



Fast convolution quadrature based impedance boundary conditions

Ralf Hiptmair^a, María López-Fernández^{b,*}, Alberto Paganini^a

^a Seminar for Applied Mathematics, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich, Switzerland

^b Institute of Mathematics, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 28 January 2013

Received in revised form 8 October 2013

MSC:

65M15

65M60

65M20

65R20

Keywords:

Eddy current problem

Impedance boundary conditions

Convolution quadrature

Fast and oblivious algorithms

ABSTRACT

We consider an eddy current problem in time-domain relying on impedance boundary conditions on the surface of the conductor(s). We pursue its full discretization comprising (i) a finite element Galerkin discretization by means of lowest order edge elements in space, and (ii) temporal discretization based on *Runge–Kutta Convolution Quadrature* (CQ) for the resulting Volterra integral equation in time. The final algorithm also involves the fast and oblivious approximation of CQ.

For this method we give a comprehensive convergence analysis and establish that the errors of spatial discretization, CQ and of its approximate realization add up to the final error bound.

© 2013 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Transient eddy current model

We consider a linear transient eddy current problem with the conductors occupying the bounded and connected polyhedron $\Omega_C \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. With a finite element discretization in mind we artificially truncate the fields to a simple bounded computational domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with $\overline{\Omega}_C \subset \Omega$.

For rapidly changing fields and high conductivities the skin effect prevents the fields from penetrating deep into the conductors. This permits us to model the effect of the conductor on the fields by means of an *impedance boundary condition* on the surface $\Gamma := \partial\Omega_C$ of the conductor without incurring a severe modeling error. This boundary condition imposes a linear relationship between the tangential components of the electric and magnetic fields that is local in space. In *frequency domain* at fixed angular frequency $\omega > 0$ this amounts to the well-known Leontovich boundary condition [1,2]

$$(\hat{\mathbf{H}} \times \mathbf{n})(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{\frac{i\omega\sigma(\mathbf{x})}{\mu(\mathbf{x})}} \hat{\mathbf{E}}_T(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\mathbf{n} : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is the exterior unit normal vector field on Γ , and $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{E}}$ denote the complex amplitudes of the magnetic and electric fields, respectively, and $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_T := (\mathbf{n} \times \hat{\mathbf{E}}) \times \mathbf{n}$ is the tangential component. The material coefficients μ (magnetic permeability) and σ (conductivity) are uniformly positive, but may vary in space. The Leontovich boundary condition (1.1) is the simplest representative of the class of surface impedance boundary conditions (SIBCs) that are hugely popular in

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +41 789443790; fax: +41 446355705.

E-mail addresses: maria.lopez@math.uzh.ch, mariaalf_es@yahoo.es (M. López-Fernández).




Fig. 1.1. The computational domain D is an open region surrounding the conductor Ω_C , with boundaries Γ and $\partial\Omega$ and outward pointing unit normal vector field \mathbf{n} .

computational electromagnetics with entire books devoted to them [3–5]. More sophisticated “higher order” specimens of SIBCs have been derived, for instance, in [6]. What they all have in common is the structure

$$(\widehat{\mathbf{H}} \times \mathbf{n})(\mathbf{x}) = Z(i\omega)(\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_T)(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma, \quad (1.2)$$

where Z may stand for a suitable surface (pseudo-)differential operator. In this article we focus on (1.1), but it should be regarded as a “structural representative” of more general relations of the form (1.2).

Multiplication with an expression in ω as in (1.1) becomes convolution in *time domain*. If we make the assumption that all fields vanish for $t \leq 0$, from (1.1) we arrive at the following *transient impedance boundary condition* for the time-dependent fields

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}, t) \times \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}) = \int_0^t \eta(\mathbf{x}) k(t - \tau) \mathbf{E}_T(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau, \quad t \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Gamma, \quad (1.3)$$

with a uniformly positive function $\eta(\mathbf{x}) := \sqrt{\sigma(\mathbf{x})\mu(\mathbf{x})^{-1}}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma$, and a *convolution kernel* $k : \Gamma \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, whose temporal Laplace transform is given by

$$K(s) := (\mathcal{L}k)(s) = \sqrt{s}, \quad s \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0). \quad (1.4)$$

For the sake of brevity we adopt the “operational calculus notation” for (1.3) [7], expressing it as $\mathbf{H} \times \mathbf{n} = \eta K(\partial_t) \mathbf{E}_T$.

Then, the evolution of the (scaled) electromagnetic fields in $D := \Omega \setminus \Omega_C$ (see Fig. 1.1) is governed by the following initial-boundary value problem that we consider up to a fixed final time $T > 0$:

$$\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad \operatorname{div} \mathbf{E} = 0 \quad \text{in } D \times (0, T), \quad (1.5a)$$

$$\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{n} = \eta(\mathbf{x}) K(\partial_t) \mathbf{E}_T \quad \text{on } \Gamma \times (0, T), \quad (1.5b)$$

$$\mathbf{E}_T = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \quad (1.5c)$$

$$\mathbf{E}(\cdot, 0) = 0 \quad \text{on } D. \quad (1.5d)$$

This is the so-called **E**-based formulation of an eddy current problem [8, Section 2.1]. The zero divergence condition on \mathbf{E} in (1.5a) should be regarded as a *gauging*, which ensures uniqueness of the electric field outside Ω_C . The right hand side \mathbf{f} stands for a source current producing an exciting magnetic field. We assume that it is compatible in the sense that $\mathbf{f}(0) = 0$ and

$$\operatorname{supp} \mathbf{f}(\cdot, t) \subset D \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad \mathbf{f} \in H^1(0, T; \mathbf{H}(\operatorname{div} 0, D)), \quad (1.6)$$

where $\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{div} 0, D)$ is the space of solenoidal (divergence-free) vector fields on D .

Remark 1.1. As explained in [9, Section 2], symmetries allow the dimensional reduction of (1.5). For instance, in the case of translational invariance, we end up with the so-called TM eddy current model, an initial-boundary value problem for a scalar unknown $u = u(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, t)$ representing a single component of the electric field

$$-\Delta u = f \quad \text{in } \tilde{D} \times (0, T), \quad (1.7a)$$

$$\mathbf{grad} u \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{n}} = \eta(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) K(\partial_t) u \quad \text{on } \tilde{\Gamma} \times (0, T), \quad (1.7b)$$

$$u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\tilde{\Omega} \times (0, T), \quad (1.7c)$$

$$u(\cdot, 0) = 0 \quad \text{on } \tilde{D} \quad (1.7d)$$

where the \sim tags two-dimensional cross-sections of the domains/boundaries.

In this article we propose a numerical method for the full discretization of (1.5) in space and time that also allows a highly efficient implementation. Discretization in space will rely on standard finite elements (FE), using edge elements for the approximation of \mathbf{E} . A particular challenge for temporal discretization arises from the non-local (in time) character of the convolution in (1.3). The so-called *Convolution Quadrature* (CQ) policy introduced by C. Lubich in [7,10] addresses this challenge in a uniquely stable fashion. Moreover, it requires only knowledge of the Laplace transform $K(s)$ of the convolution kernel $k(t)$. For the time domain impedance boundary conditions we have this very knowledge, see (1.4). The use of K instead of k is also reflected in the operational calculus notation $K(\partial_t)$. Initially, the CQ methods were based on multistep methods. In [11], they have been extended to Runge–Kutta methods. This variant will form the foundation of the discretization of (1.5) in time.

Fast algorithms on top of CQ have also been developed in the last decade. A fast “oblivious” algorithm for *approximate* CQ (FOCQ) with considerably reduced memory requirements is presented in [12] and we follow these ideas. For *sectorial* decreasing kernels (see (4.2)–(4.3)), N the total number of timesteps and ε the target accuracy, the algorithm in [12] reduces the number of multiplications of a naive implementation of CQ from $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$ to $\mathcal{O}(N \log N \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))$ and the memory requirements from $\mathcal{O}(N)$ to $\mathcal{O}(\log N \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))$.

Though we believe that application of CQ to impedance boundary conditions is new, it has become well established for certain kinds of evolution problems, most prominently wave propagation problems in unbounded domains tackled by means of time domain boundary integral equation (TDBIE) methods. We mention in particular [13,14], where the analysis of CQ based on Runge–Kutta methods is extended to this context and [15] for experimental results and a full list of references. We also mention applications of CQ to boundary element discretizations of visco-elasticity [16].

The focus of this article is on a comprehensive a priori convergence analysis of a fully discrete oblivious finite element Runge–Kutta convolution quadrature algorithm for (1.5). We adopt the “method of lines policy” successively estimating the errors due to spatial and temporal discretizations. All the error contributions add up to the total error of the scheme. For spatial and temporal discretization errors we find the expected algebraic decay in terms of mesh width and timestep size, respectively. The error due to the oblivious approximation turns out to decay exponentially in a discretization parameter and will usually be negligible compared to the other error contributions.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we address the spatial variational formulation of (1.5). In Section 3 we examine the spatial error. In Section 4 we review CQ based on Runge–Kutta methods [11,13], derive error estimates for its application to the spatial semidiscretization of (1.5) (namely (3.3)) and derive an estimate of the full discretization error. In Section 5 we analyze the error introduced by the oblivious approximation of CQ. Since the time integration of (1.5) leads to an intermediate situation where the Laplace transform of the convolution kernel is non decreasing, i.e., $\nu \geq 0$ in (4.3), we briefly show how to extend the theoretical background for the FOCQ to this case, by following closely [17,18]. Finally, 2D numerical experiments are provided in Section 6.

2. Spatial variational formulation

Impedance boundary conditions require the electric fields to belong to the “energy space”

$$U := \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}, \Omega) : \mathbf{u}_T|_F \in \mathbf{L}_t^2(\Gamma), \mathbf{u}_T = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}, \quad (2.1)$$

which is a Hilbert space, when endowed with the usual graph norm $\|\cdot\|_U$. Here, $\mathbf{L}_t^2(\Gamma)$ stands for space of square integrable tangential vector fields on Γ . In order to take into account the gauge condition $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{E} = 0$ the spatial variational formulation of (1.5) is posed on the function space V defined through the U -orthogonal *Helmholtz decomposition* [19, Theorem 3.3]

$$U = V \oplus \mathbf{grad} H_*^1(D), \quad (2.2)$$

where $H_*^1(D) := \{\varphi \in H^1(D) : \varphi|_F = \text{const}, \varphi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}$. Obviously, V is a closed subspace of U and it will be equipped with the same norm. Then the spatial variational formulation of (1.5) reads: seek $\mathbf{E} \in H^1(0, T; V)$, $\mathbf{E}(0) = 0$, such that

$$\underbrace{(\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{v})_0}_{=: a(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{v})} + K(\partial_t) \underbrace{\int_{\Gamma} \eta(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{E}_T \cdot \mathbf{v}_T \, dS}_{=: b(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{v})} = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v})_0 \quad (2.3)$$

for all $\mathbf{v} \in V$ and on $[0, T]$. Here $(\cdot, \cdot)_0$ designates the $L^2(D)$ inner product.

Theorem 2.1. *Under the assumptions (1.6) on the source term, (2.3) has a unique solution $\mathbf{E} \in H^1(0, T; V)$.*

Proof. First, we perform a reduction to the boundary, based on the U -orthogonal decomposition

$$V = V_{\partial} \oplus (V \cap \mathbf{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}, D)). \quad (2.4)$$

Note that V_{∂} can be regarded as a *trace space* of tangential surface vector fields, because we have, with equivalent norms,

$$V_{\partial} \cong \mathbf{L}_t^2(\Gamma) \cap \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{curl}_F, \Gamma),$$

where $\mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{curl}_\Gamma, \Gamma)$ is the trace space for $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}, D)$ on Γ , see [20]. In other words, through “ $\mathbf{curl curl}$ -harmonic extension” we may identify functions in V_∂ with their tangential components on Γ .

Now, consider a splitting of \mathbf{E} according to (2.4): $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_\partial + \mathbf{E}_0$. Applying the splitting to the test function in (2.3), we find that $\mathbf{E}_\partial : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_t^2(\Gamma) \cap \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{curl}_\Gamma, \Gamma)$ solves

$$a_\partial(\mathbf{E}_\partial, \mathbf{v}_\partial) + K(\partial_t)b(\mathbf{E}_\partial, \mathbf{v}_\partial) = (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{v}_\partial)_{\mathbf{L}_t^2(\Gamma)} \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_\partial \in V_\partial, \quad (2.5)$$

where $a_\partial(\mathbf{E}_\partial, \mathbf{v}_\partial) := a(\mathbf{E}_\partial, \mathbf{v}_\partial)$, using the two different interpretations of functions in V_∂ . The right hand side function \mathbf{g} can be obtained as $\mathbf{g}(t) := -\mathbf{curl w}(t) \times \mathbf{n}$, where \mathbf{w} solves the boundary value problem

$$\mathbf{w}(t) \in V \cap \mathbf{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}, D), \quad \mathbf{curl curl w}(t) = \mathbf{f}(t) \quad \text{in } D.$$

Thanks to the definition of V its solution is unique, and integrating by parts twice we find

$$(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_\partial)_0 = (\mathbf{curl w}, \mathbf{curl v}_\partial)_0 + (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{v}_\partial)_{\mathbf{L}_t^2(\Gamma)} \stackrel{\mathbf{curl curl v}_\partial=0}{=} (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{v}_\partial)_{\mathbf{L}_t^2(\Gamma)}.$$

From [21, Lemma 4.2] we conclude $\mathbf{g} \in H^1(0, T; \mathbf{L}_t^2(\Gamma))$.

Endow $\mathbf{L}_t^2(\Gamma)$ with the inner product $b(\cdot, \cdot)$, which renders the operator associated with $b(\cdot, \cdot)$ the identity, and write A_∂ for the unbounded, self-adjoint, and non-negative operator on $\mathbf{L}_t^2(\Gamma)$ induced by the bilinear form $a_\partial(\cdot, \cdot)$. Then (2.5) becomes

$$A_\partial \mathbf{E}_\partial + K(\partial_t)\mathbf{E}_\partial = \eta^{-1} \mathbf{g} \quad \text{in } \mathbf{L}_t^2(\Gamma), \quad (2.6)$$

\Updownarrow

$$\mathbf{E}_\partial + K^{-1}(\partial_t)A_\partial \mathbf{E}_\partial = K^{-1}(\partial_t)(\eta^{-1} \mathbf{g}). \quad (2.7)$$

From [22, Lemma 2.3] we know that the first component X of the $\mathbf{L}_t^2(\Gamma)$ -orthogonal Hodge decomposition

$$\mathbf{L}_t^2(\Gamma) \cap \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{curl}_\Gamma, \Gamma) = X \oplus \mathbf{curl}_\Gamma H^1(\Gamma)$$

is compactly embedded in $\mathbf{L}_t^2(\Gamma)$. Taking into account that the $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}, \Omega)$ -harmonic extensions of functions in $\mathbf{curl}_\Gamma H^1(\Gamma)$ are \mathbf{curl} -free, which means $A_\partial(\mathbf{curl}_\Gamma H^1(\Gamma)) = 0$, we infer that A_∂ possesses a compact resolvent.

In addition, note that $K^{-1}(s) = s^{-1/2}$ such that $K^{-1}(\partial_t)$ induces a convolution operator with the 1-regular L^1 -kernel $k(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi t}}$ of positive type. Thus, we can apply the abstract theory of [23, Chapter 3], which yields that $\mathbf{E}_\partial \in C^0([0, T]; V)$. Observe that $K(\partial_t)$ acts like a fractional derivative of order 1/2. This paves the way for a bootstrapping argument applied to (2.6), which establishes H^1 -smoothness of \mathbf{E}_∂ in time. \square

Both bilinear forms a, b defined in (2.3) are clearly symmetric and continuous on U , but we have even stronger properties of $c := a + b : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:

Lemma 2.1. *The bilinear form c is positive definite on V .*

Proof. The assertion of the lemma is immediate from the definition of the norm

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_U^2 = \|\mathbf{curl v}\|_{L^2(D)}^2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(D)}^2 + \|\mathbf{v}_T\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2, \quad (2.8)$$

and the Poincaré–Friedrichs type inequality

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(D)} \leq C(\|\mathbf{curl v}\|_{L^2(D)} + \|\mathbf{v}_T\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}) \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in V, \quad (2.9)$$

for some $C > 0$. The latter follows from the compact embedding of V in $L^2(D)$, which can be established along the lines of the proof of [21, Theorem 4.1]. \square

In order to exploit this useful property of c , we rewrite (2.3) in equivalent form: seek $\mathbf{E} \in H^1(0, T; V)$ such that on $[0, T]$

$$c(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{v}) + \widehat{K}(\partial_t)b(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{v}) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v})_0 \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in V, \quad (2.10)$$

by defining

$$\widehat{K}(s) := K(s) - 1 = \sqrt{s} - 1, \quad s \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0). \quad (2.11)$$

Remark 2.1. The evolution problem (1.7) can also be cast in the form (2.10) using $V := H_{\partial\Omega}^1(\widetilde{D})$ and

$$a(u, v) := \int_{\widetilde{D}} \mathbf{grad} u \cdot \mathbf{grad} v \, d\mathbf{x}, \quad b(u, v) := \int_{\widetilde{r}} \eta(\mathbf{x})uv \, dS. \quad (2.12)$$

3. Spatial semi-discretization

3.1. Finite element spaces

We equip D with a tetrahedral mesh \mathcal{M} with mesh-width h and write $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{M})$ for the finite-dimensional space of lowest order $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}, D)$ -conforming edge element functions on \mathcal{M} [21, Section 3] and set

$$U_h := U \cap \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{M}) = \{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{M}) : (\mathbf{v}_h)_T = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}. \quad (3.1)$$

In analogy to (2.2) the appropriate discrete variational space V_h will be a component of the U -orthogonal *discrete Helmholtz decomposition*

$$U_h = V_h \oplus \mathbf{grad} S_h, \quad (3.2)$$

where $S_h \subset H_*^1(D)$ denotes the space of piecewise linear continuous finite element functions on \mathcal{M} that are constant on Γ and vanish on $\partial\Omega$. Then the spatially discrete variational problem reads: seek $\mathbf{E}_h \in H^1(0, T; V_h)$, $\mathbf{E}_h(0) = 0$, such that on $[0, T]$

$$c(\mathbf{E}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) + \widehat{K}(\partial_t)b(\mathbf{E}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h)_0 \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in V_h. \quad (3.3)$$

In general, the finite element space V_h is not a subspace of V so that (3.3) turns out to be a *non-conforming* Galerkin discretization of (2.10).

Nevertheless, the two spaces are “close” on fine meshes. In order to phrase this in quantitative terms, consider the U -orthogonal projection $Q : U \rightarrow V$ onto $V \subset U$. By definition (2.1), we have $\mathbf{u} - Q\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{grad} H_*^1(D)$, which implies

$$\mathbf{curl}(\mathbf{u} - Q\mathbf{u}) = 0, \quad (\mathbf{u} - Q\mathbf{u})_T = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \quad (3.4)$$

The next lemma reveals that Q is a tool for approximating a function $\mathbf{v}_h \in V_h$ in V .

Lemma 3.1. *There is a $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ that depends only on D , such that¹*

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h - Q\mathbf{v}_h\|_U \leq Ch^\epsilon \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_U \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in V_h. \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. Following the ideas in the proof of [21, Lemma 4.5] the proof is reduced to interpolation error estimates.

The “closeness” of V_h and V is also reflected by the fact that the crucial positivity of c is preserved in the discrete setting:

Lemma 3.2. *With a constant $C > 0$ depending only on D and the shape regularity of \mathcal{M}*

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_U^2 \leq C c(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in V_h. \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. The proof is straightforward from the following variant of the discrete Poincaré–Friedrichs inequality [21, Corollary 4.4]

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(D)} \leq C(\|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(D)} + \|(\mathbf{v}_h)_T\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}) \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in V_h. \quad (3.7)$$

Its proof can rely on Lemmas 3.1 and 2.1. \square

As a consequence, c induces a norm $\|\cdot\|_c$ on V_h , which is equivalent to the U -norm uniformly in h .

3.2. Estimation of the spatial error

We retain the notations $\mathbf{E} \in H^1(0, T; V)$ and $\mathbf{E}_h \in H^1(0, T; V_h)$ for the solutions of (2.10) and (3.3), respectively, and aim to bound $t \rightarrow \|\mathbf{E}(t) - \mathbf{E}_h(t)\|_U$. As usual, such estimates rely on a Galerkin projection $P_h : V \rightarrow V_h$, here defined according to

$$c(P_h \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}_h) = c(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}_h) \quad \forall \mathbf{w}_h \in V_h, \quad (3.8)$$

which, thanks to Lemma 3.2, is a valid definition. Standard finite element error estimates from [21, Section 6.1] give the approximation property

$$\|\mathbf{u} - P_h \mathbf{u}\|_U \leq Ch(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(D)} + \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(D)} + \|\mathbf{u}_T\|_{H^1(\Gamma)}) \quad (3.9)$$

¹ We write C for generic constants (whose value may differ between different occurrences) that may only depend on D , η , and the shape-regularity of \mathcal{M} .

for all $\mathbf{u} \in (H^1(D))^3$ with $\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u} \in (H^1(D))^3$. This allows to control $\|\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}\|_U$ so that it remains to estimate $\|\mathbf{E}_h - \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}\|_U$, which is achieved through a stability argument for an evolution problem with a “residual type” right hand side. Denote $\mathbf{e}_h(t) := \mathbf{E}_h(t) - \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}(t)$ and compute

$$\begin{aligned} c(\mathbf{e}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) + \widehat{K}(\partial_t)b(\mathbf{e}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) &\stackrel{(3.8)}{=} (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h)_0 - c(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{v}_h) - \widehat{K}(\partial_t)b(\mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{v}_h) \\ &= (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h)_0 - c(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}_h) + c(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}_h - \mathbf{v}_h) - \widehat{K}(\partial_t)b(\mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{v}_h) \\ &= \underbrace{(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}_h)_0}_{=0 \text{ by (3.4)}} + \widehat{K}(\partial_t)b(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}_h) + \underbrace{c(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}_h - \mathbf{v}_h)}_{=0 \text{ by (3.4)}} - \widehat{K}(\partial_t)b(\mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{v}_h) \\ &= \widehat{K}(\partial_t)b(\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{v}_h). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the two marked terms vanish due to (3.4), (1.6), and the definition of the bilinear form c . This yields the discrete evolution equation for the error

$$c(\mathbf{e}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) + \widehat{K}(\partial_t)b(\mathbf{e}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) = \widehat{K}(\partial_t)b(\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{v}_h). \quad (3.10)$$

The stability analysis of (3.10) is achieved by means of simultaneous “diagonalization”; since both c and b are symmetric and semi-definite, and c is even positive definite on V_h , see Lemma 3.2, there exist a sequence of non-negative eigenvalues $\{\lambda_{h,\ell}\}_{\ell=1}^M$, $M := \dim V_h$, and an c -orthonormal basis $\{\mathbf{u}_{h,\ell}\}_{\ell=1}^M$ of V_h so that

$$b(\mathbf{u}_{h,\ell}, \mathbf{v}_h) = \lambda_{h,\ell} c(\mathbf{u}_{h,\ell}, \mathbf{v}_h) \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in V_h. \quad (3.11)$$

Besides, it is immediate from the definition of c on Page 6 that $0 \leq \lambda_{h,\ell} \leq 1$ for all h and ℓ .

By expanding $\mathbf{e}_h(t) = \sum_{\ell=1}^M \alpha_\ell(t) \mathbf{u}_{h,\ell}$ we obtain the following system of Volterra integral equations for the expansion coefficients

$$\alpha_\ell(t) + \lambda_{h,\ell} \widehat{K}(\partial_t) \alpha_\ell(t) = \widehat{K}(\partial_t) p_\ell(t) \quad \ell = 1, \dots, M, \quad (3.12)$$

where $p_\ell(t) := b(\mathbf{E}(t) - \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}(t), \mathbf{u}_{h,\ell})$. Note that by orthonormality $\|\mathbf{e}_h(t)\|_c^2 = \sum_{\ell=1}^M \alpha_\ell^2(t)$ so that we may target the $\alpha_\ell(t)$ ’s in order to gauge $\|\mathbf{e}_h(t)\|_U$. To do so we need the following identity [24, Theorem 31.7]:

Lemma 3.3 (Parseval’s Formula). *Let $f : [0, \infty[\rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function whose Laplace transform $F : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is analytic in the half plane $\operatorname{Re}(z) > \sigma_0$ for some $\sigma_0 \geq 0$. Then for every $\sigma > \sigma_0$ there holds true*

$$\|\phi_\sigma f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+)}^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma-i\infty}^{\sigma+i\infty} |F(s)|^2 ds,$$

where $\phi_\sigma(t) := e^{-\sigma t}$.

Lemma 3.4. *If $p_\ell(t) \in H^1(0, T)$, then for every $\sigma > 1$ there is a constant $C > 0$ depending only on D , σ , and η such that*

$$\|\mathbf{e}_h\|_{L^2(0,T;V)}^2 \leq C e^{2\sigma T} \left\| \phi_\sigma \frac{\partial}{\partial t} b(\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{P}_h \mathbf{E}, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(0,T;V_h')}^2. \quad (3.13)$$

Proof. By the associativity of the convolution the solution of the integral equation (3.12) can be rewritten as

$$\alpha_\ell(t) = \widetilde{K}_\ell(\partial_t) \widehat{K}(\partial_t) p_\ell(t),$$

where

$$\widetilde{K}_\ell(s) = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_{h,\ell}(\sqrt{s} - 1)}.$$

Since the real part of \sqrt{s} is positive and $\lambda_{h,\ell}$ is non-negative we have that

$$\widetilde{K}_\ell(s) \widehat{K}(s) = \frac{\sqrt{s} - 1}{1 + \lambda_{h,\ell}(\sqrt{s} - 1)} \quad (3.14)$$

is analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 1]$. As $\operatorname{Re}(\sqrt{s}) > 1$, if $\operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$, we find the elementary bound

$$|\widetilde{K}_\ell(s) \widehat{K}(s)| \leq |s|^{1/2}, \quad \forall \operatorname{Re}(s) \geq 1, \quad (3.15)$$

uniformly in h and ℓ .

Next, by the Sobolev extension theorem we can find an extended function p_ℓ^{ext} of p_ℓ so that $p_\ell^{\text{ext}}(t) = p_\ell(t)$ for every $t \in [0, T]$ and

$$\|\phi_\sigma p_\ell^{\text{ext}}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_+)} \leq C \|\phi_\sigma p_\ell\|_{H^1(0,T)}$$

for some $C > 0$ depending on T and σ . We also define $\alpha_\ell^{\text{ext}}(t) := \tilde{K}_\ell(\partial_t)\hat{K}(\partial_t)p_\ell^{\text{ext}}(t)$, which is a true extension of α_ℓ . Then Lemma 3.3 with $\sigma_0 = 1$, the bound (3.15) on $|\tilde{K}_\ell\hat{K}(s)|$, $|s| \geq 1$, and the assumptions on p_ℓ imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_\sigma \alpha_\ell\|_{L^2(0,T)}^2 &\leq \|\phi_\sigma \alpha_\ell^{\text{ext}}\|_{L^2([0,+\infty))}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma+i\mathbb{R}} |\tilde{K}_\ell(s)\hat{K}(s)(\mathcal{L}p_\ell^{\text{ext}})(s)|^2 ds \leq \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma+i\mathbb{R}} |s| |(\mathcal{L}p_\ell^{\text{ext}})(s)|^2 ds \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma+i\mathbb{R}} |s| |\mathcal{L}p_\ell^{\text{ext}}(s)|^2 ds \stackrel{\text{Lemma 3.3}}{=} \left\| \phi_\sigma \frac{d}{dt} p_\ell^{\text{ext}} \right\|_{L^2([0,+\infty))}^2 \\ &\leq C^2 \left\| \phi_\sigma \frac{d}{dt} p_\ell \right\|_{L^2(0,T)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\|\alpha_\ell\|_{L^2(0,T)}^2 \leq e^{2\sigma T} C^2 \left\| \phi_\sigma \frac{d}{dt} p_\ell \right\|_{L^2(0,T)}^2. \quad (3.16)$$

As remarked above $\|\mathbf{e}_h(t)\|_c^2 = \sum_{\ell=1}^M \alpha_\ell(t)^2$ and, for every $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| b \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{E}(t) - P_h \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{E}(t), \cdot \right) \right\|_{V_h'}^2 &= \sup_{\mathbf{v}_h \in V_h} \frac{|b(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{E}(t) - P_h \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{E}(t), \mathbf{v}_h)|^2}{\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_V^2} = \sup_{\mathbf{v}_h \in V_h} \frac{|\frac{\partial}{\partial t} b(\mathbf{E}(t) - P_h \mathbf{E}(t), \mathbf{v}_h)|^2}{\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_V^2} \\ &= \sup_{(\gamma_k) \in \mathbb{R}^M} \frac{\left| \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{\ell=1}^M p_\ell(t) \gamma_k \right|^2}{\|(\gamma_k)\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{R}^M)}^2} = \sup_{(\gamma_k) \in \mathbb{R}^M} \frac{\left| \sum_{\ell=1}^M \frac{d}{dt} p_\ell(t) \gamma_k \right|^2}{\|(\gamma_k)\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{R}^M)}^2} = \sum_{\ell=1}^M \left(\frac{d}{dt} p_\ell(t) \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus summing inequality (3.16) over ℓ gives (3.13). \square

Taking for granted sufficient spatial and temporal regularity of the field solution $\mathbf{E}(t)$, we can combine the estimate of Lemma 3.4 with the projection error bound (3.9) and end up with first order convergence: for fixed $\sigma > 1$,

$$\|\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{E}_h\|_{L^2(0,T;U)} \leq C e^{\sigma T} h, \quad (3.17)$$

where C may depend on \mathbf{E} , σ , and the shape regularity of the finite element mesh.

4. Temporal discretization and the error estimate of full discretization

4.1. Runge–Kutta convolution quadrature

For $g \in H^1(0, T; U)$, $g(0) = 0$, the convolution quadrature method approximates the continuous convolution

$$K(\partial_t)g = \int_0^t k(t-\tau)g(\tau) d\tau \quad (4.1)$$

by using only the Laplace transform K of the convolution kernel k [7,11,10,25]. We focus on convolution quadrature based on Runge–Kutta methods (see Remark 4.1). This method was developed in [11] for sectorial K , that is, for K being analytic in a sector

$$\Sigma(\varphi) := \left\{ s \in \mathbb{C} : |\arg(s - \sigma)| < \pi - \varphi, \text{ with } \varphi < \frac{1}{2}\pi \right\}, \quad (4.2)$$

and satisfying in this sector,

$$|K(s)| \leq C|s|^\nu, \quad (4.3)$$

for some real C and $\nu < 0$. Later, in [14], the CQ has been extended to more general kernels, namely to the case when K is analytic only on a half plane $\text{Re}(z) > \sigma_0$, for some $\sigma_0 > 0$, and the growth condition (4.3) is satisfied for some $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$, allowing for $\nu \geq 0$.

Remark 4.1. In our application it will be $K(s) = \sqrt{s} - 1$ (see Section 4.2), which is analytic in any sector $\Sigma(\varphi)$ with $0 < \varphi < \frac{1}{2}\pi$, and thus allows for the application of convolution quadrature based on $A(\theta)$ -stable multistep methods, see [7]. However, the analysis in [17], which we extend in Section 5.1, is restricted to Runge–Kutta methods. For this reason in the present paper we choose to focus on convolution quadrature based on A -stable Runge–Kutta methods.

In what follows we will assume that the underlying m -stage Runge–Kutta method is A -stable [27, Section IV.3], with order p , stage order q , and is described by the Butcher Tableau

$$\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{c} & \mathcal{Q} \\ \hline & \mathbf{b}^T \end{array},$$

where $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{m,m}$ and both $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. We will also assume, cf. [12], that the row of weights \mathbf{b}^T equals the last row of the coefficient matrix \mathcal{Q} , that is,

$$b_j = a_{m,j}, \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

Notice that in particular this implies $c_m = 1$ (consistency). Relevant examples of such Runge–Kutta methods are the m -stage RadauIIA methods, of order $p = 2m - 1$ and of stage order $q = m$.

Under these assumptions, for a fixed step-size $\Delta t > 0$, the continuous convolution (4.1) at time $t = (n + 1)\Delta t$ is approximated by the last component of the sum

$$(K(\partial_{\Delta t})\mathbf{g})_n := \sum_{j=0}^n \mathbf{W}_{n-j}\mathbf{g}_j, \quad (4.4)$$

where

$$\mathbf{g}_j := (g(t_j + c_1\Delta t), \dots, g(t_j + c_m\Delta t))^T \in U^m$$

and the convolution weights $\mathbf{W}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{m,m}$ are defined by the power series expansion [11, Section 2]

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{W}_n \zeta^n := K\left(\frac{\Delta(\zeta)}{\Delta t}\right), \quad \Delta(\zeta) := \left(\mathcal{Q} + \frac{\zeta}{1-\zeta} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{b}^T\right)^{-1}, \quad (4.5)$$

with $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^T$. In this way,

$$(K(\partial_t)g)((n+1)\Delta t) \approx (K(\partial_{\Delta t})\mathbf{g})_{n+1} := \sum_{j=0}^n \omega_{n-j}\mathbf{g}_j, \quad (4.6)$$

with $\omega_n = (\omega_n^1, \dots, \omega_n^m)$ the last row of \mathbf{W}_n . Notice that we use the notation $K(\partial_{\Delta t})$ to denote the approximation at the stage level, as in (4.4), and $K(\partial_{\Delta t})$ for the last component of it.

The matrix function $\Delta(\zeta)$ plays a key role in the derivation of the method. Its properties are gathered in [14, Lemma 3], which basically ensures that for $\zeta > 0$ small enough (4.5) is well defined.

The approximation in (4.6) can be extended to all $0 \leq t \leq T$ by using the zero extension of g to negative times and defining $(t_j := j\Delta t)$

$$(K(\partial_{\Delta t})g)(t) := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \omega_j (g(t - t_j + c_l\Delta t))_{l=1}^m. \quad (4.7)$$

The properties of (4.7) have been analyzed in [14, Theorem 3]. More precisely, for K satisfying (4.3), the following error estimate holds

$$\|(K(\partial_t)g)(t) - (K(\partial_{\Delta t})\mathbf{g})(t)\|_U \leq C(\Delta t)^{\min(p,q+1-\nu)} \left(\|g^{(r)}(0)\|_U + \int_0^t \|g^{(r+1)}(\tau)\|_U d\tau \right), \quad (4.8)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T$, $r > \max(p + \nu, p, q + 1)$, $g \in C^r([0, T]; U)$ with $g(0) = g'(0) = \dots = g^{(r-1)}(0) = 0$ and Δt small enough. The constant $C > 0$ depends on the Runge–Kutta method, on the final time T and on the constants in (4.3).

4.2. Application of convolution quadrature to Fredholm convolution equations

As a direct consequence of the Cauchy product of series, the convolution quadrature method inherits the associativity of the continuous convolution at stage level [13], that is,

$$K_1(\partial_{\Delta t})K_2(\partial_{\Delta t}) = (K_1K_2)(\partial_{\Delta t}).$$

This property is particularly useful when applying the CQ to solve integral equations. In particular, as described in Section 4.3, we will be concerned with scalar Fredholm convolution equations of the form

$$\mu(t) + \lambda \widehat{K}(\partial_t)\mu(t) = f(t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (4.9)$$

for a parameter $\lambda \geq 0$. Provided that $1 + \lambda \widehat{K}(s) \neq 0$ for every s in the analyticity domain of \widehat{K} , the associativity of the (continuous) convolution implies

$$\mu = K^*(\partial_t)f, \quad (4.10)$$

with

$$K^*(s) := \frac{1}{1 + \lambda \widehat{K}(s)}. \quad (4.11)$$

Thus, the application of the convolution quadrature to solve (4.9), this is

$$\mu_{\Delta t}(t) + \lambda \widehat{K}(\partial_{\Delta t}) \mu_{\Delta t}(t) = f(t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (4.12)$$

is equivalent to the evaluation of

$$\mu_{\Delta t} = K^*(\partial_{\Delta t})f. \quad (4.13)$$

The following lemma provides a convergence estimate which is *uniform* in λ for the approximation of μ by $\mu_{\Delta t}$, when $\widehat{K}(s) = \sqrt{s} - 1$. This result will be used in the proof of convergence for the fully discrete method in Section 4.3.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\lambda \geq 0$, $\widehat{K}(s) = \sqrt{s} - 1$, and $f \in C^{r+1}([0, T])$ satisfy $f(0) = f'(0) = \dots = f^{(r)}(0) = 0$ for $r > \max(p, q+1)$, where p and q are respectively the order and the stage order of an A -stable Runge–Kutta method. Let $\mu(t)$ be the solution of (4.9) at time $t \in [0, T]$ and $\mu_{\Delta t}$ the solution of (4.12).*

Then there exist $\overline{\Delta t} > 0$ and $C = C(\overline{\Delta t}, T, f)$ such that for $0 < \Delta t \leq \overline{\Delta t}$ and any $t \in [0, T]$ it holds

$$|\mu(t) - \mu_{\Delta t}(t)| \leq C \Delta t^{\min(p, q+1)} \int_0^t |f^{(r+1)}(\tau)| d\tau, \quad (4.14)$$

uniformly in $\lambda > 0$.

Proof. The proof follows straightforwardly from (4.10) and [14, Theorem 3] by noticing that for every s with $\operatorname{Re}(s) > -1$

$$|K^*(s)| = \left| \frac{1}{1 + \lambda(\sqrt{s} - 1)} \right| \leq 1,$$

uniformly in $\lambda > 0$. \square

4.3. Time-stepping error estimates

In this section we analyze the time discretization error of the convolution quadrature applied to the semidiscrete problem (3.3),

$$c(\mathbf{E}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) + \widehat{K}(\partial_t) b(\mathbf{E}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h)_0 \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in V_h, \quad (4.15)$$

with $\widehat{K}(s) = \sqrt{s} - 1$.

It goes without saying that convolution quadrature commutes with diagonalization of the spatial operators as performed in Section 3. Thus, let $\{\mathbf{u}_{h,\ell}\}_{\ell=1}^M$ be the c -orthonormal basis of V_h defined in (3.11). By expanding $\mathbf{E}_h(t) = \sum_{\ell=1}^M \mu_\ell(t) \mathbf{u}_{h,\ell}$ and $f_\ell(t) := (\mathbf{f}(t), \mathbf{u}_{h,\ell})_0$ we can reduce (3.3) to the following system of integral equations

$$\mu_\ell(t) + \lambda_{h,\ell} \widehat{K}(\partial_t) \mu_\ell(t) = f_\ell(t), \quad \ell = 1, \dots, M. \quad (4.16)$$

The time stepping error is derived from the above decomposition.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mathbf{E}_{h,\Delta t} := \sum_{\ell=1}^M \mu_{\ell,\Delta t} \mathbf{u}_{h,\ell}$ be the convolution quadrature approximation of the solution to (3.3) with $\mu_{\ell,\Delta t}$ according to (4.13) applied to (4.16). Then*

$$\|\mathbf{E}_h - \mathbf{E}_{h,\Delta t}\|_{L^2(0,T;U)} = C \Delta t^{\min(p, q+1)} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{H^{r+1}(0,T;U')}, \quad (4.17)$$

with $C > 0$ independent of Δt , the discretization in space, and \mathbf{f} .

Proof. By Lemma 4.1 the convolution quadrature approximation $\mu_{\ell,\Delta t}$ of μ_ℓ in (4.16) satisfies

$$|\mu_\ell(t) - \mu_{\ell,\Delta t}(t)| \leq C \Delta t^{\min(p, q+1)} \int_0^t |f_\ell^{(r+1)}(\tau)| d\tau \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T]. \quad (4.18)$$

Note that, in particular, $C > 0$ does not depend on ℓ . Then we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{E}_h - \mathbf{E}_{h,\Delta t}\|_{L^2(0,T;U)}^2 &= \int_0^T \|\mathbf{E}_h(t) - \mathbf{E}_{h,\Delta t}(t)\|_U^2 dt \\ &= \int_0^T \sum_{\ell=1}^M |\mu_\ell(t) - \mu_{\ell,\Delta t}(t)|^2 dt \\ &\stackrel{(4.18)}{\leq} C^2 \Delta t^{2\min(p,q+1)} \int_0^T \sum_{\ell=1}^M \left(\int_0^t |f_\ell^{(r+1)}(\tau)| d\tau \right)^2 dt \\ &\leq C^2 \Delta t^{2\min(p,q+1)} \int_0^T t \sum_{\ell=1}^M \int_0^t |f_\ell^{(r+1)}(\tau)|^2 d\tau dt \\ &\leq C^2 \Delta t^{2\min(p,q+1)} \frac{T^2}{2} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{H^{r+1}(0,T;U')}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality has been used in the fourth step. \square

The convergence of the fully-discrete approximation of (2.10) is immediate from (3.17) and Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.2. Let $\mathbf{E}_{h,\Delta t}$ be the fully-discrete approximation of (2.10) introduced in Theorem 4.1. Then

$$\|\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{E}_{h,\Delta t}\|_{L^2(0,T;U)} \leq C_1 e^{\sigma T} h + C_2 \Delta t^{\min(p,q+1)} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{H^{r+1}(0,T;U')}.$$

5. Fast and oblivious convolution quadrature

In the present paper we apply the fast implementation of the CQ proposed in [12]. This algorithm is based on a special quadrature approximation of the CQ weights, which is analyzed in [17] for the case $\nu > 0$ in (4.3). The extension of the analysis of the quadrature error to the case $\nu > 0$ in (4.3) is the subject of the next subsection.

5.1. Quadrature estimates for approximate CQ weights

Given K analytic in a sector (4.2) and satisfying (4.3) for some $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$, the convolution weights in (4.4) can be expressed as contour integrals in the complex plane as follows

$$\mathbf{W}_n = \frac{\Delta t}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{C}} K(s) R(\Delta t s)^{n-1} (\mathbf{I} - \Delta t s \mathcal{Q})^{-1} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{I} - \Delta t s \mathcal{Q})^{-1} ds,$$

for \mathcal{C} a contour beginning and ending in the left half of the complex plane [12], R the stability function of the Runge–Kutta method, see [27, Section IV.3],

$$R(z) = 1 + z \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{I} - z \mathcal{Q})^{-1} \mathbf{1},$$

\mathbf{I} the identity matrix and $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^T$. If $\nu \geq 0$ in (4.3), this representation is valid for $n \geq n_0$, with n_0 big enough.

The choice and the parametrization of \mathcal{C} play an important role in the numerical approximation of the \mathbf{W}_n . Following [17,12], we choose \mathcal{C} as the left branch of a hyperbola parameterized by

$$\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \gamma(x) := \mu (1 - \sin(\alpha + ix)) + \sigma, \quad (5.1)$$

for a certain parameter $\mu > 0$, which will depend on n , and for $0 < \alpha < \frac{\pi}{2} - \varphi$, with φ and σ from (4.2).

After parametrization, the convolution weights read

$$\mathbf{W}_n = \Delta t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{G}_{\Delta t,n-1}(x) dx, \quad (5.2)$$

with

$$\mathbf{G}_{\Delta t,n}(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} K(\gamma(x)) R(\Delta t \gamma(x))^n (\mathbf{I} - \Delta t \gamma(x) \mathcal{Q})^{-1} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{I} - \Delta t \gamma(x) \mathcal{Q})^{-1} \gamma'(x). \quad (5.3)$$

The approximation of \mathbf{W}_n is then carried out by means of the composite trapezoidal rule on $2N_Q - 1$ intervals of size $\tau > 0$ applied to (5.2). An essential feature of the quadrature approximation in order to achieve an oblivious algorithm is the possibility of using the same contour γ for different values of n , varying along geometrically growing intervals of the form $[B^{\ell-1}, B^\ell]$, for some prescribed ratio $B > 1$.

In order to analyze the error, we consider, for X some complex Banach space (in our case $X = \mathbb{C}^{m,m}$), the class $S(D_d, X)$ of analytic functions $G : D_d \rightarrow X$, defined on the horizontal strip

$$D_d := \{s \in \mathbb{C} : |\operatorname{Im}(s)| \leq d\},$$

which satisfy the following two conditions

$$\int_{-d}^d \|G(x + iy)\|_X dy \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5.4)$$

$$N(G, D_d) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \{\|G(x + id)\|_X + \|G(x - id)\|_X\} dx < \infty. \quad (5.5)$$

For $G \in S(D_d, X)$ we denote the quadrature error due to the composite truncated trapezoidal rule

$$E_{\tau, N_Q}(G) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x) dx - \tau \sum_{k=-N_Q}^{N_Q} G(k\tau). \quad (5.6)$$

Theorem 5.1. Assume that $G \in S(D_d, X)$ for some $d > 0$, and that there exist $C, a > 0, \theta \in (0, 1)$ and $n \geq 1$ such that

$$\|G(x)\|_X \leq C \left(1 + \frac{a}{n} \cosh x\right)^{-\theta n}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (5.7)$$

Then, for $\tau > 0, N_Q \geq 1$, there holds

$$\|E_{\tau, N_Q}(G)\|_X \leq \frac{N(G, D_d)}{e^{2\pi d/\tau} - 1} + C \left(\phi(a\theta) e^{-a\theta \cosh(N_Q \tau)/2} + \left(1 + \frac{a}{n} \cosh(N_Q \tau)\right)^{-(\theta n - 1)} \right),$$

with $\phi(a) = 2 + |\log(1 - e^{-a/2})|$.

Proof. The proof follows the one of [17, Theorem 2] and is based on Lemma A.1, which is a modified version of [17, Lemma 2]. \square

In the next theorem we derive an estimate of $E_{\tau, N_Q}(G_{\Delta t, n})$.

Theorem 5.2. For $\frac{1}{\theta} \leq b\mu t \leq \frac{n}{2}$ the quadrature error (5.6) for $G_{\Delta t, n}$ of (5.3) satisfies

$$\|E_{\tau, N_Q}(G_{\Delta t, n})\|_X \leq C \mu^{1+\nu} \left(\frac{e^{a_0 \mu t}}{e^{2\pi d/\tau} - 1} + e^{(a_1 - a_2 \cosh(N_Q \tau)) \mu t} + e^{a_1 \mu t} \left(1 + \frac{b\mu t}{n} \cosh(N_Q \tau)\right)^{-(\theta n - 1)} \right), \quad (5.8)$$

where ν is the exponent of (4.3) and we set

$$t = n\Delta t, \quad a_0 = 2 + \frac{4 - \theta}{2}b, \quad a_1 = 2 + 2b, \quad a_2 = \frac{\theta}{2}b. \quad (5.9)$$

The proof of this theorem follows the one of [17, Theorem 3] and can be found in the Appendix.

Now, given a target accuracy ε and assuming that $t = n\Delta t \in [B^{\ell-1}\Delta t, B^\ell\Delta t]$, for some $B > 1$, we select $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ small enough so that

$$\left(\frac{1}{B^{\ell-1}\Delta t} \log \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \right) \right)^{1+\nu} \tilde{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon.$$

The same arguments as in [17] show that the bracket in (5.8) is smaller than $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ if the following asymptotic proportionalities hold

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\tau} &\sim \mu t + \log \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \right), & \frac{c_1}{B} \log \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \right) &\leq \mu t \leq c_1 \log \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \right), \\ N_Q &\sim \log \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \right), & n &\geq c \log \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

for an arbitrary constant c_1 and c big enough. These relations imply

$$\mu \sim t^{-1} \log \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\varepsilon}} \right),$$

which justifies the choice of $\tilde{\varepsilon}$.

Unfortunately, the constants involved in the asymptotic proportionalities above are difficult to quantify explicitly. For practical computations, the same choice of parameters proposed in [18] for the inversion of the Laplace transform $K(s)$ at time $t \in [B^{\ell-1}\Delta t, B^\ell\Delta t]$ can be used. The exponential rate of convergence with respect to N_Q and the effect of increasing the ratio B can be observed in Fig. 5.1, where we show the error in the approximation of the convolution weights for the




Fig. 5.1. Left: the approximation error in the Euclidean norm with respect to the index n of the convolution weight \mathbf{W}_n , for $B = 10$ and $\Delta t = 0.2$. Right: the maximum error in the Euclidean norm with respect to N_Q in the window of indices $[25, 125]$, for $B = 5$, $[25, 100]$, for $B = 10$, and $[25, 400]$, for $B = 20$.

2-stage RadauIIA method and $\widehat{K}(s) = \sqrt{s} - 1$. The error is measured with respect to a reference solution computed by using the same method with $B = 10$ and $N_Q = 150$. In the left plot of Fig. 5.1 we can see that the contour integral approximation of the weights deteriorates for small n . This is consistent with Theorem 5.2 and expected also from the results in [12]. In order to eliminate this effect, the error curves in the right plot are computed only for $n \geq 25$, instead of for the whole range $n \in [B^{\ell-1}, B^\ell]$.

5.2. Analysis of the error introduced by the FOCQ

The application of the Fast and Oblivious Algorithm for the Convolution Quadrature (FOCQ) introduces another source of error in the approximation of (3.3). In order to analyze this additional perturbation, again we use the spectral decomposition (4.16). Following the notation in (4.7) and Theorem 4.1, we recall that the $\mu_{\ell, \Delta t}(t)$ are the solutions of

$$\mu_{\ell, \Delta t}(t) + \lambda_{h, \ell} \widehat{K}(\partial_{\Delta t}) \mu_{\ell, \Delta t}(t) = f_\ell(t), \quad \ell = 1, \dots, M.$$

The FOCQ essentially boils down to approximating the convolution weight matrices \mathbf{W}_j of the CQ. Thus, temporarily, we adopt a matrix perspective and write

$$\underline{\mu}_\ell := (\mu_{\ell, 0}, \dots, \mu_{\ell, N})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{mN}, \quad \mu_{\ell, n} := (\mu_{\ell, \Delta t}(t_n + c_l \Delta t))_{l=1}^m.$$

Using (4.4), we find

$$\mu_{\ell, n} + \lambda_{h, \ell} \left(\widehat{K}(\partial_{\Delta t}) \underline{\mu}_\ell \right)_n = \mathbf{f}_{\ell, n}, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, M, \quad n = 0, \dots, N, \quad (5.10)$$

for

$$\mathbf{f}_{\ell, n} := (f_\ell(t_n + c_1 \Delta t), \dots, f_\ell(t_n + c_m \Delta t))^T \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Tagging the approximate convolution weight matrices with $\widetilde{\cdot}$, the FOCQ can be taken into account by replacing the convolution in (5.10) with

$$\left(\widehat{K}(\partial_{\Delta t}) \widetilde{\underline{\mu}}_\ell \right)_n := \sum_{j=0}^n \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_{n-j} \mathbf{g}_j, \quad (5.11)$$

for $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_j$ the perturbed convolution weights, which are supposed to satisfy

$$\|\mathbf{W}_j - \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_j\| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \forall j = 0, \dots, N, \quad (5.12)$$

for some target accuracy ε , which is essentially given by the estimate of Theorem 5.2. Consequently, we denote by $\widetilde{\mu}_{\ell, n}$ the solution of

$$\widetilde{\mu}_{\ell, n} + \lambda_{h, \ell} \left(\widehat{K}(\partial_{\Delta t}) \widetilde{\underline{\mu}}_\ell \right)_n = \mathbf{f}_{\ell, n}, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, M. \quad (5.13)$$

Next, we reformulate (5.10) and (5.13) as linear systems of size $m \times (N + 1)$ as follows. As above, we define the ‘super’ (column) vectors

$$\underline{\mu}_\ell = (\mu_{\ell, n})_{n=0}^N, \quad \widetilde{\underline{\mu}}_\ell = (\widetilde{\mu}_{\ell, n})_{n=0}^N, \quad \underline{\mathbf{f}}_\ell = (\mathbf{f}_{\ell, n})_{n=0}^N,$$

and the block matrices

$$\mathcal{M} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{W}_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \mathbf{W}_1 & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \mathbf{W}_N & \cdots & \mathbf{W}_1 & \mathbf{W}_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{M}} := \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_1 & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_N & \cdots & \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_1 & \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

With this notation, (5.10) and (5.13) become

$$\mathcal{A}_{h,\ell} \underline{\mu}_\ell = \underline{\mathbf{f}}_\ell \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{h,\ell} \tilde{\underline{\mu}}_\ell = \underline{\mathbf{f}}_\ell$$

with

$$\mathcal{A}_{h,\ell} = (\mathcal{I} + \lambda_{h,\ell} \mathcal{M}), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{h,\ell} = (\mathcal{I} + \lambda_{h,\ell} \tilde{\mathcal{M}}),$$

for \mathcal{I} the identity matrix of size $m(N+1)$. By elementary linear algebra we obtain

$$\mathcal{A}_{h,\ell}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{W}_0^* & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \mathbf{W}_1^* & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \mathbf{W}_N^* & \cdots & \mathbf{W}_1^* & \mathbf{W}_0^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{h,\ell}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_0^* & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_1^* & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_N^* & \cdots & \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_1^* & \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_0^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.14)$$

for certain blocks \mathbf{W}_j^* and $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_j^*$, $j = 0, \dots, N$. Then the expansion coefficients of the final FOCQ solution are defined according to

$$\tilde{\mu}_{\ell,\Delta t}(t) := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\omega}_j^* (f(t - t_j + c_l \Delta t))_{l=1}^m, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (5.15)$$

for $\tilde{\omega}_j^*$ the last row of $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_j^*$, cf. (4.7). These coefficients are to be compared with

$$\mu_{\ell,\Delta t}(t) := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \omega_j^* (f(t - t_j + c_l \Delta t))_{l=1}^m, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (5.16)$$

for ω_j^* the last row of \mathbf{W}_j^* .

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\mu_{\ell,\Delta t}$, $\ell = 1, \dots, M$ be the approximation of the coefficient μ_ℓ in (4.16) by the CQ. Let $\tilde{\mu}_{\ell,\Delta t}$ be the result of computing the $\mu_{\ell,\Delta t}$ by means of the perturbed CQ satisfying (5.12). Then there exists $C > 0$, depending on the Runge–Kutta method but not on ℓ and any discretization parameter, such that*

$$\|\mu_{\ell,\Delta t} - \tilde{\mu}_{\ell,\Delta t}\|_{L^2(0,T)} \leq \frac{mC^2 N^3 e^{2\sigma T} \varepsilon}{1 - CN^2 e^{\sigma T} \varepsilon} \|f_\ell\|_{L^2(0,T)}. \quad (5.17)$$

Proof. From (5.15) and (5.16) it follows, for $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu_{\ell,\Delta t} - \tilde{\mu}_{\ell,\Delta t}\|_{L^2(0,T)} &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|(\omega_j^* - \tilde{\omega}_j^*) (f_\ell(\cdot - t_j + c_l \Delta t))_{l=1}^m\|_{L^2(0,T)} \\ &\leq \max_{0 \leq j \leq N} \|f_\ell(\cdot - t_j + c_l \Delta t)\|_{l=1}^m \| \omega_j^* - \tilde{\omega}_j^* \|_\infty \sum_{j=0}^N 1 \\ &\leq m \|f_\ell\|_{L^2(0,T)} \sum_{j=0}^N \|\mathbf{W}_j^* - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_j^*\|_\infty \\ &= m \|f_\ell\|_{L^2(0,T)} \|\mathcal{A}_{h,\ell}^{-1} - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{h,\ell}^{-1}\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

If $\|\mathcal{A}_{h,\ell} - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{h,\ell}\|_\infty \|\mathcal{A}_{h,\ell}^{-1}\|_\infty < 1$ we can write

$$\|\mathcal{A}_{h,\ell}^{-1} - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{h,\ell}^{-1}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{A}_{h,\ell}^{-1}\|_\infty^2 \|\mathcal{A}_{h,\ell} - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{h,\ell}\|_\infty}{1 - \|\mathcal{A}_{h,\ell} - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{h,\ell}\|_\infty \|\mathcal{A}_{h,\ell}^{-1}\|_\infty}.$$

From (5.12) it follows

$$\|\mathcal{A}_{h,\ell} - \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{h,\ell}\|_{\infty} \leq \lambda_{\ell,h} N \varepsilon \leq N \varepsilon,$$

since the eigenvalues $\lambda_{\ell,h}$ are all in $[0, 1]$, see the remark after (3.11).

In order to estimate the norm of $\mathcal{A}_{h,\ell}^{-1}$, we use the associativity of the CQ at the stage level. This property implies that the blocks \mathbf{W}_j^* in (5.14) are the convolution weights associated to the kernel with Laplace transform

$$K^*(s) = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_{h,\ell} \widehat{K}(s)},$$

cf. (4.11), which satisfies

$$|K^*(s)| \leq 1, \quad \forall \lambda_{h,\ell} > 0, \operatorname{Re} s > 1.$$

On the one hand, by [13, Lemma 5.2] we have that for every $\sigma > 1$ there exist $\Delta t_0 > 0$ and a constant C , depending on the Runge–Kutta method, such that

$$\sup_{|\zeta| \leq e^{-\Delta t \sigma}} \left\| K^* \left(\frac{\Delta(\zeta)}{\Delta t} \right) \right\| \leq C \quad \text{for } \Delta t < \Delta t_0.$$

On the other hand, for $0 < \rho < 1$, the convolution weights can be written as the Cauchy integrals

$$\mathbf{W}_j^* = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|\zeta|=\rho} \zeta^{-1-j} K^* \left(\frac{\Delta(\zeta)}{\Delta t} \right) d\zeta. \quad (5.18)$$

Then, by taking $\rho = e^{-\Delta t \sigma}$, we deduce the bound

$$\|\mathbf{W}_j^*\| \leq C e^{j\Delta t \sigma} \leq C e^{\sigma T}.$$

Now we can estimate, for every $n = 0, \dots, N$,

$$\|\mu_{\ell,n}\|_{\infty} = \left\| \sum_{j=0}^n \mathbf{W}_{n-j}^* \mathbf{f}_{\ell,j} \right\|_{\infty} \leq C \sum_{j=0}^n e^{(n-j)\Delta t \sigma} \|\mathbf{f}_{\ell,j}\|_{\infty} \leq C(N+1) e^{\sigma T} \|\mathbf{f}_{\ell}\|_{\infty},$$

and thus

$$\|\underline{\mu}_{\ell}\|_{\infty} \leq C(N+1) e^{\sigma T} \|\underline{\mathbf{f}}_{\ell}\|_{\infty}, \quad (5.19)$$

so that

$$\|\mathcal{A}_{\Delta t,\ell}^{-1}\|_{\infty} \leq C(N+1) e^{\sigma T}$$

and (5.17) follows. \square

Theorem 5.3. *Adopting the notations from Theorem 4.1, we can bound the impact of the fast and oblivious implementation of our CQ methods by*

$$\|\mathbf{E}_{h,\Delta t} - \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{h,\Delta t}\|_{L^2(0,T;U)} \leq M \frac{C^2 N^3 e^{2\sigma T} \varepsilon}{1 - CN^2 e^{\sigma T} \varepsilon} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(0,T;U')}, \quad (5.20)$$

for $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{h,\Delta t} = \sum_{\ell=1}^M \tilde{\mu}_{\ell,\Delta t} \mathbf{u}_{h,\ell}$. The constant $C > 0$ depends only on the underlying Runge–Kutta method.

6. Numerical experiments

For numerical tests we restrict ourselves to the scalar TM eddy current model (1.7) in two dimensions, because prohibitive computational cost would not permit us to study asymptotic convergence for 3D settings. As trial spaces U_h we use spaces of piecewise linear continuous functions on triangular meshes on \bar{D} . Writing $M := \dim U_h$ we end up with the Fredholm integral equation

$$\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\mu}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{K}(\partial_t)\boldsymbol{\mu}(t) = \mathbf{f}(t) \quad \text{for } t \in]0, T], \quad (6.1)$$

where the vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^M$ contains the time-dependent coefficients of an approximation in space of u with respect to the standard nodal basis, \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are the Galerkin matrices associated with the bilinear forms $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $b(\cdot, \cdot)$ from (2.12), and $\mathbf{f}(t)$ is the load vector associated with the source function f . Note that in the 2-dimensional case the matrix \mathbf{A} is symmetric positive definite. Thus, we need not introduce the modified convolution kernel \hat{K} , cf (2.11).




Fig. 6.1. Error in the $\ell^2_{\Delta t}(0, 4; H^1(\tilde{D}))$ -norm (left) and in the $L^2(\tilde{D})$ at a fixed time $t = 4$ (right) for the coupling of FEM and FOCQ based on the implicit Euler method. The two dots denote the spatial mesh and timestep used in Fig. 6.2.

We discretize the convolution in (6.1) by means of Runge–Kutta CQ as explained in Section 4.1. As we have seen there, the convolution quadrature algorithm provides an approximation of the convolution simultaneously at Runge–Kutta internal times. To write the time discretization of the equation of (6.1) we thus rely on vectors

$$\tilde{\mu}_i \approx (\mu(i\Delta t + c_1\Delta t), \dots, \mu(i\Delta t + c_m\Delta t))^T \in \mathbb{R}^{mM},$$

which contain approximations of the spatially semi-discrete solution at Runge–Kutta internal times. The fully discrete approximation of (1.7) can be then computed by successively solving

$$(\mathbf{I}_m \otimes \mathbf{A}) \cdot \tilde{\mu}_i + (\mathbf{I}_m \otimes \mathbf{B}) \sum_{j=0}^i (\mathbf{W}_{i-j} \otimes \mathbf{I}_M) \tilde{\mu}_j = \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_i \quad (6.2)$$

for $i = 0, \dots, (T - \Delta t)/\Delta t$, where \otimes is the Kronecker product, \mathbf{I}_n is an $n \times n$ identity matrix, and $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_i = (\mathbf{f}(i\Delta t + c_1\Delta t), \dots, \mathbf{f}(i\Delta t + c_m\Delta t))^T$. Regarding the first 20 terms of the sum in (6.2), we approximate the convolution weights \mathbf{W}_i as in [11, Section 2] and compute the sum classically. For the rest we exploit the FOCQ approximation along suitable hyperbolae with the range parameter $B = 10$ and compute the sum efficiently with the FOCQ, see Section 5. The contour parameters are chosen accordingly to [18, Section 4]. Already for moderate numbers of quadrature points the FOCQ introduces a negligible error in the approximation, as confirmed by the experiments (see Fig. 6.2).

In our numerical tests² we choose \tilde{D} to be an annulus around the origin with radii 0.5 and 2 and we include the source function by imposing the Dirichlet boundary condition $g(x, y, t) := \frac{32}{105\sqrt{\pi}}t^{7/2} + \frac{t^3}{6}\log(4)$ on $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$. The analytical solution is then

$$u(x, y, t) := \frac{32}{105\sqrt{\pi}}t^{7/2} + \frac{t^3}{6} \left(\frac{1}{2} \log(x^2 + y^2) + \log(2) \right).$$

A first numerical test is performed by choosing the fast convolution quadrature based on the implicit Euler method, which is the 1-step RadauIIA method (FOCQ of order 1). For 6 different spatial grids and 12 different timesteps we measured the time-discrete $\ell^2_{\Delta t}(0, 4; H^1(\tilde{D}))$ -error as well as the $L^2(\tilde{D})$ -error in space³ at a fixed time $t = 4$. The spatial triangular meshes have been created through uniform refinement (and projecting new nodes on the actual boundary, when necessary) while the timesteps by repetitively halving an initial timestep.

The expected linear convergence both in time and space in the $\ell^2_{\Delta t}(0, 4; H^1(\tilde{D}))$ -norm is observed in Fig. 6.1. The rates of algebraic convergence become more conspicuous when we examine the $L^2(\tilde{D})$ -norm in space at a fixed time, where we have quadratic convergence in space; see Fig. 6.1.

The impact of the FOCQ on the algorithm is investigated in Fig. 6.2. We compute the error in the $\ell^2_{\Delta t}(0, 4; H^1(\tilde{D}))$ -norm and in the $L^2(\tilde{D})$ -norm in space at a fixed time for the fourth finest spatial grid and the timestep $\Delta t = 2^{-8}$ (see the dots in Fig. 6.1). In both cases few quadrature nodes on the contours are enough to render the perturbation due to the FOCQ approximation of the convolution weights \mathbf{W}_i negligible.

We perform a second numerical test and this time the convolution is approximated by using the FOCQ based on the 2-stage RadauIIA method (FOCQ of order 3). Again we measure both the $\ell^2_{\Delta t}(0, 4; H^1(\tilde{D}))$ -error and the $L^2(\tilde{D})$ -error in space at a fixed time $t = 4$ for several meshes and timesteps. We expect that the convolution quadrature error contributes to the total error with a cubic algebraic rate in Δt . This is only partially confirmed by the experiment because the total error is almost always dominated by the discretization error in space, as we can see in Fig. 6.3.

² The experiments are performed in MATLAB and are based on the library LehrFEM developed at the ETHZ.

³ Both the $H^1(\tilde{D})$ - and the $L^2(\tilde{D})$ -norm are computed approximately with 7 point quadrature rules on triangles.




Fig. 6.2. Impact of FOCQ on the total error in the $\ell^2_{\Delta t}([0, 4], H^1(\tilde{D}))$ -norm (left) and in the $L^2(\tilde{D})$ at a fixed time $t = 4$ (right) for the coupling of FEM and FCQ based on the implicit Euler method.




Fig. 6.3. Error in the $\ell^2_{\Delta t}([0, 4], H^1(\tilde{D}))$ -norm (left) and in the $L^2(\tilde{D})$ at a fixed time $t = 4$ (right) for the coupling of FEM and FOCQ based on the 2-stage RadauIIA method.

For further reading

[26]

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Professor Jan Prüss from Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Germany, for valuable hints on how to develop parts of the theory of Section 2.

The work of A. Paganini was partly supported by ETH Grant CH1-02 11-1. The second author's work was partially supported by grants MTM 2010-19510 and MTM 2012-31298, from Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, Spain.

Appendix. Proof of Theorem 5.2

Proof. The integrand $G_{\Delta t, n}$ is analytic in the strip D_d . Moreover, by [17, Lemma 1] it holds

$$\|G_{\Delta t, n}(x + iy)\|_X \leq \frac{C\mu^{1+\nu} e^{2\mu\Delta t n}}{(1 - b\Delta t \mu)^n (1 + b\Delta t \mu \cosh(x))^n},$$

for some $b, \mu > 0$. It is easy to show that for any $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$, $b > 0$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$ there exist $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$x^{1-\nu} \left(1 + \frac{bx}{n}\right)^{-(1-\theta)n} < C(n_0, x_0), \quad \text{for } x > x_0 \text{ and } n > n_0.$$

Then we can estimate

$$\|G_{\Delta t, n}(x + iy)\|_X \leq \frac{C\mu^{1+\nu} e^{2\mu\Delta t n}}{(1 - b\Delta t \mu)^n (1 + b\Delta t \mu \cosh(x))^{\theta n}}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

for $\theta \in (0, 1)$, x and n big enough. The bound (A.1) implies that $G_{\Delta t, n}$ satisfies (5.4) and (5.7).

We now estimate $N(G_{\Delta t, n}, D_d)$. By Lemma A.1 below, it is

$$N(G_{\Delta t, n}, D_d) \leq \frac{C\mu^{1+v}e^{2\mu t}}{(1 - b\mu t/n)^n} \left(\phi(b\mu t\theta) e^{-b\mu t\theta/2} + \left(1 + \frac{b\mu t}{n}\right)^{-(\theta n-1)} \right).$$

Since for $0 \leq b\mu t \leq n/2$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - b\mu t/n)^{-n} &\leq e^{2b\mu t}, \\ (1 + b\mu t/n)^{-(\theta n-1)} &\leq \frac{3}{2} e^{-b\mu t\theta/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

and $\phi(x) \leq 3$ for $x \geq 1$, it follows

$$N(G_{\Delta t, n}, D_d) \leq C\mu^{1+v}e^{\mu t(2+(4-\theta)b/2)}.$$

Then Theorem 5.1 and inequality (A.2) give the result, with the notation (5.9). \square

The technical lemma below is a modified version of [17, Lemma 2].

Lemma A.1. For $R \geq 0$, $a > 0$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $n \geq 1$ there holds

$$\int_R^{+\infty} \left(1 + \frac{a}{n} \cosh(x)\right)^{-\theta n} dx \leq \phi(a\theta) e^{-a\theta \cosh(R)/2} + \left(1 + \frac{a}{n} \cosh(R)\right)^{-(\theta n-1)}.$$

Proof. With the change of variables $u = \cosh(x)$ we have

$$\int_R^{+\infty} \left(1 + \frac{a}{n} \cosh(x)\right)^{-\theta n} dx = \int_{\cosh(R)}^{+\infty} \left(1 + \frac{a}{n} u\right)^{-\theta n} \frac{du}{\sqrt{u^2 - 1}}.$$

With the following inequality, which holds for $0 \leq y \leq n$,

$$\left(1 + \frac{y}{n}\right)^{-n} \leq e^{-y/2},$$

we can choose $\beta = \max\{\cosh(R), \frac{n}{a}\}$ and use [28, Lemma 1] to bound

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\cosh(R)}^{\beta} \left(1 + \frac{a}{n} u\right)^{-\theta n} \frac{du}{\sqrt{u^2 - 1}} &\leq \int_{\cosh(R)}^{\beta} e^{-au\theta/2} \frac{du}{\sqrt{u^2 - 1}} \\ &\leq \int_R^{+\infty} e^{-a\theta \cosh(x)/2} dx \leq \phi(a\theta) e^{-a\theta \cosh(R)/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\left(1 + \frac{a}{n} u\right)^{-1} \leq \left(1 + \frac{a}{n} \cosh(R)\right)^{-1} \quad \text{for } u \geq \cosh(R),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\beta}^{+\infty} \left(1 + \frac{a}{n} u\right)^{-\theta n} \frac{du}{\sqrt{u^2 - 1}} &\leq \left(1 + \frac{a}{n} \cosh(R)\right)^{-(\theta n-1)} \int_{\beta}^{+\infty} \left(1 + \frac{a}{n} u\right)^{-1} \frac{du}{\sqrt{u^2 - 1}} \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{a}{n} \cosh(R)\right)^{-(\theta n-1)} \end{aligned}$$

because the integral on the right hand side is bounded by 1, see [17, Lemma 2]. \square

References

- [1] T. Senior, Impedance boundary conditions for imperfectly conducting surfaces, *Appl. Sci. Res. Sect. B* 8 (1960) 418–436.
- [2] V. De Santis, S. Cruciani, M. Feliziani, M. Okoniewski, Efficient low order approximation for surface impedance boundary conditions in finite-difference time-domain method, *IEEE Trans. Magn.* 48 (2) (2012) 271–274.
- [3] S.V. Yuferev, N. Ida, *Surface Impedance Boundary Conditions: A Comprehensive Approach*, Taylor & Francis, 2009.
- [4] T.B.A. Senior, J.L. Volakis, *Approximate Boundary Conditions in Electromagnetics*, IEE Electromagnetic Wave Series, IEEE, Stevenage, UK, 1995.
- [5] D.J. Hoppe, Y. Rahmat-Sami, *Impedance Boundary Conditions in Electromagnetics*, Taylor & Francis, 1995.
- [6] H. Haddar, P. Joly, H.-M. Nguyen, Generalized impedance boundary conditions for scattering problems from strongly absorbing obstacles: the case of Maxwell's equations, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 18 (10) (2008) 1787–1827.
- [7] Ch. Lubich, Convolution quadrature and discretized operational calculus. I, *Numer. Math.* 52 (2) (1988) 129–145.
- [8] A. Alonso-Rodriguez, A. Valli, *Eddy Current Approximation of Maxwell Equations, Modelling, Simulation & Applications*, vol. 4, Springer, Milan, 2010.

- [9] A. Bermúdez, C. Reales, R. Rodríguez, P. Salgado, Numerical analysis of a finite-element method for the axisymmetric eddy current model of an induction furnace, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* 30 (3) (2010) 654–676.
- [10] Ch. Lubich, On the multistep time discretization of linear initial–boundary value problems and their boundary integral equations, *Numer. Math.* 67 (3) (1994) 365–389.
- [11] Ch. Lubich, A. Ostermann, Runge–Kutta methods for parabolic equations and convolution quadrature, *Math. Comp.* 60 (201) (1993) 105–131.
- [12] A. Schädle, M. López-Fernández, Ch. Lubich, Fast and oblivious convolution quadrature, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 28 (2) (2006) 421–438.
- [13] L. Banjai, Ch. Lubich, An error analysis of Runge–Kutta convolution quadrature, *BIT* 51 (3) (2011) 483–496.
- [14] L. Banjai, Ch. Lubich, J.M. Melenk, Runge–Kutta convolution quadrature for operators arising in wave propagation, *Numer. Math.* 119 (1) (2011) 1–20.
- [15] L. Banjai, Multistep and multistage convolution quadrature for the wave equation: algorithms and experiments, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 32 (5) (2010) 2964–2994.
- [16] M. Schanz, A boundary element formulation in time domain for viscoelastic solids, *Comm. Numer. Methods Engrg.* 15 (11) (1999) 799–809.
- [17] M. López-Fernández, Ch. Lubich, C. Palencia, A. Schädle, Fast Runge–Kutta approximation of inhomogeneous parabolic equations, *Numer. Math.* 102 (2) (2005) 277–291.
- [18] M. López-Fernández, C. Palencia, A. Schädle, A spectral order method for inverting sectorial Laplace transforms, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 44 (3) (2006) 1332–1350.
- [19] V. Girault, P.A. Raviart, *Finite Element Methods for Navier–Stokes Equations*, Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [20] A. Buffa, M. Costabel, D. Sheen, On traces for $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl}, \Omega)$ in Lipschitz domains, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 276 (2) (2002) 845–867.
- [21] R. Hiptmair, Finite elements in computational electromagnetism, *Acta Numer.* 11 (2002) 237–339.
- [22] R. Hiptmair, C. Schwab, Natural boundary element methods for the electric field integral equation on polyhedra, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 40 (1) (2002) 66–86.
- [23] J. Prüss, *Evolutionary Integral Equations and Applications*, in: *Monographs in Mathematics*, vol. 87, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1993.
- [24] G. Doetsch, *Introduction to the Theory and Application of the Laplace Transformation*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1974.
- [25] Ch. Lubich, Convolution quadrature revisited, *BIT* 44 (3) (2004) 503–514.
- [26] P.P.B. Eggermont, On the quadrature error in operational quadrature methods for convolutions, *Numer. Math.* 62 (1) (1992) 35–48.
- [27] E. Hairer, G. Wanner, *Solving Ordinary Differential Equations. II: Stiff and Differential–Algebraic Problems*, second revised ed., in: *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*, vol. 14, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.
- [28] M. López-Fernández, C. Palencia, On the numerical inversion of the Laplace transform of certain holomorphic mappings, *Appl. Numer. Math.* 51 (2–3) (2004) 289–303.