\\_et\\_al.pdf](http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/1493/1/congreve_et_al.pdf)

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Nottingham ePrints service makes this work by researchers of the University of Nottingham available open access under the following conditions.

This article is made available under the University of Nottingham End User licence and may be reused according to the conditions of the licence. For more details see:  
[http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/end\\_user\\_agreement.pdf](http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/end_user_agreement.pdf)

**A note on versions:**

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the repository url above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact [eprints@nottingham.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@nottingham.ac.uk)

# TWO-GRID $hp$ -VERSION DISCONTINUOUS GALERKIN FINITE ELEMENT METHODS FOR SECOND-ORDER QUASILINEAR ELLIPTIC PDES

SCOTT CONGREVE, PAUL HOUSTON, AND THOMAS P. WIHLER

ABSTRACT. In this article we propose a class of so-called two-grid  $hp$ -version discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods for the numerical solution of a second-order quasilinear elliptic boundary value problem of monotone type. The key idea in this setting is to first discretise the underlying nonlinear problem on a coarse finite element space  $V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P})$ . The resulting ‘coarse’ numerical solution is then exploited to provide the necessary data needed to linearise the underlying discretisation on the finer space  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ ; thereby, only a linear system of equations is solved on the richer space  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ . In this article both the *a priori* and *a posteriori* error analysis of the two-grid  $hp$ -version discontinuous Galerkin finite element method is developed. Moreover, we propose and implement an  $hp$ -adaptive two-grid algorithm, which is capable of designing both the coarse and fine finite element spaces  $V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P})$  and  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ , respectively, in an automatic fashion. Numerical experiments are presented for both two- and three-dimensional problems; in each case, we demonstrate that the cpu time required to compute the numerical solution to a given accuracy is typically less when the two-grid approach is exploited, when compared to the standard discontinuous Galerkin method.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past few decades, there has been a considerable renewed interest in discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods (DGFEMs) for the numerical solution of a wide range of partial differential equations; for an extensive survey of this area of research, we refer to [12]. DGFEMs were introduced in the early 1970s for the numerical solution of first-order hyperbolic problems (see [13, 14, 16, 28, 30, 38]). Simultaneously, but quite independently, they were proposed as non-standard schemes for the approximation of second-order elliptic equations [2, 34, 43]. The recent upsurge of interest in this class of methods has been stimulated by the computational convenience of DGFEMs due to a high degree of locality, the need to approximate advection-dominated diffusion problems without excessive numerical stabilisation, the necessity to accommodate high-order  $hp$ - and spectral element discretisations for first-order hyperbolic equations and advection-diffusion problems [20, 29], and the desire to handle nonlinear hyperbolic problems in a locally conservative manner and without auxiliary numerical stabilisation [10, 15]; see also [9, 11] for the error analysis of the local version of the DGFEM in the elliptic case, as well as [3] and [35].

In the recent articles [24, 27] a family of interior-penalty  $hp$ -DGFEMs were formulated for the numerical approximation of a class of scalar quasilinear boundary value problems of monotone type. In particular, both *a priori* ([24]) and *a posteriori* ([27]) bounds were derived on the error, measured in terms of a mesh-dependent energy norm. For related work on  $h$ -version local DGFEMs for quasilinear PDEs, we refer to the articles [8, 21], for example; for  $hp$ -version DGFEMs, see [22, 23], for example. This article is devoted to the *a priori* and *a posteriori* error analysis of the so-called two-grid variant of the  $hp$ -version symmetric interior penalty (SIP) DGFEM for the numerical approximation of strongly monotone second-order quasilinear partial differential equations. We point out that two-grid methods were originally introduced by Xu [47, 48, 49]; see, also, [4, 6, 7, 18, 19, 32, 42, 46] for related work.

The construction of a two-grid method to compute the numerical approximation of a nonlinear partial differential equation may be summarised as follows. Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be two Hilbert spaces. Further, we write  $\mathcal{N}(\cdot; \cdot, \cdot) : X \times X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to denote a semilinear form, with the convention

---

*Key words and phrases.*  $hp$ -finite element methods, discontinuous Galerkin methods, adaptivity, two-grid methods, quasilinear PDEs.

that  $\mathcal{N}(\cdot; \cdot, \cdot)$  is linear with respect to the arguments to the right of the semi-colon. We suppose that  $u$  is the unique solution to the variational problem: find  $u$  in  $X$  such that

$$\mathcal{N}(u; u, v) = 0 \quad \forall v \in Y. \quad (1)$$

Problem (1) can be thought of as the weak formulation of a nonlinear partial differential equation on  $X$  whose unique solution is  $u \in X$ . In practice (1) cannot be solved in closed form but needs to be approximated numerically. For the purposes of this paper, we shall consider general  $hp$ -version finite element approximations to (1). In order to construct a Galerkin approximation to this problem, we consider a sequence of finite-dimensional spaces  $\{X_{h,p}\}$ , parameterised by the positive discretisation parameters  $h$  and  $p$ . Simultaneously, consider a sequence of finite-dimensional spaces  $\{Y_{h,p}\}$ . For the purposes of this paper,  $X_{h,p}$  and  $Y_{h,p}$  can be thought of as finite element spaces consisting of piecewise polynomial functions of degree  $p$  on a partition  $\mathcal{T}_h$ , of granularity  $h$ , of the computational domain. The (standard) Galerkin approximation  $u_{h,p}$  of  $u$  is then sought in  $X_{h,p}$  as the solution of the finite-dimensional problem

$$\mathcal{N}_{h,p}(u_{h,p}; u_{h,p}, v_{h,p}) = 0 \quad \forall v_{h,p} \in Y_{h,p}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}_{h,p}(\cdot; \cdot, \cdot) : X_{h,p} \times X_{h,p} \times Y_{h,p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The computation of  $u_{h,p}$  defined in (2) involves the numerical solution of a potentially very large number of coupled nonlinear equations, which can be extremely computationally expensive. The key idea of the two-grid approach is as follows: given ‘coarser’ finite element spaces  $X_{H,P} \subseteq X_{h,p}$  and  $Y_{H,P} \subseteq Y_{h,p}$ , first solve the nonlinear problem: find  $u_{H,P} \in X_{H,P}$  such that

$$\mathcal{N}_{H,P}(u_{H,P}; u_{H,P}, v_{H,P}) = 0 \quad \forall v_{H,P} \in Y_{H,P}. \quad (3)$$

Finally, using  $u_{H,P}$  as appropriate data, compute the two-grid approximation of (1) by solving the problem: find  $u_{2G} \in X_{h,p}$  such that

$$\mathcal{N}_{h,p}(u_{H,P}; u_{2G}, v_{h,p}) = 0 \quad \forall v_{h,p} \in Y_{h,p}. \quad (4)$$

We emphasise that this latter problem is *linear*.

In this article we analyse the  $hp$ -version of the two-grid SIP DGFEM, see [7], for the numerical solution of the following quasi-linear elliptic boundary-value problem:

$$-\nabla \cdot (\mu(\mathbf{x}, |\nabla u|) \nabla u) = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (5)$$

$$u = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \quad (6)$$

where  $\Omega$  is a bounded polygonal domain in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , with boundary  $\Gamma$  and  $f \in L_2(\Omega)$ . Here, we assume that the nonlinearity  $\mu$  satisfies the following conditions:

(A1)  $\mu \in C^0(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, \infty))$  and

(A2) there exists positive constants  $m_\mu$  and  $M_\mu$  such that the following monotonicity property is satisfied:

$$m_\mu(t-s) \leq \mu(\mathbf{x}, t)t - \mu(\mathbf{x}, s)s \leq M_\mu(t-s), \quad t \geq s \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \bar{\Omega}. \quad (7)$$

From [31, Lemma 2.1] we note that, as  $\mu$  satisfies (7), there exists constants  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ ,  $C_1 \geq C_2 > 0$ , such that for all vectors  $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and all  $\mathbf{x} \in \bar{\Omega}$ ,

$$|\mu(\mathbf{x}, |\mathbf{v}|)\mathbf{v} - \mu(\mathbf{x}, |\mathbf{w}|)\mathbf{w}| \leq C_1 |\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}|, \quad (8)$$

$$C_2 |\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}|^2 \leq (\mu(\mathbf{x}, |\mathbf{v}|)\mathbf{v} - \mu(\mathbf{x}, |\mathbf{w}|)\mathbf{w}) \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}). \quad (9)$$

By setting  $s = 0$  in (7) we deduce the following bound on  $\mu$ :

$$m_\mu \leq \mu(\mathbf{x}, t) \leq M_\mu, \quad t \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \bar{\Omega}. \quad (10)$$

For ease of notation we shall suppress the dependence of  $\mu$  on  $\mathbf{x}$  and write  $\mu(t)$  instead of  $\mu(\mathbf{x}, t)$ .

The outline of the rest of this article is as follows. Section 2 introduces the two-grid  $hp$ -version of the SIP DGFEM for the numerical approximation of (5)–(6). In Section 3 we derive both *a priori* and *a posteriori* bounds on the error, measured in terms of the corresponding (DGFEM) energy norm, for the proposed numerical scheme. Section 4 is devoted to the design of an  $hp$ -adaptive algorithm which can construct the coarse and fine  $hp$ -finite element spaces in an automatic fashion. The performance of the proposed adaptive strategy is demonstrated in Section 5; we refer to [18]

for numerical experiments which validate the sharpness of the *a priori* error bounds. Finally, in Section 6 we summarise the work presented in this paper and draw some conclusions.

## 2. TWO-GRID $hp$ -VERSION DGFEM

In this section we discuss the numerical approximation of the problem (5)–(6) based on employing both the  $hp$ -version of the (standard) SIP DGFEM, together with its so-called two-grid variant. To this end, in the following section we first introduce the necessary notation.

**2.1. Meshes, Spaces, and Trace Operators.** We consider shape-regular meshes  $\mathcal{T}_h$  that partition  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  into open disjoint triangles and/or parallelograms  $\kappa$ , such that  $\overline{\Omega} = \bigcup_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \overline{\kappa}$ . By  $h_\kappa$  we denote the element diameter of  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$ ,  $h = \max_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_\kappa$ , and  $\mathbf{n}_\kappa$  signifies the unit outward normal vector to  $\kappa$ . We allow the meshes  $\mathcal{T}_h$  to be *1-irregular*, i.e., each edge of any one element  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$  contains at most one hanging node (which, for simplicity, we assume to be the midpoint of the corresponding edge). Here, we suppose that  $\mathcal{T}_h$  is *regularly reducible* (cf. [37, Section 7.1]), i.e., there exists a shape-regular conforming (regular) mesh  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h$  (consisting of triangles and parallelograms) such that the closure of each element in  $\mathcal{T}_h$  is a union of closures of elements of  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h$ , and that there exists a constant  $C > 0$ , independent of the element sizes, such that for any two elements  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$  and  $\tilde{\kappa} \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h$  with  $\tilde{\kappa} \subseteq \kappa$  we have  $h_\kappa/\tilde{h}_{\tilde{\kappa}} \leq C$ . Note that these assumptions imply that the family  $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_{h>0}$  is of *bounded local variation*, i.e., there exists a constant  $\rho_1 \geq 1$ , independent of the element sizes, such that

$$\rho_1^{-1} \leq h_\kappa/h_{\kappa'} \leq \rho_1, \quad (11)$$

for any pair of elements  $\kappa, \kappa' \in \mathcal{T}_h$  which share a common edge  $e = \partial\kappa \cap \partial\kappa'$ .

To each  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$  we assign a polynomial degree  $p_\kappa \geq 1$  (local approximation order) and define the degree vector  $\mathbf{p} = \{p_\kappa : \kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$ . We suppose that  $\mathbf{p}$  is also of bounded local variation, i.e., there exists a constant  $\rho_2 \geq 1$ , independent of the element sizes and  $\mathbf{p}$ , such that, for any pair of neighbouring elements  $\kappa, \kappa' \in \mathcal{T}_h$ ,

$$\rho_2^{-1} \leq p_\kappa/p_{\kappa'} \leq \rho_2. \quad (12)$$

With this notation, we introduce the finite element space

$$V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p}) = \{v \in L_2(\Omega) : v|_\kappa \in \mathcal{S}_{p_\kappa}(\kappa) \quad \forall \kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h\},$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}_{p_\kappa}(\kappa) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{P}_{p_\kappa}(\kappa) & \text{if } \kappa \text{ is a triangle,} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{p_\kappa}(\kappa) & \text{if } \kappa \text{ is a parallelogram.} \end{cases}$$

Here, given  $p \geq 0$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_p(\kappa)$  denotes the space of polynomials of degree at most  $p$  on  $\kappa$ , while  $\mathcal{Q}_p(\kappa)$  is the space of polynomials of degree at most  $p$  in each variable on  $\kappa$ .

We shall now define some suitable edge operators that are required for the definition of the proceeding DGFEM. To this end, associated with the mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{E}_h^I$  the set of all interior edges of the partition  $\mathcal{T}_h$  of  $\Omega$ , and by  $\mathcal{E}_h^B$  the set of all boundary edges of  $\mathcal{T}_h$ . In addition,  $\mathcal{E}_h = \mathcal{E}_h^B \cup \mathcal{E}_h^I$  denotes the set of all edges in the mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$ .

Let  $v$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  be scalar- and vector-valued functions, respectively, which are smooth inside each element  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$ . Given two adjacent elements,  $\kappa^+, \kappa^- \in \mathcal{T}_h$  which share a common edge  $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^I$ , i.e.,  $e = \partial\kappa^+ \cap \partial\kappa^-$ , we write  $v^\pm$  and  $\mathbf{q}^\pm$  to denote the traces of the functions  $v$  and  $\mathbf{q}$ , respectively, on the edge  $e$ , taken from the interior of  $\kappa^\pm$ , respectively. With this notation, the averages of  $v$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  at  $\mathbf{x} \in e$  are given by

$$\{\{v\}\} = \frac{1}{2}(v^+ + v^-), \quad \{\{\mathbf{q}\}\} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{q}^+ + \mathbf{q}^-),$$

respectively. Similarly, the jumps of  $v$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  at  $\mathbf{x} \in e$  are given by

$$[[v]] = v^+ \mathbf{n}_{\kappa^+} + v^- \mathbf{n}_{\kappa^-}, \quad [[\mathbf{q}]] = \mathbf{q}^+ \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\kappa^+} + \mathbf{q}^- \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\kappa^-},$$

respectively, where  $\mathbf{n}_{\kappa^\pm}$  denotes the unit outward normal vector on  $\partial\kappa^\pm$ , respectively. On a boundary edge  $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^B$ , we set  $\{\{v\}\} = v$ ,  $\{\{\mathbf{q}\}\} = \mathbf{q}$ ,  $[[v]] = v\mathbf{n}$  and  $[[\mathbf{q}]] = \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n}$ , with  $\mathbf{n}$  denoting the unit outward normal vector on the boundary  $\Gamma$ .

For an edge  $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$ , we define  $h_e$  to be the length of the edge; moreover, the edge polynomial degree  $p_e$  is defined by

$$p_e = \begin{cases} \max(p_\kappa, p_{\kappa'}), & \text{if } e = \partial\kappa \cap \partial\kappa' \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\mathcal{I}}, \\ p_\kappa, & \text{if } e = \partial\kappa \cap \Gamma \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\mathcal{B}}. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Finally, we recall the following inverse trace inequalities.

**Lemma 2.1.** *We note that for an edge  $e$  of an element  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$  that the following inverse trace inequalities hold: there exists a positive constant  $C_T$ , independent of  $h$  and  $\mathbf{p}$ , such that*

$$\|w\|_{L_2(e)}^2 \leq C_T \frac{p_\kappa^2}{h_e} \|w\|_{L_2(\kappa)}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla w\|_{L_2(e)}^2 \leq C_T \frac{p_\kappa^2}{h_e} \|\nabla w\|_{L_2(\kappa)}^2$$

for all  $w \in V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ .

*Proof.* See [40, Theorem 4.76] for details.  $\square$

**2.2. Standard interior penalty DGFEM discretisation.** In this section we first introduce the so-called *standard* SIP DGFEM for the numerical approximation of the problem (5)–(6). To this end, given a (fine) mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$  partition of  $\Omega$ , together with a corresponding polynomial degree vector  $\mathbf{p}$ , the standard DGFEM is defined as follows: find  $u_{h,p} \in V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$  such that

$$A_{h,p}(u_{h,p}; u_{h,p}, v_{h,p}) = F_{h,p}(v_{h,p}) \quad (14)$$

for all  $v_{h,p} \in V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{h,p}(\psi; u, v) &= \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\kappa} \mu(|\nabla_h \psi|) \nabla_h u \cdot \nabla_h v \, d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \sigma_{h,p} \llbracket u \rrbracket \cdot \llbracket v \rrbracket \, ds \\ &\quad - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e (\{\!\! \{ \mu(|\nabla_h \psi|) \nabla_h u \} \!\!\} \cdot \llbracket v \rrbracket + \{\!\! \{ \mu(|\nabla_h \psi|) \nabla_h v \} \!\!\} \cdot \llbracket u \rrbracket) \, ds, \\ F_{h,p}(v) &= \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\kappa} f v \, d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

and  $\nabla_h$  is used to denote the broken gradient operator, defined elementwise. Here, the *interior penalty parameter*  $\sigma_{h,p}$  is defined as follows:

$$\sigma_{h,p} = \gamma \frac{p_e^2}{h_e},$$

where  $\gamma > 0$  is a constant, which must be chosen sufficiently large (independent of the local element sizes and polynomial degrees), cf. Lemma 2.2 below; see, also, [22, 24], for example.

*Remark 2.1.* The SIP DGFEM scheme defined in (14) is identical the method studied in [22], and represents a slight alternative to the parameterised DGFEMs considered in [24].

*Remark 2.2.* In the case of an inhomogeneous boundary condition  $u = g$  on  $\Gamma$ , the right-hand side linear functional  $F_{h,p}(\cdot)$  must be replaced by

$$F_{h,p}(v) = \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\kappa} f v \, d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\mathcal{B}}} \int_e \sigma_{h,p} g v \, ds,$$

and the fourth term in the semilinear form  $A_{h,p}$  is replaced by

$$- \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\mathcal{I}}} \int_e \{\!\! \{ \mu(|\nabla_h \psi|) \nabla_h v \} \!\!\} \cdot \llbracket u \rrbracket \, ds - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\mathcal{B}}} \int_e \mu(|\nabla_h \psi|) \nabla_h v \cdot \mathbf{n} (u - g) \, ds,$$

cf. [24]

Introducing the *energy norm*

$$\|v\|_{h,p}^2 = \|\nabla_h v\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \sigma_{h,p} |\llbracket v \rrbracket|^2 ds,$$

on the class of spaces  $H^1(\Omega) + V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ , the general form of the semi-linear form  $A_{h,p}(\psi; \cdot, \cdot)$  is coercive, in the sense that the following lemma holds for sufficiently large  $\gamma$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *There exists a positive constant  $\gamma_{\min}$ , such that for any  $\gamma \geq \gamma_{\min}$ , there exists a coercivity constant  $C_c > 0$ , independent of  $h$  and  $\mathbf{p}$ , such that*

$$A_{h,p}(\psi; v, v) \geq C_c \|v\|_{h,p}^2 \quad (15)$$

for all  $\psi, v \in V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ .

*Proof.* By application of (10), Lemma 2.1 and the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality,  $2ab \leq \varepsilon a^2 + \varepsilon^{-1}b^2$  with  $\varepsilon = \delta\sigma_{h,p}^{-1}$  and  $\delta > 1$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{h,p}(\psi; v, v) &= \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\kappa} \mu(|\nabla\psi|) |\nabla v|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \sigma_{h,p} |\llbracket v \rrbracket|^2 ds \\ &\quad - 2 \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \{\mu(|\nabla\psi|) \nabla v\} \cdot \llbracket v \rrbracket ds \\ &\geq \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\kappa} \mu(|\nabla\psi|) |\nabla v|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \sigma_{h,p} |\llbracket v \rrbracket|^2 ds \\ &\quad - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e (\varepsilon |\{\mu(|\nabla\psi|) \nabla v\}|^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} |\llbracket v \rrbracket|^2) ds \\ &\geq m_{\mu} \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla v\|_{L_2(\kappa)}^2 + (1 - \delta^{-1})\gamma \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e p_e^2 h_e^{-1} |\llbracket v \rrbracket|^2 ds \\ &\quad - M_{\mu}^2 C_{\rho} \delta \gamma^{-1} \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} p_{\kappa}^{-2} h_{\kappa} \|\nabla v\|_{L_2(\partial\kappa)}^2 \\ &\geq \min(m_{\mu} - C_T M_{\mu}^2 C_{\rho} \delta \gamma^{-1}, (1 - \delta^{-1})\gamma) \|v\|_{h,p}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thereby, the statement of the lemma immediately follows, provided  $\gamma > C_T M_{\mu}^2 C_{\rho} \delta m_{\mu}^{-1}$ , where  $C_{\rho}$  is a positive constant dependent on  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  from (11) and (12), respectively.  $\square$

**2.3. Two-grid interior penalty discretisation.** In this section, we now proceed to introduce the so-called two-grid SIP DGFEM approximation to (5)–(6). To this end, we consider two partitions  $\mathcal{T}_h$  and  $\mathcal{T}_H$  of the computational domain  $\Omega$ , of granularity  $h$  and  $H$ , respectively. Here, we refer to  $\mathcal{T}_h$  and  $\mathcal{T}_H$  as the fine and coarse mesh partitions of  $\Omega$ , respectively. In particular, we assume that  $\mathcal{T}_h$  and  $\mathcal{T}_H$  are nested in the sense that, for any  $\kappa_h \in \mathcal{T}_h$  there exists an element  $\kappa_H \in \mathcal{T}_H$  such that  $\bar{\kappa}_h \subseteq \bar{\kappa}_H$ . Moreover, to each mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$  and  $\mathcal{T}_H$ , we associate a corresponding polynomial degree distribution  $\mathbf{p} = \{p_{\kappa} : \kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$  and  $\mathbf{P} = \{P_{\kappa} : \kappa \in \mathcal{T}_H\}$ , respectively, with the property that, given  $\kappa_h \in \mathcal{T}_h$  and the associated  $\kappa_H \in \mathcal{T}_H$ , such that  $\bar{\kappa}_h \subseteq \bar{\kappa}_H$ , the corresponding polynomial degrees satisfy the following condition:

$$p_{\kappa_h} \geq P_{\kappa_H}.$$

Given  $\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P}$ , we may construct the corresponding fine and coarse  $hp$ -finite element spaces  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$  and  $V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P})$ , respectively, which satisfy the following condition:  $V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P}) \subseteq V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ .

With this notation, we now introduce the  $hp$ -version of the two-grid algorithm [7, Algorithm 1] for the SIP DGFEM discretisation of (5)–(6):

- (1) Compute the coarse grid approximation  $u_{H,P} \in V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P})$  such that

$$A_{H,P}(u_{H,P}; u_{H,P}, v_{H,P}) = F_{H,P}(v_{H,P}) \quad (16)$$

for all  $v_{H,P} \in V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P})$ .

(2) Determine the fine grid solution  $u_{2G} \in V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$  such that

$$A_{h,p}(u_{H,P}; u_{2G}, v_{h,p}) = F_{h,p}(v_{h,p}) \quad (17)$$

for all  $v_{h,p} \in V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ .

Existence and uniqueness of the solution  $u_{H,P}$  for this formulation is demonstrated in [22]. The formulation (17) is a symmetric interior penalty discretisation of a linear elliptic PDE, where the coefficient  $\mu(|\nabla_h u_{H,P}|)$  is a known function; thereby, the existence and uniqueness of the solution  $u_{2G}$  to this problem follows immediately, cf., for example, [41, 45].

### 3. ERROR ANALYSIS

In this section, we develop the *a priori* and *a posteriori* error analysis of the two-grid SIP DGFEM defined by (16)–(17).

**3.1. *A priori* error bound.** We first recall the following *a priori* error bound for the standard SIP DGFEM approximation (14) of the quasi-linear problem (5)–(6).

**Lemma 3.1.** *Assuming that  $u \in C^1(\Omega)$  and  $u|_\kappa \in \mathbb{H}^{k_\kappa}(\kappa)$ ,  $k_\kappa \geq 2$ , for  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$  then the solution  $u_{h,p} \in V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$  of (14) satisfies the error bound*

$$\|u - u_{h,p}\|_{h,p}^2 \leq C_3 \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_\kappa^{2s_\kappa-2}}{p_\kappa^{2k_\kappa-3}} \|u\|_{H^{k_\kappa}(\kappa)}^2 \quad (18)$$

with  $1 \leq s_\kappa \leq \min\{p_\kappa + 1, k_\kappa\}$ ,  $p_\kappa \geq 1$ , for  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , and  $C_3$  is a positive constant independent of  $u$ ,  $h$  and  $\mathbf{p}$ .

*Proof.* See [22] or [24]; we note, however, that the latter article employs a slightly different DGFEM formulation.  $\square$

*Remark 3.1.* We note that this error bound also clearly holds for the two-grid coarse solution  $u_{H,P}$  defined in (16) with the energy norm  $\|\cdot\|_{h,p}$  replaced by  $\|\cdot\|_{H,P}$ , and similarly the mesh size and polynomial degrees  $h_\kappa$  and  $p_\kappa$  replaced by  $H_\kappa$  and  $P_\kappa$ , respectively.

Employing Lemma 3.1, we now deduce the following error bound for the two-grid approximation defined in (16)–(17).

**Theorem 3.1.** *Assuming that  $u \in C^1(\Omega)$ ,  $u|_\kappa \in \mathbb{H}^{k_\kappa}(\kappa)$ ,  $k_\kappa \geq 2$ , for  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$  and  $u|_\kappa \in \mathbb{H}^{K_\kappa}(\kappa)$ ,  $K_\kappa \geq 2$ , for  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_H$ , then the solution  $u_{2G} \in V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$  of (17) satisfies the error bounds*

$$\|u_{h,p} - u_{2G}\|_{h,p}^2 \leq C_4 \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_H} \frac{H_\kappa^{2S_\kappa-2}}{P_\kappa^{2K_\kappa-3}} \|u\|_{H^{K_\kappa}(\kappa)}^2, \quad (19)$$

$$\|u - u_{2G}\|_{h,p}^2 \leq C_3 \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_\kappa^{2s_\kappa-2}}{p_\kappa^{2k_\kappa-3}} \|u\|_{H^{k_\kappa}(\kappa)}^2 + C_4 \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_H} \frac{H_\kappa^{2S_\kappa-2}}{P_\kappa^{2K_\kappa-3}} \|u\|_{H^{K_\kappa}(\kappa)}^2, \quad (20)$$

with  $1 \leq s_\kappa \leq \min\{p_\kappa + 1, k_\kappa\}$ ,  $p_\kappa \geq 1$ , for  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$ ,  $1 \leq S_\kappa \leq \min\{P_\kappa + 1, K_\kappa\}$ ,  $P_\kappa \geq 1$ , for  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_H$ , and  $C_3$  and  $C_4$  are positive constants independent of  $u$ ,  $h$ ,  $H$ ,  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{P}$ .

*Proof.* By application of the triangle inequality, we get

$$\|u - u_{2G}\|_{h,p} \leq \|u - u_{h,p}\|_{h,p} + \|u_{2G} - u_{h,p}\|_{h,p}. \quad (21)$$

We note that the first term on the right-hand side of (21) may be bounded by employing Lemma 3.1. Let us now deal with the second term; to this end, from (14) and (17) we have that

$$A_{h,p}(u_{H,P}, u_{2G}, v_{h,p}) = A_{h,p}(u_{h,p}; u_{h,p}, v_{h,p})$$

for all  $v_{h,p}$  in  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ . Let  $\phi = u_{2G} - u_{h,p} \in V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ ; then from Lemma 2.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} C_c \|u_{2G} - u_{h,p}\|_{h,p}^2 &\leq A_{h,p}(u_{H,P}; u_{2G} - u_{h,p}, \phi) \\ &= A_{h,p}(u_{H,P}; u_{2G}, \phi) - A_{h,p}(u_{H,P}; u_{h,p}, \phi) \\ &= A_{h,p}(u_{h,p}; u_{h,p}, \phi) - A_{h,p}(u_{H,P}; u_{h,p}, \phi) \\ &\equiv T_1 + T_2 + T_3, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\kappa} (\mu(|\nabla u_{h,p}|) - \mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|)) \nabla u_{h,p} \cdot \nabla \phi \, d\mathbf{x}, \\ T_2 &= - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \{ (\mu(|\nabla u_{h,p}|) - \mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|)) \nabla u_{h,p} \} \cdot [\![\phi]\!] \, ds, \\ T_3 &= - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \{ (\mu(|\nabla u_{h,p}|) - \mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|)) \nabla \phi \} \cdot [\![u_{h,p}]\!] \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

To bound term  $T_1$ , we employ the triangle inequality, (8), (10) and Lemma 3.1; thereby, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |T_1| &\leq \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\kappa} |\mu(|\nabla u_{h,p}|) \nabla u_{h,p} - \mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|) \nabla u_{H,P}| \cdot |\nabla \phi| \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\kappa} |\mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|) \nabla (u_{H,P} - u_{h,p})| \cdot |\nabla \phi| \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq (C_1 + M_\mu) \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\kappa} |\nabla (u_{h,p} - u_{H,P})| \cdot |\nabla \phi| \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq (C_1 + M_\mu) \left\{ \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla(u - u_{h,p})\|_{L_2(\kappa)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_H} \|\nabla(u - u_{H,P})\|_{L_2(\kappa)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L_2(\kappa)} \\ &\leq (C_1 + M_\mu) C_3 \left\{ \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_\kappa^{2s_k-2}}{p_\kappa^{2k_\kappa-3}} \|u\|_{\mathbb{H}^{k_\kappa}(\kappa)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_H} \frac{H_\kappa^{2S_k-2}}{P_\kappa^{2K_\kappa-3}} \|u\|_{\mathbb{H}^{K_\kappa}(\kappa)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \|\phi\|_{h,p}. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Proceeding in an analogous manner for term  $T_2$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} |T_2| &\leq \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \{ (\mu(|\nabla u_{h,p}|) \nabla u_{h,p} - \mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|) \nabla u_{H,P}) \} \cdot [\![\phi]\!] \, ds \\ &\quad + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \{ (\mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|) \nabla (u_{H,P} - u_{h,p})) \} \cdot [\![\phi]\!] \, ds \\ &\leq (C_1 + M_\mu) \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \{ |\nabla (u_{h,p} - u_{H,P})| \} \cdot [\![\phi]\!] \, ds \\ &\leq (C_1 + M_\mu) \left( \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \sigma_{h,p} |\![\phi]\!]|^2 \, ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \left( \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \sigma_{h,p}^{-1} \|\{ \nabla(u - u_{h,p}) \}\|_{L_2(e)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left( \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \sigma_{h,p}^{-1} \|\{ \nabla(u - u_{H,P}) \}\|_{L_2(e)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$



Applying Lemma 2.1, inequalities (11) and (12), and Lemma 3.1 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
|T_2| &\leq (C_1 + M_\mu) C_\rho C_T \gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\phi\|_{h,p} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla(u - u_{h,p})\|_{L_2(\kappa)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla(u - u_{H,P})\|_{L_2(\kappa)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\
&\leq (C_1 + M_\mu) C_3 C_\rho C_T \gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\phi\|_{h,p} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_\kappa^{2s_k-2}}{p_\kappa^{2k_\kappa-3}} \|u\|_{H^{k_\kappa}(\kappa)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_H} \frac{H_\kappa^{2S_k-2}}{P_\kappa^{2K_\kappa-3}} \|u\|_{H^{K_\kappa}(\kappa)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}, \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant  $C_\rho$  depends on  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$ , from (11) and (12) respectively. We now consider the term  $T_3$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
|T_3| &\leq \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \{ (\mu(|\nabla u_{h,p}|) - \mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|)) \nabla \phi \} \cdot \llbracket u_{h,p} \rrbracket \, ds \\
&\leq \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \|\mu(|\nabla u_{h,p}|) - \mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|)\|_{L_\infty(e)} \|\llbracket \nabla \phi \rrbracket\|_{L_2(e)} \|\llbracket u_{h,p} \rrbracket\|_{L_2(e)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We note that from inequality (10), we have

$$\|\mu(|\nabla u_{h,p}|) - \mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|)\|_{L_\infty(e)} \leq \|\mu(|\nabla u_{h,p}|)\|_{L_\infty(e)} + \|\mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|)\|_{L_\infty(e)} \leq 2M_\mu.$$

Since  $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ , we note that  $\llbracket u - u_{h,p} \rrbracket = \llbracket u_{h,p} \rrbracket$ ; thereby,

$$|T_3| \leq 2M_\mu \left( \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \sigma_{h,p}^{-1} \|\llbracket \nabla \phi \rrbracket\|_{L_2(e)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \sigma_{h,p} |u - u_{h,p}|^2 \, ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Applying Lemma 2.1, (11), (12) and Lemma 3.1 completes the bound for this term:

$$\begin{aligned}
|T_3| &\leq 2M_\mu C_\rho C_T \gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla \phi\|_{L_2(\kappa)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u - u_{h,p}\|_{h,p} \\
&\leq 2M_\mu C_3 C_\rho C_T \gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_\kappa^{2s_k-2}}{p_\kappa^{2k_\kappa-3}} \|u\|_{H^{k_\kappa}(\kappa)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\phi\|_{h,p}. \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting (23)-(25) into (22) and dividing both sides by  $\|\phi\|_{h,p}$  gives

$$\|u_{2G} - u_{h,p}\|_{h,p} \leq C \left\{ \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_\kappa^{2s_k-2}}{p_\kappa^{2k_\kappa-3}} \|u\|_{H^{k_\kappa}(\kappa)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_H} \frac{H_\kappa^{2S_k-2}}{P_\kappa^{2K_\kappa-3}} \|u\|_{H^{K_\kappa}(\kappa)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}.$$

Noting that  $V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P}) \subseteq V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ , we deduce that

$$\|u_{2G} - u_{h,p}\|_{h,p} \leq C_4 \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_H} \frac{H_\kappa^{2S_k-2}}{P_\kappa^{2K_\kappa-3}} \|u\|_{H^{K_\kappa}(\kappa)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which gives (19). Exploiting this inequality to bound the second term on the right-hand side of (21) and applying Lemma 3.1 to bound the first term, we deduce (20).  $\square$

*Remark 3.2.* We note that due to the dependence of the nonlinear coefficient  $\mu$  on  $|\nabla u|$ , the error bound derived in Theorem 3.1 indicates that the mesh and polynomial distribution of both the fine and coarse finite element spaces  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$  and  $V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P})$ , respectively, should grow at roughly the same rate, albeit the constants  $C_3$  and  $C_4$  present in the error bound being of differing sizes. Numerical experiments demonstrating the optimality of these theoretical bounds are given in [18]. This is in contrast to the  $h$ -version *a priori* error analysis undertaken in [7] in the case when  $\mu = \mu(u)$ . Indeed, in that setting, by using a suitable duality argument (e.g., in convex domains)

in order to optimally bound the resulting  $L_2$ -terms, it is shown that for convergence, the coarse and fine mesh sizes  $H$  and  $h$ , respectively, should satisfy  $H = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{h})$ , when the polynomial degree is (uniformly) set equal to one.

**3.2. *A posteriori* error bound.** In this section, we develop the *a posteriori* error analysis of the two-grid SIP DGFEM defined by (16)–(17).

Let us denote by  $\Pi_{\kappa,p,\kappa}$  the  $L_2$ -projection onto  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ . Then, we state the following upper bound.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  be the analytical solution of (5)–(6),  $u_{H,P} \in V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P})$  the numerical approximation obtained from (16) and  $u_{2G} \in V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$  the numerical approximation computed from (17); then the following  $hp$ -a posteriori error bound holds*

$$\|u - u_{2G}\|_{h,p} \leq C_5 \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\eta_\kappa^2 + \xi_\kappa^2) + \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_\kappa^2 p_\kappa^{-2} \|f - \Pi_{\kappa,p,\kappa} f\|_{L_2(\kappa)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (26)$$

with a constant  $C_5 > 0$ , which is independent of  $h$ ,  $H$ ,  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{P}$ . Here, for  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , the local fine grid error indicators  $\eta_\kappa$  are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_\kappa^2 &= h_\kappa^2 p_\kappa^{-2} \|\Pi_{\kappa,p,\kappa} f + \nabla \cdot \{\mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|) \nabla u_{2G}\}\|_{L_2(\kappa)}^2 \\ &\quad + h_e p_e^{-1} \|\mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|) \nabla u_{2G}\|_{L_2(\partial\kappa \setminus \Gamma)}^2 + \gamma^2 h_e^{-1} p_e^3 \|\llbracket u_{2G} \rrbracket\|_{L_2(\partial\kappa)}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

and the local two-grid error indicators  $\xi_\kappa$  are defined, for all  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , as

$$\xi_\kappa^2 = \|(\mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|) - \mu(|\nabla u_{2G}|)) \nabla u_{2G}\|_{L_2(\kappa)}^2. \quad (28)$$

*Remark 3.3.* We note that the third term in the local error indicator  $\eta_\kappa$  defined in (27) is sub-optimal with respect to the polynomial degree. This sub-optimality results from the fact that due to the possible presence of hanging nodes in  $\mathcal{T}_h$ , a non-conforming interpolant is used in the proof to Theorem 3.2. For conforming meshes, a conforming  $hp$ -version interpolant may be employed which removes this sub-optimality; see [27, Remark 3.3] for details.

*Remark 3.4.* In the case of an inhomogeneous boundary condition  $u = g$  on  $\Gamma$ , the third term in the local error indicators  $\eta_\kappa$  is replaced by

$$\gamma^2 h_e^{-1} p_e^3 \|\llbracket u_{2G} \rrbracket\|_{L_2(\partial\kappa \setminus \Gamma)}^2 + \gamma^2 h_e^{-1} p_e^3 \|u_{2G} - g_h\|_{L_2(\partial\kappa \cap \Gamma)}^2,$$

where  $g_h$  is a piecewise approximation to the boundary function  $g$ ; in this setting additional data-oscillation terms also arise, see [25] for details.

*Remark 3.5.* We remark that local lower bounds for the right-hand side of (26), i.e., the efficiency of the proposed error indicator, can be proved by adding the term

$$E^2 := \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\mu(|\nabla u|) \nabla u - \mu(|\nabla u_{2G}|) \nabla u_{2G}\|_{L_2(\kappa)}^2$$

to the norm  $\|u - u_{2G}\|_{h,p}^2$ . Then, by applying (8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} E^2 &\leq 2 \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \xi_\kappa^2 + 2 \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\mu(|\nabla u|) \nabla u - \mu(|\nabla u_{2G}|) \nabla u_{2G}\|_{L_2(\kappa)}^2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \xi_\kappa^2 + 2C_1^2 \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla u - \nabla u_{2G}\|_{L_2(\kappa)}^2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \xi_\kappa^2 + 2C_1^2 \|u - u_{2G}\|_{h,p}^2, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore we obtain (26) with the left-hand side being replaced by  $(\|u - u_{2G}\|_{h,p}^2 + E^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , and a different constant  $\tilde{C}_5$ . Furthermore, in order to obtain lower bounds on the error, the fine grid

indicators  $\eta_\kappa$  can be estimated in terms of the local error by proceeding along the lines of [27]. Finally, in order to bound the two-grid error indicators, we use again (8) to infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_\kappa &\leq \|\mu(|\nabla u_{H,P})\nabla u_{2G} - \mu(|\nabla u|)\nabla u\|_{L_2(\kappa)} + \|\mu(|\nabla u|)\nabla u - \mu(|\nabla u_{2G}|)\nabla u_{2G}\|_{L_2(\kappa)} \\ &\leq \|\mu(|\nabla u_{H,P})\nabla u_{2G} - \mu(|\nabla u|)\nabla u\|_{L_2(\kappa)} + C_1 \|\nabla u - \nabla u_{2G}\|_{L_2(\kappa)}. \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 3.6.* Based on the *hp*-*a posteriori* error analysis developed in [50], the error bound stated in Theorem 3.2 may be generalised to domains  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ , assuming that the underlying mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$  consists of 1-irregular hexahedral elements.

*Proof of Theorem 3.2:* The proof of this error bound is based on a generalisation of the proof of the corresponding *a posteriori* bound for the standard *hp*-version SIP DGFEM for second-order quasi-linear elliptic PDEs; see [27] for details. Given that the fine mesh partition  $\mathcal{T}_h$  of  $\Omega$  may contain hanging nodes, under the assumption that  $\mathcal{T}_h$  is regularly reducible, i.e.,  $\mathcal{T}_h$  may be refined to create a conforming mesh  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h$  as outlined in Section 2.1. We denote by  $V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h, \tilde{\mathbf{p}})$  the corresponding DGFEM finite element space with polynomial degree vector  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  defined by  $\tilde{p}_{\tilde{\kappa}} = p_\kappa$  for any  $\tilde{\kappa} \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h$  with  $\tilde{\kappa} \subseteq \kappa$  and some  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$ . We note that  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p}) \subseteq V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h, \tilde{\mathbf{p}})$  and due to the assumptions in Section 2.1, the DGFEM norms  $\|\cdot\|_{h,p}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{h},\tilde{p}}$  corresponding to the spaces  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$  and  $V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h, \tilde{\mathbf{p}})$ , respectively, are equivalent on  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ , cf. [27].

An important step in our analysis is the decomposition of the DGFEM space  $V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h, \tilde{\mathbf{p}})$  into two orthogonal subspaces: a conforming part  $[V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h, \tilde{\mathbf{p}})]^\parallel = V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ , and a nonconforming part  $[V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h, \tilde{\mathbf{p}})]^\perp$  defined as the orthogonal complement of  $[V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h, \tilde{\mathbf{p}})]^\parallel$  in  $V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h, \tilde{\mathbf{p}})$  with respect to the DGFEM energy inner product  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\tilde{h},\tilde{p}}$  (inducing the DGFEM energy norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{h},\tilde{p}}$ ), i.e.,

$$V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}) = [V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h, \tilde{\mathbf{p}})]^\parallel \oplus_{\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{h},\tilde{p}}} [V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h, \tilde{\mathbf{p}})]^\perp.$$

Based on this setting, the DGFEM-solution  $u_{2G}$  obtained by (16)-(17) may be split accordingly,

$$u_{2G} = u_{2G}^\parallel + u_{2G}^\perp, \quad (29)$$

where  $u_{2G}^\parallel \in [V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h, \tilde{\mathbf{p}})]^\parallel$  and  $u_{2G}^\perp \in [V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h, \tilde{\mathbf{p}})]^\perp$ . We can define the error in the solution obtained by (16)-(17) as

$$E_{h,p} = u - u_{2G}, \quad (30)$$

and let

$$E_{h,p}^\parallel = u - u_{2G}^\parallel \in H_0^1(\Omega). \quad (31)$$

We notice that

$$\|E_{h,p}^\parallel\|_{h,p} \leq C_D \|E_{h,p}\|_{h,p}, \quad (32)$$

where the constant  $C_D > 0$  is independent of  $\gamma$ ,  $h$  and  $\mathbf{p}$  but depends only on the shape regularity of  $\mathcal{T}_h$  and the constants  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  in (11) and (12), respectively; see [27, Corollary 3.6].

Exploiting inequality (9) yields

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 \|E_{h,p}\|_{h,p}^2 &= C_2 \left( \sum_{\tilde{\kappa} \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h} \int_{\tilde{\kappa}} |\nabla u - \nabla u_{2G}|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \sigma_{h,p} |[E_{h,p}]|^2 ds \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{\tilde{\kappa} \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_h} \int_{\tilde{\kappa}} \{\mu(|\nabla u|)\nabla u - \mu(|\nabla u_{2G}|)\nabla u_{2G}\} \cdot \nabla E_{h,p} d\mathbf{x} + C_2 \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \sigma_{h,p} |[E_{h,p}]|^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

By noticing that  $E_{h,p} = E_{h,p}^\parallel - u_{2G}^\perp$ , we split the right-hand side of this inequality into the following four parts

$$C_2 \|E_{h,p}\|_{h,p}^2 \leq |T_1| + |T_2| + |T_3| + |T_4|, \quad (33)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1 &= \sum_{\tilde{\kappa} \in \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{h}}} \int_{\tilde{\kappa}} \{ \mu(|\nabla u|) \nabla u - \mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|) \nabla u_{2G} \} \cdot \nabla E_{h,p}^{\parallel} \, d\mathbf{x}, \\
T_2 &= - \sum_{\tilde{\kappa} \in \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{h}}} \int_{\tilde{\kappa}} \{ \mu(|\nabla u|) \nabla u - \mu(|\nabla u_{2G}|) \nabla u_{2G} \} \cdot \nabla u_{2G}^{\perp}, \, d\mathbf{x} \\
T_3 &= C_2 \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \sigma_{h,p} |[[E_{h,p}]]|^2 \, ds, \\
T_4 &= \sum_{\tilde{\kappa} \in \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{h}}} \int_{\tilde{\kappa}} \{ \mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|) \nabla u_{2G} - \mu(|\nabla u_{2G}|) \nabla u_{2G} \} \cdot \nabla E_{h,p}^{\parallel} \, d\mathbf{x}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here,  $E_{h,p}^{\parallel} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  and  $u_{2G}^{\perp} \in [V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})]^{\perp}$  are defined by (31) and (29), respectively. We note that  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$  and  $T_3$  are analogous to the corresponding terms which arise in the *a posteriori* error analysis of the standard SIP DGFEM discretisation of (5)–(6), cf. [17] and [27]. Indeed, from [17] and [27], we recall the following bound:

$$|T_1| + |T_2| + |T_3| \leq C \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \eta_{\kappa}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|E_{h,p}\|_{h,p}. \quad (34)$$

We now consider the term  $T_4$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
T_4 &= \sum_{\tilde{\kappa} \in \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{h}}} \int_{\tilde{\kappa}} \{ \mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|) \nabla u_{2G} - \mu(|\nabla u_{2G}|) \nabla u_{2G} \} \cdot \nabla E_{h,p}^{\parallel} \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&= \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\kappa} \{ \mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|) \nabla u_{2G} - \mu(|\nabla u_{2G}|) \nabla u_{2G} \} \cdot \nabla E_{h,p}^{\parallel} \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&\leq \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|(\mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|) - \mu(|\nabla u_{2G}|)) \nabla u_{2G}\|_{L_2(\kappa)} \left\| \nabla E_{h,p}^{\parallel} \right\|_{L_2(\kappa)} \\
&\leq \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \xi_{\kappa}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|E_{h,p}\|_{h,p}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thereby, applying (32), gives

$$T_4 \leq C_D \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \xi_{\kappa}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|E_{h,p}\|_{h,p}. \quad (35)$$

Inserting (34) and (35) into (33) gives

$$C_2 \|E_{h,p}\|_{h,p}^2 \leq C \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \eta_{\kappa}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|E_{h,p}\|_{h,p} + C_D \left( \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h} \xi_{\kappa}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|E_{h,p}\|_{h,p}.$$

Dividing both sides of the above inequality by  $\|E_{h,p}\|_{h,p}$ , using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and applying the triangle inequality in order to replace  $f$  by  $\Pi_{\kappa, p_{\kappa}} f$ , completes the proof of Theorem 3.2.  $\square$

#### 4. TWO-GRID $hp$ -ADAPTIVE MESH REFINEMENT ALGORITHM

For the standard SIP DGFEM discretisation of the quasi-linear problem (5)–(6), the mesh may be automatically constructed using the  $hp$ -adaptive refinement algorithm outlined in [27]. In that setting, the local error indicators are defined in an analogous way to  $\eta_{\kappa}$  given in (27), with  $u_{H,P}$  and  $u_{2G}$  both replaced by  $u_{h,p}$ . In the context of the two-grid SIP DGFEM discretisation defined by (16)–(17), it is necessary to refine both the fine and coarse meshes, together with their corresponding polynomial degree vectors, in order to decrease the error between  $u$  and  $u_{2G}$  with respect to the energy norm  $\|\cdot\|_{h,p}$ .

To this end, we first note that, from the Theorem 3.2, we have, for each fine element  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , a local error indicator  $\eta_\kappa$  and a local two-grid error indicator  $\xi_\kappa$ . As noted above, the local error indicator  $\eta_\kappa$  is similar to the one which arises within the analysis of the standard SIP DGFEM discretisation. With this in mind,  $\eta_\kappa$  represents the error arising from the linear fine grid solve defined in (17), while the local two-grid error indicator  $\xi_\kappa$  represents the error stemming from the approximation of the nonlinear coefficient  $\mu(|\nabla u_{h,p}|)$  on the fine mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$  by the same quantity evaluated with respect to the coarse grid solution  $u_{H,P}$ , i.e., the error committed by replacing  $\mu(|\nabla u_{h,p}|)$  by  $\mu(|\nabla u_{H,P}|)$ .

With this observation, we design the fine finite element space  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$  by employing the local error indicators (27), while the coarse finite element space  $V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P})$  is constructed in such a manner as to control the size of the local two-grid error indicators (28). More precisely, we wish to design both  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$  and  $V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P})$  in such a manner that  $\eta_\kappa$  and  $\xi_\kappa$  are of comparable size. To this end, we propose the following algorithm.

**Algorithm 4.1.** *The finite element spaces  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$  and  $V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P})$  are constructed, based on employing the following algorithm.*

- (1) *Initial step: Select initial coarse and fine meshes  $\mathcal{T}_H$  and  $\mathcal{T}_h$ , as well as initial coarse and fine polynomial degree distributions  $\mathbf{P}$  and  $\mathbf{p}$ , respectively, in such a manner that the resulting coarse and fine  $hp$ -finite element spaces  $V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P})$  and  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ , respectively, satisfy the condition:  $V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P}) \subseteq V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ .*
- (2) *Perform  $hp$ -mesh refinement of the fine  $hp$ -finite element space  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ : more precisely, using the fine grid error indicators  $\eta_\kappa$  from (27), apply a fixed fraction strategy to mark elements with a comparatively large error contribution. Then, if an element is set for refinement, decide on whether to perform  $h$ - or  $p$ -refinement based on testing the smoothness of the fine grid solution  $u_{2G}$ ; see, e.g., [26] (or [44]) to design  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ .*
- (3) *Perform coarse mesh refinement: for a fixed constant steering parameter  $0 \leq \lambda < \infty$ , for each element  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , do:*
  - (a) *If  $\lambda \xi_\kappa^2 \geq \eta_\kappa^2$  then mark for refinement the coarse element  $\kappa_H \in \mathcal{T}_H$  where  $\kappa \subseteq \kappa_H$ .*
  - (b) *If the element is set for refinement decide on whether to perform  $h$ - or  $p$ -refinement, e.g., by again testing the smoothness of the coarse grid solution  $u_{H,P}$ ; see, [26, Section 2.4.1] (or [44]).*
- (4) *Perform mesh smoothing to ensure:*
  - *For all fine elements  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$  there exists a coarse mesh element  $\kappa_H \in \mathcal{T}_H$  such that  $\kappa \subseteq \kappa_H$ ;*
  - *For all  $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}_h$  and  $\kappa_H \in \mathcal{T}_H$ , where  $\kappa \subseteq \kappa_H$ , that  $P_\kappa \leq p_\kappa$ .*

*In this article we perform  $h$ -refinement on the fine mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$  and  $p$ -derefinement on the coarse mesh  $\mathcal{T}_H$  where necessary.*

*Remark 4.1.* For the purposes of the numerical experiments in the following section, in Step 1 above, the two-grid  $hp$ -adaptive algorithm is initially started with  $V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P}) = V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ .

*Remark 4.2.* We note that the algorithm allows the steering parameter  $\lambda$  to be zero. In this situation no coarse mesh refinement will be performed and hence the algorithm will only refine the fine mesh.

## 5. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section we present a series of numerical experiments in two- and three-dimensional space to demonstrate the performance of the *a posteriori* error bound derived in Theorem 3.2 and the  $hp$ -adaptive mesh refinement strategy from Algorithm 4.1. We set the interior penalty parameter constant  $\gamma$  to 10 and the steering parameter  $\lambda$  to 1 for all experiments. The nonlinear equations are solved by employing a damped Newton method [36, Section 14.4]. The solution of the resulting set of linear equations, emanating from either the fine mesh or at each step of the iterative nonlinear solver, was computed using either the direct MUMPS solver, see [1], for two-dimensional problems or an ILU preconditioned GMRES algorithm, see [39], for the three-dimensional problem. We also calculate the error bound in Theorem 3.2 by setting the constant  $C_5$  to 1.




Figure 1: Example 1. (a) Comparison of the error in the DGFEM norm, using both the standard nonlinear solver ( $u_* = u_{h,p}$ ) and the two-grid method ( $u_* = u_{2G}$ ), with respect to the number of degrees of freedom; (b) Effectivity of the  $h$ - and  $hp$ -refinement using the two-grid method; (c) Comparison of number of degrees of freedom in the coarse and fine mesh.

For each example, as well as solving using the two-grid method, we compute the standard SIP DGFEM formulation (14) for comparison. In order to determine the improvement in the computation time from using the two-grid method over the standard SIP DGFEM, both algorithms were timed, on the same computer, using the FORTRAN `cpu_time` function [33, Section 8.16.2], which times purely the amount of cpu time and is therefore unaffected by other processes on the computer.

5.1. **Example 1.** In this example we repeat the first numerical experiment from [27, Section 4.1] with  $s = 20$ . Therefore, we let  $\Omega$  be the unit square  $(0, 1)^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  and define the nonlinear coefficient as

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}, |\nabla u|) = 2 + \frac{1}{1 + |\nabla u|}. \quad (36)$$

We select the right-hand forcing function  $f$  so that the analytical solution to (5)–(6) is given by

$$u(x, y) = x(1-x)y(1-y)(1-2y)e^{-20(2x-1)^2}.$$

In Figure 1(a) we present a comparison of the actual error measured in terms of the energy norm versus the third root of the number of degrees of freedom (of the fine mesh) for both the standard DGFEM formulation (14), together with the two-grid SIP DGFEM (16)–(17). In this figure we perform both  $h$ - and  $hp$ -adaptive mesh refinement for both schemes. Here, we can see that, for the problem at hand, the true error in the two-grid SIP DGFEM is only marginally worse than the corresponding quantity for the standard DGFEM, when the same number of degrees of freedom in the two-grid fine mesh, as in the mesh for the standard DGFEM, are used. From Figure




Figure 2: Example 1. Cumulative cpu timing of the standard ( $u_* = u_{h,p}$ ) and two-grid ( $u_* = u_{2G}$ ) solver compared to the actual error in the DGFEM norm: (a)  $h$ -refinement; (b)  $hp$ -refinement.




Figure 3: Example 1. (a) Coarse and (b) fine meshes after 11  $h$ -adaptive refinements; (c) Coarse and (d) fine meshes after 11  $hp$ -adaptive refinements.

1(b), we observe that for both the  $h$ - and  $hp$ -refinement strategy, the error bound overestimates the true error by a roughly consistent amount, in the sense that the effectivity indices are roughly constant; indeed, here, the effectivity indices are around 13. Although the two-grid SIP DGFEM gives a slightly worse error than the standard DGFEM, for a fixed number of fine mesh degrees of freedom, we note that the two-grid algorithm only performs the expensive nonlinear solve on a coarser grid which, hopefully, possesses far less degrees of freedom than the standard DGFEM.




Figure 4: Example 2. (a) Comparison of the error in the DGFEM norm, using both a standard nonlinear solver ( $u_* = u_{h,p}$ ) and the two-grid method ( $u_* = u_{2G}$ ), with respect to the number of degrees of freedom; (b) Effectivity of the  $h$ - and  $hp$ -refinement using the two-grid method; (c) Comparison of number of degrees of freedom in the coarse and fine mesh.

Figure 1(c) shows the number of degrees of freedom on the coarse grid compared to the number of degrees of freedom on the fine mesh. As can be seen, there are considerable less degrees of freedom on the coarse grid and, therefore, we would expect the two-grid solver to be computationally less expensive. To this end, the magnitude of the true error, measured in the DGFEM norm, for both the standard and two-grid methods, when both  $h$ - and  $hp$ -adaptive mesh refinement has been employed, compared to the cumulative cpu time required for the calculation of each numerical solution is shown in Figure 2. This figure clearly illustrates the superiority of employing the two-grid variant of the SIP DGFEM for this problem. Indeed, for a given fixed accuracy, the two-grid SIP DGFEM requires around an order of magnitude less cpu time to compute the numerical approximation to  $u$ , compared to the standard DGFEM.

In Figure 3 we show the fine and coarse  $h$ - and  $hp$ -refinement meshes after 11 mesh refinements, where the colour bar indicates the polynomial degree for  $hp$ -refinement. For  $h$ -refinement we can see that all the fine grid refinement occurs around the interior and bases of the exponential ‘hills’ in the analytical solution, as would occur for the standard DGFEM. Notice that only a small amount of refinement has taken place in the corresponding elements in the coarse mesh, namely, wherever  $\xi_\kappa$  is expected to be large. In the fine mesh of the  $hp$ -refinement case the  $h$ -refinement occurs mostly around the base of the hills with  $p$ -refinement in the interior of the hills, cf. also the coarse grid.

**5.2. Example 2.** In this example we repeat the second numerical experiment from [27, Section 4.2]. Thereby, we let  $\Omega$  denote the L-shaped domain  $(-1, 1)^2 \setminus [0, 1) \times (-1, 0] \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  and select the






Figure 5: Example 2. Cumulative cpu timing of the standard ( $u_* = u_{h,p}$ ) and two-grid ( $u_* = u_{2G}$ ) solver compared to the actual error in the DGFEM norm: (a)  $h$ -refinement; (b)  $hp$ -refinement.




Figure 6: Example 2. (a) Coarse and (b) fine meshes after 11  $h$ -adaptive refinements; (c) Coarse and (d) fine meshes after 11  $hp$ -adaptive refinements.

nonlinearity to be

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}, |\nabla u|) = 1 + e^{-|\nabla u|^2}.$$

By writing  $(r, \varphi)$  to denote the system of polar coordinates, we choose the forcing function  $f$  and an inhomogeneous boundary condition such that the analytical solution to (5)–(6) is

$$u = r^{2/3} \sin\left(\frac{2}{3}\varphi\right).$$

Note that  $u$  is analytic in  $\bar{\Omega} \setminus \{0\}$ , but  $\nabla u$  is singular at the origin.

In Figure 4(a), we again present a comparison of the actual error measured in terms of the energy norm versus the third root of the number of degrees of freedom (of the fine mesh) for both the standard DGFEM formulation (14), together with the two-grid SIP DGFEM (16)–(17), employing both  $h$ - and  $hp$ -refinement. As in Example 1, for this problem the true error in the two-grid SIP DGFEM is only marginally worse than the corresponding quantity for the standard DGFEM, when the same number of degrees of freedom in the two-grid fine mesh, as in the mesh for the standard DGFEM, are employed. Figure 4(b), shows the effectivity indices of both the  $h$ - and  $hp$ -refinement strategies. For all meshes, these are roughly constant. We can see from Figure 4(c), which shows the number of degrees of freedom on the coarse grid compared to the number of degrees of freedom on the fine mesh, that there are considerably less degrees of freedom on the coarse grid and, thereby, we would again expect the two-grid solver to be computationally less expensive. In Figure 5 we plot the cumulative cpu time taken by the two schemes, which is compared to the actual error, for both  $h$ - and  $hp$ -refinement strategies. Here, we see that for  $h$ -refinement, the two-grid SIP DGFEM results in an error that is roughly a constant amount lower than the error in the standard method, for the same computation time. For  $hp$ -refinement, we see that initially the two-grid method is less computationally expensive, however, as refinement proceeds the improvement in computation time from using the two-grid method decreases.

In Figure 6 we show the fine and coarse  $h$ - and  $hp$ -refinement meshes after 11 mesh refinements, where the colour bar indicates the polynomial degree for  $hp$ -refinement. For  $h$ -refinement we can see that both the fine and coarse grid refinement is fairly uniform except around the singularity at the origin, where strong refinement appears, with the coarse grid mesh refinement being less refined. For the  $hp$ -refinement case, the  $h$ -refinement occurs mostly around the origin with high  $p$ -refinement in the rest of the domain, with the coarse grid refinement done mostly by  $p$ -refinement, with a small amount of  $h$ -refinement around the origin.

**5.3. Example 3.** In this section we let  $\Omega$  be the Fichera corner  $(-1, 1)^3 \setminus [0, 1]^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ , use the nonlinearity (36) from the first example and select  $f$  and a suitable inhomogeneous boundary conditions such that the analytical solution to (5)–(6) is

$$u(x, y, z) = (x^2 + y^2 + z^2)^{q/2},$$

where  $q \in \mathbb{R}$ . From [5] we note that for  $q > -1/2$  the solution satisfies  $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ ; in this case we select  $q = -1/4$  as in [50]. We note that this gives a singularity at the re-entrant corner (the origin).

In Figure 7(a), we again present a comparison of the actual error measured in terms of the energy norm versus the fourth root (see [50]) of the number of degrees of freedom (of the fine mesh) for both the standard DGFEM formulation (14), together with the two-grid SIP DGFEM (16)–(17), employing both  $h$ - and  $hp$ -refinement. Here, we can see that for this problem the true error in the two-grid SIP DGFEM is almost identical to the corresponding quantity for the standard DGFEM when the same number of degrees of freedom in the two-grid fine mesh is employed as in the mesh for the standard DGFEM. From Figure 7(b), we can see that the effectivity indices of the  $h$ -refinement strategy are roughly constant, suggesting that the error bound constantly overestimates the error. For the  $hp$ -refinement strategy, we note that the effectivity index seems to rise slightly as refinement occurs; we point out that similar behaviour was observed in [50] for the numerical approximation of the Poisson equation posed in the same Fichera corner domain. From Figure 7(c), which shows the number of degrees of freedom on the coarse grid compared to the number of degrees of freedom on the fine mesh, we can see that the two-grid solver uses significantly less degrees of freedom on the coarse grid than on the fine mesh; thereby, we would expect the computation time to be considerably lower than for the standard solver. From the comparison of the cumulative cpu timing with the actual error in the DGFEM norm, Figure 8, this expected improvement is indeed observed for both  $h$ - and  $hp$ -refinement strategies. In particular, for a given fixed accuracy, the two-grid SIP DGFEM requires around an order of magnitude less cpu time to compute the numerical approximation to  $u$ , compared to the standard DGFEM.




Figure 7: Example 3. (a) Comparison of the error in the DGFEM norm, using both a standard nonlinear solver ( $u_* = u_{h,p}$ ) and the two-grid method ( $u_* = u_{2G}$ ), with respect to the number of degrees of freedom; (b) Effectivity of the  $h$ - and  $hp$ -refinement using the two-grid method; (c) Comparison of number of degrees of freedom in the coarse and fine mesh.




Figure 8: Example 3. (a) Cumulative cpu timing of standard ( $u_* = u_{h,p}$ ) and two-grid ( $u_* = u_{2G}$ ) solver compared to the actual error in the DGFEM norm: (a)  $h$ -refinement; (b)  $hp$ -refinement.

Figure 9 shows the fine and coarse meshes after 5  $h$ -refinements. We can see that both the fine and coarse grid refinement is fairly uniform but concentrated around the singularity at the origin; we also note that the coarse grid mesh is less refined than the fine mesh, as we would expect. The fine and coarse meshes after 6  $hp$ -mesh refinements are shown in Figure 10. Here, we see




Figure 9: Example 3. Finite element mesh after 5  $h$ -adaptive mesh refinements: (a) Coarse mesh; (b) Fine mesh; (c) Three-slice of coarse mesh; (d) Three-slice of fine mesh.

that at the singularity at the origin both the fine and coarse meshes have mostly  $h$ -refinement with  $p$ -refinement occurring away from this area. Again we can see that both the coarse and fine meshes have been refined in a similar manner, with the coarse mesh just being less refined than the fine mesh.

## 6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this article, we have developed the *a priori* and *a posteriori* error analysis for a class of two-grid  $hp$ -version DGFEMs for the numerical solution of second-order quasilinear elliptic boundary value problems of monotone type. In particular, due to the type of nonlinearity considered, the *a priori* error bounds indicate that the dimension of the coarse and fine finite element spaces  $V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P})$  and  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ , respectively, should grow at roughly the same rate, in order to retain optimal convergence of the underlying numerical method; computational results confirming these theoretical findings have been presented in [18]. On the basis of the *a posteriori* error bound, we have designed and implemented a two-grid  $hp$ -adaptive algorithm which is capable of designing both the coarse and fine finite element spaces  $V(\mathcal{T}_H, \mathbf{P})$  and  $V(\mathcal{T}_h, \mathbf{p})$ , respectively, in an automatic manner. In particular, our numerical experiments indicate that gains in computational efficiency may be attained when the two-grid method is exploited in comparison to the standard (single grid) DGFEM. Current work is based on extending the present analysis to non-Newtonian fluid flows in both two- and three-dimensions.




Figure 10: Example 3. Finite element mesh after 6  $hp$ -adaptive mesh refinements: (a) Coarse mesh; (b) Fine mesh; (c) Three-slice of coarse mesh; (d) Three-slice of fine mesh.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

PH acknowledges the financial support of the EPSRC under the grant EP/H005498. TW acknowledges the financial support of the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF) under grant No. 200021\_126594.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] P.R. Amestoy, I.S. Duff, and J.-Y. L'Excellent. Multifrontal parallel distributed symmetric and unsymmetric solvers. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 184:501–520, 2000.
- [2] D.N. Arnold. An interior penalty finite element method with discontinuous elements. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 19:742–760, 1982.
- [3] D.N. Arnold, F. Brezzi, B. Cockburn, and L.D. Marini. Unified analysis of discontinuous Galerkin methods for elliptic problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 39:1749–1779, 2001.
- [4] O. Axelsson and W. Layton. A two-level method for the discretization of nonlinear boundary value problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 33(6):2359–2374, 1996.
- [5] L. Beilina, S. Korotov, and M. Krížek. Nonobtuse tetrahedral partitions that refine locally towards Fichera-like corners. *App. Math.*, 50(6):569–581, 2005.
- [6] C. Bi and V. Ginting. Two-grid finite volume element method for linear and nonlinear elliptic problems. *Numer. Math.*, 108:177–198, 2007.
- [7] C. Bi and V. Ginting. Two-grid discontinuous Galerkin method for quasi-linear elliptic problems. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 2011. In press.
- [8] R. Bustinza and G.N. Gatica. A local discontinuous Galerkin method for nonlinear diffusion problems with mixed boundary conditions. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 26(1):152–177, 2004.

- [9] P. Castillo, B. Cockburn, I. Perugia, and D. Schötzau. An a priori error analysis of the local discontinuous Galerkin method for elliptic problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 38:1676–1706, 2000.
- [10] B. Cockburn, S. Hou, and C.-W. Shu. TVB Runge–Kutta local projection discontinuous Galerkin finite elements for hyperbolic conservation laws. *Math. Comp.*, 54:545–581, 1990.
- [11] B. Cockburn, G. Kanschat, I. Perugia, and D. Schötzau. Superconvergence of the local discontinuous Galerkin method for elliptic problems on Cartesian grids. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 39:264–285, 2001.
- [12] B. Cockburn, G.E. Karniadakis, and C.-W. Shu, editors. *Discontinuous Galerkin Methods. Theory, Computation and Applications*, volume 11 of *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Engrg.* Springer, 2000.
- [13] B. Cockburn and C.-W. Shu. TVB Runge–Kutta local projection discontinuous Galerkin finite element method for scalar conservation laws ii: General framework. *Math. Comp.*, 52:411–435, 1989.
- [14] B. Cockburn and C.-W. Shu. The Runge–Kutta local projection  $P^1$ -discontinuous Galerkin method for scalar conservation laws. *Modél. Math. Anal. Numér.*, 25:337–361, 1991.
- [15] B. Cockburn and C.-W. Shu. The local discontinuous Galerkin method for time-dependent reaction–diffusion systems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 35:2440–2463, 1998.
- [16] B. Cockburn and C.-W. Shu. The Runge–Kutta discontinuous Galerkin method for conservation laws: Multi-dimensional systems. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 141:199–244, 1998.
- [17] S. Congreve. A posteriori error analysis of  $hp$ -adaptive finite element methods for second-order quasi-linear PDEs. Master’s thesis, University of Nottingham, 2010.
- [18] S. Congreve, P. Houston, and T.P. Wihler. Two-grid  $hp$ -version DGFEMs for strongly monotone second-order quasilinear elliptic PDEs. In *Proceedings in Applied Mathematics and Mechanics. 82nd Annual GAMM Scientific Conference, Graz, Austria*, 2011.
- [19] C. N. Dawson, M. F. Wheeler, and C. S. Woodward. A two-grid finite difference scheme for non-linear parabolic equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 35:435–452, 1998.
- [20] J.E. Flaherty, R.M. Loy, M.S. Shephard, and J.D. Teresco. Software for parallel adaptive solution of conservation laws by discontinuous Galerkin methods. In B. Cockburn, G.E. Karniadakis, and C.-W. Shu, editors, *Discontinuous Galerkin Methods: Theory, Computation and Applications, Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering, Vol. 11*, pages 113–123. Springer, 2000.
- [21] G.N. Gatica M. González and S. Meddahi. A low-order mixed finite element method for a class of quasi-Newtonian Stokes flows. Part I: A-priori error analysis. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 193(9-11):881–892, 2004.
- [22] T. Gudi, N. Nataraj, and A.K. Pani.  $hp$ -discontinuous Galerkin methods for strongly nonlinear elliptic boundary value problems. *Numer. Math.*, 109:233–268, 2008.
- [23] T. Gudi and A.K. Pani. Discontinuous Galerkin methods for quasi-linear elliptic problems of nonmonotone type. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 45(1):163–192, 2007.
- [24] P. Houston, J. Robson, and E. Süli. Discontinuous Galerkin finite element approximation of quasilinear elliptic boundary value problems I: the scalar case. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 25:726–749, 2005.
- [25] P. Houston, D. Schötzau, and T.P. Wihler. Energy norm a posteriori error estimation of  $hp$ -adaptive discontinuous Galerkin methods for elliptic problems. *Math. Model. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 17(1):33–62, 2007.
- [26] P. Houston, C. Schwab, and E. Süli. A note on the design of  $hp$ -adaptive finite element methods for elliptic partial differential equations. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 194(2-5):229–243, 2005.
- [27] P. Houston, E. Süli, and T.P. Wihler. A posteriori error analysis of  $hp$ -version discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods for second-order quasi-linear PDEs. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 28(2):245–273, 2007.
- [28] C. Johnson and J. Pitkäranta. An analysis of the discontinuous Galerkin method for a scalar hyperbolic equation. *Math. Comp.*, 46:1–26, 1986.
- [29] G.E. Karniadakis and S. Sherwin. *Spectral/ $hp$  Finite Element Methods in CFD*. Oxford University Press, 1999.
- [30] P. LeSaint and P.A. Raviart. On a finite element method for solving the neutron transport equation. In C. de Boor, editor, *Mathematical Aspects of Finite Elements in Partial Differential Equations*, pages 89–145. Academic Press, New York, 1974.
- [31] W.B. Liu and J.W. Barrett. Quasi-norm error bounds for the finite element approximation of some degenerate quasilinear elliptic equations and variational inequalities. *RAIRO Modél. Math. Anal Numér.*, 28(6):725–744, 1994.
- [32] M. Marion and J. Xu. Error estimates on a new nonlinear Galerkin method based on two-grid finite elements. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 32(4):1170–1184, 1995.
- [33] M. Metcalf, J. Reid, and M. Cohen. *Fortran 95/2003 explained*. Oxford University Press, 2004.
- [34] J. Nitsche. Über ein Variationsprinzip zur Lösung von Dirichlet Problemen bei Verwendung von Teilräumen, die keinen Randbedingungen unterworfen sind. *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg*, 36:9–15, 1971.
- [35] J.T. Oden, I. Babuška, and C.E. Baumann. A discontinuous  $hp$ -finite element method for diffusion problems. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 146:491–519, 1998.
- [36] J.M. Ortega and W.C. Rheinboldt. *Iterative Solution of Nonlinear Equations in Several Variables*. Computer Science and Applied Mathematics. Academic Press, New York, 1970.
- [37] C. Ortner and E. Süli. Discontinuous Galerkin finite element approximation of nonlinear second-order elliptic and hyperbolic systems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 45(4):1370–1397, 2007.
- [38] W.H. Reed and T.R. Hill. Triangular mesh methods for the neutron transport equation. Technical Report Tech. Report LA-UR-73-479, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, 1973.

- [39] Y. Saad and M.H. Schultz. GMRES: A generalized minimal residual algorithm for solving nonsymmetric linear systems. *SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comput.*, 7(3):856–869, 1986.
- [40] C. Schwab. *p- and hp-FEM - Theory and Applications in Solid and Fluid Mechanics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998.
- [41] B. Stamm and T.P. Wihler. *hp*-optimal discontinuous Galerkin methods for linear elliptic problems. *Math. Comp.*, 79(272):2117–2133, 2010.
- [42] T. Utnes. Two-grid finite element formulations of the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations. *Comm. Numer. Meth. Engng.*, 13(8):675–684, 1997.
- [43] M.F. Wheeler. An elliptic collocation finite element method with interior penalties. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 15:152–161, 1978.
- [44] T.P. Wihler. An *hp*-adaptive strategy based on continuous Sobolev embedding. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 235:2731–2739, 2011.
- [45] T.P. Wihler, P. Frauenfelder, and C. Schwab. Exponential convergence of the *hp*-DGFEM for diffusion problems. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 26:183–205, 2003.
- [46] L. Wu and M.B. Allen. Two-grid method for mixed finite-element solution of coupled reaction-diffusion systems. *Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations*, 1999:589–604, 1999.
- [47] J. Xu. A new class of iterative methods for nonselfadjoint or indefinite problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 29:303–319, 1992.
- [48] J. Xu. A novel two-grid method for semilinear elliptic equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comp.*, 15:231–237, 1994.
- [49] J. Xu. Two-grid discretization techniques for linear and nonlinear PDEs. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 33:1759–1777, 1996.
- [50] L. Zhu, S. Giani, P. Houston, and D. Schötzau. Energy norm a-posteriori error estimation for *hp*-adaptive discontinuous Galerkin methods for elliptic problems in three dimensions. *Math. Model. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 2011.

*E-mail address:* `pmxsc@nottingham.ac.uk` and `Paul.Houston@nottingham.ac.uk`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM, UNIVERSITY PARK, NOTTINGHAM, NG7 2RD, UK

*E-mail address:* `wihler@math.unibe.ch`

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT BERN, SIDLERSTRASSE 5, CH-3012 BERN, SWITZERLAND