

An adaptive inexact Newton method

Martin Vohralík, *INRIA Paris-Rocquencourt*

Lecture III/IV

IIT Bombay, July 13–17, 2015

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 A posteriori error estimate
- 3 Stopping criteria, efficiency, and robustness
- 4 Applications
- 5 Numerical results
- 6 References and bibliography

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 A posteriori error estimate
- 3 Stopping criteria, efficiency, and robustness
- 4 Applications
- 5 Numerical results
- 6 References and bibliography

Inexact iterative linearization

System of nonlinear algebraic equations

Nonlinear operator $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, vector $F \in \mathbb{R}^N$: find $U \in \mathbb{R}^N$ s.t.

$$\mathcal{A}(U) = F$$

Algorithm (Inexact iterative linearization)

- 1 Choose initial vector U^0 . Set $k := 1$.
- 2 $U^{k-1} \Rightarrow$ matrix \mathbb{A}^{k-1} and vector F^{k-1} : find U^k s.t.

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^k \approx F^{k-1}.$$
- 3
 - 1 Set $U^{k,0} := U^{k-1}$ and $i := 1$.
 - 2 Do an algebraic solver step $\Rightarrow U^{k,i}$ s.t. ($R^{k,i}$ algebraic res.)

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^{k,i} = F^{k-1} - R^{k,i}.$$
 - 3 Convergence? OK $\Rightarrow U^k := U^{k,i}$. KO $\Rightarrow i := i + 1$, back to 3.2.
- 4 Convergence? OK \Rightarrow finish. KO $\Rightarrow k := k + 1$, back to 2.

Inexact iterative linearization

System of nonlinear algebraic equations

Nonlinear operator $\mathcal{A}: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, vector $F \in \mathbb{R}^N$: find $U \in \mathbb{R}^N$ s.t.

$$\mathcal{A}(U) = F$$

Algorithm (Inexact iterative linearization)

- 1 Choose initial vector U^0 . Set $k := 1$.
- 2 $U^{k-1} \Rightarrow$ matrix \mathbb{A}^{k-1} and vector F^{k-1} : find U^k s.t.

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^k \approx F^{k-1}.$$
- 3
 - 1 Set $U^{k,0} := U^{k-1}$ and $i := 1$.
 - 2 Do an algebraic solver step $\Rightarrow U^{k,i}$ s.t. ($R^{k,i}$ algebraic res.)

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^{k,i} = F^{k-1} - R^{k,i}.$$
 - 3 Convergence? OK $\Rightarrow U^k := U^{k,i}$. KO $\Rightarrow i := i + 1$, back to 3.2.
- 4 Convergence? OK \Rightarrow finish. KO $\Rightarrow k := k + 1$, back to 2.

Inexact iterative linearization

System of nonlinear algebraic equations

Nonlinear operator $\mathcal{A}: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, vector $F \in \mathbb{R}^N$: find $U \in \mathbb{R}^N$ s.t.

$$\mathcal{A}(U) = F$$

Algorithm (Inexact iterative linearization)

- 1 Choose initial vector U^0 . Set $k := 1$.
- 2 $U^{k-1} \Rightarrow$ matrix \mathbb{A}^{k-1} and vector F^{k-1} : find U^k s.t.

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^k \approx F^{k-1}.$$
 - 1 Set $U^{k,0} := U^{k-1}$ and $i := 1$.
 - 2 Do an algebraic solver step $\Rightarrow U^{k,i}$ s.t. ($R^{k,i}$ algebraic res.)

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^{k,i} = F^{k-1} - R^{k,i}.$$
 - 3 Convergence? OK $\Rightarrow U^k := U^{k,i}$. KO $\Rightarrow i := i + 1$, back to 3.2.
- 4 Convergence? OK \Rightarrow finish. KO $\Rightarrow k := k + 1$, back to 2.

Inexact iterative linearization

System of nonlinear algebraic equations

Nonlinear operator $\mathcal{A}: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, vector $F \in \mathbb{R}^N$: find $U \in \mathbb{R}^N$ s.t.

$$\mathcal{A}(U) = F$$

Algorithm (Inexact iterative linearization)

- 1 Choose initial vector U^0 . Set $k := 1$.
- 2 $U^{k-1} \Rightarrow$ matrix \mathbb{A}^{k-1} and vector F^{k-1} : find U^k s.t.

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^k \approx F^{k-1}.$$
- 3
 - 1 Set $U^{k,0} := U^{k-1}$ and $i := 1$.
 - 2 Do an algebraic solver step $\Rightarrow U^{k,i}$ s.t. ($R^{k,i}$ algebraic res.)

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^{k,i} = F^{k-1} - R^{k,i}.$$
 - 3 Convergence? OK $\Rightarrow U^k := U^{k,i}$. KO $\Rightarrow i := i + 1$, back to 3.2.
- 4 Convergence? OK \Rightarrow finish. KO $\Rightarrow k := k + 1$, back to 2.

Inexact iterative linearization

System of nonlinear algebraic equations

Nonlinear operator $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, vector $F \in \mathbb{R}^N$: find $U \in \mathbb{R}^N$ s.t.

$$\mathcal{A}(U) = F$$

Algorithm (Inexact iterative linearization)

- 1 Choose initial vector U^0 . Set $k := 1$.
- 2 $U^{k-1} \Rightarrow$ matrix \mathbb{A}^{k-1} and vector F^{k-1} : find U^k s.t.

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^k \approx F^{k-1}.$$
- 3
 - 1 Set $U^{k,0} := U^{k-1}$ and $i := 1$.
 - 2 Do an algebraic solver step $\Rightarrow U^{k,i}$ s.t. ($R^{k,i}$ algebraic res.)

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^{k,i} = F^{k-1} - R^{k,i}.$$
 - 3 Convergence? OK $\Rightarrow U^k := U^{k,i}$. KO $\Rightarrow i := i + 1$, back to 3.2.
 - 4 Convergence? OK \Rightarrow finish. KO $\Rightarrow k := k + 1$, back to 2.

Inexact iterative linearization

System of nonlinear algebraic equations

Nonlinear operator $\mathcal{A}: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, vector $F \in \mathbb{R}^N$: find $U \in \mathbb{R}^N$ s.t.

$$\mathcal{A}(U) = F$$

Algorithm (Inexact iterative linearization)

- 1 Choose initial vector U^0 . Set $k := 1$.
- 2 $U^{k-1} \Rightarrow$ matrix \mathbb{A}^{k-1} and vector F^{k-1} : find U^k s.t.

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^k \approx F^{k-1}.$$
- 3
 - 1 Set $U^{k,0} := U^{k-1}$ and $i := 1$.
 - 2 Do an algebraic solver step $\Rightarrow U^{k,i}$ s.t. ($R^{k,i}$ algebraic res.)

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^{k,i} = F^{k-1} - R^{k,i}.$$
 - 3 Convergence? OK $\Rightarrow U^k := U^{k,i}$. KO $\Rightarrow i := i + 1$, back to 3.2.
- 4 Convergence? OK \Rightarrow finish. KO $\Rightarrow k := k + 1$, back to 2.

Inexact iterative linearization

System of nonlinear algebraic equations

Nonlinear operator $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, vector $F \in \mathbb{R}^N$: find $U \in \mathbb{R}^N$ s.t.

$$\mathcal{A}(U) = F$$

Algorithm (Inexact iterative linearization)

- 1 Choose initial vector U^0 . Set $k := 1$.
- 2 $U^{k-1} \Rightarrow$ matrix \mathbb{A}^{k-1} and vector F^{k-1} : find U^k s.t.

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^k \approx F^{k-1}.$$
- 3
 - 1 Set $U^{k,0} := U^{k-1}$ and $i := 1$.
 - 2 Do an algebraic solver step $\Rightarrow U^{k,i}$ s.t. ($R^{k,i}$ algebraic res.)

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^{k,i} = F^{k-1} - R^{k,i}.$$
 - 3 Convergence? OK $\Rightarrow U^k := U^{k,i}$. KO $\Rightarrow i := i + 1$, back to 3.2.
- 4 Convergence? OK \Rightarrow finish. KO $\Rightarrow k := k + 1$, back to 2.

Context and questions

Approximate solution

- approximate solution $U^{k,i}$ does **not solve** $\mathcal{A}(U^{k,i}) = F$

Numerical method

- underlying numerical method: the vector $U^{k,i}$ is associated with a (piecewise polynomial) **approximation** $u_h^{k,i}$

Partial differential equation

- underlying PDE, u its **weak solution**: $A(u) = f$

Question (Stopping criteria)

- *What is a good **stopping criterion** for the **linear solver**?*
- *What is a good **stopping criterion** for the **nonlinear solver**?*

Question (Error)

- *How big is the error $\|u - u_h^{k,i}\|$ on **Newton step** k and **algebraic solver step** i , how is it distributed?*

Context and questions

Approximate solution

- approximate solution $U^{k,i}$ does **not solve** $\mathcal{A}(U^{k,i}) = F$

Numerical method

- underlying numerical method: the vector $U^{k,i}$ is associated with a (piecewise polynomial) **approximation** $u_h^{k,i}$

Partial differential equation

- underlying PDE, u its **weak solution**: $A(u) = f$

Question (Stopping criteria)

- *What is a good **stopping criterion** for the **linear solver**?*
- *What is a good **stopping criterion** for the **nonlinear solver**?*

Question (Error)

- *How big is the error $\|u - u_h^{k,i}\|$ on **Newton step** k and **algebraic solver step** i , how is it distributed?*

Context and questions

Approximate solution

- approximate solution $U^{k,i}$ does **not solve** $\mathcal{A}(U^{k,i}) = F$

Numerical method

- underlying numerical method: the vector $U^{k,i}$ is associated with a (piecewise polynomial) **approximation** $u_h^{k,i}$

Partial differential equation

- underlying PDE, u its **weak solution**: $A(u) = f$

Question (Stopping criteria)

- *What is a good **stopping criterion** for the **linear solver**?*
- *What is a good **stopping criterion** for the **nonlinear solver**?*

Question (Error)

- *How big is the error $\|u - u_h^{k,i}\|$ on **Newton step** k and **algebraic solver step** i , how is it distributed?*

Context and questions

Approximate solution

- approximate solution $U^{k,i}$ does **not solve** $\mathcal{A}(U^{k,i}) = F$

Numerical method

- underlying numerical method: the vector $U^{k,i}$ is associated with a (piecewise polynomial) **approximation** $u_h^{k,i}$

Partial differential equation

- underlying PDE, u its **weak solution**: $A(u) = f$

Question (Stopping criteria)

- *What is a good **stopping criterion** for the **linear solver**?*
- *What is a good **stopping criterion** for the **nonlinear solver**?*

Question (Error)

- *How big is the error $\|u - u_h^{k,i}\|$ on **Newton step** k and **algebraic solver step** i , how is it distributed?*

Context and questions

Approximate solution

- approximate solution $U^{k,i}$ does **not solve** $\mathcal{A}(U^{k,i}) = F$

Numerical method

- underlying numerical method: the vector $U^{k,i}$ is associated with a (piecewise polynomial) **approximation** $u_h^{k,i}$

Partial differential equation

- underlying PDE, u its **weak solution**: $A(u) = f$

Question (Stopping criteria)

- *What is a good **stopping criterion** for the **linear solver**?*
- *What is a good **stopping criterion** for the **nonlinear solver**?*

Question (Error)

- *How big is the error $\|u - u_h^{k,i}\|$ on **Newton step** k and **algebraic solver step** i , how is it distributed?*

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 A posteriori error estimate
- 3 Stopping criteria, efficiency, and robustness
- 4 Applications
- 5 Numerical results
- 6 References and bibliography

Model steady problem, discretization

Quasi-linear elliptic problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot \sigma(u, \nabla u) &= f && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned}$$

- $p > 1$, $q := \frac{p}{p-1}$, $f \in L^q(\Omega)$
- example: p -Laplacian with $\sigma(u, \nabla u) = |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u$
- f piecewise polynomial for simplicity
- weak solution: $u \in V := W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that

$$(\sigma(u, \nabla u), \nabla v) = (f, v) \quad \forall v \in V$$

Numerical approximation

- simplicial mesh \mathcal{T}_h , linearization step k , algebraic step i
- $u_h^{k,i} \in V(\mathcal{T}_h) := \{v \in L^p(\Omega), v|_K \in W^{1,p}(K) \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\} \not\subseteq V$

Model steady problem, discretization

Quasi-linear elliptic problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot \sigma(u, \nabla u) &= f && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned}$$

- $p > 1$, $q := \frac{p}{p-1}$, $f \in L^q(\Omega)$
- example: p -Laplacian with $\sigma(u, \nabla u) = |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u$
- f piecewise polynomial for simplicity
- weak solution: $u \in V := W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that

$$(\sigma(u, \nabla u), \nabla v) = (f, v) \quad \forall v \in V$$

Numerical approximation

- simplicial mesh \mathcal{T}_h , linearization step k , algebraic step i
- $u_h^{k,i} \in V(\mathcal{T}_h) := \{v \in L^p(\Omega), v|_K \in W^{1,p}(K) \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\} \not\subseteq V$

Intrinsic error measure

Energy error in the Laplace case

$$\|\nabla(u - u_h)\|^2 = \underbrace{\sup_{\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega); \|\nabla\varphi\|=1} (\nabla(u - u_h), \nabla\varphi)^2}_{\text{dual norm of the residual}} + \underbrace{\min_{v \in H_0^1(\Omega)} \|\nabla(v - u_h)\|^2}_{\text{distance of } u_h \text{ to } H_0^1(\Omega)}$$

Intrinsic error measure

$$\mathcal{J}_u(u_h^{k,i}) := \underbrace{\sup_{\varphi \in V; \|\nabla\varphi\|_p=1} (\sigma(u, \nabla u) - \sigma(u_h^{k,i}, \nabla u_h^{k,i}), \nabla\varphi)}_{\text{dual norm of the residual}} + \underbrace{\left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{\theta \in \mathcal{E}_K} h_\theta^{1-q} \|\llbracket u - u_h^{k,i} \rrbracket\|_{q,e}^q \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}}_{\text{distance of } u_h \text{ to } V}$$

- there holds $\mathcal{J}_u(u_h^{k,i}) = 0$ if and only if $u = u_h^{k,i}$

Intrinsic error measure

Energy error in the Laplace case

$$\|\nabla(u - u_h)\|^2 = \underbrace{\sup_{\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega); \|\nabla\varphi\|=1} (\nabla(u - u_h), \nabla\varphi)^2}_{\text{dual norm of the residual}} + \underbrace{\min_{v \in H_0^1(\Omega)} \|\nabla(v - u_h)\|^2}_{\text{distance of } u_h \text{ to } H_0^1(\Omega)}$$

Intrinsic error measure

$$\mathcal{J}_u(u_h^{k,i}) := \underbrace{\sup_{\varphi \in V; \|\nabla\varphi\|_p=1} (\sigma(u, \nabla u) - \sigma(u_h^{k,i}, \nabla u_h^{k,i}), \nabla\varphi)}_{\text{dual norm of the residual}} + \underbrace{\left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{\theta \in \mathcal{E}_K} h_\theta^{1-q} \|\llbracket u - u_h^{k,i} \rrbracket\|_{q,\theta}^q \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}}_{\text{distance of } u_h \text{ to } V}$$

- there holds $\mathcal{J}_u(u_h^{k,i}) = 0$ if and only if $u = u_h^{k,i}$

Intrinsic error measure

Energy error in the Laplace case

$$\|\nabla(u - u_h)\|^2 = \underbrace{\sup_{\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega); \|\nabla\varphi\|=1} (\nabla(u - u_h), \nabla\varphi)^2}_{\text{dual norm of the residual}} + \underbrace{\min_{v \in H_0^1(\Omega)} \|\nabla(v - u_h)\|^2}_{\text{distance of } u_h \text{ to } H_0^1(\Omega)}$$

Intrinsic error measure

$$\mathcal{J}_u(u_h^{k,i}) := \underbrace{\sup_{\varphi \in V; \|\nabla\varphi\|_p=1} (\sigma(u, \nabla u) - \sigma(u_h^{k,i}, \nabla u_h^{k,i}), \nabla\varphi)}_{\text{dual norm of the residual}} + \underbrace{\left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{\theta \in \mathcal{E}_K} h_\theta^{1-q} \|\llbracket u - u_h^{k,i} \rrbracket\|_{q,\theta}^q \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}}_{\text{distance of } u_h \text{ to } V}$$

- there holds $\mathcal{J}_u(u_h^{k,i}) = 0$ if and only if $u = u_h^{k,i}$

Abstract assumptions

Assumption A (Total flux reconstruction)

There exists $\sigma_h^{k,i} \in \mathbf{H}^q(\text{div}, \Omega)$ and $\rho_h^{k,i} \in L^q(\Omega)$ such that

$$\nabla \cdot \sigma_h^{k,i} = f - \underbrace{\rho_h^{k,i}}_{\substack{\text{algebraic} \\ \text{remainder}}}.$$

Assumption B (Discretization, linearization, and alg. fluxes)

There exist fluxes $\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}, \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i}, \mathbf{a}_h^{k,i} \in [L^q(\Omega)]^d$ such that

- (i) $\sigma_h^{k,i} = \mathbf{d}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{a}_h^{k,i}$;
- (ii) as the linear solver converges, $\|\mathbf{a}_h^{k,i}\|_q \rightarrow 0$;
- (iii) as the nonlinear solver converges, $\|\mathbf{l}_h^{k,i}\|_q \rightarrow 0$.

Abstract assumptions

Assumption A (Total flux reconstruction)

There exists $\sigma_h^{k,i} \in \mathbf{H}^q(\text{div}, \Omega)$ and $\rho_h^{k,i} \in L^q(\Omega)$ such that

$$\nabla \cdot \sigma_h^{k,i} = f - \underbrace{\rho_h^{k,i}}_{\substack{\text{algebraic} \\ \text{remainder}}}.$$

Assumption B (Discretization, linearization, and alg. fluxes)

There exist fluxes $\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}, \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i}, \mathbf{a}_h^{k,i} \in [L^q(\Omega)]^d$ such that

- (i) $\sigma_h^{k,i} = \mathbf{d}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{a}_h^{k,i}$;
- (ii) as the linear solver converges, $\|\mathbf{a}_h^{k,i}\|_q \rightarrow 0$;
- (iii) as the nonlinear solver converges, $\|\mathbf{l}_h^{k,i}\|_q \rightarrow 0$.

Abstract assumptions

Assumption A (Total flux reconstruction)

There exists $\sigma_h^{k,i} \in \mathbf{H}^q(\text{div}, \Omega)$ and $\rho_h^{k,i} \in L^q(\Omega)$ such that

$$\nabla \cdot \sigma_h^{k,i} = f - \underbrace{\rho_h^{k,i}}_{\substack{\text{algebraic} \\ \text{remainder}}}.$$

Assumption B (Discretization, linearization, and alg. fluxes)

There exist fluxes $\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}, \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i}, \mathbf{a}_h^{k,i} \in [L^q(\Omega)]^d$ such that

- (i) $\sigma_h^{k,i} = \mathbf{d}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{a}_h^{k,i}$;
- (ii) as the linear solver converges, $\|\mathbf{a}_h^{k,i}\|_q \rightarrow 0$;
- (iii) as the nonlinear solver converges, $\|\mathbf{l}_h^{k,i}\|_q \rightarrow 0$.

Estimate distinguishing error components

Theorem (Estimate distinguishing different error components)

Let

- $u \in V$ be the weak solution,
- $u_h^{k,i} \in V(\mathcal{T}_h)$ be arbitrary,
- **Assumptions A and B** hold.

Then there holds

$$\mathcal{J}_u(u_h^{k,i}) \leq \eta_{\text{disc}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{lin}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{alg}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{rem}}^{k,i}.$$

Estimators

- *discretization* estimator

$$\eta_{\text{disc},K}^{k,i} := 2^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\|\sigma(u_h^{k,i}, \nabla u_h^{k,i}) + \mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}\|_{q,K} + \left\{ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} h_e^{1-q} \| [u_h^{k,i}] \|_{q,e}^q \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}} \right)$$

- *linearization* estimator

$$\eta_{\text{lin},K}^{k,i} := \| \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i} \|_{q,K}$$

- *algebraic* estimator

$$\eta_{\text{alg},K}^{k,i} := \| \mathbf{a}_h^{k,i} \|_{q,K}$$

- *algebraic remainder estimator*

$$\eta_{\text{rem},K}^{k,i} := h_\Omega \| \rho_h^{k,i} \|_{q,K}$$

- $\eta_{\cdot}^{k,i} := \left\{ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\eta_{\cdot,K}^{k,i})^q \right\}^{1/q}$

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 A posteriori error estimate
- 3 Stopping criteria, efficiency, and robustness**
- 4 Applications
- 5 Numerical results
- 6 References and bibliography

Stopping criteria

Global stopping criteria

- stop whenever:

$$\eta_{\text{rem}}^{k,i} \leq \gamma_{\text{rem}} \max\{\eta_{\text{disc}}^{k,i}, \eta_{\text{lin}}^{k,i}, \eta_{\text{alg}}^{k,i}\},$$

$$\eta_{\text{alg}}^{k,i} \leq \gamma_{\text{alg}} \max\{\eta_{\text{disc}}^{k,i}, \eta_{\text{lin}}^{k,i}\},$$

$$\eta_{\text{lin}}^{k,i} \leq \gamma_{\text{lin}} \eta_{\text{disc}}^{k,i}$$

- $\gamma_{\text{rem}}, \gamma_{\text{alg}}, \gamma_{\text{lin}} \approx 0.1$

Local stopping criteria

- stop whenever:

$$\eta_{\text{rem},K}^{k,i} \leq \gamma_{\text{rem},K} \max\{\eta_{\text{disc},K}^{k,i}, \eta_{\text{lin},K}^{k,i}, \eta_{\text{alg},K}^{k,i}\} \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h,$$

$$\eta_{\text{alg},K}^{k,i} \leq \gamma_{\text{alg},K} \max\{\eta_{\text{disc},K}^{k,i}, \eta_{\text{lin},K}^{k,i}\} \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h,$$

$$\eta_{\text{lin},K}^{k,i} \leq \gamma_{\text{lin},K} \eta_{\text{disc},K}^{k,i} \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h$$

- $\gamma_{\text{rem},K}, \gamma_{\text{alg},K}, \gamma_{\text{lin},K} \approx 0.1$

Stopping criteria

Global stopping criteria

- stop whenever:

$$\eta_{\text{rem}}^{k,i} \leq \gamma_{\text{rem}} \max\{\eta_{\text{disc}}^{k,i}, \eta_{\text{lin}}^{k,i}, \eta_{\text{alg}}^{k,i}\},$$

$$\eta_{\text{alg}}^{k,i} \leq \gamma_{\text{alg}} \max\{\eta_{\text{disc}}^{k,i}, \eta_{\text{lin}}^{k,i}\},$$

$$\eta_{\text{lin}}^{k,i} \leq \gamma_{\text{lin}} \eta_{\text{disc}}^{k,i}$$

- $\gamma_{\text{rem}}, \gamma_{\text{alg}}, \gamma_{\text{lin}} \approx 0.1$

Local stopping criteria

- stop whenever:

$$\eta_{\text{rem},K}^{k,i} \leq \gamma_{\text{rem},K} \max\{\eta_{\text{disc},K}^{k,i}, \eta_{\text{lin},K}^{k,i}, \eta_{\text{alg},K}^{k,i}\} \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h,$$

$$\eta_{\text{alg},K}^{k,i} \leq \gamma_{\text{alg},K} \max\{\eta_{\text{disc},K}^{k,i}, \eta_{\text{lin},K}^{k,i}\} \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h,$$

$$\eta_{\text{lin},K}^{k,i} \leq \gamma_{\text{lin},K} \eta_{\text{disc},K}^{k,i} \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h$$

- $\gamma_{\text{rem},K}, \gamma_{\text{alg},K}, \gamma_{\text{lin},K} \approx 0.1$

Assumptions for efficiency

Assumption C (Piecewise polynomials, meshes, quadrature)

The approximation $u_h^{k,i}$ is *piecewise polynomial*. The meshes \mathcal{T}_h are *shape-regular*. The quadrature error is negligible.

Assumption D (Approximation property)

For all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(u_h^{k,i}, \nabla u_h^{k,i}) + \mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}\|_{q,K} \leq C \left\{ \sum_{K' \in \mathfrak{I}_K} h_{K'}^q \|f + \nabla \cdot \sigma(u_h^{k,i}, \nabla u_h^{k,i})\|_{q,K'}^q \right. \\ + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K^{\text{int}}} h_e \|[\![\sigma(u_h^{k,i}, \nabla u_h^{k,i}) \cdot \mathbf{n}_e]\!] \|_{q,e}^q \\ \left. + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} h_e^{1-q} \|[\![u_h^{k,i}]\!] \|_{q,e}^q \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Assumptions for efficiency

Assumption C (Piecewise polynomials, meshes, quadrature)

The approximation $u_h^{k,i}$ is *piecewise polynomial*. The meshes \mathcal{T}_h are *shape-regular*. The quadrature error is negligible.

Assumption D (Approximation property)

For all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(u_h^{k,i}, \nabla u_h^{k,i}) + \mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}\|_{q,K} \leq C \left\{ \sum_{K' \in \mathfrak{I}_K} h_{K'}^q \|f + \nabla \cdot \sigma(u_h^{k,i}, \nabla u_h^{k,i})\|_{q,K'}^q \right. \\ + \sum_{e \in \mathfrak{E}_K^{\text{int}}} h_e \|\llbracket \sigma(u_h^{k,i}, \nabla u_h^{k,i}) \cdot \mathbf{n}_e \rrbracket\|_{q,e}^q \\ \left. + \sum_{e \in \mathfrak{E}_K} h_e^{1-q} \|\llbracket u_h^{k,i} \rrbracket\|_{q,e}^q \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Global efficiency

Theorem (Global efficiency)

Let the *Assumptions C* and *D* be satisfied. Let the *global stopping criteria* hold. Then,

$$\eta_{\text{disc}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{lin}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{alg}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{rem}}^{k,i} \leq C \mathcal{J}_u(u_h^{k,i}),$$

where *C* is independent of σ and q .

Theorem (Local efficiency)

Let the *Assumptions C* and *D* be satisfied. Let the *local stopping criteria* hold. Then

$$\eta_{\text{disc},K}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{lin},K}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{alg},K}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{rem},K}^{k,i} \leq C \mathcal{J}_{u, \mathfrak{T}_K}(u_h^{k,i}) \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

- **robustness** with respect to the **nonlinearity** thanks to the choice of \mathcal{J}_u as error measure

Global efficiency

Theorem (Global efficiency)

Let the *Assumptions C* and *D* be satisfied. Let the *global stopping criteria* hold. Then,

$$\eta_{\text{disc}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{lin}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{alg}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{rem}}^{k,i} \leq C \mathcal{J}_u(u_h^{k,i}),$$

where *C* is *independent* of σ and q .

Theorem (Local efficiency)

Let the *Assumptions C* and *D* be satisfied. Let the *local stopping criteria* hold. Then

$$\eta_{\text{disc},K}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{lin},K}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{alg},K}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{rem},K}^{k,i} \leq C \mathcal{J}_{u, \mathcal{T}_K}(u_h^{k,i}) \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

- **robustness** with respect to the **nonlinearity** thanks to the choice of \mathcal{J}_u as error measure

Global efficiency

Theorem (Global efficiency)

Let the *Assumptions C* and *D* be satisfied. Let the *global* stopping criteria hold. Then,

$$\eta_{\text{disc}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{lin}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{alg}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{rem}}^{k,i} \leq C \mathcal{J}_u(u_h^{k,i}),$$

where *C* is *independent* of σ and q .

Theorem (Local efficiency)

Let the *Assumptions C* and *D* be satisfied. Let the *local* stopping criteria hold. Then

$$\eta_{\text{disc},K}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{lin},K}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{alg},K}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{rem},K}^{k,i} \leq C \mathcal{J}_{u,\mathfrak{T}_K}(u_h^{k,i}) \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

- **robustness** with respect to the **nonlinearity** thanks to the choice of \mathcal{J}_u as error measure

Global efficiency

Theorem (Global efficiency)

Let the *Assumptions C* and *D* be satisfied. Let the *global* stopping criteria hold. Then,

$$\eta_{\text{disc}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{lin}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{alg}}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{rem}}^{k,i} \leq C \mathcal{J}_u(u_h^{k,i}),$$

where *C* is *independent* of σ and q .

Theorem (Local efficiency)

Let the *Assumptions C* and *D* be satisfied. Let the *local* stopping criteria hold. Then

$$\eta_{\text{disc},K}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{lin},K}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{alg},K}^{k,i} + \eta_{\text{rem},K}^{k,i} \leq C \mathcal{J}_{u,\mathfrak{T}_K}(u_h^{k,i}) \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

- **robustness** with respect to the **nonlinearity** thanks to the choice of \mathcal{J}_u as error measure

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 A posteriori error estimate
- 3 Stopping criteria, efficiency, and robustness
- 4 Applications**
- 5 Numerical results
- 6 References and bibliography

Nonconforming finite elements for the p -Laplacian

Discretization

Find $u_h \in V_h$ such that

$$(\sigma(\nabla u_h), \nabla v_h) = (f, v_h) \quad \forall v_h \in V_h.$$

- $\sigma(\nabla u_h) = |\nabla u_h|^{p-2} \nabla u_h$
- $V_h \not\subset V$ the Crouzeix–Raviart space
- leads to the system of nonlinear algebraic equations

$$\mathcal{A}(U) = F$$

Nonconforming finite elements for the p -Laplacian

Discretization

Find $u_h \in V_h$ such that

$$(\sigma(\nabla u_h), \nabla v_h) = (f, v_h) \quad \forall v_h \in V_h.$$

- $\sigma(\nabla u_h) = |\nabla u_h|^{p-2} \nabla u_h$
- $V_h \not\subset V$ the Crouzeix–Raviart space
- leads to the system of **nonlinear algebraic equations**

$$\mathcal{A}(U) = F$$

Linearization

Linearization

Find $u_h^k \in V_h$ such that

$$(\sigma^{k-1}(\nabla u_h^k), \nabla \psi_e) = (f, \psi_e) \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\text{int}}.$$

- $u_h^0 \in V_h$ yields the initial vector U^0
- fixed-point linearization

$$\sigma^{k-1}(\xi) := |\nabla u_h^{k-1}|^{p-2} \xi$$

- Newton linearization

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{k-1}(\xi) := & |\nabla u_h^{k-1}|^{p-2} \xi + (p-2) |\nabla u_h^{k-1}|^{p-4} \\ & (\nabla u_h^{k-1} \otimes \nabla u_h^{k-1})(\xi - \nabla u_h^{k-1}) \end{aligned}$$

- leads to the system of linear algebraic equations

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^k = F^{k-1}$$

Linearization

Linearization

Find $u_h^k \in V_h$ such that

$$(\sigma^{k-1}(\nabla u_h^k), \nabla \psi_e) = (f, \psi_e) \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\text{int}}.$$

- $u_h^0 \in V_h$ yields the initial vector U^0
- fixed-point linearization

$$\sigma^{k-1}(\xi) := |\nabla u_h^{k-1}|^{p-2} \xi$$

- Newton linearization

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{k-1}(\xi) &:= |\nabla u_h^{k-1}|^{p-2} \xi + (p-2) |\nabla u_h^{k-1}|^{p-4} \\ &\quad (\nabla u_h^{k-1} \otimes \nabla u_h^{k-1})(\xi - \nabla u_h^{k-1}) \end{aligned}$$

- leads to the system of **linear algebraic equations**

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^k = F^{k-1}$$

Algebraic solution

Algebraic solution

Find $u_h^{k,i} \in V_h$ such that

$$(\sigma^{k-1}(\nabla u_h^{k,i}), \nabla \psi_e) = (f, \psi_e) - R_e^{k,i} \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\text{int}}.$$

- algebraic residual vector $R^{k,i} = \{R_e^{k,i}\}_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\text{int}}}$
- discrete system

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^k = F^{k-1} - R^{k,i}$$

Algebraic solution

Algebraic solution

Find $u_h^{k,i} \in V_h$ such that

$$(\sigma^{k-1}(\nabla u_h^{k,i}), \nabla \psi_e) = (f, \psi_e) - R_e^{k,i} \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\text{int}}.$$

- algebraic residual vector $R^{k,i} = \{R_e^{k,i}\}_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\text{int}}}$
- discrete system

$$\mathbb{A}^{k-1} U^k = F^{k-1} - R^{k,i}$$

Flux reconstructions

Definition (Construction of $(\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i})$)

For all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$(\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i})|_K := -\sigma^{k-1}(\nabla u_h^{k,i})|_K + \frac{f|_K}{d}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_K) - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} \frac{R_e^{k,i}}{d|D_e|}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_K)|_{K_e},$$

where $R_e^{k,i} = (f, \psi_e) - (\sigma^{k-1}(\nabla u_h^{k,i}), \nabla \psi_e) \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\text{int}}$.

Definition (Construction of $\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}$)

For all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}|_K := -\sigma(\nabla u_h^{k,i})|_K + \frac{f|_K}{d}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_K) - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} \frac{\bar{R}_e^{k,i}}{d|D_e|}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_K)|_{K_e},$$

where $\bar{R}_e^{k,i} := (f, \psi_e) - (\sigma(\nabla u_h^{k,i}), \nabla \psi_e) \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\text{int}}$.

Definition (Construction of $\mathbf{a}_h^{k,i}$)

Set $\mathbf{a}_h^{k,i} := (\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i+\nu} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i+\nu}) - (\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i})$ for (adaptively chosen) $\nu > 0$ additional algebraic solvers steps; $R^{k,i+\nu} \rightsquigarrow \rho_h^{k,i}$.

Flux reconstructions

Definition (Construction of $(\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i})$)

For all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$(\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i})|_K := -\sigma^{k-1}(\nabla u_h^{k,i})|_K + \frac{f|_K}{d}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_K) - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} \frac{R_e^{k,i}}{d|D_e|}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_K)|_{K_e},$$

where $R_e^{k,i} = (f, \psi_e) - (\sigma^{k-1}(\nabla u_h^{k,i}), \nabla \psi_e) \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\text{int}}$.

Definition (Construction of $\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}$)

For all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}|_K := -\sigma(\nabla u_h^{k,i})|_K + \frac{f|_K}{d}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_K) - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} \frac{\bar{R}_e^{k,i}}{d|D_e|}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_K)|_{K_e},$$

where $\bar{R}_e^{k,i} := (f, \psi_e) - (\sigma(\nabla u_h^{k,i}), \nabla \psi_e) \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\text{int}}$.

Definition (Construction of $\mathbf{a}_h^{k,i}$)

Set $\mathbf{a}_h^{k,i} := (\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i+\nu} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i+\nu}) - (\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i})$ for (adaptively chosen) $\nu > 0$ additional algebraic solvers steps; $R^{k,i+\nu} \rightsquigarrow \rho_h^{k,i}$.

Flux reconstructions

Definition (Construction of $(\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i})$)

For all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$(\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i})|_K := -\sigma^{k-1}(\nabla u_h^{k,i})|_K + \frac{f|_K}{d}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_K) - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} \frac{R_e^{k,i}}{d|D_e|}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_K)|_{K_e},$$

where $R_e^{k,i} = (f, \psi_e) - (\sigma^{k-1}(\nabla u_h^{k,i}), \nabla \psi_e) \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\text{int}}$.

Definition (Construction of $\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}$)

For all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}|_K := -\sigma(\nabla u_h^{k,i})|_K + \frac{f|_K}{d}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_K) - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} \frac{\bar{R}_e^{k,i}}{d|D_e|}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_K)|_{K_e},$$

where $\bar{R}_e^{k,i} := (f, \psi_e) - (\sigma(\nabla u_h^{k,i}), \nabla \psi_e) \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h^{\text{int}}$.

Definition (Construction of $\mathbf{a}_h^{k,i}$)

Set $\mathbf{a}_h^{k,i} := (\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i+\nu} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i+\nu}) - (\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i} + \mathbf{l}_h^{k,i})$ for (adaptively chosen)

$\nu > 0$ additional algebraic solvers steps; $R^{k,i+\nu} \rightsquigarrow \rho_h^{k,i}$.

Verification of the assumptions

Lemma (Assumptions A and B)

Assumptions A and B hold.

Comments

- $\|\mathbf{a}_h^{k,i}\|_{q,K} \rightarrow 0$ as the linear solver converges by definition
- $\|\mathbf{l}_h^{k,i}\|_{q,K} \rightarrow 0$ as the nonlinear solver converges by the construction of $\mathbf{l}_h^{k,i}$

Lemma (Assumptions C and D)

Assumptions C and D hold.

Comments

- quadrature error is zero
- $\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}$ is close to $\sigma(\nabla u_h^{k,i})$: approximation properties of the Raviart–Thomas–Nédélec spaces

Verification of the assumptions

Lemma (Assumptions A and B)

Assumptions A and B hold.

Comments

- $\|\mathbf{a}_h^{k,i}\|_{q,K} \rightarrow 0$ as the linear solver converges by definition
- $\|\mathbf{l}_h^{k,i}\|_{q,K} \rightarrow 0$ as the nonlinear solver converges by the construction of $\mathbf{l}_h^{k,i}$

Lemma (Assumptions C and D)

Assumptions C and D hold.

Comments

- quadrature error is zero
- $\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}$ is close to $\sigma(\nabla u_h^{k,i})$: approximation properties of the Raviart–Thomas–Nédélec spaces

Verification of the assumptions

Lemma (Assumptions A and B)

Assumptions A and B hold.

Comments

- $\|\mathbf{a}_h^{k,i}\|_{q,K} \rightarrow 0$ as the linear solver converges by definition
- $\|\mathbf{l}_h^{k,i}\|_{q,K} \rightarrow 0$ as the nonlinear solver converges by the construction of $\mathbf{l}_h^{k,i}$

Lemma (Assumptions C and D)

Assumptions C and D hold.

Comments

- quadrature error is zero
- $\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}$ is close to $\sigma(\nabla u_h^{k,i})$: approximation properties of the Raviart–Thomas–Nédélec spaces

Verification of the assumptions

Lemma (Assumptions A and B)

Assumptions A and B hold.

Comments

- $\|\mathbf{a}_h^{k,i}\|_{q,K} \rightarrow 0$ as the linear solver converges by definition
- $\|\mathbf{l}_h^{k,i}\|_{q,K} \rightarrow 0$ as the nonlinear solver converges by the construction of $\mathbf{l}_h^{k,i}$

Lemma (Assumptions C and D)

Assumptions C and D hold.

Comments

- quadrature error is zero
- $\mathbf{d}_h^{k,i}$ is close to $\sigma(\nabla u_h^{k,i})$: approximation properties of the Raviart–Thomas–Nédélec spaces

Summary

Discretization methods

- conforming finite elements
- nonconforming finite elements
- discontinuous Galerkin
- various finite volumes
- mixed finite elements

Linearizations

- fixed point
- Newton

Linear solvers

- independent of the linear solver

... all Assumptions A to D verified

Summary

Discretization methods

- conforming finite elements
- nonconforming finite elements
- discontinuous Galerkin
- various finite volumes
- mixed finite elements

Linearizations

- fixed point
- Newton

Linear solvers

- independent of the linear solver

... all Assumptions A to D verified

Summary

Discretization methods

- conforming finite elements
- nonconforming finite elements
- discontinuous Galerkin
- various finite volumes
- mixed finite elements

Linearizations

- fixed point
- Newton

Linear solvers

- independent of the linear solver

... all Assumptions A to D verified

Summary

Discretization methods

- conforming finite elements
- nonconforming finite elements
- discontinuous Galerkin
- various finite volumes
- mixed finite elements

Linearizations

- fixed point
- Newton

Linear solvers

- independent of the linear solver

... all Assumptions A to D verified

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 A posteriori error estimate
- 3 Stopping criteria, efficiency, and robustness
- 4 Applications
- 5 Numerical results**
- 6 References and bibliography

Numerical experiment I

Model problem

- p -Laplacian


$$\begin{aligned}\nabla \cdot (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) &= f && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= u_D && \text{on } \partial\Omega\end{aligned}$$

- weak solution (used to impose the Dirichlet BC)


$$u(x, y) = -\frac{p-1}{p} \left(\left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + \left(y - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2(p-1)}} + \frac{p-1}{p} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}}$$

- tested values $p = 1.5$ and 10
- Crouzeix–Raviart nonconforming finite elements

Analytical and approximate solutions




Case $p = 1.5$




Case $p = 10$


Error and estimators as a function of CG iterations, $\rho = 10$, 6th level mesh, 6th Newton step.



Newton




inexact Newton




ad. inexact Newton


Error and estimators as a function of Newton iterations, $p = 10$, 6th level mesh



Newton




inexact Newton




ad. inexact Newton


Error and estimators, $p = 10$



Newton




inexact Newton




ad. inexact Newton


Effectivity indices, $p = 10$



Newton




inexact Newton




ad. inexact Newton

Error distribution, $p = 10$




Estimated error distribution




Exact error distribution


Newton and algebraic iterations, $p = 10$



Newton it. / refinement




alg. it. / Newton step




alg. it. / refinement


Error and estimators as a function of CG iterations, $\rho = 1.5$, 6th level mesh, 1st Newton step.



Newton




inexact Newton




ad. inexact Newton


Error and estimators as a function of Newton iterations, $p = 1.5$, 6th level mesh



Newton




inexact Newton




ad. inexact Newton


Error and estimators, $p = 1.5$



Newton




inexact Newton




ad. inexact Newton


Effectivity indices, $p = 1.5$



Newton




inexact Newton




ad. inexact Newton


Newton and algebraic iterations, $p = 1.5$



Newton it. / refinement



alg. it. / Newton step



alg. it. / refinement

Numerical experiment II

Model problem

- p -Laplacian


$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot (|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) &= f && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= u_D && \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned}$$

- weak solution (used to impose the Dirichlet BC)


$$u(r, \theta) = r^{\frac{7}{8}} \sin(\theta^{\frac{7}{8}})$$

- $p = 4$, L-shape domain, singularity in the origin (Carstensen and Klose (2003))
- Crouzeix–Raviart nonconforming finite elements

Error distribution on an adaptively refined mesh




Estimated error distribution




Exact error distribution

Estimated and actual errors and the effectivity index




Estimated and actual errors




Effectivity index

Energy error and overall performance



Energy error



Overall performance

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 A posteriori error estimate
- 3 Stopping criteria, efficiency, and robustness
- 4 Applications
- 5 Numerical results
- 6 References and bibliography

Previous results

Inexact Newton method

- Eisenstat and Walker (1990's) (conception, convergence, a priori error estimates)
- Moret (1989) (discrete a posteriori error estimates)

Adaptive inexact Newton method

- Bank and Rose (1982), combination with multigrid
- Hackbusch and Reusken (1989), damping and multigrid
- Deuffhard (1990's, 2004 book), adaptivity

Stopping criteria for algebraic solvers

- engineering literature, since 1950's
- Becker, Johnson, and Rannacher (1995), multigrid stopping criterion
- Arioli (2000's), comparison of the algebraic and discretization errors

Previous results

Inexact Newton method

- Eisenstat and Walker (1990's) (conception, convergence, a priori error estimates)
- Moret (1989) (discrete a posteriori error estimates)

Adaptive inexact Newton method

- Bank and Rose (1982), combination with multigrid
- Hackbusch and Reusken (1989), damping and multigrid
- Deuffhard (1990's, 2004 book), adaptivity

Stopping criteria for algebraic solvers

- engineering literature, since 1950's
- Becker, Johnson, and Rannacher (1995), multigrid stopping criterion
- Arioli (2000's), comparison of the algebraic and discretization errors

Previous results

Inexact Newton method

- Eisenstat and Walker (1990's) (conception, convergence, a priori error estimates)
- Moret (1989) (discrete a posteriori error estimates)

Adaptive inexact Newton method

- Bank and Rose (1982), combination with multigrid
- Hackbusch and Reusken (1989), damping and multigrid
- Deuffhard (1990's, 2004 book), adaptivity

Stopping criteria for algebraic solvers

- engineering literature, since 1950's
- Becker, Johnson, and Rannacher (1995), multigrid stopping criterion
- Arioli (2000's), comparison of the algebraic and discretization errors

Previous results

A posteriori error estimates for numerical discretizations of nonlinear problems

- Ladevèze (since 1990's), guaranteed upper bound
- Han (1994), general framework
- Verfürth (1994), residual estimates
- Carstensen and Klose (2003), guaranteed estimates
- Chaillou and Suri (2006, 2007), distinguishing discretization and linearization errors
- Kim (2007), guaranteed estimates, locally conservative methods

Bibliography

Bibliography

- ERN A., VOHRALÍK M., Adaptive inexact Newton methods with a posteriori stopping criteria for nonlinear diffusion PDEs, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **35** (2013), A1761–A1791.

Thank you for your attention!