

---

Analysis of a kinematic dynamo model  
with FEM–BEM coupling

W. Lemster, G. Lube, G. Of, O. Steinbach

---

**Berichte aus dem  
Institut für Numerische Mathematik**



# Technische Universität Graz

---

## Analysis of a kinematic dynamo model with FEM–BEM coupling

W. Lemster, G. Lube, G. Of, O. Steinbach

---

**Berichte aus dem  
Institut für Numerische Mathematik**

Bericht 2012/3

Technische Universität Graz  
Institut für Numerische Mathematik  
Steyrergasse 30  
A 8010 Graz

**WWW:** <http://www.numerik.math.tu-graz.ac.at>

© Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Nachdruck nur mit Genehmigung des Autors.

# Analysis of a kinematic dynamo model with FEM–BEM coupling

W. Lemster<sup>1</sup>, G. Lube<sup>1</sup>, G. Of<sup>2</sup>, O. Steinbach<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institut für Numerische und Angewandte Mathematik,  
Universität Göttingen  
Lotzestrasse 16–18, 37083 Göttingen, Germany  
lube@math.uni-goettingen.de

<sup>2</sup>Institut für Numerische Mathematik, TU Graz,  
Steyrergasse 30, 8010 Graz, Austria  
of@tugraz.at, o.steinbach@tugraz.at

## Abstract

We consider a kinematic dynamo model in a bounded interior region  $\Omega$  and in an insulating exterior region  $\Omega^c := \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{\Omega}$ . In the so-called direct problem, the magnetic field  $\mathbf{B}$  and the electric field  $\mathbf{E}$  are unknown, and which are driven by a given incompressible flow field  $\mathbf{w}$ . After eliminating  $\mathbf{E}$ , a vector and a scalar potential ansatz for  $\mathbf{B}$  in the interior and exterior domains, respectively, are applied, leading to a coupled interface problem. We apply a finite element approach in the bounded interior domain  $\Omega$ , whereas a symmetric boundary element approach in the unbounded exterior domain  $\Omega^c$  is used. We present results on the well-posedness of the continuous coupled variational formulation, prove well-posedness and stability of the semi-discretized and fully discretized schemes, and provide quasi-optimal error estimates for the fully discretized scheme. Finally we present some first numerical results.

## 1 Introduction

Large-scale planetary and stellar magnetic activities are driven by magnetohydrodynamic dynamo processes in the interior of planets and stars. In the convectively unstable case, they consist of large-scale global circulations and small-scale turbulent flows. A widely accepted theory for the generation of large-scale magnetic fields through the effect of small-scale turbulences in a conducting field is the mean-field dynamo theory [17] which will be considered here.

Starting point are the full Maxwell equations

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{E} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\mathbf{B}, \quad \nabla \times \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{j} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\mathbf{D}, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D} = \varrho,$$

where the dielectric displacement  $\mathbf{D}$  and the magnetic field intensity  $\mathbf{H}$  are expressed through the electric field  $\mathbf{E}$  and the magnetic field  $\mathbf{B}$ , respectively, by the constitutive relations

$$\mathbf{D} = \varepsilon\mathbf{E}, \quad \mathbf{H} = \frac{1}{\mu}\mathbf{B}$$

with the magnetic permeability  $\mu$  and the electric permittivity  $\varepsilon$ .

If  $\mathbf{w}$  is a given incompressible flow field, we can write an extended Ohm's law as

$$\mathbf{j} = \sigma \left( \mathbf{E} + \mathbf{w} \times \mathbf{B} + \frac{Rf}{1 + s|\mathbf{B}|^2}\mathbf{B} \right),$$

where  $\sigma$  is the electric conductivity. The nonlinear saturation term is a turbulence modelling term from the mean-field dynamo theory [6, Section 6.2] where the turbulent electromotive force  $\mathcal{E} = \langle \hat{\mathbf{w}} \times \hat{\mathbf{B}} \rangle$  is a key quantity. Here  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  indicates an average in the dynamo domain, and  $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$  denote the fluctuating small-scale velocity and magnetic fields. Following [4] we consider the  $\alpha$ -quenching approximation

$$\mathcal{E} \approx \alpha\mathbf{B} = \frac{Rf}{1 + s|\mathbf{B}|^2}\mathbf{B}$$

with a model-oriented function  $f$ , and positive parameters  $s$  and  $R$ . Moreover, following [6, Section 2.5] we neglect the Gauss law since the electric charge  $\varrho$  is very small, and we neglect the temporal change of the dielectric displacements. Finally we assume that the electric conductivity  $\sigma$  and the magnetic permeability  $\mu$  do not depend on time but satisfy  $\mu \geq \mu_{\min} > 0$  and  $0 < \sigma_{\min} \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_{\max}$  in a bounded interior domain  $\Omega$ . Since the exterior domain  $\Omega^c := \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \bar{\Omega}$  is assumed to be insulating, we have  $\sigma = 0$  and  $\mu = \mu_0$  is constant in  $\Omega^c$ . Hence we end up with the coupled problem

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{E} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\mathbf{B}, \quad \nabla \times \frac{1}{\mu}\mathbf{B} = \sigma \left( \mathbf{E} + \mathbf{w} \times \mathbf{B} + \frac{Rf}{1 + s|\mathbf{B}|^2}\mathbf{B} \right), \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (1.1)$$

and

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{E} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\mathbf{B}, \quad \nabla \times \frac{1}{\mu_0}\mathbf{B} = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega^c, \quad (1.2)$$

together with the transmission conditions

$$[\mathbf{n} \times (\mathbf{H} \times \mathbf{n})]_{|\Gamma} = 0, \quad [\mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{n}]_{|\Gamma} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma := \partial\Omega, \quad (1.3)$$

where  $[\cdot]_{|\Gamma}$  denotes the jump of a function across  $\Gamma$ , and  $\mathbf{n}$  is the exterior normal vector. Moreover, we have some initial condition  $\mathbf{B}(0) = \mathbf{B}_0$ ,  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B}_0 = 0$ .

Let us briefly comment on the literature. The majority of stellar and planetary dynamo models employs spectral methods with spherical harmonics which are not feasible in the case of variable data. For bounded domains, the standard approach for the finite element solution of Maxwell’s system is to use curl conforming elements, e.g., Nédélec elements, see [2, 3]. Alternatively, a saddle point approach with a (vanishing) pressure like Lagrange multiplier allows to apply Lagrangian finite elements [4]. In the case of discontinuous data, an interior penalty approach together with Lagrange finite elements is addressed in [7, 8, 14]. For the full space  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , a usual approach is a coupling of finite element (FEM) or finite volume (FVM) methods in a bounded domain with boundary element (BEM) methods in the remaining exterior domain. For a FVM–BEM coupling we refer, e.g., to [12, 24]. The idea of a symmetric FEM–BEM coupling for the stationary linear Maxwell system can be found in [13] and [10] which will be used in this paper as well. An hp–adaptive FEM–BEM coupling is considered in [23]. A comparison of the interior penalty finite element approach and a FVM–BEM coupling is considered in [9].

In the present paper we consider the coupled problem (1.1)–(1.3) where we first eliminate the electric field  $\mathbf{E}$  and apply a vector potential ansatz for the magnetic field  $\mathbf{B}$  in the interior domain  $\Omega$ , and a scalar potential ansatz for  $\mathbf{B}$  in the exterior domain  $\Omega^c$ . The coupling of both subproblems at the interface is accomplished by using both boundary integral equations of the exterior Calderón projection where we discuss two different approaches. Then we analyze the well–posedness of the arising continuous coupled problem which is formed by a time–dependent nonlinear problem in the interior, and a quasi–stationary elliptic problem in the exterior domain. For the spatial discretization we first introduce an approximation of the exterior Dirichlet to Neumann map, and apply lowest order Nédélec elements for a finite element discretization. For simplicity we only consider an implicit Euler scheme for the time discretization, but we prove well–posedness of the discrete system arising within each time step. Finally we present a priori error estimates of the fully discretized system, and we present some first numerical results.

## 2 Variational formulation

In this section, we specify the mathematical model and derive a variational formulation of the coupled problem (1.1)–(1.3). Later on, and following the approach in [13], this will be the basis of a symmetric coupling of finite element methods (FEM) and boundary element methods (BEM) in the discrete case. We start by using a vector potential ansatz to describe solutions of the interior problem (1.1), and a scalar potential ansatz for the exterior problem (1.2).

## 2.1 Interior problem

In the interior bounded domain  $\Omega$  we use a vector potential ansatz to describe the magnetic field  $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$ . From (1.1) we then obtain

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = \nabla \cdot (\nabla \times \mathbf{A}) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{B} + \nabla \times E = \nabla \times \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{E} \right) = \mathbf{0},$$

from which we further conclude

$$\mathbf{E} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{A} - \nabla \phi$$

for some scalar potential  $\phi$ . Hence we may introduce the new potential

$$\mathbf{u} := \mathbf{A} + \int_0^t \nabla \phi \, ds,$$

from which we conclude

$$\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{E} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{u}.$$

Inserting these expressions into the remaining equation of (1.1) we finally obtain the partial differential equation to be solved

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{u}(x, t) + \nabla_x \times \frac{1}{\mu(x)} (\nabla_x \times \mathbf{u}(x, t)) \\ - \sigma(x) \mathbf{w}(x, t) \times (\nabla_x \times \mathbf{u}(x, t)) - \frac{\sigma(x) Rf(x, t)}{1 + s |\nabla_x \times \mathbf{u}(x, t)|^2} \nabla_x \times \mathbf{u}(x, t) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

In order to prove ellipticity of the spatial linear second order partial differential operator in (2.1) we will use a scaling argument. Let  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_+$  be some parameter to be specified later in (3.4). We multiply the partial differential equation (2.1) with the nonnegative function  $e^{-\kappa t}$ , apply the product rule, and introduce  $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}(x, t) := e^{-\kappa t} \mathbf{u}(x, t)$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(x, t) + \sigma(x) \kappa \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(x, t) + \nabla_x \times \frac{1}{\mu(x)} (\nabla_x \times \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(x, t)) \\ - \sigma(x) \mathbf{w}(x, t) \times (\nabla_x \times \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(x, t)) - \frac{\sigma(x) Rf(x, t)}{1 + s e^{2\kappa t} |\nabla_x \times \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(x, t)|^2} \nabla_x \times \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(x, t) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

To derive a variational formulation which is related to (2.2) we first introduce the function space

$$H(\text{curl}; \Omega) := \{ \mathbf{v} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^3 \mid \text{curl } \mathbf{v} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^3 \}$$

with the graph norm

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)}^2 = \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\nabla \times \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$



Moreover, the duality pairing between the dual space  $[H(\text{curl}; \Omega)]^*$  and  $H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$  is denoted by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ , while the inner product in  $[L^2(\Omega)]^3$  is denoted by  $(\cdot, \cdot)$ . In addition we use  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\Gamma$  for the duality pairing on  $\Gamma$ . For the treatment of the time dependent partial differential equation (2.2), we consider the standard vector valued Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces  $L^q(0, T; W)$  and  $H^1(0, T; W) := W^{1,2}(0, T; W)$  with an appropriate Banach space  $W$ . Multiplication of the partial differential equation (2.2) with a test function  $\mathbf{v} \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$ , integration over the interior domain  $\Omega$ , and integration by parts, see, e.g., [1], lead to a variational formulation to find  $\widehat{\mathbf{u}} \in H^1(0, T; H(\text{curl}; \Omega))$  such that for all test functions  $\mathbf{v} \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$  and almost all  $t \in (0, T)$  there holds

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & \left( \sigma \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(t), \mathbf{v} \right) + \kappa \left( \sigma \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(t), \mathbf{v} \right) + \left( \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla \times \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(t), \nabla \times \mathbf{v} \right) - \left\langle \left( \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla \times \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(t) \right) \times \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{v} \right\rangle_\Gamma \\ & - \left( \sigma \mathbf{w}(t) \times (\nabla \times \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(t)), \mathbf{v} \right) - \left( \frac{\sigma Rf(t)}{1 + se^{2\kappa t} |\nabla \times \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(t)|^2} \nabla \times \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(t), \mathbf{v} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

together with the initial condition  $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}(0) = \mathbf{u}_0$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{B}_0 = \text{curl } \mathbf{u}_0$ .

## 2.2 Exterior domain

In the exterior domain  $\Omega^c$ , the partial differential equations (1.2) reduce to the solution of

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega^c,$$

with an appropriate radiation condition. Hence we introduce the scalar potential  $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \Phi$  satisfying

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \nabla \Phi = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = \nabla \cdot \nabla \Phi = \Delta \Phi = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega^c, \quad \Phi(x) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{|x|}\right) \text{ as } |x| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Any solution of the Laplace equation in the exterior domain  $\Omega^c$  can be described by the representation formula

$$\Phi(x) = - \int_\Gamma U^*(x, y) [\mathbf{n}_y \cdot \nabla \Phi(y)] ds_y + \int_\Gamma [\mathbf{n}_y \cdot \nabla_y U^*(x, y)] \Phi(y) ds_y \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega^c, \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$U^*(x, y) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{1}{|x - y|} \quad \text{for } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3, x \neq y,$$

is the related fundamental solution. From (2.4) we obtain a system of boundary integral equations which can be written by using the exterior Calderon projection

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Phi \\ \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \Phi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}I + K & -V \\ -D & \frac{1}{2}I - K' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Phi \\ \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \Phi \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.5)$$

where for  $x \in \Gamma$  we use the single layer integral operator

$$(V\Psi)(x) = \int_\Gamma U^*(x, y) \Psi(y) ds_y, \quad V : H^{-1/2}(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\Gamma),$$

the double layer integral operator

$$(K\Phi)(x) = \int_{\Gamma} [\mathbf{n}_y \cdot \nabla_y U^*(x, y)] \Phi(y) ds_y, \quad K : H^{1/2}(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\Gamma),$$

its adjoint

$$(K'\Psi)(x) = \int_{\Gamma} [\mathbf{n}_x \cdot \nabla_x U^*(x, y)] \Psi(y) ds_y, \quad K' : H^{-1/2}(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\Gamma),$$

and the hypersingular boundary integral operator

$$(D\Phi)(x) = -\mathbf{n}_x \cdot \nabla_x \int_{\Gamma} [\mathbf{n}_y \cdot \nabla_y U^*(x, y)] \Phi(y) ds_y, \quad D : H^{1/2}(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\Gamma).$$

The mapping properties of the boundary integral operators are well established, see, e.g., [5, 11, 16, 22].

### 2.3 Transmission problem

For the coupling of the interior partial differential equation (1.1) with the exterior problem (1.2) we need to take care of the transmission conditions (1.3). By using the vector potential ansatz  $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{u}$  in the interior domain  $\Omega$  and the scalar potential ansatz  $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \Phi$  in the exterior domain  $\Omega^c$ , the transmission conditions (1.3) read

$$\frac{1}{\mu}(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \times \mathbf{n} = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \nabla \Phi \times \mathbf{n}, \quad (\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \nabla \Phi \cdot \mathbf{n} \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \quad (2.6)$$

Using the first transmission condition of (2.6), Stokes theorem for surface integrals [19], the first boundary integral equation in (2.5), and the second transmission condition of (2.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \left( \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla \times \mathbf{u} \right) \times \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{v} \right\rangle_{\Gamma} &= \frac{1}{\mu_0} \langle \nabla \Phi \times \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\Gamma} = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \langle \Phi, (\nabla \times \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\Gamma} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\mu_0} \left[ \langle V(\nabla \Phi \cdot \mathbf{n}) - \left( \frac{1}{2} I + K \right) \Phi, (\nabla \times \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\Gamma} \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{\mu_0} \left[ \langle V[(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n}] - \left( \frac{1}{2} I + K \right) \Phi, (\nabla \times \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\Gamma} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we consider the second boundary integral equation in (2.5), which together with the second transmission condition of (2.6) results in a variational formulation to find  $\Phi \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$  such that

$$\langle D\Phi, \Psi \rangle_{\Gamma} = -\langle \left( \frac{1}{2} I + K' \right) (\nabla \Phi \cdot \mathbf{n}), \Psi \rangle_{\Gamma} = -\langle \left( \frac{1}{2} I + K' \right) [(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n}], \Psi \rangle_{\Gamma}$$

is satisfied for all  $\Psi \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ . Since the hypersingular boundary integral operator  $D$  is only semi-elliptic, and since the scalar potential  $\Phi$  is only unique up to an additive constant, we consider the stabilized variational formulation to find  $\Phi \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$  such that

$$\langle \tilde{D}\Phi, \Psi \rangle_\Gamma := \langle D\Phi, \Psi \rangle_\Gamma + \langle \Phi, 1 \rangle_\Gamma \langle \Psi, 1 \rangle_\Gamma = -\langle (\frac{1}{2}I + K')[(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n}], \Psi \rangle_\Gamma \quad (2.7)$$

is satisfied for all  $\Psi \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ . Although we have fixed the constant part of the scalar potential  $\Phi$  when solving the modified variational problem (2.7), the constant part is eliminated when applying  $\frac{1}{2}I + K$ . Since the stabilized hypersingular integral operator  $\tilde{D} : H^{1/2}(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$  is  $H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ -elliptic [20], we obtain for the unique solution of the variational formulation (2.7) the representation

$$\Phi = -\tilde{D}^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}I + K')[(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n}].$$

By using the transformations  $\hat{\mathbf{u}} := e^{-\kappa t} \mathbf{u}$  and  $\hat{\Phi} := e^{-\kappa t} \Phi$  we finally obtain for the coupling term as used in (2.3)

$$\left\langle \left( \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla \times \hat{\mathbf{u}} \right) \times \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{v} \right\rangle_\Gamma = -\frac{1}{\mu_0} \langle [V + (\frac{1}{2}I + K)\tilde{D}^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}I + K')]T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}}, T_n \mathbf{v} \rangle_\Gamma \quad (2.8)$$

where for all  $\mathbf{v} \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$  we have, see [1],

$$T_n \mathbf{v} := (\nabla \times \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n}, \quad \|T_n \mathbf{v}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} = \|(\nabla \times \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq c_T \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)}. \quad (2.9)$$

Before we introduce the variational formulation of the transmission problem (1.1)–(1.3) we will present an alternative boundary integral operator representation for the exterior problem, which is probably more suitable for the numerical implementation. As before, we write the interface term as

$$\left\langle \left( \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla \times \mathbf{u} \right) \times \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{v} \right\rangle_\Gamma = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \langle \Phi, (\nabla \times \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_\Gamma$$

where we now keep the first equation of (2.5) separately,

$$V[n \cdot \nabla \Phi] = (-\frac{1}{2}I + K)\Phi, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad [n \cdot \nabla \Phi] = V^{-1}(-\frac{1}{2}I + K)\Phi.$$

Inserting this into the stabilized version of the second equation of (2.5) and using the second transmission condition of (2.6) this gives

$$(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \Phi = -\tilde{D}\Phi + (\frac{1}{2}I - K')[n \cdot \nabla \Phi] = -\left[ \tilde{D} + (\frac{1}{2}I - K')V^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}I - K) \right] \Phi.$$

Hence we find

$$\Phi = -\left[ \tilde{D} + (\frac{1}{2}I - K')V^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}I - K) \right]^{-1} [(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n}],$$

and therefore we obtain the alternative representation

$$\left\langle \left( \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla \times \hat{\mathbf{u}} \right) \times \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{v} \right\rangle_{\Gamma} = -\frac{1}{\mu_0} \left\langle \left[ \tilde{D} + \left( \frac{1}{2}I - K' \right) V^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{2}I - K \right) \right]^{-1} T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}}, T_n \mathbf{v} \right\rangle_{\Gamma}. \quad (2.10)$$

Unifying (2.8) and (2.10) we finally write for the coupling term

$$\left\langle \left( \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla \times \hat{\mathbf{u}} \right) \times \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{v} \right\rangle_{\Gamma} = -\frac{1}{\mu_0} \langle \mathcal{B} T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}}, T_n \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\Gamma},$$

where  $\mathcal{B} : H^{-1/2}(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{B} = V + \left( \frac{1}{2}I + K \right) \tilde{D}^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{2}I + K' \right) = \left[ \tilde{D} + \left( \frac{1}{2}I - K' \right) V^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{2}I - K \right) \right]^{-1}. \quad (2.11)$$

By using the mapping properties of all boundary integral operators we conclude

$$\langle \mathcal{B}\eta, \eta \rangle_{\Gamma} \geq c_1^{\mathcal{B}} \|\eta\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)}^2, \quad \|\mathcal{B}\eta\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq c_2^{\mathcal{B}} \|\eta\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \quad \text{for all } \eta \in H^{-1/2}(\Gamma). \quad (2.12)$$

Now we are in a position to introduce the variational formulation of the transmission problem (1.1)–(1.3).

**Problem 2.1** Find  $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in H^1(0, T; H(\text{curl}; \Omega))$  such that for all test functions  $\mathbf{v} \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$  and almost all  $t \in (0, T)$  there holds

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left( \sigma \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \hat{\mathbf{u}}(t), \mathbf{v} \right) + \kappa \left( \sigma \hat{\mathbf{u}}(t), \mathbf{v} \right) + \left( \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla \times \hat{\mathbf{u}}(t), \nabla \times \mathbf{v} \right) \\ &\quad - \left( \sigma \mathbf{w}(t) \times (\nabla \times \hat{\mathbf{u}}(t)), \mathbf{v} \right) - \left( \frac{\sigma R f(t)}{1 + s e^{2\kappa t} |\nabla \times \hat{\mathbf{u}}(t)|^2} \nabla \times \hat{\mathbf{u}}(t), \mathbf{v} \right) + \frac{1}{\mu_0} \langle \mathcal{B} T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}}(t), T_n \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\Gamma} \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

together with the initial condition  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}(0) = \mathbf{u}_0$ .

Using the following definitions

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{A}(t) \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle &:= \left( \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla \times \mathbf{u}, \nabla \times \mathbf{v} \right) - \left( \sigma \mathbf{w}(t) \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{u}), \mathbf{v} \right) + \kappa \left( \sigma \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \right), \\ \langle \mathcal{A}_{nl}(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{v} \rangle &:= \left( \frac{\sigma R f(t)}{1 + s e^{2\kappa t} |\nabla \times \mathbf{u}|^2} \nabla \times \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \right), \\ \langle \mathcal{S}(t) \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle &:= \langle \mathcal{A}(t) \mathbf{u} - \mathcal{A}_{nl}(\mathbf{u}) + \frac{1}{\mu_0} T_n' \mathcal{B} T_n \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

for all  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$ , we can reformulate Problem 2.1 in the following way:

**Problem 2.2** Find  $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in H^1(0, T; H(\text{curl}; \Omega))$  such that for almost all  $t \in (0, T)$  there holds

$$\sigma \frac{d}{dt} \hat{\mathbf{u}}(t) + \mathcal{S}(t) \hat{\mathbf{u}}(t) = 0$$

together with the initial condition  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}(0) = \mathbf{u}_0$ .

### 3 Well-posedness of the coupled formulation

For the subsequent analysis, we apply the following result on nonlinear evolution problems, cf. [25, Theorem 30.A].

**Theorem 3.1** *Let  $V \subset H \subset V^*$  be an evolution triple with  $\dim V = \infty$ . Let  $0 < T < \infty$ , and let the following assumptions to be satisfied:*

- (a) *For each  $t \in (0, T)$ , the operator  $\mathcal{S}(t) : V \rightarrow V^*$  is monotone and hemicontinuous.*
- (b) *For each  $t \in (0, T)$ , the operator  $\mathcal{S}(t)$  is coercive, i.e., there exist constants  $M > 0$  and  $\Lambda \geq 0$  such that*

$$\langle \mathcal{S}(t)v, v \rangle_{V^* \times V} \geq M \|v\|_V^2 - \Lambda \quad \text{for all } v \in V.$$

- (c) *There exist a nonnegative function  $K_1 \in L^2(0, T)$  and a constant  $K_2 > 0$  such that*

$$\|\mathcal{S}(t)v\|_{V^*} \leq K_1(t) + K_2 \|v\|_V \quad \text{for all } v \in V, t \in (0, T).$$

- (d) *The function  $t \mapsto \mathcal{S}(t)$  is weakly measurable, i.e., the function  $t \mapsto \langle \mathcal{S}(t)u, v \rangle$  is measurable on  $(0, T)$  for all  $u, v \in V$ .*
- (e) *Let  $u_0 \in H$  be given.*

Then there exists a unique solution to the problem:

Find  $u \in \{v \in L^2(0, T; V) \mid \exists v' \in L^2(0, T; V^*)\}$  which fulfils

$$\frac{d}{dt}u(t) + \mathcal{S}(t)u(t) = 0 \quad \text{for almost all } t \in (0, T), \quad u(0) = u_0.$$

Although we will not give all details on the application of Theorem 3.1, we will sketch two important properties, Lipschitz continuity and strong monotonicity.

**Lemma 3.2** *Assume  $f(t) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbf{w}(t) \in [L^\infty(\Omega)]^3$  for all  $t \in (0, T)$ . The operator  $\mathcal{S}(t)$  as defined in (2.14) is Lipschitz continuous, i.e. for all  $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v} \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$  and for all  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $t \in (0, T)$  there holds*

$$\langle \mathcal{S}(t)\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathcal{S}(t)\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v} \rangle \leq c_L^{\mathcal{S}} \|\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)} \quad (3.1)$$

with

$$c_L^{\mathcal{S}} := \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\mu_{\min}}, \sigma_{\max} \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \sigma_{\max} \kappa, \frac{c_2^{\mathcal{B}}}{\mu_0} c_T^2, 3\sigma_{\max} R \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \|f(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right\}.$$

**Proof.** By using (2.12) and (2.9) we first have for all  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$ ,  $t \in (0, T)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle \left[ \mathcal{A}(t) + \frac{1}{\mu_0} T_n' \mathcal{B} T_n \right] \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \right\rangle \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla \times \mathbf{u}, \nabla \times \mathbf{v} \right) - \left( \sigma \mathbf{w}(t) \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{u}), \mathbf{v} \right) + \kappa (\sigma \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + \frac{1}{\mu_0} \left\langle \mathcal{B} T_n \mathbf{u}, T_n \mathbf{v} \right\rangle_{\Gamma} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\mu_{\min}} \|\nabla \times \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla \times \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \sigma_{\max} \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\nabla \times \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad + \sigma_{\max} \kappa \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{c_2^{\mathcal{B}}}{\mu_0} \|T_n \mathbf{u}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \|T_n \mathbf{v}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \\
&\leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\mu_{\min}}, \sigma_{\max} \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \sigma_{\max} \kappa, \frac{c_2^{\mathcal{B}}}{\mu_0} c_T^2 \right\} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to consider the nonlinear term  $\mathcal{A}_{nl}$ . For  $\varrho, \tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$  we define

$$\psi_\varrho(\tau) := \frac{1}{1 + \varrho \tau^2}, \quad \text{thus } |\psi_\varrho(\tau)| \leq 1.$$

The Lipschitz continuity

$$|\psi_\varrho(\tau_1) \tau_1 - \psi_\varrho(\tau_2) \tau_2| \leq |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \quad \text{for all } \tau_1, \tau_2, \varrho \in \mathbb{R}_+ \quad (3.2)$$

follows from

$$\left| \frac{d}{d\tau} \left( \frac{\tau}{1 + \varrho \tau^2} \right) \right| \leq 1.$$

For  $s, t \in \mathbb{R}_+$  we define  $\varrho := s e^{2\kappa t}$  and set  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i = \nabla \times \mathbf{u}_i$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \frac{\nabla \times \mathbf{u}_1}{1 + s e^{2\kappa t} |\nabla \times \mathbf{u}_1|^2} - \frac{\nabla \times \mathbf{u}_2}{1 + s e^{2\kappa t} |\nabla \times \mathbf{u}_2|^2}, \mathbf{v} \right) = \left( \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1}{1 + \varrho |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1|^2} - \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2}{1 + \varrho |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2|^2}, \mathbf{v} \right) \\
&= \left( \psi_\varrho(|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1|) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 - \psi_\varrho(|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2|) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2, \mathbf{v} \right) \\
&= \left( \psi_\varrho(|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1|) (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2), \mathbf{v} \right) + \left( [\psi_\varrho(|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1|) - \psi_\varrho(|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2|)] \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2, \mathbf{v} \right) \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \psi_\varrho(|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1|) (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2) \cdot \mathbf{v} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} [\psi_\varrho(|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1|) - \psi_\varrho(|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2|)] \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2 \cdot \mathbf{v} \, dx \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} |\psi_\varrho(|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1|)| |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2| |\mathbf{v}| \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |\psi_\varrho(|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1|) - \psi_\varrho(|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2|)| |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2| |\mathbf{v}| \, dx \\
&\leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \int_{\Omega} |\psi_\varrho(|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1|)| [|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2| - |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1|] |\mathbf{v}| \, dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} [|\psi_\varrho(|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1|)| |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1| - |\psi_\varrho(|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2|)| |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2|] |\mathbf{v}| \, dx \\
&\stackrel{(3.2)}{\leq} \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

By using the triangle inequality  $||\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1| - |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2|| \leq |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_2|$  we finally obtain

$$\langle A_{nl}(\mathbf{u}_1) - A_{nl}(\mathbf{u}_2), \mathbf{v} \rangle \leq 3\sigma_{\max} R \|f(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\nabla \times (\mathbf{u}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad (3.3)$$

which together with the boundedness of the linear part concludes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

Let us finally consider the strong monotonicity of  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Lemma 3.3** *Let  $\mathcal{S}(t)$  be given as in (2.14), and  $f(t) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbf{w}(t) \in [L^\infty(\Omega)]^3$  for all  $t \in (0, T)$ . Let  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_+$  be chosen such that*

$$\kappa \geq \mu_{\max} \sigma_{\max} \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \left[ \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + 3R \|f(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right]^2 \quad (3.4)$$

*is satisfied. Then there holds the monotonicity estimate*

$$\langle \mathcal{S}(t)\mathbf{u} - \mathcal{S}(t)\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \rangle \geq c_M \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)}^2 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega), t \in (0, T) \quad (3.5)$$

*with some positive constant  $c_M$ .*

**Proof.** By neglecting the positive definite operator  $\mathcal{B}$  (see (2.12)), and by using the Lipschitz continuity (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{S}(t)\mathbf{u} - \mathcal{S}(t)\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \rangle &\geq \langle \mathcal{A}(t)(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}) - \mathcal{A}_{nl}(\mathbf{u}) + \mathcal{A}_{nl}(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \rangle \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla \times (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}), \nabla \times (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}) \right) - \left( \sigma \mathbf{w}(t) \times (\nabla \times (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \right) + \kappa \left( \sigma(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}), \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \right) \\ &\quad - \left( \sigma f(t) R \left[ \frac{\nabla \times \mathbf{u}}{1 + se^{2\kappa t} |\nabla \times \mathbf{u}|^2} - \frac{\nabla \times \mathbf{v}}{1 + se^{2\kappa t} |\nabla \times \mathbf{v}|^2} \right], \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\mu_{\max}} \|\nabla \times (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \kappa \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad - \sqrt{\sigma_{\max}} \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \left[ \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + 3R \|f(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right] \|\nabla \times (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\mu_{\max}} \|\nabla \times (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \kappa \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\sigma_{\max}} \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \left[ \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + 3R \|f(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right] \\ &\quad \cdot \left[ \gamma \|\nabla \times (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

with  $\gamma > 0$ . By setting

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{\mu_{\max} \sqrt{\sigma_{\max}} \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \left[ \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + 3R \|f(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right]}$$

for

$$\kappa \geq \mu_{\max} \sigma_{\max} \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \left[ \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + 3R \|f(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right]^2$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{S}(t)\mathbf{u} - \mathcal{S}(t)\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \rangle &\geq \frac{1}{2\mu_{\max}} \|\nabla \times (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2} \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\geq c_M \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

with the positive constant

$$c_M := \min \left[ \frac{1}{2\mu_{\max}}; \frac{\mu_{\max} \sigma_{\max}}{2\sigma_{\min}} \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \left[ \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + 3R \|f(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right]^2 \right].$$

■

All other assumptions of Theorem 3.1 follow in a similar way, so that we can conclude unique solvability of Problem 2.2.

## 4 Discretisation of the coupled problem

In this section we describe the spatial and temporal discretization of Problem 2.2. First, let  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  some bounded and at least positive semi-definite approximation of  $\mathcal{B}$  which results from the approximate solution of the involved boundary integral equations. Specific approximations will be given in Sect. 4.3. Such an approximation implies an approximate operator

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) := \mathcal{A}(t) - \mathcal{A}_{nl}(\cdot) + \frac{1}{\mu_0} T_n' \tilde{\mathcal{B}} T_n.$$

Instead of Problem 2.2 we now consider a perturbed evolution equation.

**Problem 4.1** *Find  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in H^1(0, T; H(\text{curl}; \Omega))$  such that for almost all  $t \in (0, T)$  there holds*

$$\sigma \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\mathbf{u}} + \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = 0, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(0) = \mathbf{u}_0.$$

As for  $\mathcal{S}$  we can prove all required assumptions of Theorem 3.1 for the perturbed operator  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ , in particular, the Lipschitz continuity (3.1) (with a Lipschitz constant  $c_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}$ ) and the monotonicity estimate (3.5) (with the same constant  $c_M$ ) remain true. Hence we conclude the well-posedness of Problem 4.1. It remains to estimate the error due to the use of the approximation  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ .

**Lemma 4.1** *Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} : H^{-1/2}(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$  be some bounded and positive semi-definite approximation of  $\mathcal{B}$ . Let  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in L^2(0, T; H(\text{curl}; \Omega))$  be the unique solutions of Problems 2.2 and 4.1, respectively. Then there hold the error estimates*

$$\|\sqrt{\sigma}[\hat{\mathbf{u}}(T) - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(T)]\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_M \|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0, T; H(\text{curl}; \Omega))}^2 \leq \frac{c_T^2}{c_M \mu_0^2} \|(\tilde{\mathcal{B}} - \mathcal{B}) T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0, T; H^{1/2}(\Gamma))}^2$$



and

$$\|\sigma \frac{d}{dt} [\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}]\|_{L^2(0,T;[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*)} \leq \frac{c_T}{\mu_0} \left(1 + \frac{c_L^{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}}{c_M}\right) \|(\mathcal{B} - \tilde{\mathcal{B}})T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0,T;H^{1/2}(\Gamma))}.$$

**Proof.** From Problems 2.2 and 4.1 we obtain

$$\sigma \frac{d}{dt} (\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) + \mathcal{A}(t)(\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) + \frac{1}{\mu_0} T_n' \tilde{\mathcal{B}} T_n [\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}] - \mathcal{A}_{nl}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) + \mathcal{A}_{nl}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) = \frac{1}{\mu_0} T_n' [\tilde{\mathcal{B}} - \mathcal{B}] T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}},$$

and by using the monotonicity of  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$  and the continuity of  $T_n$  we conclude, for any  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_M \|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 &\leq \frac{1}{\mu_0} \langle [\tilde{\mathcal{B}} - \mathcal{B}] T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}}, T_n(\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) \rangle_{\Gamma} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mu_0} \|(\tilde{\mathcal{B}} - \mathcal{B}) T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \|T_n(\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \\ &\leq \frac{c_T}{\mu_0} \|(\tilde{\mathcal{B}} - \mathcal{B}) T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{c_T}{\mu_0} \left[ \frac{1}{\gamma} \|(\tilde{\mathcal{B}} - \mathcal{B}) T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}^2 + \gamma \|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In particular for  $\gamma = c_M \mu_0 / c_T$  we then obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_M \|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 \leq \frac{c_T^2}{c_M \mu_0^2} \|(\tilde{\mathcal{B}} - \mathcal{B}) T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}^2.$$

Integration in time gives the first estimate, where we use  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}(0) = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(0) = \mathbf{u}_0$ .

On the other hand, we have

$$\sigma \frac{d}{dt} (\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \mathcal{S}(t) \hat{\mathbf{u}}.$$

For  $\mathbf{v} \in H(\text{curl};\Omega)$  we then conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma \frac{d}{dt} (\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}), \mathbf{v} \rangle &= \langle \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \mathcal{S}(t) \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \langle \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{v} \rangle + \langle \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \mathcal{S}(t) \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \\ &\leq c_L^{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)} + \frac{1}{\mu_0} \|(\mathcal{B} - \tilde{\mathcal{B}}) T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \|T_n \mathbf{v}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.9), dividing by  $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}$ , and taking the supremum over all  $\mathbf{v} \in H(\text{curl};\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{0}$ , this gives

$$\|\sigma \frac{d}{dt} (\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|_{[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*} \leq c_L^{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)} + \frac{c_T}{\mu_0} \|(\mathcal{B} - \tilde{\mathcal{B}}) T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}.$$

Integration in time and using the first estimate gives the second result. ■

## 4.1 Spatial discretisation

Next we discuss the spatial discretization of the perturbed evolution Problem 4.1 where we start with the definition of appropriate discrete spaces. For the discretized vector potential in the interior domain  $\Omega$  we use  $X_h \subset H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$  which consists of lowest order Nédélec elements.

**Problem 4.2** Find  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h \in H^1(0, T; X_h)$  such that for almost all  $t \in (0, T)$  and all  $\mathbf{v}_h \in X_h$  there holds

$$\left\langle \sigma \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(t), \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle + \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(t), \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle = 0, \quad \left( \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(0) - \mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{v}_h \right) = 0.$$

**Theorem 4.2** Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in H^1(0, T; H(\text{curl}; \Omega))$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h \in H^1(0, T; X_h)$  be the unique solutions of Problems 4.1 and 4.2, respectively. Let  $\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} \in X_h$  be some approximation of the solution  $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$  of Problem 2.2. Then there holds the error estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}(T) - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(T))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_M \|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{L^2(0, T; H(\text{curl}; \Omega))}^2 \\ & \leq c \left[ \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}(T) - \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}(T))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\pi_h \mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}_0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}_0 - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(0))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right. \\ & \quad + \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0, T; H(\text{curl}; \Omega))}^2 + \left\| \sigma \frac{d}{dt} (\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \hat{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_{L^2(0, T; [H(\text{curl}; \Omega)]^*)}^2 \\ & \quad \left. + \|(\mathcal{B} - \tilde{\mathcal{B}})T_n \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0, T; H^1(\Gamma))}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof.** Since  $X_h \subset H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$ , we first obtain the Galerkin orthogonality

$$\left\langle \sigma \frac{d}{dt} (\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h), \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle + \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h, \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v}_h \in X_h,$$

or equivalently

$$\left\langle \sigma \frac{d}{dt} (\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h), \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle + \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h, \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle = \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle + \left\langle \sigma \frac{d}{dt} (\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}), \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle$$

for all  $\mathbf{v}_h \in X_h$ . In particular for  $\mathbf{v}_h = \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h$  we conclude, by using the monotonicity and the Lipschitz continuity of  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_M \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)}^2 \\ & \leq c_L^{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)} \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)} \\ & \quad + \left\| \sigma \frac{d}{dt} (\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_{[H(\text{curl}; \Omega)]^*} \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} c_L^{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \left[ \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)}^2 + \gamma_1 \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)}^2 \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{\gamma_2} \left\| \sigma \frac{d}{dt} (\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_{[H(\text{curl}; \Omega)]^*}^2 + \gamma_2 \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)}^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constants  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$ . In particular for  $\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2}c_M/c_L^{\tilde{S}}$  and  $\gamma_2 = \frac{1}{2}c_M$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_M \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 \\ & \leq 2 \frac{[c_L^{\tilde{S}}]^2}{c_M} \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 + \frac{2}{c_M} \|\sigma \frac{d}{dt}(\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|_{[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Integration in time gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}(T) - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(T))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_M \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{L^2(0,T;H(\text{curl};\Omega))}^2 \\ & \leq \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}(0) - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(0))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2 \frac{[c_L^{\tilde{S}}]^2}{c_M} \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0,T;H(\text{curl};\Omega))}^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{2}{c_M} \|\sigma \frac{d}{dt}(\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|_{L^2(0,T;[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we find, by using the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}(T) - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(T))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_M \|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{L^2(0,T;H(\text{curl};\Omega))}^2 \\ & \leq 2 \left( \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}(T) - \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}(T))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}(T) - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(T))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + 2c_M \left( \|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0,T;H(\text{curl};\Omega))}^2 + \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{L^2(0,T;H(\text{curl};\Omega))}^2 \right) \\ & \leq 2 \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}(T) - \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}(T))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2c_M \|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0,T;H(\text{curl};\Omega))}^2 \\ & \quad + 2 \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}(0) - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(0))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 4 \frac{[c_L^{\tilde{S}}]^2}{c_M} \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0,T;H(\text{curl};\Omega))}^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{4}{c_M} \|\sigma \frac{d}{dt}(\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|_{L^2(0,T;[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Again by using the triangle inequality we further conclude

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}(T) - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(T))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_M \|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h\|_{L^2(0,T;H(\text{curl};\Omega))}^2 \\ & \leq 2 \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}(T) - \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}(T))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2c_M \|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0,T;H(\text{curl};\Omega))}^2 \\ & \quad + 4 \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}(0) - \mathbf{u}_0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 4 \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}_0 - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(0))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \quad + 8 \frac{[c_L^{\tilde{S}}]^2}{c_M} \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0,T;H(\text{curl};\Omega))}^2 + 8 \frac{[c_L^{\tilde{S}}]^2}{c_M} \|\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0,T;H(\text{curl};\Omega))}^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{8}{c_M} \|\sigma \frac{d}{dt}(\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}} - \hat{\mathbf{u}})\|_{L^2(0,T;[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*)}^2 + \frac{8}{c_M} \|\sigma \frac{d}{dt}(\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|_{L^2(0,T;[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows by using Lemma 4.1. ■

## 4.2 Time discretization

We proceed with the time discretization of the semi-discrete Problem 4.2 which was to find  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h \in H^1(0, T; X_h)$  such that for almost all  $t \in (0, T)$  and all  $\mathbf{v}_h \in X_h$  there holds

$$\left\langle \sigma \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(t), \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle + \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(t), \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle = 0, \quad \left( \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h(0) - \mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{v}_h \right) = 0.$$

For simplicity we only consider the implicit Euler scheme with a constant time step  $\tau = \frac{T}{M}$ , and with nodes  $t_m = m\tau$ ,  $m = 0, \dots, M$ . If we evaluate a function  $\mathbf{u}$  at time  $t_m$  we write  $\mathbf{u}^m$ . The discretized time derivative is  $\Delta_\tau \mathbf{v}^m := \frac{1}{\tau} [\mathbf{v}^m - \mathbf{v}^{m-1}]$ ,  $m = 1, \dots, M$ . Hence we obtain the following fully discretized problem.

**Problem 4.3** *Given  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^0$ , find for all  $m = 1, \dots, M$   $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m \in X_h$  such that*

$$\left\langle \sigma \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{m-1}}{\tau}, \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle + \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(t_m) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m, \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v}_h \in X_h.$$

The well-posedness of the fully discretized Problem 4.3 follows from the main theorem on strongly monotone operators, see, e.g., [25]. In addition we can prove the following stability estimate.

**Lemma 4.3** *Assume  $f(t) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbf{w}(t) \in [L^\infty(\Omega)]^3$  for all  $t \in (0, T)$ . Let  $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_+$  be chosen according to (3.4). For the solution of the fully discrete Problem 4.3 there holds*

$$\|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^M\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\tau}{\mu_{\max}} \sum_{m=1}^M \|\nabla \times \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

**Proof.** Choosing  $\tau \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m$  as a test function in Problem 4.3 this gives

$$\langle \sigma \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m + \tau \mathcal{A}(t_m) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m - \tau \mathcal{A}_{nl}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m) + \frac{\tau}{\mu_0} T_n' \tilde{\mathcal{B}} T_n \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m \rangle = \langle \sigma \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{m-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m \rangle,$$

which results in

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\tau}{\mu_{\max}} \|\nabla \times \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \kappa \tau \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \leq \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{m-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \tau \left( \sigma \mathbf{w}(t_m) \times (\nabla \times \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m), \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m \right) \\ & \quad + \tau \left( \sigma \frac{Rf(t_m)}{1 + \varrho e^{2\kappa t_m} |\nabla \times \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m|^2} \nabla \times \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{m-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \quad + \tau \sqrt{\sigma_{\max}} \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \left( \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + R \|f(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right) \|\nabla \times \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{m-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \tau \sqrt{\sigma_{\max}} \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \left( \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + R \|f(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right) \left[ \gamma \|\nabla \times \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant  $\gamma$ . In particular for

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{\mu_{\max} \sqrt{\sigma_{\max}} \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \left( \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + R \|f(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right)}$$

we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\tau}{2\mu_{\max}} \|\nabla \times \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{m-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \quad + \tau \left[ \frac{1}{2} \mu_{\max} \sigma_{\max} \sup_{t \in (0, T)} \left( \|\mathbf{w}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + R \|f(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right)^2 - \kappa \right] \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{m-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

if we chose  $\kappa$  according to (3.4). Hence we obtain

$$\|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\tau}{\mu_{\max}} \|\nabla \times \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \|\sqrt{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{m-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$$

and summation over  $m = 1, \dots, M$  gives the desired estimate.  $\blacksquare$

### 4.3 Boundary element approximations

In this section we will introduce suitable approximations  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  of the operator  $\mathcal{B}$  as defined in (2.11). Using the first representation in (2.11), the application of  $\mathcal{B}$  for a given  $\psi \in H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$  reads

$$\mathcal{B}\psi = V\psi + \left(\frac{1}{2}I + K\right)\tilde{D}^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}I + K'\right)\psi = V\psi + \left(\frac{1}{2}I + K\right)w,$$

where  $w = \tilde{D}^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}I + K'\right)\psi \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$  is the unique solution of the variational problem

$$\langle \tilde{D}w, v \rangle_\Gamma = \langle \left(\frac{1}{2}I + K'\right)\psi, v \rangle_\Gamma \quad \text{for all } v \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma). \quad (4.1)$$

Let  $S_h^1(\Gamma) \subset H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$  be some boundary element space of, e.g., piecewise linear basis functions, which are defined with respect to an admissible and globally quasi-uniform boundary element mesh. From a theoretical point of view it is not required that the boundary element mesh matches the trace of the finite element mesh, but from a practical point of view such a matching will simplify the implementation.

The Galerkin discretization of the variational problem (4.1) is to find  $w_h \in S_h^1(\Gamma)$  such that

$$\langle \tilde{D}w_h, v_h \rangle_\Gamma = \langle \left(\frac{1}{2}I + K'\right)\psi, v_h \rangle_\Gamma \quad \text{for all } v_h \in S_h^1(\Gamma). \quad (4.2)$$

Since the stabilized hypersingular boundary integral operator  $\tilde{D} : H^{1/2}(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$  is  $H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ -elliptic, stability and quasi-optimality follow, i.e.,

$$\|w_h\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq c_1 \|\psi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)}, \quad \|w - w_h\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq c \inf_{v_h \in S_h^1(\Gamma)} \|w - v_h\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}.$$

Hence we can define an approximate operator  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  by considering

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}\psi := V\psi + \left(\frac{1}{2}I + K\right)w_h. \quad (4.3)$$

From the properties of the Galerkin approximation  $w_h$  we easily conclude the boundedness of  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ , as well as an approximation estimate, see, e.g., [22], i.e.,

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{B}}\psi\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq \tilde{c}_1 \|\psi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)}, \quad \|(\mathcal{B} - \tilde{\mathcal{B}})\psi\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq \tilde{c}_2 \inf_{v_h \in S_h^1(\Gamma)} \|w - v_h\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}.$$

Moreover,  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} : H^{-1/2}(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$  is  $H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$ -elliptic. Hence we conclude, that (4.3) defines an admissible approximation of  $\mathcal{B}$ .

However, the use of the approximation (4.3) results in the Galerkin discretization of boundary integral operators by using boundary traces of lowest order Nédélec elements. From a practical point of view, this may become rather cumbersome. Hence we are interested in a formulation, where the finite and boundary element basis functions are only linked via a generalized mass matrix. For this we consider the second representation of  $\mathcal{B}$  as given in (2.11). For a given  $\psi \in H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$ , the application of  $\mathcal{B}$  reads

$$\mathcal{B}\psi = \left[ \tilde{D} + \left(\frac{1}{2}I - K'\right)V^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}I - K\right) \right]^{-1} \psi =: w,$$

where  $w \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$  is the unique solution of the variational problem

$$\langle [\tilde{D} + \left(\frac{1}{2}I - K'\right)V^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}I - K\right)]w, v \rangle_{\Gamma} = \langle \psi, v \rangle_{\Gamma} \quad \text{for all } v \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma).$$

By introducing  $\theta := V^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}I - K\right)w \in H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$  this is equivalent to a variational problem to find  $(w, \theta) \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma) \times H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$  such that

$$\langle \tilde{D}w, v \rangle_{\Gamma} + \langle \left(\frac{1}{2}I - K'\right)\theta, v \rangle_{\Gamma} = \langle \psi, v \rangle_{\Gamma}, \quad \langle V\theta, \eta \rangle_{\Gamma} - \langle \left(\frac{1}{2}I - K\right)w, \eta \rangle_{\Gamma} = 0 \quad (4.4)$$

is satisfied for all  $(v, \eta) \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma) \times H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$ . In addition to  $S_h^1(\Gamma) \subset H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$  we now consider a second boundary element space  $S_h^0(\Gamma) \subset H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$  of, e.g., piecewise constant basis functions, which, for convenience, are defined with respect to the same boundary element mesh as  $S_h^1(\Gamma)$ . The Galerkin discretization of the variational problem (4.4) is to find  $(w_h, \theta_h) \in S_h^1(\Gamma) \times S_h^0(\Gamma)$  such that

$$\langle \tilde{D}w_h, v_h \rangle_{\Gamma} + \langle \left(\frac{1}{2}I - K'\right)\theta_h, v_h \rangle_{\Gamma} = \langle \psi, v_h \rangle_{\Gamma}, \quad \langle V\theta_h, \eta_h \rangle_{\Gamma} - \langle \left(\frac{1}{2}I - K\right)w_h, \eta_h \rangle_{\Gamma} = 0 \quad (4.5)$$

is satisfied for all  $(v_h, \eta_h) \in S_h^1(\Gamma) \times S_h^0(\Gamma)$ . The Galerkin solution  $w_h$  finally implies the approximation

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}\psi := w_h. \quad (4.6)$$

Using standard arguments, see, e.g., [22], we can prove boundedness of  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ , as well as an approximation property, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathcal{B}}\psi\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} &\leq c_1 \|\psi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)}, \\ \|(\mathcal{B} - \tilde{\mathcal{B}})\psi\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} &\leq c_2 \left\{ \inf_{v_h \in S_h^1(\Gamma)} \|w - v_h\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} + \inf_{\eta_h \in S_h^0(\Gamma)} \|\theta - \eta_h\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} : H^{1/2}(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$  may fail to be  $H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ -elliptic, but  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  is  $H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ -semi-elliptic. This is due to the mixed approximation scheme as used in the definition (4.6). As in mixed finite element methods, stability would require an appropriate inf-sup condition. But as seen in the proof of the monotonicity estimate (3.5), semi-ellipticity of  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  is sufficient. Hence we conclude, that (4.6) also defines an admissible approximation.

## 4.4 Convergence results

To present a final convergence result for the solution of the fully discrete Problem 4.3 we first cite an approximation property of the lowest order Nédélec ansatz space.

**Theorem 4.4** [18, Theorem 5.41] *Let  $X_h \subset H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$  be the space of lowest order Nédélec elements which is defined with respect to a regular and globally quasi uniform finite element mesh. For  $\mathbf{u} \in [H^1(\Omega)]^3$  and  $\nabla \times \mathbf{u} \in [H^1(\Omega)]^3$  let  $r_h \mathbf{u} \in X_h$  be the interpolation. Then there holds the error estimate*

$$\|\mathbf{u} - r_h \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla \times (\mathbf{u} - r_h \mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq ch \left[ \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\nabla \times \mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \right]. \quad (4.7)$$

Next we define  $\pi_h \mathbf{u} \in X_h$  as the  $H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$  projection of  $\mathbf{u} \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$ . By using standard techniques and (4.7) we conclude the error estimate

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \pi_h \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla \times (\mathbf{u} - \pi_h \mathbf{u})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq ch \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^1(\text{curl}; \Omega)} \quad (4.8)$$

for  $\mathbf{u} \in [H^1(\Omega)]^3$  and  $\nabla \times \mathbf{u} \in [H^1(\Omega)]^3$  as well as the stability estimate

$$\|\pi_h \mathbf{v}\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)} \leq c_\pi \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)} \quad \text{for all } v \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega). \quad (4.9)$$

Now we are in the position to state the final convergence result.

**Theorem 4.5** *Let  $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in L^2(0, T; H(\text{curl}; \Omega))$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m \in X_h$  for all  $m = 1, \dots, M$  be the unique solutions of Problem 2.2 and Problem 4.3, respectively. Assume*

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\text{curl}; \Omega)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H^1(\text{curl}; \Omega))$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt}\widehat{\mathbf{u}}, \frac{d^2}{dt^2}\widehat{\mathbf{u}} \in L^2(0, T; [H(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)]^*), \quad \frac{d}{dt}\widehat{\mathbf{u}} \in H^1(\operatorname{curl}, \Omega), \quad \mathbf{u}_0 \in H^1(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega).$$

Then there holds the error estimate

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^M - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^M\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \tau \sum_{m=1}^M \|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{H(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)}^2 \leq c(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}) \left[ h^2 + \tau^2 \right].$$

**Proof.** The proof follows partly the lines of the proof of Theorem 4.2. We will use the triangle inequality to estimate the error of an auxiliary approximation  $\pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m$  and the additional errors of the time discretization and the approximation of  $\widetilde{S}$  on the discrete level. We start investigating the latter. We substract the variational formulation of Problem 4.3 from Problem 4.1 at time  $t = t_m$  and obtain

$$\left\langle \sigma \frac{d}{dt} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^m + \widetilde{S}(t_m) \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^m, \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle = \left\langle \sigma \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{m-1}}{\tau} + \widetilde{S}(t_m) \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m, \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v}_h \in X_h,$$

or equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \sigma (\pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m), \mathbf{v}_h \rangle + \tau \langle \widetilde{S}(t_m) \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{S}(t_m) \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle & (4.10) \\ &= \underbrace{\langle \sigma (\pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1} - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^{m-1}), \mathbf{v}_h \rangle}_{=:A} + \underbrace{\left\langle \sigma \left[ \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1} - \tau \frac{d}{dt} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(t_m) \right], \mathbf{v}_h \right\rangle}_{=:B} \\ & \quad + \tau \underbrace{\langle \widetilde{S}(t_m) \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{S}(t_m) \pi_h \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^m, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle}_{=:C} + \tau \underbrace{\langle \widetilde{S}(t_m) \pi_h \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{S}(t_m) \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^m, \mathbf{v}_h \rangle}_{=:D}. \end{aligned}$$

We set  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_h^m := \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m$  and estimate the different terms of the error equation (4.10). The monotonicity of  $\widetilde{S}$  gives for the left hand side terms

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \sigma (\pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m) + \tau \left( \widetilde{S}(t_m) \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{S}(t_m) \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m \right), \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m \right\rangle \\ & \geq \|\sqrt{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\psi}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \tau c_M \|\boldsymbol{\psi}_h^m\|_{H(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The first right hand side term of (4.10) can be estimated as

$$A = \langle \sigma \boldsymbol{\psi}_h^{m-1}, \boldsymbol{\psi}_h^m \rangle \leq \|\sqrt{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\psi}_h^{m-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\psi}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\psi}_h^{m-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\psi}_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

The Lipschitz continuity of  $\widetilde{S}$  and the continuity (4.9) of the projection  $\pi_h$  enable the estimate of the third right hand side term of (4.10):

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \tau \left\langle \widetilde{S}(t_m) \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{S}(t_m) \pi_h \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^m, \boldsymbol{\psi}_h^m \right\rangle \leq \tau c_L^{\widetilde{S}} c_\pi \|\pi_h(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^m)\|_{H(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)} \|\boldsymbol{\psi}_h^m\|_{H(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \gamma_1 \tau \|\boldsymbol{\psi}_h^m\|_{H(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)}^2 + \tau \frac{(c_L^{\widetilde{S}})^2 c_\pi^2}{2\gamma_1} \|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^m\|_{H(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)}^2 \end{aligned}$$



for some positive constant  $\gamma_1$ . The Lipschitz continuity of  $\tilde{S}$  implies for the fourth right hand side term of (4.10), and for some positive constant  $\gamma_2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} D &= \tau \left\langle \tilde{S}(t_m) \pi_h \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^m - \tilde{S}(t_m) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^m, \psi_h^m \right\rangle \leq \tau c_L^{\tilde{S}} \|\pi_h \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^m - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)} \|\psi_h^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \gamma_2 \tau \|\psi_h^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 + \tau \frac{(c_L^{\tilde{S}})^2}{2\gamma_2} \|\pi_h \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^m - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the second right hand side term of (4.10) we obtain, for some positive constant  $\gamma_3$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \left\langle \sigma \left[ \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1} - \tau \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t_m) \right], \psi_h^m \right\rangle \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \tau \gamma_3 \|\psi_h^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{2\gamma_3 \tau} \left\| \sigma \left[ \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1} - \tau \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t_m) \right] \right\|_{[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We now collect the estimates of (4.10), set  $\gamma_i = \frac{1}{3} c_M$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 3$ , and rearrange the terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sqrt{\sigma} \psi_h^m\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_M \tau \|\psi_h^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 &\leq \|\sqrt{\sigma} \psi_h^{m-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{3(c_L^{\tilde{S}})^2 c_\pi^2}{c_M} \tau \|\hat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \tau \frac{3(c_L^{\tilde{S}})^2}{c_M} \|\pi_h \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^m - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 + \frac{3}{c_M \tau} \left\| \sigma \left[ \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1} - \tau \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t_m) \right] \right\|_{[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summarizing over  $m = 1, \dots, M$  leads to

$$\|\sqrt{\sigma}(\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}^M - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^M)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_M \tau \sum_{m=1}^M \|\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 \leq F$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} F &:= \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}^0 - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{3(c_L^{\tilde{S}})^2 c_\pi^2}{c_M} \tau \sum_{m=1}^M \|\hat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \tau \frac{3(c_L^{\tilde{S}})^2}{c_M} \sum_{m=1}^M \|\pi_h \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^m - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{c_M \tau} \sum_{m=1}^M \left\| \sigma \left[ \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \pi_h \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1} - \tau \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t_m) \right] \right\|_{[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the approximation  $\pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m$  and application of the triangle inequality yields for the total error

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^M - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^M)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + c_M \tau \sum_{m=1}^M \|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 \\
& \leq 2 \left( \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^M - \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^M)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^M - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^M)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + 2c_M \tau \sum_{m=1}^M \left( \|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 + \|\pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \leq 2 \|\sqrt{\sigma}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^M - \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^M)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2c_M \tau \sum_{m=1}^M \|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 + 2F. \quad (4.11)
\end{aligned}$$

Based on the approximation properties (4.8) of the  $H(\text{curl};\Omega)$  projection  $\pi_h$ , the following terms of the right hand side of equation (4.11) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\|\sqrt{\sigma}(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^M - \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^M)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2c_M \tau \sum_{m=1}^M \|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m\|_{H(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 + 2\|\sqrt{\sigma}(\pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^0 - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_h^0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \quad (4.12) \\
& \leq ch^2 \left( \|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\text{curl};\Omega))}^2 + \|\nabla \times \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\text{curl};\Omega))}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_0\|_{H^1(\text{curl};\Omega)}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For the last term of  $2F$  we conclude, by using the triangle inequality and a Taylor expansion, requiring  $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$  to be twice continuously differentiable in time,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{6}{c_M \tau} \sum_{m=1}^M \left\| \sigma \left[ \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1} - \tau \frac{d}{dt} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(t_m) \right] \right\|_{[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*}^2 \\
& \leq \frac{18}{c_M \tau} \sum_{m=1}^M \left\| \sigma \left[ \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m + \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1} \right] \right\|_{[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*}^2 \quad (4.13) \\
& \quad + \frac{18}{c_M \tau} \sum_{m=1}^M \left( \left\| \sigma \left[ \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1} - \tau \frac{d}{dt} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(t_m) \right] \right\|_{[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*}^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \tau^2 \left\| \sigma \frac{d}{dt} \left( \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(t_m) - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(t_m) \right) \right\|_{[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*}^2 \right) \\
& \leq c_1 h^2 \left\| \frac{d}{dt} \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\text{curl};\Omega))}^2 + c_2 \tau^2 \left\| \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*)}^2 \\
& \quad + c_3 \tau^2 \left\| \sigma \frac{d}{dt} \left( \widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}} \right) \right\|_{L^2(0,T;[H(\text{curl};\Omega)]^*)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For the last step we applied the equivalence of the discrete  $L^2$  norm and the  $L^2(0, T)$  norm. In particular, we have used the mean value theorem for the first term to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{m=1}^M \left\| \sigma \left[ \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m + \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1} \right] \right\|_{[H(\text{curl}; \Omega)]^*}^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{m=1}^M \left\| \sigma \tau \left[ \pi_h \left( \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1}}{\tau} \right) - \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1}}{\tau} \right] \right\|_{[H(\text{curl}; \Omega)]^*}^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{m=1}^M \left\| \sigma \tau \left[ \pi_h \frac{d}{dt} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\xi) - \frac{d}{dt} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\xi) \right] \right\|_{[H(\text{curl}; \Omega)]^*}^2 \\
&\leq ch^2 \sum_{m=1}^M \tau \left\| \frac{d}{dt} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\xi) \right\|_{H^1(\text{curl}; \Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term we applied a Taylor expansion to obtain

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{m=1}^M \left\| \sigma \left[ \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^{m-1} - \tau \frac{d}{dt} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(t_m) \right] \right\|_{[H(\text{curl}; \Omega)]^*}^2 \leq \sigma_{\max} \tau^3 \sum_{m=1}^M \left\| \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\xi_m) \right\|_{[H(\text{curl}; \Omega)]^*}^2.$$

Then Lemma 4.1 and the estimates of the BEM approximations in Subsect. 4.3 yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sigma \frac{d}{dt} [\widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}] \right\|_{L^2(0, T; [H(\text{curl}; \Omega)]^*)} &\leq \frac{c_T}{\mu_0} \left( 1 + \frac{c_L^{\tilde{s}}}{c_M} \right) \|(\mathcal{B} - \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}) T_n \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0, T; H^{1/2}(\Gamma))} \\
&\leq ch \|T_n \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0, T; H_{\text{pw}}^{1/2}(\Gamma))} \\
&\leq ch \|\nabla \times \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega))}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

The same kind of estimate holds true for the remaining part of the term  $2F$ , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
& 6 \frac{(c_L^{\tilde{s}})^2 c_\pi^2}{c_M} \tau \sum_{m=1}^M \left[ c_\pi^2 \|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^m\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)}^2 + \|\pi_h \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^m\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)}^2 \right] \\
&\leq 6 \frac{(c_L^{\tilde{s}})^2 c_\pi^2}{c_M} \tau \sum_{m=1}^M \left[ (c_\pi^2 + 2(1 + c_\pi)^2) \|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^m\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)}^2 + \|\pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}^m\|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)}^2 \right] \\
&\leq c_1 \|(\mathcal{B} - \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}) T_n \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0, T; H^{1/2}(\Gamma))}^2 + c_2 \|\pi_h \widehat{\mathbf{u}} - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0, T; H(\text{curl}; \Omega))}^2
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq c_1 h^2 \|T_n \widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0, T; H_{\text{pw}}^{1/2}(\Gamma))}^2 + c_2 h^2 \|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0, T; H^1(\text{curl}; \Omega))}^2 \\
&\leq ch^2 \|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^2(0, T; H^1(\text{curl}; \Omega))}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Now the assertion follows after summarizing all previous estimates.  $\blacksquare$

## 5 Numerical examples

In this section we present some first numerical results in order to verify the applicability of the presented FEM–BEM approach. We restrict ourselves to the simplified linear model, i.e., we do not include the nonlinear saturation term  $\mathcal{A}_{nl}$ .

For the finite element discretization of the interior problem we use hexahedral finite elements with lowest order Nédélec basis functions. This implementation was done by using the C++ library deal.II (see [www.dealii.org](http://www.dealii.org)). The boundary element approximation (4.6) was realized by using a fast multipole boundary element method [21].

### 5.1 Simulation of current through a coil

As a first example we consider the current through a coil which is given as the cylindrical interior domain

$$\Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid -1.2 < x_1 < 1.2, x_2^2 + x_3^2 < 0.36\}$$

and which is decomposed into 5120 hexahedral finite elements. This corresponds to 16544 degrees of freedom (DOF) of the finite element approximation. For the boundary element approximation we use a conforming boundary mesh with 2304 triangles, i.e. 2304 DOF for the flux  $\theta_h$ , and 1154 related DOF for the potential  $w_h$ , see (4.5).




Figure 5.1: (a) Hollow cylinder  $S$  (grey) in the interior domain  $\Omega$ , (b) Slices for the visualisation of the finite element solution. (Example 1)

In the hollow cylinder, i.e. in the coil, see Fig. 5.1,

$$S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid -0.5 < x_1 < 0.5, 0.2 < x_2^2 + x_3^2 < 0.25\},$$

we prescribe the velocity field  $\mathbf{w} = (0, x_3, -x_2)^\top$  and set  $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{0}$  elsewhere. Moreover, we set

$$\mu(x) := \begin{cases} 1000 & \text{for } x \in \Omega, \\ 1 & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad \sigma(x) := \begin{cases} 1000 & \text{for } x \in S, \\ 10^{-3} & \text{for } x \in \Omega \setminus \bar{S}, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

The initial condition is given as  $\mathbf{u}_0 = (0, x_3, -x_2)^\top$ . The constant time step length is chosen as  $\tau = 0.01$ . For the visualisation of the finite element solution we use Tecplot

360 to calculate the rotation. This allows to visualize the magnetic field  $\mathbf{B}$  instead of the potential  $\mathbf{u}$ , see Fig. 5.2. Fig. 5.3 shows the component  $\mathbf{B}_1$  of the magnetic field at different slices in the interior domain as depicted in Fig. 5.1(b).




Figure 5.2: Magnetic field lines of the BEM solution in the plane  $x_2 = 0$  at timestep 240. The coil  $S$  is marked by the rectangle. (Example 1)

We observe that the magnetic field points in one direction in the interior of the coil and in the opposite direction parallel to the coil. Its magnitude decreases when the distance in  $x_1$  direction to the coil increases. In particular, the magnetic field in the exterior behaves like a dipole field as expected.

## 5.2 Simulation of the earth’s magnetic field without dynamo

The second example is a first step towards a simulation of the earth’s magnetic field. The interior domain  $\Omega = B(0, R)$  is a ball with radius  $R = 6.38$  where we consider two different meshes, see Table 5.1.

mesh	DOF (FEM)	finite elements	DOF (BEM)	boundary elements
coarse	87632	28672	1538	3072
fine	694432	229376	6146	12288

Table 5.1: Number of finite and boundary elements and degrees of freedom. (Example 2)

We prescribe the given velocity field  $\mathbf{w} = (-x_2, x_1, 0)^\top$  in the spherical shell

$$S = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid 2 < \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2} < 5 \right\}$$




Figure 5.3: Magnetic field component  $\mathbf{B}_1$  in the interior domain at slices (a)  $x_1 = -1.2$ , (b)  $x_1 = -1$ , (c)  $x_1 = -0.65$ , (d)  $x_1 = -0.5$ , (e)  $x_1 = -0.3$ , and (f)  $x_1 = 0$ . Note that the scale varies. (Example 1)

and set  $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{0}$  elsewhere. Moreover, let

$$\mu(x) := \frac{10^7}{4\pi} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(x) := \begin{cases} 3 \cdot 10^5 & \text{for } |x| \leq 5, \\ 100 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

The initial condition is  $\mathbf{u}_0 = (0, x_3, -x_2)^\top$ . Fig. 5.4 shows the magnetic field in a part of the exterior domain when using the fine mesh. It looks almost like a dipole field. Although an axisymmetric velocity field cannot generate an axisymmetric magnetic field (see, e.g., [17]) the solution shows the correct behaviour. The strength of the magnetic field decreases in time. Additionally we made another test with the coarse mesh and a 100 times larger velocity. The amplitude of the magnetic field decreases even faster in this setting (cf. Fig. 5.4). We plot the  $L^2$  norm of the magnetic field in the interior domain for both velocity fields.

## 6 Conclusions

In the present paper we have given a numerical analysis of a coupled finite and boundary element formulation to model a kinematic dynamo in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . While the analysis is given for the nonlinear model, the numerical example only covers a simplified linear model. Although the implementation can be extended to the nonlinear model straight forward, this would




Figure 5.4: Example 2. (a) BEM solution on the fine mesh at timestep 240, (b)  $L^2$ -norm of the magnetic field on the coarse grid in the FEM domain for the given velocity field  $\mathbf{w}$  and the velocity field  $100\mathbf{w}$ . One timestep is 0.001.

require a more efficient solution approach for the linearized model, which is beyond the scope of this paper.

The model as used in this paper is based on the knowledge of the given velocity field  $\mathbf{w}$ . A more general model will incorporate the Navier–Stokes equations to describe this velocity field as an additional unknown. However, the solution of these direct problems may serve as the basis of the inverse problem, i.e., the determination of the velocity field in the interior domain from measurements on the boundary.

## References

- [1] A. Buffa, P. Ciarlet Jr.: On traces for functional spaces related to Maxwell’s equations. I: An integration by parts formula in Lipschitz polyhedra. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* 24 (2001) 9–30.
- [2] Z. Chen, Q. Du, J. Zhou: Finite element methods with matching and nonmatching meshes for Maxwell equations with discontinuous coefficients. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 37 (2002) 1542–1570.
- [3] P. Ciarlet Jr., J. Zou: Fully discrete finite element approaches for time–dependent Maxwell’s equations. *Numer. Math.* 82 (1999) 193–219.
- [4] K. H. Chan, K. Zhang, J. Zou: Spherical interface dynamos: Mathematical theory, finite element approximation, and application. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 44 (2006) 1877–1902.

- [5] M. Costabel: Boundary integral operators on Lipschitz domains: Elementary results. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 19 (1988) 613–626.
- [6] P. A. Davidson: An introduction to magnetohydrodynamics. Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [7] J. L. Guermond, R. Laguerre, J. Leorat, C. Nore: A interior penalty Galerkin method for the MHD equations in heterogeneous domains. *J. Comp. Phys.* 221 (2007) 349–369.
- [8] J. L. Guermond, R. Laguerre, J. Leorat, C. Nore: Nonlinear magnetohydrodynamics in axisymmetric heterogeneous domains using a Fourier/finite element technique and an interior penalty method. *J. Comp. Phys.* 228 (2009) 2739–2757.
- [9] A. Giesecke, C. Norre, F. Stefani, G. Gerbeth, J. Leorat, F. Luddens, J. L. Guermond: Electromagnetic induction in non-uniform domains. *Geophys. Astrophys. Fluid Dynam.* 104 (2010) 505–529.
- [10] R. Hiptmair: Symmetric coupling for eddy current problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 40 (2002) 41–65.
- [11] G. C. Hsiao, W. L. Wendland: *Boundary Integral Equations*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2008.
- [12] A. B. Iskakov, S. Descombes, J. Dormy: An integro-differential formulation for magnetic induction in bounded domains: boundary element-finite volume method. *J. Comp. Phys.* 197 (2004) 540–554.
- [13] M. Kuhn, O. Steinbach: Symmetric coupling of finite and boundary elements for exterior magnetic field problems. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* 25 (2002) 357–371.
- [14] R. Laguerre, C. Nore, J. Leorat, J. L. Guermond: Effects of conductivity jumps in the envelope of a kinematic dynamo model. *C. R. Mecanique* 334 (2006) 593–598.
- [15] W. Lemster: Untersuchung eines kinematischen Dynamo-Problems mittels FEM-BEM Kopplung. Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Göttingen, 2011.
- [16] W. McLean: *Strongly Elliptic Systems and Boundary Integral Equations*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [17] H. K. Moffat: *Magnetic field generation in electrically conducting fluids*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1978.
- [18] P. Monk: *Finite Element Methods for Maxwell’s Equations*. Oxford University Press, 2003.
- [19] J.-C. Nédélec: *Acoustic and electromagnetic equations*. vol 144 of Applied Mathematical Sciences, Springer, New York, 2001.



- [20] G. Of, O. Steinbach: A fast multipole boundary element method for a modified hyper-singular boundary integral equation. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Multifield Problems (M. Efendiev, W. L. Wendland eds.), Springer Lecture Notes in Applied Mechanics, vol. 12, Springer, Berlin, pp. 163–169, 2003.
- [21] G. Of, O. Steinbach, W. L. Wendland: The fast multipole method for the symmetric boundary integral formulation. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* 26 (2006) 272–296.
- [22] O. Steinbach: Numerical Approximation Methods for Elliptic Boundary Value Problems. Finite and Boundary Elements. Springer, New York, 2008.
- [23] E. P. Stephan, M. Maischak, F. Leydecker: An hp-adaptive finite element/boundary element coupling method for electromagnetic problems. *Comput. Mech.* 39 (2007) 673–680.
- [24] M. Xu, F. Stefani, G. Gerbeth: The integral equation method for a steady kinematic dynamo problem. *J. Comp. Phys.* 196 (2004) 102–125.
- [25] E. Zeidler: Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications. II/B: Nonlinear monotone operators. Springer, New York, 1990.

## Erschienene Preprints ab Nummer 2011/1

- 2011/1 O. Steinbach, G. Unger: Convergence orders of iterative methods for nonlinear eigenvalue problems.
- 2011/2 M. Neumüller, O. Steinbach: A flexible space–time discontinuous Galerkin method for parabolic initial boundary value problems.
- 2011/3 G. Of, G. J. Rodin, O. Steinbach, M. Taus: Coupling methods for interior penalty discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods and boundary element methods.
- 2011/4 U. Langer, O. Steinbach, W. L. Wendland (eds.): 9th Workshop on Fast Boundary Element Methods in Industrial Applications, Book of Abstracts.
- 2011/5 A. Klawonn, O. Steinbach (eds.): Söllerhaus Workshop on Domain Decomposition Methods, Book of Abstracts.
- 2011/6 G. Of, O. Steinbach: Is the one–equation coupling of finite and boundary element methods always stable?
- 2012/1 G. Of, O. Steinbach: On the ellipticity of coupled finite element and one–equation boundary element methods for boundary value problems.
- 2012/2 O. Steinbach: Boundary element methods in linear elasticity: Can we avoid the symmetric formulation?