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#### Abstract

Explicit a priori error bounds for the approximation by the $H_{0}^{1}$-projection into piecewise polynomial spaces are given. In particular, for the quadratic approximation, the optimal constant is derived, and a nearly optimal value for the cubic is obtained. These constants play an important role in the numerical verification method of finite element solutions for nonlinear elliptic equations. © 1998 Academic Press


## 1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this article is to bound the $L^{2}$-norm of the error in the least-squares approximation by piecewise polynomials in terms of the $L^{2}$-norm of the first derivative of the function being approximated. However, we prefer to describe this problem in the terms of the following application.

Let $u \in H_{0}^{1}(I) \cap H^{2}(I)$ be a function defined on the interval $I:=[0,1]$. We set a partition of $I$,

$$
\Delta: 0=x_{0}<x_{1}<\cdots<x_{m}=1,
$$

and the mesh size of this partition,

$$
h:=\max _{1 \leqslant i \leqslant m}\left(x_{i}-x_{i-1}\right) .
$$

For any nonnegative integer $N$, we define the piecewise polynomial space of degree $N+1$,

$$
\begin{align*}
S_{\Delta, N}(I):= & \{p \in C(I) \mid p \text { is a polynomial of degree } \leqslant N+1 \\
& \text { on each subinterval } \left.\left[x_{i-1}, x_{i}\right], 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m, \text { with } p(0)=p(1)=0\right\} . \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

We define the $H_{0}^{1}$-projection of $u$ onto $S_{\Delta, N}(I)$ by

$$
P_{\Delta, N} u \in S_{\Delta, N}(I), \quad \text { such that } \quad\left(\left(P_{\Delta, N} u\right)^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right)=\left(u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right), \quad \forall v \in S_{\Delta, N}(I),
$$

where $(u, v):=\left[\int_{0}^{1} u(x) v(x) d x\right]^{1 / 2}$ means the inner product in $L^{2}(I)$.
We consider error bounds for the $H_{0}^{1}$-projection of the form

$$
\left\|u^{\prime}-\left(P_{\Delta, N} u\right)^{\prime}\right\| \leqslant C h\left\|u^{\prime \prime}\right\|,
$$

where $\|u\|:=(u, u)^{1 / 2}$, and seek the smallest possible $C$, i.e., the number

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{N}:=\sup _{\Delta} \sup _{u \in H_{0}^{1}(I) \cap H^{2}(I), u \neq 0} \frac{\left\|u^{\prime}-\left(P_{\Delta, N} u\right)^{\prime}\right\|}{h\left\|u^{\prime \prime}\right\|} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, $C_{N}$ depends only on $N$. When we are not able to determine $C_{N}$ exactly, we look for good lower and upper bounds, i.e., for $\underline{C}_{N}$ and $\bar{C}_{N}$ with

$$
\underline{C}_{N} \leqslant C_{N} \leqslant \bar{C}_{N} .
$$

The explicit value of $C_{0}$ (i.e., for $N=0$, the piecewise linear case) equals $1 / \pi$. Indeed, by the facts that the piecewise linear interpolation coincides with the $H_{0}^{1}$-projection and the error estimates in [8, Theorem 2.5], we have

$$
\left\|u^{\prime}-\left(P_{\Delta, 0} u\right)^{\prime}\right\| \leqslant \frac{h}{\pi}\left\|u^{\prime \prime}\right\| .
$$

Equality holds iff $u(x)=\sin (\pi x / h)$ and $\Delta$ is a uniform partition. Therefore, $C_{0}=1 / \pi$.

In this paper, we present the following results:

- We show that $C_{1}=1 /(2 \pi)$.
- We obtain the nearly optimal bounds $1 / 8.98954 \leqslant C_{2} \leqslant 1 / 8.92338$ for the cubic case, $N=2$.


## 2. EXPLICIT ESTIMATES FOR $C_{N}$

### 2.1. Reduction of the Problem

As is well known, $u-P_{\Delta, N} u$ vanishes at $x_{i}$ for all $0 \leqslant i \leqslant m$ (e.g., [8]) and, on each interval $\left[x_{i}, x_{i+1}\right.$ ], depends only on $u$ on that interval. So we can reduce the problem of calculating $C_{N}$ to each subinterval. Moreover,
by a simple scaling, it is sufficient to consider only the case $m=1$. Therefore,

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{N}=\sup _{u \in H_{0}^{1}(I) \cap H^{2}(I), u \neq 0} \frac{\left\|u^{\prime}-\left(P_{N} u\right)^{\prime}\right\|}{\left\|u^{\prime \prime}\right\|} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
P_{N}:=P_{I, N} .
$$

We also define another projection $\bar{u} \in Q_{n}(I):=S_{I, N}(I)$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{u}=P_{N}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{\left(u, s_{k}\right)}{\left\|s_{k}\right\|^{2}} s_{k}\right], \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $s_{k}(x):=\sin (k \pi x)$, all $k$, and use it to determine a suitable constant $\bar{C}_{N}$ which satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u^{\prime}-\left(P_{N} u\right)^{\prime}\right\| \leqslant\left\|u^{\prime}-\bar{u}^{\prime \prime}\right\| \leqslant \bar{C}_{N}\left\|u^{\prime \prime}\right\|, \quad \forall u \in H_{0}^{1}(I) \cap H^{2}(I), \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

as an upper bound for $C_{N}$.

### 2.2. The Case of Polynomials of Degree 2

We obtained the following theorem for $N=1$.

Theorem 1. In the quadratic case, the exact constant is $C_{1}=1 /(2 \pi)$.
Proof. For any function $u \in H_{0}^{1}(I) \cap H^{2}(I)$, using the Fourier expansion of $u$,

$$
u(x) \sim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} u_{k} \sin (k \pi x),
$$

the first derivative, $\bar{u}^{\prime}$, of the function $\bar{u}$ defined in (4) can be written as

$$
\bar{u}^{\prime}=u_{1}\left(\pi c_{1}, L_{1}\right) L_{1},
$$

where, here and below, $c_{k}(x):=\cos (k \pi x)$, and $L_{i}$ is the $i$ th normalized Legendre polynomial defined by

$$
L_{i}(x):=\frac{\sqrt{2 i+1}}{i!} \frac{d^{i}}{d x^{i}}\left(x^{i}(1-x)^{i}\right) .
$$

Considering the orthogonality of the trigonometric functions, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|u^{\prime}-\bar{u}^{\prime}\right\|^{2}= & \left\|u_{1} \pi c_{1}\right\|^{2}-\left\|u_{1}\left(\pi c_{1}, L_{1}\right) L_{1}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} u_{k} k \pi c_{k}\right\|^{2} \\
& -2 u_{1}\left(\pi c_{1}, L_{1}\right)\left(L_{1}, \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} u_{k} k \pi c_{k}\right) . \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

From this, by Parseval's equality and the property of the $H_{0}^{1}$-projection,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u^{\prime}-\bar{u}^{\prime}\right\|^{2}=\left(\frac{\pi^{2}}{2}-\frac{48}{\pi^{2}}\right) u_{1}^{2}+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{(k \pi)^{2}}{2} u_{k}^{2}-\frac{96}{\pi^{2}} u_{1} \sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \frac{u_{2 l-1}}{2 l-1} . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

For arbitrary $\gamma_{1}>0$, this can be bounded as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u^{\prime}-\bar{u}^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leqslant\left(\frac{\pi^{2}}{2}-\frac{48}{\pi^{2}}\right) u_{1}^{2}+\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{(k \pi)^{2}}{2} u_{k}^{2}+\frac{48}{\pi^{2}}\left(\gamma_{1} u_{1}^{2}+\frac{1}{\gamma_{1}} \sum_{l=2}^{\infty}\left(\frac{u_{2 l-1}}{2 l-1}\right)^{2}\right), \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have used the inequality

$$
2|a b| \leqslant \gamma_{1} a^{2}+\frac{1}{\gamma_{1}} b^{2} \quad\left(\forall \gamma_{1}>0\right) .
$$

Moreover, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\left(\sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \frac{u_{2 l-1}}{2 l-1}\right)^{2}= & \left(\sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2 l-1)^{3}} \cdot(2 l-1)^{2} u_{2 l-1}\right)^{2} \\
& \leqslant\left(\sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2 l-1)^{6}}\right)\left(\sum_{l=2}^{\infty}(2 l-1)^{4} u_{2 l-1^{2}}^{2}\right) \\
& =\left(\frac{\left(2^{6}-1\right) \pi^{6}}{2 \cdot 6!} B_{6}-1\right)\left(\sum_{l=2}^{\infty}(2 l-1)^{4} u_{2 l-1}{ }^{2}\right) \\
& =\left(\frac{\pi^{6}}{960}-1\right)\left(\sum_{l=2}^{\infty}(2 l-1)^{4} u_{2 l-1}^{2}\right), \tag{9}
\end{align*}
$$

where $B_{n}$ is the Bernoulli number.
Thus, from (6)-(9), we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|u^{\prime}-\bar{u}^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leqslant & \left(\frac{\pi^{2}}{2}-\frac{48}{\pi^{2}}+\frac{48}{\pi^{2}} \gamma_{1}\right) u_{1}{ }^{2} \\
& +\sum_{l=2}^{\infty}\left[\frac{((2 l-1) \pi)^{2}}{2}+\frac{48}{\pi^{2}}\left(\frac{\pi^{6}}{960}-1\right)(2 l-1)^{4} \frac{1}{\gamma_{1}}\right] u_{2 l-1}{ }^{2} \\
& +\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2 l \pi)^{2}}{2} u_{2 l}{ }^{2} . \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

Now observe that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u^{\prime \prime}\right\|^{2}=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(k \pi)^{4}}{2} u_{k}^{2}, \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

from the Fourier expansion of $u^{\prime \prime}$ and Parseval's equality. By comparing the corresponding coefficients of each $u_{k}^{2}$ in (10) and (11), we get the following sufficient conditions for $\bar{C}_{1}$ in (5):
(i) $\frac{\pi^{2}}{2}-\frac{48}{\pi^{2}}+\frac{48}{\pi^{2}} \gamma_{1} \leqslant \frac{\pi^{4}}{2} \bar{C}_{1}^{2}$,
(ii) $\frac{((2 l-1) \pi)^{2}}{2}+\frac{48}{\pi^{2}}\left(\frac{\pi^{6}}{960}-1\right)(2 l-1)^{4} \frac{1}{\gamma_{1}}$

$$
\leqslant \frac{((2 l-1) \pi)^{4}}{2} \bar{C}_{1}^{2} \quad(\forall l \geqslant 2),
$$

(iii) $\frac{1}{(2 l \pi)^{2}} \leqslant \bar{C}_{1}^{2} \quad(\forall l \geqslant 1)$.

Condition (i) is equivalent to

$$
\text { (i) } \gamma_{1} \leqslant \frac{\pi^{4}}{96}\left(\bar{C}_{1}^{2} \pi^{2}-1\right)+1 .
$$

Condition (ii) is equivalent to

$$
\frac{48}{\pi^{2} \gamma_{1}}\left(\frac{\pi^{6}}{960}-1\right) \leqslant \frac{\pi^{2}}{2}\left(\bar{C}_{1}^{2} \pi^{2}-\frac{1}{(2 l-1)^{2}}\right) \quad(\forall l \geqslant 2),
$$

and this can be reduced to the inequality for the smallest $l$, i.e., $l=2$,

$$
\frac{48}{\pi^{2} \gamma_{1}}\left(\frac{\pi^{6}}{960}-1\right) \leqslant \frac{\pi^{2}}{2}\left(\bar{C}_{1}^{2} \pi^{2}-\frac{1}{9}\right) .
$$

So we have the following condition equivalent to (ii):

$$
\text { (ii)' } \frac{96}{\pi^{4}}\left(\frac{\pi^{6}}{960}-1\right)\left(\bar{C}_{1}^{2} \pi^{2}-\frac{1}{9}\right)^{-1} \leqslant \gamma_{1} .
$$

By (i) ${ }^{\prime}$ and (ii) ${ }^{\prime}$, the existence of $\gamma_{1}>0$ is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\pi^{6}}{10}-96 \leqslant \pi^{4}\left(\frac{\pi^{4}}{96}\left(\pi^{2} \bar{C}_{1}^{2}-1\right)+1\right)\left(\pi^{2} \bar{C}_{1}^{2}-\frac{1}{9}\right) . \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easily seen that the smallest $\bar{C}_{1}$ satisfying this inequality is smaller than $1 /(2 \pi)$ which is the minimal solution of (iii). Thus, we obtain (5) with $\bar{C}_{1}=1 /(2 \pi)$ for this case. On the other hand, for $u=s_{2}$, we have $u^{\prime}=2 \pi c_{2}$, while $\left(P_{1} u\right)^{\prime}=0$ and $u^{\prime \prime}=-4 \pi^{2} s_{2}$, hence $\left\|u^{\prime}-\left(P_{1} u\right)^{\prime}\right\| /\left\|u^{\prime \prime}\right\|=1 /(2 \pi)$. Thus, $C_{1}=\bar{C}_{1}=1 /(2 \pi)$.

### 2.3. The Case of Polynomials of Degree 3

It is tempting to deduce from the cases $N=0$ and $N=1$ that, for any $N$,

$$
C_{N}=\frac{1}{(N+1) \pi} .
$$

But, already for $N=2$, we found the counterexample

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{u}(x):=\sin \left(\frac{\pi x}{h}\right)^{3}, \quad \frac{1}{3 \pi}<\frac{\left\|\underline{u}^{\prime}-\left(P_{2} \underline{u}\right)^{\prime}\right\|}{h\left\|\underline{u}^{\prime \prime}\right\|} \approx \frac{1}{8.98954} . \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, we adopt the right-hand side as $\underline{C}_{2}$.
As to an upper bound, $\bar{C}_{2}$, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2. For any $u \in H_{0}^{1}(I) \cap H^{2}(I)$ and its $H_{0}^{1}$-projection $P_{2} u$ into $Q_{2}(I)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|u^{\prime}-\left(P_{2} u\right)^{\prime}\right\| \leqslant \bar{C}_{2}\left\|u^{\prime \prime}\right\| \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{C}_{2}:= & \frac{1}{3 \sqrt{5} \pi^{3}} \\
& \times\left(-2160+25 \pi^{4}+4 \sqrt{5} \sqrt{-174960-1080 \pi^{4}+243 \pi^{6}+5 \pi^{8}}\right)^{1 / 2} \\
\approx & \frac{1}{8.92337} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. First note that, for $\bar{u}$ given in (4), $\bar{u}^{\prime}$ can be written as

$$
\bar{u}^{\prime}=u_{1}\left(\pi c_{1}, L_{1}\right) L_{1}+u_{2}\left(2 \pi c_{2}, L_{2}\right) L_{2} .
$$

Considering the orthogonality of the trigonometric functions, Parseval's equality, and the property of $H_{0}^{1}$-projection, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|u^{\prime}-\bar{u}^{\prime}\right\|^{2}= & \left\|u_{1} \pi c_{1}\right\|^{2}-\left\|u_{1}\left(\pi c_{1}, L_{1}\right) L_{1}\right\|^{2} \\
& +\left\|u_{2} 2 \pi c_{2}\right\|^{2}-\left\|u_{2}\left(2 \pi c_{2}, L_{2}\right) L_{2}\right\|^{2}+\left\|\sum_{k=3}^{\infty} u_{k} k \pi c_{k}\right\|^{2} \\
& -2 u_{1}\left(\pi c_{1}, L_{1}\right)\left(L_{1}, \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} u_{k} k \pi c_{k}\right) \\
& -2 u_{2}\left(2 \pi c_{2}, L_{2}\right)\left(L_{2}, \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} u_{k} k \pi c_{k}\right) \\
= & \left(\frac{\pi^{2}}{2}-\frac{48}{\pi^{2}}\right) u_{1}^{2}+\left(2 \pi^{2}-\frac{180}{\pi^{2}}\right) u_{2}^{2} \\
& +\sum_{k=3}^{\infty} \frac{(k \pi)^{2}}{2} u_{k}^{2}-2 \cdot \frac{48}{\pi^{2}} u_{1} \sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \frac{u_{2 l-1}}{2 l-1} \\
& -2 \cdot \frac{180}{\pi^{2}} u_{2} \sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \frac{u_{2 l}}{2 l}, \tag{15}
\end{align*}
$$

Arguing as in the proof for Theorem 1 and with the equality

$$
\sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l^{6}}=\frac{(2 \pi)^{6}}{2 \cdot 6!} B_{6}-1=\frac{\pi^{6}}{945}-1,
$$

we have, for arbitrary $\gamma_{1}>0$ and $\gamma_{2}>0$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|u^{\prime}-\bar{u}^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \leqslant & \left(\frac{\pi^{2}}{2}-\frac{48}{\pi^{2}}+\frac{48}{\pi^{2}} \gamma_{1}\right) u_{1}^{2} \\
& +\sum_{l=2}^{\infty}\left[\frac{((2 l-1) \pi)^{2}}{2}+\frac{48}{\pi^{2}}\left(\frac{\pi^{6}}{960}-1\right)(2 l-1)^{4} \frac{1}{\gamma_{1}}\right] u_{2 l-1}^{2} \\
& +\left(\frac{(2 \pi)^{2}}{2}-\frac{180}{\pi^{2}}+\frac{180}{\pi^{2}} \gamma_{2}\right) u_{2}^{2} \\
& +\sum_{l=2}^{\infty}\left[\frac{((2 l) \pi)^{2}}{2}+\frac{180}{\pi^{2}} \frac{1}{16}\left(\frac{\pi^{6}}{945}-1\right)(2 l)^{4} \frac{1}{\gamma_{2}}\right] u_{2 l}^{2} . \tag{16}
\end{align*}
$$

By comparing the corresponding coefficients in the above and (11), we obtain sufficient conditions for $\bar{C}_{2}$ in (5):
(I) $\frac{\pi^{2}}{2}-\frac{48}{\pi^{2}}+\frac{48}{\pi^{2}} \gamma_{1} \leqslant \frac{\pi^{4}}{2} \bar{C}_{2}^{2} \quad$ (coefficients of $u_{1}^{2}$ ),
(II) $\frac{((2 l-1) \pi)^{2}}{2}+\frac{48}{\pi^{2}}\left(\frac{\pi^{6}}{960}-1\right)(2 l-1)^{4} \frac{1}{\gamma_{1}} \leqslant \frac{((2 l-1) \pi)^{4}}{2} \bar{C}_{2}^{2}$
$(\forall l \geqslant 2)$ (coefficients of $u_{k}^{2}$ for odd integers $k \geqslant 3$ ),
(III) $\frac{(2 \pi)^{2}}{2}-\frac{180}{\pi^{2}}+\frac{180}{\pi^{2}} \gamma_{2} \leqslant \frac{(2 \pi)^{4}}{2} \bar{C}_{2}^{2} \quad$ (coefficients of $u_{2}^{2}$ ),
(IV) $\frac{(2 l \pi)^{2}}{2}+\frac{180}{\pi^{2}} \frac{1}{16}\left(\frac{\pi^{6}}{945}-1\right)(2 l)^{4} \frac{1}{\gamma_{2}} \leqslant \frac{(2 l \pi)^{4}}{2} \bar{C}_{2}^{2}$
$(\forall l \geqslant 2)$ (coefficients of $u_{k}^{2}$ for even integers $k \geqslant 4$ ).
We now try to find the smallest $\bar{C}_{2}>0$ for which there exists $\gamma_{1}>0$ and $\gamma_{2}>0$ satisfying (I)-(IV). This problem is reduced to getting the smallest solution of the following three inequalities for $\bar{C}_{2}^{2}$ (the first, from (I) and (II), is just (12), the second follows from (III) and (IV), the third by (13)):

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{\pi^{6}}{10}-96 & \leqslant \pi^{4}\left(\frac{\pi^{4}}{96}\left(\pi^{2} \bar{C}_{2}^{2}-1\right)+1\right)\left(\pi^{2} \bar{C}_{2}^{2}-\frac{1}{9}\right) \\
\frac{\pi^{6}}{84}-\frac{45}{4} & \leqslant \pi^{4}\left(\frac{\pi^{4}}{180}\left(4 \pi^{2} \bar{C}_{2}^{2}-1\right)+\frac{1}{2}\right)\left(\pi^{2} \bar{C}_{2}^{2}-\frac{1}{16}\right) \\
\frac{1}{3 \pi} & <\bar{C}_{2} \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

Straightforward calculations of the solution range of each of these inequalities show that the desired minimal solution $\bar{C}_{2}$ of (I)-(IV) is provided by the larger of the two places of equality in the first inequality in (17). This is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\bar{C}_{2}:= & \frac{1}{3 \sqrt{5} \pi^{3}} \\
& \times\left(-2160+25 \pi^{4}+4 \sqrt{5} \sqrt{-174960-1080 \pi^{4}+243 \pi^{6}+5 \pi^{8}}\right)^{1 / 2} \tag{18}
\end{align*}
$$

and thus Theorem 2 is proved.

## 3. AN APPLICATION: THE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CASE

In the present section, we show that our result can be extended to the multidimensional case that involves the tensor product of one-dimensional piecewise polynomial spaces.

Let $\Omega$ be a bounded convex domain in $\mathbf{R}^{n} .(\cdot, \cdot)_{L^{2}(\Omega)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}$ denote the inner product and the associated norm in $L^{2}(\Omega)$, respectively. We use several Sobolev spaces such as $H^{1}(\Omega), H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$, and so on. In particular,

$$
|\psi|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}:=\left[\sum_{|\alpha|=2}\left\|D^{\alpha} \psi\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}
$$

denotes the semi-norm of $H^{2}(\Omega)$ where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha & =:\left(\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right), \quad \alpha_{j} \in \mathbf{N}, \\
|\alpha| & :=\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}+\cdots+\alpha_{n}, \\
D^{\alpha} \psi & :=\frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} \psi}{\partial x_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} \partial x_{2}^{\alpha_{2}} \cdots \partial x_{n}^{\alpha_{n}}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We only describe an example for the case of the region $\Omega=[0,1] \times[0,1]$, but the higher dimensional extension will be straightforward. We consider the tensor product space of the one dimensional piecewise polynomials of degree $\leqslant N+1$. Since the $H_{0}^{1}$-projection $P u$ of $u \in H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$ into the approximation space $S(\Omega):=S_{\Delta, N}(I) \otimes S_{\Delta, N}(I)$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\nabla(u-P u)\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leqslant\|\nabla(u-v)\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \quad \text { for } \quad \forall v \in S(\Omega) \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

we obtain the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\nabla(u-P u)\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leqslant\left\|\nabla\left(u-P_{y} P_{x} u\right)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} . \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here, $P_{x} u(\cdot, y)$ means the one dimensional $H_{0}^{1}$-projection in $x$ for fixed $y$, and $P_{y}(x, \cdot)$ as well.

Then, by (2), we have

$$
\left\|u-P_{x} u\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leqslant C_{N} h\left\|u_{x}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} .
$$

Therefore, by the orthogonality of the $H_{0}^{1}$-projection, we get

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\|\left(u-P_{y} P_{x} u\right)_{x}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} & =\left\|\left(u-P_{x} u\right)_{x}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}+\left\|\left(P_{x} u-P_{y} P_{x} u\right)_{x}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \\
& =\left\|\left(u-P_{x} u\right)_{x}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}+\left\|\left(P_{x}\left(u-P_{y} u\right)\right)_{x}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \\
& \leqslant\left\|\left(u-P_{x} u\right)_{x}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}=\left\|\left(u-P_{y} u\right)_{x}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \\
& \leqslant C_{N}^{2} h^{2}\left(\left\|u_{x x}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}+\left\|u_{x y}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} .\right. \tag{21}
\end{align*}
$$

Similarly, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\left(u-P_{x} P_{y} u\right)_{y}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \leqslant C_{N}^{2} h^{2}\left(\left\|u_{y y}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}+\left\|u_{y x}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}\right) \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, we obtain the estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|\nabla(u-P u)\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leqslant C_{N} h|u|_{H^{2}(\Omega)}, \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

which implies that the same constant as in the one-dimensional case can also be used for two dimensions.

Remark. In the numerical verification methods for nonlinear elliptic boundary value problems, the magnitude of the constants in the a priori error estimates for finite element solutions of Poisson's equation plays an essential role $[6,7,9,10]$. In general, these constants have to be estimated as sharply as possible, because their size seriously affects the efficiency of verification cost. This is the principal motivation of our present work. The practical and efficient estimates of such constants for a triangular finite element mesh would also be an important task in the future.
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