

Implicit Residual Type Error Estimators

Antonio Huerta and Pedro Díez

Abstract The error associated with a numerical solution is intimately related with the residual, that is the lack of verification of the equation by the approximated solution. The residual is computable but obtaining the exact error from the residual is as difficult as computing the exact solution. Residual type estimators provide error assessment tools based on post processing the residual. This post process is either explicit (integrating the residual) or implicit (solving local problems with the residual as source term). Some of the residual type estimates are guaranteed error bounds. The standard estimators aim at assessing the energy norm of the error. Goal-oriented assessment is carried out by considering an auxiliary problem associated with the selected quantity of interest (the adjoint or dual problem). Thus, an error representation allows estimating the error in the quantity of interest as a post-process of the energy measures of the errors in both the original problem and the adjoint one.

Keywords Implicit error estimates · Hybrid-flux equilibration · Flux-free techniques · Goal-oriented estimates · Adjoint problem · Error representation

1 Introduction and Problem Statement

1.1 Preliminaries

The error is the difference between the approximated and the exact solutions, $e := u - u^h$. In the a posteriori error estimation setup, we assume that the approximated solution is available but the exact solution is not. The error is an unknown function

A. Huerta (✉) · P. Díez
Laboratori de Càlcul Numèric, Departament de Matemàtica Aplicada III,
Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, C/Jordi Girona 1-3, Campus Nord,
Edifici C2, 08034 Barcelona, Spain
e-mail: antonio.huerta@upc.edu

P. Díez
e-mail: pedro.diez@upc.edu

and it is as difficult to obtain as the exact solution. Error estimates aim at providing approximations of (some measures of) the error circumventing the need of having an accurate description of the error function itself.

The equation characterising the error is similar to the original problem, just replacing the source term (loads, in a mechanical context) by the residual associated with the approximated solution. The residual is therefore the driving force for the error. All the information about the error is contained in the residual. However, the key to access this information is the capacity to solve the error equation, which, as previously said, has the same level of complexity and difficulty as the original problem.

The first attempts in a posteriori error assessment aimed at providing approximations of the error measured in energy norm. Lately, a huge effort has been produced in assessing the error in arbitrary quantities of interest. This is of outmost practical importance because it relates with goal-oriented error adaptivity. That is, finding the optimal mesh producing the result specified by the user with the prescribed accuracy at a minimum cost. Moreover, a recently open line of research concentrates in providing certificates of the approximate solution or, conversely, guaranteed upper and lower bounds of the quantity of interest associated with the exact solution.

This article is intended to provide a summary of the different approaches to introduce residual-type error estimates and to highlight the main characteristics of each of them.

1.2 Problem Statement

The standard linear elasticity boundary value problem is used as model problem. The fact of having vectorial unknowns (by opposition to scalar elliptic problems, like the thermal problems modelled by the Poisson equation, which is conceptually similar because has the same mathematical structure) is carrying some additional complexity in the notation but is also allowing us to present points of particular interest that do not appear in the simplest version.

The body under study occupies the domain Ω with boundary $\partial\Omega$, see Fig. 1. The boundary $\partial\Omega$ is divided in two disjoint parts, Γ_N and Γ_D . In the Dirichlet part of the boundary, Γ_D , the displacement is set to be equal to a given value \mathbf{u}_D . A body load \mathbf{b} is applied in Ω and a traction \mathbf{t} is applied on the Neumann part of the boundary, Γ_N . The unknown displacement field \mathbf{u} and the corresponding stresses $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u})$ are found by solving the following boundary value problem:

$$-\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{b} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (1a)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{t} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_N, \quad (1b)$$

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_D \quad \text{on } \Gamma_D. \quad (1c)$$

The variational or weak form of problem (1) requires introducing the following functional spaces. The space of admissible displacements \mathcal{U} (a subspace of $\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)$)




Fig. 1 Illustration of the boundary value problem

of functions fulfilling (1c)) and the space of virtual displacements, \mathcal{V} (also known as trial functions, similar to \mathcal{U} but vanishing on Γ_D). Thus the weak form is readily expressed as find $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ such that

$$a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = l(\mathbf{v}), \text{ for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (2)$$

where

$$a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) := \int_{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{v}) d\Omega, \quad l(\mathbf{v}) := \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{v} d\Omega + \int_{\Gamma_N} \mathbf{t} \cdot \mathbf{v} d\Gamma,$$

being $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\cdot)$ the strain operator. Recall that the Hooke tensor \mathbb{C} relates stresses and strains,

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbb{C} : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{u}). \quad (3)$$

It is useful expressing the bilinear form $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ in terms of stresses instead of displacements by formally introducing $\bar{a}(\cdot, \cdot)$ such that

$$\bar{a}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) := \int_{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\sigma} : \mathbb{C}^{-1} : \boldsymbol{\tau} d\Omega.$$

Note that, with this definition, $a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \bar{a}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}), \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{v}))$.

In this context, the numerical approximation whose error is to be assessed, \mathbf{u}^h is readily introduced.

A finite element mesh of characteristic size h discretizing Ω induces the functional spaces $\mathcal{U}^h \subset \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}^h \subset \mathcal{V}$. The finite element approximation to \mathbf{u} , $\mathbf{u}^h \in \mathcal{U}^h$, is such that

$$a(\mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{v}) = l(\mathbf{v}), \text{ for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}^h.$$

2 Error Equations and a Priori Estimates

A posteriori error estimation techniques aim at assessing the error committed in the approximation of \mathbf{u} , $\mathbf{e} := \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^h$, where $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{V}$ is the solution of the residual equation

$$a(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{v}) = l(\mathbf{v}) - a(\mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{v}) =: R(\mathbf{v}), \text{ for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (4)$$

Remark 1 The right-hand side of Eq. (4) is the weak residual associated with the trial function \mathbf{v} . Error estimation techniques based on solving this equation or making use of it are hence named residual type error estimators. It is worth noting also that the weak residual is also expressed in terms of the elementary strong residual $\mathbf{r}_{\text{el}} = \mathbf{b} + \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}^h)$ (which can be evaluated in the interior of the elements Ω_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, n_{\text{el}}$, of the mesh) and the singular residual, \mathbf{r}_{sing} . The singular residual is defined as the jump of the normal component of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}^h)$ on the interelement edges γ (sides in 3D) in Γ_{int} , $\mathbf{r}_{\text{sing}} = \llbracket \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}^h) \cdot \mathbf{n} \rrbracket_{\Gamma_{\text{int}}}$ and as the non verification of the Neumann boundary condition on the element edges γ in Γ_N , $\mathbf{r}_{\text{sing}} = \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}^h) \cdot \mathbf{n}$. The resulting expression is

$$R(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_{\text{el}}} \int_{\Omega_k} \mathbf{r}_{\text{el}} \cdot \mathbf{v} d\Omega + \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{int}} \cup \Gamma_N} \int_{\gamma} \mathbf{r}_{\text{sing}} \cdot \mathbf{v} d\Gamma. \quad (5)$$

These two components of the residual reveal the existence of two different error sources, the elementary and singular residuals. The former is associated with the lack of verification of the differential equation in the interior of the elements, the latter with the non verification of the continuity requirements of the stress field. The main rationale of the explicit residual error estimates consists in evaluating this two terms separately.

The energy norm of the error, $\|\mathbf{e}\|$, is taken as a global measure of the error. This is the norm induced by $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ or $\bar{a}(\cdot, \cdot)$ when applied to stresses, namely

$$\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 = a(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e}) = \bar{a}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_e) = \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e\|^2,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e$ is the error in stresses $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e := \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}^h)$.

A priori error estimates are expressions of bounds stating the asymptotic behaviour of the error depending of the mesh parameters.

At this point it is interesting reviewing a classical result on interpolation. The values of some function f are known at $n + 1$ sample points x_i , for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$. The interpolant p is the polynomial of degree n such that $p(x_i) = f(x_i)$, for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$. The expression of the interpolation error is obtained from the Lagrange interpolation methodology and reads

$$E(x) := f(x) - p(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\nu)}{(n+1)!} L(x)$$

being ν some point in the interval $[x_0, x_n]$ and $L(x)$ a $n + 1$ degree polynomial vanishing at the sample points, namely

$$L(x) = \prod_{i=0}^n (x - x_i)$$

For a uniform distribution of same points, $h = x_{i+1} - x_i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$, the particularisation of the previous expression yields

$$E = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(\nu)}{4(n+1)} h^{n+1}$$

This expression is used to assess the error associated with the interpolation in the finite element mesh (assuming the exact nodal values are known). In this context, h stands for the characteristic element size of the mesh and n is replaced by p , that is the usual notation for the degree of the polynomial in the finite element approximation. Thus, a finite element interpolation estimate reads

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \Pi^h \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \leq \underbrace{C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{p+1}}_{C^*} h^{p+1} \quad (6)$$

where Π^h stands for the interpolation operator in the discrete finite element space \mathcal{V}^h , $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}$ is the standard \mathcal{L}^2 norm and the norm $\|\cdot\|_{p+1}$ includes the derivatives of order $p + 1$ of the argument function. The unknown constant C depends on the geometry of the domain, the regularity of the loading terms and the distortion of the elements in the mesh. It is worth noting that nor C nor the norm $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{p+1}$ depend on the mesh parameters h and p . Consequently, the dependence of the (interpolation) error on the mesh parameters is concentrated in the term h^{p+1} . This is the reason of introducing the constant C^* , independent of the mesh parameters.

Starting from Eq. (6) and using the Céa's lemma and the Galerkin orthogonality, the different a priori estimates for the error on the finite element solution are readily obtained. The main idea is replacing $\Pi^h \mathbf{u}$ by \mathbf{u}^h and generalising the result for norms different than the energy norm.

These expressions are similar to (6) but with different unknown constants and exponential expressions for the dependence on the mesh parameters. Two examples corresponding to the energy (or \mathcal{H}^1) norm and the \mathcal{L}^2 norm read

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^h\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \leq \underbrace{C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{p+1}}}_{C^*} h^{p+1} \quad (7)$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^h\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \leq \underbrace{C \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{p+1}}}_{C^*} h^p \quad (8)$$

The a priori estimates (7) and (8) are not providing the actual measure of the error but only an expression stating the asymptotic behaviour of the error when the mesh

is successively enriched, either increasing p or decreasing h in a uniform manner. For instance, for $p = 1$ (linear elements), one should expect a reduction of the error along a uniform h -refinement which is quadratic if the error is measured in the \mathcal{L}^2 norm and only linear if the error is measured in the \mathcal{H}^1 norm.

Explicit residual estimates, which are discussed in detail in another chapter, are based on the decomposition of the weak residual discussed in Remark 1. The computable elementary residual \mathbf{r}_{el} and singular residual \mathbf{r}_{sing} are seen as the two sources of error. Explicit estimates are based on postprocessing these two quantities and getting an approximation to the error. Thus, the estimate does not require solving any local problem and is computed directly from the finite element approximation. The input data of the problem to be solved is required to compute the elementary residual, and the part of the singular residual associated with the Neumann boundary. Note that this information is not used in the recovery estimates, which are computed using only $\sigma(\mathbf{u}^h)$ and no use is made of the data of the original problem.

The idea of explicit residual estimates uses (5) for $v = e - \Pi^h e$ (Π^h stands for the interpolation operator in \mathcal{V}^h) together with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the a priori interpolation estimates. Cooking all these ingredients, the following expression is found (see [1] for a detailed derivation)

$$\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 \leq C \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n_{\text{el}}} h_k^2 \|\mathbf{r}_{\text{el}}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega_k)}^2 + \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{int}} \cup \Gamma_N} h_\gamma \|\mathbf{r}_{\text{sing}}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\gamma)}^2 \right), \quad (9)$$

where C is a constant related with the interpolation estimates, generally unknown. Note that each residual is scaled with the local mesh sizes, h_k (element size) and h_γ (edge size), with different exponents arising also from the interpolation estimates. The right-hand side term in (9) is naturally decomposed into elementary contributions and, except for the unknown constant C , it is computable once \mathbf{u}^h is obtained.

These estimates are computationally costless and very useful for adaptive procedures where it is important to identify the parts of the domain contributing to the error. Constant C is seen as a single (unknown) multiplicative factor and the local contributions of the elements are therefore properly assessed in a relative basis. Nevertheless, the global value of the error norm is only assessed up to the determination of C . Of course, C could also be estimated and even bounded but in general explicit estimates cannot produce guaranteed upper bounds for $\|\mathbf{e}\|$.

3 Implicit Residual Error Estimates

3.1 Classification

Implicit estimators aim at avoiding the disadvantages of explicit estimates by solving the original error equation (4) in a local basis. That is, typically in small domains

(the elements or patches of elements) in which a local version of (4) is solved numerically. This requires locally increasing the resolution with respect to the original approximation in \mathcal{U}^h . The implicit estimates are classified in different categories, depending on

- the domain in which the local problem is stated: element residual methods (solved element by element) and subdomain residual methods (solved in patches of elements, either centered in nodes or elements)
- the boundary conditions imposed on the local problems: either Dirichlet or Neumann. Roughly speaking, the Dirichlet methods provide continuous approximations to the displacement error and lower bounds of the energy and the Neumann methods yield statically admissible stress fields and upper bounds of the energy error
- the numerical method used to approximate the solution of the local problem: either a standard FE method providing a displacement based approximation of the error (producing the so-called asymptotic estimates which have bounding properties only with respect to a reference solution, not with respect to the exact error) or a dual approach yielding an approximation of the stress field exactly fulfilling the equilibrium equations (producing guaranteed or strict error bounds).

It is worth mentioning here the pioneering work of Ladevèze introducing the error estimators based in the concept of constitutive relation error, see [9]. This family of error estimators is classified here in the implicit residual framework, together with the estimators solving elementary problems with Neumann boundary conditions, because it perfectly matches the category. The rationale for the presentation and the derivation of these techniques is however pretty different. Following this line of thought, based also in mechanical arguments, strategies to generalize these tools to nonlinear and transient problems have been suggested, see [5].

An alternative approach fitting also the implicit residual philosophy are the so-called *dual global solvers*. This strategy is based on the ideas introduced by [8]. A statically admissible stress field σ^* is obtained by means of a global computation over a discrete space \mathcal{S}^h (where the stresses are interpolated). This requires solving a global optimization problem reading: find $\sigma^* \in \mathcal{S}^h$ such that the complementary energy $|||\sigma^*|||^2 = \tilde{a}(\sigma^*, \sigma^*)$ is minimum, with the additional restriction of being statically admissible, see (10). Thus, the statically admissible stress field σ^* produces an upper bound energy norm estimate, overestimating $\|e\|$, see Sect. 3.2. Moreover, this error bound is the sharper you can get in \mathcal{S}^h . Thus, estimates based on *dual global solvers* are generally sharp. Nevertheless, the global nature of the dual approximation makes them computationally expensive. Both the element residual methods and the subdomain residual methods are alternatives based on solving only local problems and, consequently, providing upper bounds of the error at an affordable computational cost.

3.2 Assessing the Energy Norm of the Error

A first step in a posteriori assessment is estimating the error measured in the energy norm, that is obtaining a good approximation of σ_e and computing $\|e\|$. This translates in finding a new stress field σ^* based on the information at hand, that is $\sigma(u^h)$, and such that σ^* approximates the actual stresses $\sigma(u)$ much better than $\sigma(u^h)$. Thus, a computable error estimate is readily obtained

$$\sigma_e \approx \sigma_e^* = \sigma^* - \sigma(u^h),$$

yielding also the corresponding energy norm estimate $\|\sigma_e^*\|^2 = \bar{a}(\sigma_e^*, \sigma_e^*) \approx \|e\|^2$.

The stress field σ^* is said to be statically admissible if it is continuous (at least in the normal components to the discontinuity surface, that is without traction jumps) and it fulfills the equilibrium equations (1a) and (1b). This is equivalent to say that for all the virtual displacements $v \in \mathcal{V}$

$$\bar{a}(\sigma^*, \sigma(v)) = l(v). \quad (10)$$

Note that the solution of (10) is not unique because σ^* is not assumed to fulfill any compatibility condition, in other words σ^* does not necessarily derive from a displacement field following (3).

A statically admissible stress field σ^* produces an energy norm estimate $\|\sigma_e^*\|$ larger than (or equal to) $\|e\|$. The error estimation technique providing this kind of error approximation is referred as an upper bound error estimator. The upper bound property of the statically admissible stress field is readily derived by considering $v = e$ in (2) and (10), thus

$$\bar{a}(\sigma(u), \sigma_e) = l(e) = \bar{a}(\sigma^*, \sigma_e)$$

and subtracting $\bar{a}(\sigma(u^h), \sigma_e)$ in both sides

$$\bar{a}(\sigma_e, \sigma_e) = \bar{a}(\sigma_e^*, \sigma_e),$$

which yields $\|\sigma_e\| \leq \|\sigma_e^*\|$ by simply considering the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

Thus, the key issue in any error estimation technique is to produce a properly enhanced stress field σ^* . Moreover, if σ^* is build up such that it is statically admissible, then this additional feature confers to the estimator the upper bound property. The strategies producing the enhanced stresses σ^* are classified into two categories: recovery type estimators (no discussed here) and implicit residual type estimators.

It is worth remarking that, in general, the enhanced stress σ^* and the corresponding stress error σ_e can only be used to evaluate the energy norm of the error, and no other quantities. In particular, any magnitude based on the displacement error cannot be directly evaluated using σ^* .

3.3 Element Residual Method; Equilibrated Residual Estimates

The local version of the error equation (4) in the element Ω_k of the mesh states that the restriction of the error \mathbf{e} to Ω_k fulfills

$$a_k(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{v}) = l_k(\mathbf{v}) - a_k(\mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{v}) + \int_{\partial\Omega_k \setminus \partial\Omega} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n}) \cdot \mathbf{v} d\Gamma \quad (11)$$

for all \mathbf{v} taking values in Ω_k . Subscript k in the linear and bilinear forms indicates that the corresponding integrals are restricted to Ω_k . Note that the last term of the right-hand side stands for the local Neumann boundary conditions and depends on the unknown traction associated with the exact solution. Note also that the local error stress field $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{e})$ fulfills a variant of (11), substituting the left-hand side term by $\bar{a}_k(\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{e}), \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{v}))$.

In order to obtain a solvable local problem, the unknown boundary traction $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n}$ on the boundary of Ω_k is replaced by some approximated value \mathbf{g}_k that has to be determined on all the interelement edges. Thus, the local equation for the approximated stress error, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e^*$ is

$$\bar{a}_k(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e^*, \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{v})) = l_k(\mathbf{v}) - a_k(\mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{v}) + \int_{\partial\Omega_k \setminus \partial\Omega} \mathbf{g}_k \cdot \mathbf{v} d\Gamma. \quad (12)$$

In order to provide statically admissible stresses, the approximated traction \mathbf{g}_k has to fulfill two properties

1. on the common edge of two contiguous elements Ω_k and $\Omega_{k'}$, $\mathbf{g}_k = -\mathbf{g}_{k'}$ (this is to guarantee the continuity of the traction associated with $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*$)
2. the boundary traction must be in equilibrium with the interior loads. This *compatibility condition* is needed to ensure that the problem (12) is solvable.

The compatibility condition requires \mathbf{g}_k to fulfill

$$l_k(\mathbf{v}) - a_k(\mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{v}) + \int_{\partial\Omega_k \setminus \partial\Omega} \mathbf{g}_k \cdot \mathbf{v} d\Gamma = 0 \quad (13)$$

for any rigid body motion \mathbf{v} (in 2D, this means \mathbf{v} taking the values of the two translations \mathbf{t}_x and \mathbf{t}_y and the rotation $\boldsymbol{\theta}$). If this condition is fulfilled, problem (12) is solvable (the solution exists, even if it is not unique). Any of the solutions of this problem produces an upper bound estimate.

The first idea to determine \mathbf{g}_k was introduced by [3] and consists in taking \mathbf{g}_k equal to the average of the numerical normal traction, computed from $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}^h)$. This is equivalent to assume that $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \approx \langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}^h) \rangle_{\text{ave}} \cdot \mathbf{n}$ on the interelement edges. This option fulfills the continuity restriction but fails guaranteeing the compatibility condition (13). To overcome this problem, [3] propose the following work-around: the test function \mathbf{v} in problem (12) is taken in a restricted functional space of functions




Fig. 2 Illustration of the element residual method (*left*) and the subdomain residual method (*right*). In the element residual method the contribution to the tractions \mathbf{g}_k of every node of the mesh (represented by the *blue squares*) are computed in a nodal basis. Then, the tractions \mathbf{g}_k are used to solve the local elementary problems and the stresses inside the element fulfilling the equilibrium are determined. Subdomain residual method: A larger local problem is solved for each node of the mesh but no equilibrated tractions have to be computed. The *red circles* represent the degrees of freedom describing the approximated stresses. (color in online)

vanishing at the vertex nodes of element Ω_k . This simple approach only yields statically admissible estimates stresses σ_e^* if the error on the nodes of the mesh is zero. This is not the general case and consequently if this strategy is used, the upper bound property cannot be guaranteed. An alternative also devised in [3] consists in replacing in the right-hand side of (12) \mathbf{v} by $\mathbf{v} - \Pi^h \mathbf{v}$. This automatically guarantees that the local problem is compatible (or equilibrated) and preserves the global upper bound property. The global property is kept because subtracting $\Pi^h \mathbf{v}$ in the argument of $R(\cdot)$ (the right-hand side of (4)) does not change the error equation. This smart operation can also be seen as an implicit way of recovering a compatible traction \mathbf{g}_k .

This is the basis of the so-called *equilibrated residual estimates*. In fact, this family of estimators introduces efficient and practical algorithms for constructing equilibrated fluxes, that is recovering \mathbf{g}_k by solving only local problems. The compatibility condition (13) is at the first sight a global restriction, involving the tractions on all the element boundaries. If the equilibrated residual methods are among the most popular implicit residual type estimators is because the computation of the tractions \mathbf{g}_k is decoupled node to node. Using a smart representation of \mathbf{g}_k , the nodal contributions to \mathbf{g}_k on all the edges converging in a given node are computed independently, and it requires solving a small linear system of equations as indicated in [2, 9–11, 14, 16] (Fig. 2).

3.4 Subdomain Residual Methods; Flux-Free Estimates

The effectivity of the equilibrated residual method depends on the quality of the local tractions \mathbf{g}_k . For instance, the dual-global estimates are usually much sharper than the equilibrated residual estimates. Moreover, although computing \mathbf{g}_k as indicated above is computationally inexpensive because the local problems are decoupled,

the implementation of the equilibration techniques is often involved and difficult to generalize to different element types or space dimensions.

The subdomain residual methods are introduced as an alternative to equilibrated residual methods such that:

- they preclude solving a global problem (the local equations are posed in different subdomains, patches of elements surrounding a node, also denoted as *stars*)
- they provide upper bound estimates
- they circumvent the necessity of finding proper tractions as boundary conditions for the local problems. The local boundary conditions are *natural* and the estimates are also said to be *flux-free*.

In order to localize the error equation (4), use is made of the partition of unity property. Let ϕ_i be the linear finite element interpolation function associated with the i th vertex node of the mesh. Note that these functions sum up to the unity and that the support of ϕ_i is precisely the patch of elements containing this node, ω_i . Thus, a local version of (4) in ω_i , providing a local approximation $\sigma_e^{\star i}$ of the stress error, is readily recovered as

$$\bar{a}_{\omega_i}(\sigma_e^{\star i}, \sigma(\mathbf{v})) = R(\phi_i \mathbf{v}) \quad (14)$$

for all \mathbf{v} taking values in ω_i , being $\bar{a}_{\omega_i}(\cdot, \cdot)$ the restriction of $\bar{a}(\cdot, \cdot)$ to ω_i . The sum of the local approximations to the stress error $\sigma_e^{\star i}$ provide a statically admissible stress field σ_e and its corresponding error norm is a sharp upper bound of the error, see [15]. The local problem (14) is automatically equilibrated in most of the cases because the right-hand side vanishes for \mathbf{v} equal to a rigid body motion. In the unique case in which this equilibrium is not automatically guaranteed (linear elements for structural mechanics) a straightforward modification is introduced to ensure solvability, see [15].

Similar approaches are developed taking $\bar{a}_{\omega_i}(\cdot, \cdot)$ as a locally weighted version of $\bar{a}(\cdot, \cdot)$, see [4, 12, 13]. In this case the upper bound estimate is obtained adding the squared norms of the local contributions rather than adding the functions and computing the norm afterwards. The estimates obtained following this rationale are not as sharp as the ones obtained taking $\bar{a}_{\omega_i}(\cdot, \cdot)$ as simple restriction of $\bar{a}(\cdot, \cdot)$.

4 Goal-Oriented Estimates

Assessing the energy norm of the error is not sufficient for many applications. In practice, the finite element user is interested in specific magnitudes extracted from the global solution by some post-process. These magnitudes are referred as *quantities of interest* or *functional outputs*. Goal-oriented error assessment strategies aim at estimating the error committed in these quantities and possibly providing bounds for it.

The quantities of interest considered here are linear functional outputs of the solution, $l^O(\mathbf{u})$. In particular, those expressed in the form

$$l^O(u) = \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{O}} \cdot \mathbf{u} \, d\Omega + \int_{\Gamma_N} \mathbf{t}^{\mathcal{O}} \cdot \mathbf{u} \, d\Gamma + a(\mathbf{u}, \chi^{\mathcal{O}}), \quad (15)$$

where $\mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{O}}$, $\mathbf{t}^{\mathcal{O}}$ and $\chi^{\mathcal{O}}$ are given functions characterizing the quantity of interest. Note that $l^O(\cdot)$ has the same structure as the right-hand side of (2). The extension to nonlinear outputs is discussed in [17].

This expression is pretty general and accounts for a large variety of quantities of interest. The first term in (15) is a weighted average of the displacements, being $\mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{O}}$ the weight. Note that this average is restricted to the support of $\mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{O}}$ which is in practice the way of indicating the zone of interest. Similarly, the second term in (15) accounts for averaged displacements along a part of the Neumann boundary. Note that displacements on the Dirichlet boundary, Γ_D , are known a priori and therefore it makes not sense to include in the quantity of interest averaged displacements on Γ_D . On the contrary, tractions on Γ_D are generally interesting for the end-users, as they are reaction forces on the supports. In fact, this kind of quantities are accounted by the third term in (15). At first sight, the third term in (15) only represents an average of the stresses in the interior of the domain of study. However, a proper choice of function $\chi^{\mathcal{O}}$ allows also representing traction averages along Γ_D . This is readily demonstrated by noting that

$$\int_{\Gamma_D} \chi^{\mathcal{O}} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n}) \, d\Gamma = a(\mathbf{u}, \chi^{\mathcal{O}}) - \int_{\Gamma_N} \mathbf{t} \cdot \chi^{\mathcal{O}} \, d\Gamma - \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{b} \cdot \chi^{\mathcal{O}} \, d\Omega. \quad (16)$$

Equation (16) is obtained after the usual algebraic manipulation, using the weighted residuals technique into the original equation (1), taking $\chi^{\mathcal{O}}$, which does not vanish on Γ_D , as weighting function. It is clear from (16) that the third term in (15) is a traction average on Γ_D plus a computable term involving part of the data.

The expression (15) allows also determining pointwise quantities by using functions of the Dirac delta type although in practice smeared versions are preferred (averages in neighborhoods of the point) in order to avoid singularities.

The objective of the goal-oriented error assessment is to estimate the value of $l^O(\mathbf{e})$ which, for linear outputs, coincides with $l^O(\mathbf{u}) - l^O(\mathbf{u}_H)$.

As pointed out in the previous section, the enhanced stresses $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*$ can only be used to assess the energy norm of the error. Thus, an error representation is needed to express the error in the quantity of interest in terms of the energy error. This error representation requires introducing an auxiliary problem, denoted as *adjoint* or *dual* problem by different authors. This problem reads: find $\psi \in \mathcal{V}$ such that

$$a(\mathbf{v}, \psi) = l^O(\mathbf{v}), \text{ for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (17)$$

Note that the adjoint solution ψ lies in the space \mathcal{V} (that is vanishes on Γ_D) and that, for the sake of clarity, the order of the arguments in $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ is switched with respect to the original equation (2). The numerical solution of the adjoint problem (17), ψ^h , has the associated error $\varepsilon := \psi - \psi^h$. These auxiliary functions are introduced such

that the following error representation holds:

$$l^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{e}) = a(\mathbf{e}, \psi) = a(\mathbf{e}, \varepsilon).$$

This error representation allows bounding the error in terms of the energy norm of the errors in the direct and adjoint problem. This is a direct consequence of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, namely

$$|l^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{e})| = |a(\mathbf{e}, \varepsilon)| \leq \|\mathbf{e}\| \|\varepsilon\|. \quad (18)$$

An obvious error bound for the quantity of interest follows: $l^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{e})$ ranges between $\pm \|\mathbf{e}\| \|\varepsilon\|$. Thus, an upper bound of the quantity of interest (in absolute value) is obtained if upper bounds for $\|\mathbf{e}\|$ and $\|\varepsilon\|$ are available. The sharpness of this upper and lower bounding of the error in the quantity of interest is improved by considering the so-called parallelogram identity:

$$l^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{e}) = \frac{1}{4} \|\kappa \mathbf{e} + \frac{1}{\kappa} \varepsilon\|^2 - \frac{1}{4} \|\kappa \mathbf{e} - \frac{1}{\kappa} \varepsilon\|^2 \quad (19)$$

standing for any non-zero factor κ . It follows from (19) that an upper bound for $l^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{e})$ is obtained by combining an upper bound for $\|\kappa \mathbf{e} + \frac{1}{\kappa} \varepsilon\|$ and a lower bound for $\|\kappa \mathbf{e} - \frac{1}{\kappa} \varepsilon\|$ (using zero as a lower bound is a not sharp but robust option). Conversely a lower bound for $l^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{e})$ is obtained by combining a lower bound for $\|\kappa \mathbf{e} + \frac{1}{\kappa} \varepsilon\|$ and an upper bound for $\|\kappa \mathbf{e} - \frac{1}{\kappa} \varepsilon\|$. In practice, if the lower bounds are properly assessed, this alternative is much sharper than using only (18) and usually allows determining the sign of $l^{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{e})$ because both upper and lower bounds may have the same sign.

4.1 Lower Bounds for the Energy Using Implicit Dirichlet Estimates

Recall that in order to get sharp bounds of the error in the quantities of interest using (19), it is important to obtain lower bounds of the energy norm of the error. Any continuous approximation of the displacement error, $\mathbf{e}^* \in \mathcal{V}$, is such that $R(\mathbf{e}^*) \|\mathbf{e}^*\|^{-1} \leq \|\mathbf{e}\|$. This is a direct consequence of taking $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{e}^*$ in (4) (this is only possible if \mathbf{e}^* is continuous) and use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Thus, a lower bound is easily recovered after \mathbf{e}^* .

The simplest way of guaranteeing continuity by solving local residual problems is to use homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions (prescribe displacements equal to zero) on the boundary of the local subdomains. This idea was used in [6] solving such problems elementwise and then complementing the estimate by adding the contribution of a new family of subdomains overlapping the elements while keeping the lower bound property in the resulting error assessment.

The continuous estimate \mathbf{e}^* can also be obtained using the recovery techniques or postprocessing the local solution of the residual type estimates based on Neumann local problems as described in [7]. Obviously, the quality of the resulting lower bound depends on how well \mathbf{e}^* approximates \mathbf{e} , in particular, for $\mathbf{e}^* = \mathbf{e}$, $R(\mathbf{e}^*)\|\mathbf{e}^*\|^{-1} = \|\mathbf{e}\|$ and the estimate is therefore exact.

Note that the energy norm assessment and energy bounds for the direct (or primal) and adjoint problems (or the combined problems yielding $\kappa\mathbf{e} \pm \frac{1}{\kappa}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$) are the basic underlying tools for goal oriented assessment.

References

1. M. Ainsworth, J.T. Oden, A posteriori error estimation in finite element analysis, in *Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York)* (Wiley-Interscience [Wiley], Chichester, 2000)
2. M. Ainsworth, J.T. Oden, A unified approach to a posteriori error estimation using element residual methods. *Numer. Math.* **65**(1), 23–50 (1993)
3. R.E. Bank, A. Weiser, Some a posteriori error estimators for elliptic partial differential equations. *Math. Comput.* **170**(44), 283–301 (1985)
4. C. Carstensen, S.A. Funken, Fully reliable localized error control in the FEM. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **4**(21), 1465–1484 (1999–2000)
5. L. Chamoin, P. Ladevèze, A non-intrusive method for the calculation of strict and efficient bounds of calculated outputs of interest in linear viscoelasticity problems. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.* **197**(9–12), 994–1014 (2008)
6. P. Díez, J.J. Egozcue, A. Huerta, A posteriori error estimation for standard finite element analysis. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.* **163**(1–4), 141–157 (1998)
7. P. Díez, N. Parés, A. Huerta, Recovering lower bounds of the error by postprocessing implicit residual a posteriori error estimates. *Int. J. Numer. Methods Eng.* **10**(56), 1465–1488 (2003)
8. B. Fraeijs de Veubeke, Displacement and equilibrium models in the finite element method, in *Zienkiewicz and Holister, Editors, Stress Analysis* (Wiley, London, 1965). *Int. J. Numer. Methods Eng.*, Classical Reprint Series **52**, 287–342 (2001)
9. P. Ladevèze, D. Leguillon, Error estimate procedure in the finite element method and applications. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **20**(3), 485–509 (1983)
10. P. Ladevèze, E.A.W. Maunder, A general method for recovering equilibrating element tractions. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.* **137**(41), 111–151 (1996)
11. P. Ladevèze, J.-P. Pelle, P. Rougeot, Error estimation and mesh optimization for classical finite elements Engineering Computations. *Int. J. Comput.-Aided Eng. Softw.* **8**(1), 69–80 (1991)
12. L. Machiels, Y. Maday, A.T. Patera, et al., A “flux-free” nodal Neumann subproblem approach to output bounds for partial differential equations. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Série I. Math.* **330**, 249–254 (2000)
13. P. Morin, R.H. Nochetto, K.G. Siebert, Local problems on stars: a posteriori error estimators, convergence, and performance. *Math. Comput.* **243**(72), 1067–1097 (2003)
14. N. Parés, J. Bonet, A. Huerta, J. Peraire, The computation of bounds for linear-functional outputs of weak solutions to the two-dimensional elasticity equations. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.* **195**(4–6), 406–429 (2006)
15. N. Parés, P. Díez, A. Huerta, Subdomain-based flux-free a posteriori error estimators. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.* **195**(4–6), 297–323 (2006)
16. A.M. Sauer-Budge, J. Bonet, A. Huerta, J. Peraire, Computing bounds for linear functionals of exact weak solutions to Poisson’s equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **42**(4), 1610–1630 (2004)
17. Z.C. Xuan, N. Parés, J. Peraire, Computing upper and lower bounds for the J -integral in two-dimensional linear elasticity. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng.* **195**(4–6), 430–443 (2006)

Verifying Calculations - Forty Years On
An Overview of Classical Verification Techniques for FEM
Simulations

Chamoin, L.; Diez, P. (Eds.)

2016, VII, 94 p. 20 illus., Softcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-20552-6