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## Introduction

We consider the nonlinear evolution equation
(1.1a)

$$
u_{t}+\gamma D^{4} u=D^{2} \varphi(u), x \in I=(0, L), t>0
$$

with boundary conditions

$$
\begin{equation*}
D u=D^{3} u=0 \quad \text { at } \quad x=0, L \tag{1.1b}
\end{equation*}
$$

and initial condition
(1.1c)

$$
u(\cdot, 0)=u_{0}
$$

where $D \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \gamma$ is a prescribed positive constant and $\varphi \in C^{1}(1 R)$ is a prescribed function.

If

$$
\phi(u)=u\left(u^{2}-\beta^{2}\right)
$$

then (1.1a) is the Cahn-Hilliard equation, see Cahn [1968], Novick-Cohen \& Segel [1984], Elliott \& French [1987], and the references cited therein.

The Cahn-Hilliard generalized diffusion equation has been proposed to model phase separation in a binary mixture where $u$ is a scaled concentration. The solution $u(x, t)$ exhibits pattern formation with interfaces separating regions where $u$ is nearly constant taking the phase values $\pm \beta$. Also in the time evolution the solution reaches certain states and remains close to them for a long time before evolving into different states of lower energy; this phenomenon is called metastability.

We assume that (1.1) has a unique solution for $t \in[0, T]$. Further we assume that the solution is sufficiently smooth and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbf{1})} \leq M \quad \forall t \in[0, T] \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the case of the Cahn-Hilliard equation global existence and boundedness of $u$ has been proved in Elliott \& Zheng [1986].

A weak formulation for this problem is: (P) Find $u(\cdot, t) \in H_{E}^{2}(I)$ for $t \in[0, T]$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(u_{t}, v\right)+\gamma\left(D^{2} u, D^{2} v\right)=\left(\varphi(u), D^{2} v\right) \quad \forall v \in H_{E}^{2}(I) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $u(\cdot, 0)=u_{0}$;
where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (v, w) \equiv \int_{I} v(x) w(x) d x, \\
& H_{E}^{2}(I)=\left\{v \in H^{2}(I): D v=0 \text { at } x=0 \text { and } x=L\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Throughout this note the norms in $L^{\infty}(\mathrm{I}), \mathrm{L}^{\mathbf{2}}(\mathrm{I})$ and $\mathrm{H}^{\mathbf{E}}(\mathrm{I})$ are denoted by $|\cdot|_{0, \infty},|\cdot|_{0}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{s}$. The semi-norm $\left|D^{2} v\right|_{0}$ is denoted by $|v|_{s}$.

Numerical Method: Let $S_{h}^{r}$ be the piecewise polynomial spline space

$$
S_{h}^{r}=\left\{x \in C^{r-2}(I):\left.\chi\right|_{I_{j}} \in P_{r-1}(I), j=1 \ldots N\right\}
$$

where $r \geq 3$ is an integer;

$$
0=x_{0}<x_{1}<\ldots<x_{N}=L
$$

is a partition of $I=(0, L)$ with $I_{j}=\left(x_{j-1}, x_{j}\right), h=\max _{j}\left(x_{j}-x_{j-1}\right)$ and $\mathbf{P}_{r-1}\left(I_{j}\right)$ denotes the set of all polynomial functions on $I_{j}$ of degree less than or equal to $r-1$. Define

$$
\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbf{r}}=\left\{\chi \in \mathbf{S}_{h}^{\mathbf{r}}: \mathrm{D}_{\chi}=0 \text { at } \mathrm{x}=0 \text { and } \mathrm{x}=\mathrm{L}\right\}
$$

and let

$$
\alpha \geq h\left(\min _{j}\left(x_{j}-x_{j-1}\right)\right)^{-1}
$$

where we assume that for a family of partitions $\alpha$ is fixed.
The approximation scheme using a Galerkin method in space and Crank-Nicolson time discretization gives the following problem: ( $P_{h, k}$ ). Find $\left\{U^{n}\right\}_{0 \leq n k \leq T}$ such that $\mathbf{U}^{\mathbf{n}} \in{\underset{\mathbf{S}}{\mathbf{S}}}_{\mathbf{\mathbf { S } ^ { \mathbf { r } }}}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\partial U^{n} \cdot \chi\right)+\gamma\left(D^{2} U^{n+1 / 2}, D^{2} \chi\right)=\left(\varphi\left(U^{n+1 / 2}\right), D^{2} \chi\right) \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $\chi \in \stackrel{O}{S}_{h}^{r}$ and $u^{0}=u_{0}^{h}$;
where $u_{0}^{h}$ is an approximation of $u_{0}$.

$$
\partial V^{n}=\frac{1}{k}\left(V^{n+1}-V^{n}\right)
$$

and

$$
u^{n+1 / 2}=\frac{1}{2}\left(U^{n+1}+u^{n}\right)
$$

For $v \in H_{E}^{2}(1)$, let $P_{h} v \in \mathcal{S}_{h}$ be the unique solution of

$$
\left(D^{2} P_{h} v-D^{2} v, D^{2} x\right)=0 \text { for all } x \in \mathcal{S}_{h}^{r}
$$

where $(x, 1)=0$ and $\left(P_{h} v, 1\right)=(v, 1)$. If $p^{n}=P_{h} u(\cdot, n k)-u(\cdot, n k)$ then (1.5) $\left\|\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right)^{j} \rho^{n}\right\|_{0} \leq C h^{\bar{r}} ; j=0,1 ; 0 \leq n k \leq T$
where

$$
\bar{r}= \begin{cases}2 & \text { if } r=3 \\ r & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

and $C$ depends on $\left\|\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right)^{j} u\right\|_{r}$; see Elliott \& Zheng [1986].
We will assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|_{0}^{h}-\left.u(\cdot, 0)\right|_{0} \leq C h^{\bar{r}} \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C$ is independent of $h, k$.
We also need the subspace inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
|x|_{0, \infty} \leq \frac{C}{h}|x|_{0} \quad \forall x \in \stackrel{\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{h}}^{r}}{\mathbf{r}} \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C$ depends on $r$ and $\alpha$.
Error bounds for the continuous in time Galerkin approximation of the
 [1986]. Numerical experiments based on the Crank-Nicolson time discretization (1.4) are reported on in Elliott \& French [1987]. Also in this latter paper an error analysis was carried out based on the assumptions that $(A)(1.4)$ has a unique solution for $k$ sufficiently small and (B) $\left|\mathrm{U}^{n}\right|_{0, \infty}$ is uniformly bounded independently of $h$ and $k$. It is the purpose of this note to justify ( $B$ ) and to show that (1.4) has a unique solution in the ball $B=\left\{\chi \in{\underset{\mathbf{S}}{\boldsymbol{r}}}_{\mathbf{h}}:|\chi|_{0, \infty} \leq M+1\right\}$ for $h$ and $k$ sufficiently small. We also analyse an iterative method to solve (1.4) which is similar but slightly different to that used in Elliott \& French [1987].

Section 3 has the main Theorem of this note which is an optimal order error estimate for the fully discrete Crank-Nicolson method (1.4) where the solution is obtained at each time step by a fixed point iteration procedure. Section 2 has several auxiliary results for (1.1) in the special case where $\varphi^{\prime}$ is bounded. The main idea here is that because we are interested in computing with unbounded $\varphi^{\prime}()$ the error analysis of (1.4) requires an $L^{\infty}$ bound on $U^{n}$. Unfortunately it is not clear how to obtain an $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$ priori bound simply by studying (1.4). However since (1.4) is a perturbation of (1.1), it is possible to use the boundedness of $u(x, t)$ to derive the fact that there is a unique solution $u^{n} \in B$ for $h$ and $k$ sufficiently small.

## 2. Bounded $\varphi^{\prime}(\cdot)$

In this section we study the fully discrete approximation of (1.1) under the assumption that $\varphi^{\prime}$ is bounded. These results are used in section 3 in the analysis of the interesting case of (1.4) with $\varphi^{\cdot}$ unbounded.

Proposition 2.1. Let $\varphi(\cdot)$ be such that
(2.1) $\quad \varphi \in C^{1}(\mathbb{1 R}) ; \sup _{s \in \mathbb{R}}\left|\varphi^{\prime}(s)\right| \leq \lambda$

There exists a $\mathbf{k}_{0}>0$, sufficiently small such that for

$$
\begin{equation*}
k<\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{0}} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

there is a unique sequence $\left\{U^{n}\right\}_{0 \leq n k \leq T}$ solving (1.4) and
(2.3) $\left.\left|u^{n}-u(\cdot, n k)\right|_{0} \leq \alpha u\right)\left(h^{\bar{r}}+k^{2}\right)$
(2.4) $\left|\mathbf{u}^{n}-u(\cdot, n k)\right|_{0, \infty} \leq C(u)\left(h^{\overline{-1}}+k^{2} / h\right)$.

Furthermore for each $n>0$ and $U_{0}^{n} \in{\underset{S}{S}}_{S_{h}^{r}}$ the sequence $\left\{U^{n}\right\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$ defined by:

$$
\begin{align*}
\left(U_{j}^{n}, \chi\right) & +\frac{\gamma k}{2}\left(D^{2} U_{j}^{n}, D^{2} \chi\right)=k\left(\varphi\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(U_{j-1}^{n}+U^{n-1}\right)\right), D^{2} \chi\right)+\left(U^{n-1}, \chi\right)  \tag{2.5}\\
& -\frac{\gamma k}{2}\left(D^{2} U^{n-1}, D^{2} \chi\right) \forall \chi \in S_{h}^{r}
\end{align*}
$$

converges to $U^{n}$ at the rate.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|u_{j}^{n}-u^{n}\right|_{0}^{2} \leq\left(k \frac{\lambda^{2}}{4 \gamma}\right)^{\mu}\left|u_{0}^{n}-u^{n}\right|_{0}^{2} \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|u_{j}^{n}-u^{n}\right|_{0, \infty}^{2} \leq C \frac{\lambda}{\gamma}\left(k \frac{\lambda^{2}}{4 \gamma}\right)^{j-1 / 2}\left|u_{0}^{n}-u^{n}\right|_{0}^{2} \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof: For fixed $n \geq 1$, given $\mathbf{U}_{0}^{n} \in{\underset{S}{\mathbf{O}}}_{\mathbf{r}}^{r}$ it is clear that (2.5) generates a well defined sequence $\left\{U_{j}^{n}\right\}$ since the bilinear form $(\cdot)+,\frac{\gamma k}{2}\left(D^{2} \cdot, D^{2}\right)$ is strictly coercive on $\stackrel{O}{\mathbf{S}}_{\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbf{r}}$. Set $e_{j}=\mathbf{U}_{j+1}^{\mathbf{n}}-\mathbf{U}_{j}^{\mathbf{n}}$. It follows by subtraction that for each $x \in g_{h}^{r}$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left(e_{j}, \chi\right)+\frac{k y}{2} D^{2} e_{j}, D^{2} \chi\right)=k\left(\left[\varphi\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(U_{j}^{n}+U^{n-1}\right)\right)-\varphi\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(U_{j-1}^{n}+U^{n-1}\right)\right)\right], D^{2} \chi\right) \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Taking $x=e_{j}$ in (2.8) yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
|e|_{0}^{2}+\frac{\gamma k}{2}\left|e_{j}\right|_{2}^{2} & =\frac{k}{2}\left(\varphi^{\prime}\left(\eta_{j}^{n}\right) e_{j-1}, D^{2} e_{j}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{k \lambda}{2}\left|e_{j-1}\right|_{0}\left|e_{j}\right|_{2} \\
& \leq \frac{k}{2}\left[\frac{\lambda^{2}}{2 \gamma}\left|e_{j-1}\right|_{0}^{2}+\frac{\gamma}{2}\left|e_{j}\right|_{2}^{2}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

so that
(2.9a)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.\left|e_{j}^{2}+\frac{\gamma k}{4}\right| e_{j}\right|_{2} ^{2} \leq \frac{k \lambda^{2}}{4 \gamma}\left|e_{j-1}\right|_{0}^{2} \\
& \left|e_{j}\right|_{0}^{2} \leq\left(\frac{k \lambda^{2}}{4 \gamma}\right)^{j}\left|e_{0}\right|_{0}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking $k$ sufficiently small, $\left\{U_{j}^{n}\right\}$ is a Cauchy sequence with limit $U^{n} \in \mathcal{S}_{h}^{r}$ and, by the continuity of $\varphi$, passing to the limit in (2.5) yields (1.4). A similar argument yields the uniqueness of $\mathbf{U}^{\mathbf{n}}$ solving (1.4). Furthermore setting $\mathbf{E}_{j}=\mathbf{U}_{j}^{\mathbf{n}}-\mathbf{U}^{\mathbf{n}}$ and subtracting (1.4) from (2.5) we obtain the following analogue of (2.9)
(2.10a) $\left|E_{j}\right|_{0}^{2}+\frac{\gamma k}{4}\left|E_{j}\right|_{2}^{2} \leq \frac{k \lambda^{2}}{4 \gamma}\left|E_{j-1}\right|_{0}^{2}$
(2.10b) $\left|E_{j}\right|_{0}^{2} \leq\left(\frac{k \lambda^{2}}{4 \gamma}\right)^{j}\left|E_{0}\right|_{0}^{2}$.

Note that (2.10b) proves (2.6).
In order to prove (2.7) note that taking $\chi=1$ in (1.4) and (2.5) yields $(E, 1)=0$ so that by the Poincare inequality

$$
|v|_{0} \leq C\left(|v|_{1}+|(v, 1)|\right) \quad \forall v \in H^{1}(I)
$$

the inequality

$$
|v|_{1} \leq|v|_{2}^{1 / 2}|v|_{0}^{1 / 2} \quad \forall v \in H_{E}^{2}(I),
$$

and the Sobolev inequality

$$
|v|_{0, \infty} \leq C\|v\|_{1} \forall v \in H^{1}(\mathbf{I})
$$

we obtain

$$
\left.\left|E_{j, \infty} \leq C\right| E_{j}\right|_{0} ^{1 / 2}\left|E_{j}\right|^{1 / 2} ;
$$

applying (2.10) yields (2.7).
We now turn to the proof of (2.3) and (2.4) To prove (2.3) we use standard techniques (see Thomee [1984]). For completeness, parts of the proof from Elliott
\& French [1987] are included below.
Let $t_{n}=n k, P_{h} u^{n} \equiv P_{h}^{n}\left(u \cdot, t_{n}\right)$ and $t_{n+1 / 2}=\frac{1}{2}\left(t_{n}+t_{n+1}\right)$.
We use the standard error decomposition:

$$
u^{n}-u\left(\cdot t_{n}\right)=\left[u^{n}-P_{h} u^{n}\right]+\left[P_{h} u^{n}-u\left(\cdot t_{n}\right)\right]=\theta^{n}+e^{n}
$$

Using (1.4) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\partial \theta^{n}, \chi\right)+\gamma\left(D^{2} \theta^{n+1 / 2}, D^{2} \chi\right)=\left(p\left(U^{n+1 / 2}\right)-p\left(u\left(\cdot, t_{n+1 / 2}\right)\right), D^{2} \chi\right) \\
& -\left(\partial P_{h} u^{n}-u_{t}, \chi\right)-\gamma\left(D^{2}\left[\frac{1}{2} u\left(\cdot, t_{n+1}\right)+\frac{1}{2} u\left(\cdot, t_{n}\right)-u\left(\cdot, t_{n+1 / 2}\right)\right], D^{2} \chi\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Setting $\chi=\theta^{n+1 / 2}$, the above becomes

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(\partial \theta^{n}, \theta^{n+1 / 2}\right)+\gamma\left|\theta^{n+1 / 2}\right|_{2}^{2} \leq\left[\left|\varphi\left(u^{n+1 / 2}\right)-p\left(u\left(\cdot, t_{n+1 / 2}\right)\right)\right|_{0}+\right.  \tag{2.11}\\
& \left|\partial P_{h} u^{n}-u_{t}\left(\cdot, t_{n+1 / 2}\right)\right|_{0}+\gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} u\left(\cdot, t_{n+1}\right)+\frac{1}{2} u\left(\cdot, t_{n}\right)-\left.u\left(\cdot \cdot t_{n+1 / 2}\right)\right|_{2}\right]\left|\theta^{n+1 / 2}\right|_{2}
\end{align*}
$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\partial \theta^{n}, \theta^{n+1 / 2}\right)=C\left(I_{1}+I_{2}+I_{3}\right)^{2} \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the I's are the three terms in the first factor on the right-hand side of (2.11). Estimate $I_{3}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{3} & =\gamma\left|\int_{t_{n+1 / 2}}^{t_{n+1}}\left(s-t_{n+1 / 2}\right) u_{t t}(\cdot, s) d s-\int_{t_{n}}^{t_{n+1 / 2}}\left(s-t_{n+1 / 2}\right) u_{t t}(\cdot, s) d s\right|_{0}^{2} \\
& =\gamma k^{\frac{3}{2}}\left(\int_{t}^{t_{n+1}}\left\|u_{t t}(\cdot, s)\right\|_{2}^{2} d s\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Estimate $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{I}_{1} & =\left|\varphi^{\prime}(\eta)\left[\mathbf{u}^{n+1 / 2}-u\left(\cdot, t_{n+1 / 2}\right)\right]\right|_{0} \leq \lambda\left|U^{n+1 / 2}-u\left(\cdot, t_{n+1 / 2}\right)\right|_{0} \\
& \leq C\left[\left|\theta^{n+1 / 2}\right|_{0}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\left|\rho^{n+1}\right|_{0}+\left|\rho^{n}\right|_{0}+\left|\frac{1}{2} u\left(\cdot, t_{n+1}\right)+\frac{1}{2} u\left(\cdot, t_{n}\right)-u\left(\cdot, t_{n+1 / 2}\right)\right|_{0}\right]\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

The last term in the above is estimated in the same way as $I_{3}$.

Finally we consider $I_{2}$. Let $\partial u\left(\cdot, t_{\mathbf{n}}\right)=k^{-1}\left(u\left(\cdot, t_{n+1}\right)-u\left(\cdot, t_{\mathbf{n}}\right)\right)$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{2} & \leq \mid \partial P_{h} u^{n}-\partial u\left(\cdot, t_{n} y_{0}+\left|\partial u\left(\cdot, t_{n}\right)-u_{t}\left(\cdot, t_{n+1 / 2}\right)\right|_{0}\right. \\
& =k^{-1}\left|\rho^{n+1}-\rho^{n}\right|_{0}+\mid k^{-1}\left(u\left(\cdot, t_{n+1}\right)-u\left(\cdot, t_{n}\right)-u_{t}\left(\cdot, t_{n+1 / 2}\right)_{0}\right. \\
& \leq k^{-1 / 2}\left(\int_{t_{n}}^{t_{n+1}}\left|\rho_{t}(\cdot, s)\right| \delta d s\right)^{1 / 2} \\
& +k^{-1}\left(\int_{t_{n+1 / 2}}^{t_{n+1}}\left(s-t_{n+1 / 2}\right)^{2} u_{t t t}(\cdot, s) d s-\left.\int_{t_{n}}^{t_{n+1 / 2}}\left(s-t_{n+1 / 2}\right)^{2} u_{t t t}(\cdot, s) d s\right|_{0}\right) \\
& \leq k^{-1 / 2}\left(\int_{t_{n}}^{t_{n+1}}\left|\rho_{t}(\cdot, s)\right|_{0}^{2} d s\right)^{1 / 2}+k^{\frac{3}{2}}\left(\int_{t_{n}}^{t_{n+1}}\left|u_{t t t}(\cdot, s)\right| 2 d s\right)^{1 / 2}
\end{aligned}
$$

With these estimates (2.12) becomes

$$
\frac{1}{2} k^{-1}\left(\left|\theta^{n+1}\right|_{0}^{2}-\left|\theta^{n}\right|_{0}^{2}\right) \leq C\left(\left|\theta^{n+1 / 2}\right|_{0}^{2}+w_{n}\right)
$$

where

$$
w_{n}=\left|\rho^{n+1}\right|_{0}^{2}+\left|\rho^{n}\right|_{0}^{2}+k^{3}\left(\int_{t_{n}}^{t_{n+1}}\left\|u_{t t}(\cdot, s)\right\|_{2}^{2}+\left|u_{t t t}(\cdot, s)\right|_{0}^{2} d s\right)+k^{-1} \int_{t_{n}}^{t_{n+1}}\left|\rho_{t}(\cdot, s)\right|_{0}^{2} d s
$$

which yields

$$
\left|\theta^{n+1}\right|_{0}^{2} \leq \frac{1+C k}{1-C k}\left|\theta^{n}\right|_{0}^{2}+C k w_{n} .
$$

Iterating this inequality, we have for $\mathbf{k}_{0}<1 / 2 \mathrm{C}$

$$
\left|\theta^{n}\right|_{0}^{2} \leq C(T)\left(\left|\theta^{n}\right|_{0}^{2}+C k \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} w_{j}\right)
$$

Noting that

$$
\left|\theta^{0}\right| z \leq\left|p^{0}\right| z+\left|u^{0}-u_{0}\right|_{0}^{2}
$$

we obtain (2.3) by recalling the bounds (1.5).
It remains to prove (2.4). We note that there exists $I_{h} u\left(\cdot, t_{n}\right) \in{\underset{\mathbf{S}}{h}}_{\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{r}}}$, an interpolant of $u\left(\cdot, t_{n}\right)$, which satisfies

$$
\left|\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{u}\left(\cdot, \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{n}}\right)-\mathbf{u}\left(\cdot, \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{n}}\right)\right|_{0, \infty} \leq \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{h}^{\bar{r}}
$$

so that, using the inverse norm inequality (1.7),

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|u^{n}-u\left(\cdot, t_{n}\right)\right|_{0, \infty} & \leq C(u) h^{r}+\left|I_{h} u\left(\cdot, t_{n}\right)-u^{n}\right|_{0, \infty} \\
& \leq C(u) h^{r}+C^{-1}\left|I_{\mathbf{h}} u\left(\cdot, t_{\mathbf{n}}\right)-U^{n}\right|_{0} \\
& \leq C(u) h^{r}+C h^{-1}\left[\left.\right|_{h^{\prime}} u\left(\cdot, t_{n}\right)-\left.u\left(\cdot, t_{n}\right)\right|_{0}\right. \\
& \left.+\left|u\left(\cdot, t_{\mathbf{n}}\right)-u^{n}\right|_{0}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

and so (2.4) now follows from (2.3).

Corollary 2.1: There exists constants $h_{0}>0$ and $\varepsilon_{0}>0$ independent of $h$ and $k$ such that if $h \leq h_{o}, k^{2} / h \leq \varepsilon_{0}$ and
(2.13) $\quad\left|U_{0}^{n}\right|_{0, \infty} \leq K \quad$ for $0 \leq n k \leq T$
for some constant $K>0$ then

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\left|U_{j}^{n}\right|_{0, \infty} \leq M+1 & \text { for } 0 \leq n k \leq T \\
& \text { and } j=1,2, \ldots .
\end{array}
$$

Proof:
From the estimate (2.4) and the given bound (1.2) on $u$ we have $\left|U^{n}\right|_{0 . \infty} \leq M+C(u)\left(h^{\bar{r}-1}+\frac{k^{2}}{h}\right)$.
(2.7) gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|U_{j}^{n}\right|_{0, \infty} & \leq\left|U^{n}\right|_{0, \infty}+(c k)^{1 / 2}\left|u_{o}^{n}-u^{n}\right|_{0} \\
& \leq\left(1+(c k)^{1 / 2}\right)\left|U^{n}\right|_{0, \infty}+(c k)^{1 / 2}\left|U_{o}^{n}\right|_{0, \infty} \\
& \leq\left(M+C(u)\left(h^{\overline{r-1}}+\frac{k h^{2}}{h}\right)\left(1+(c k)^{1 / 2}\right)+(c k)^{1 / 2} K .\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

Clearly for $\varepsilon_{0}$ and $h_{0}$ sufficiently small the right hand side is less than $\mathbf{M + 1}$.

## 3 Unboundod $\varphi^{\prime}(1)$

We now consider (1.1) and (1.4) without requiring that $\varphi^{\prime}(\cdot)$ be bounded; this is the case for the Cahn-Hilliard equation where

$$
\varphi(u)=3 u^{2}-\beta^{2} .
$$

In order to obtain error bounds for this case we analyse problem ( $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}}$ ) which has $\varphi$ replaced by $\tilde{\varphi} \in C^{1}(\mathrm{IR})$ such that
(3.1a) $\tilde{\varphi}(s) \quad=\varphi(s) \quad$ for $|s| \leq M+1$
and
(3.1b)

$$
\operatorname{Sup}_{s \in I R}\left|\tilde{\varphi}^{\prime}(s)\right| \leq \lambda
$$

In this case we know that, because of the assumptions (1.2), the initial boundary-value problem (1.1) has the same unique solution when $\varphi$ is replaced by $\check{\varphi}$.

Thoorem 3.1: There exist positive constants $h_{0}$ and $\varepsilon_{0}$ such that for $h \leq h_{0}$ and $k^{2} \leq \varepsilon_{0} h$ :
(i) (1.4) has a unique solution $U_{B}^{n}$ in the ball

$$
\mathbf{B}=\left\{\begin{array}{llll}
x & \varepsilon \mathbf{S}_{h}^{r} & :|\chi|_{0 . \infty} \leq M+1
\end{array}\right\} .
$$

(ii) For every $\mathbf{u}_{0}^{n} \in B$ the fixed point iteration (2.5) converges to $\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{B}}^{\mathbf{n}}$.
(iii) The error bound

$$
\left|u_{B}^{n}-u\left(\cdot, t_{n}\right)\right|_{0} \leq C(u)\left(h^{\bar{r}}+k^{2}\right)
$$

holds.

Proof: Let $\mathbf{U}^{\mathbf{n}}$ and $\mathbf{U}_{j}^{\mathbf{n}}$ denote solutions of $\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_{\mathrm{n}, \mathrm{k}}\right)$ and
(2.5) for fixed $n$ with $\varphi$ replaced by $\tilde{\varphi}$. Proposition 2.1 applies and we know that $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{n}$ is unique and is the limit as $j \rightarrow \infty$ of the well defined sequence $\left\{\tilde{U}_{j}^{n}\right\}$. Furthermore it follows from the Proposition and Corollary 2.1 that $U^{\mathbf{n}} \in B$ and $\tilde{\mathrm{U}}_{j}^{n} \in \mathrm{~B}$ for each $\mathrm{n} \geq 1$ and $\mathrm{J}=0,1,2 \ldots$. Since $\varphi$ is identical to $\tilde{\varphi}$ on the ball $B$, Theorem 3.1 is an immediate consequence of section 2 with

$$
\mathbf{u}_{j}^{\mathbf{n}}=\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{j}^{\mathbf{n}}, \quad \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{B}}^{\mathbf{n}}=\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathbf{n}}
$$

Remark: Suitable choices for $U_{0}^{n} \in B$ are
a) $u_{0}^{n}=u^{n-1}$
b) $u_{0}^{n}=2 u^{n-1}-u^{n-2}$.

In case b) the fact that $U_{0}{ }^{n} \in B$ is a consequence of the fact that $2 U^{n-1}-U^{n-2}$ approximates $2 u\left(\cdot, t_{n-1}\right)-u\left(\cdot, t_{n-2}\right)$ in $L^{\infty}$ and the latter approximates $\mathbf{u}\left(\cdot, \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{n}}\right)$ to order $\mathbf{k}^{\mathbf{2}}$.

Remark: We considered other fully discrete numerical methods for problem (1.1). The backward Euler method for (1.1), "time-lagging" the nonlinear term, is given by the problem : Find $\left\{U^{n}\right\}_{0 \leq n k \leq T}$ such that $U^{n} \in S_{h}^{i r}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\partial \mathbf{U}^{\mathbf{n}}, \chi\right)+\gamma\left(D^{2} \mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{n}+1}, D^{2} x\right)=\left(\varphi\left(\mathbf{U}^{\mathrm{n}}\right), D^{2} \chi\right) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $x \in \stackrel{\mathbf{S}}{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbf{r}}$ and $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathbf{o}}=\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathbf{h}}$. An optimal order linearized Crank-Nicholson method is defined as above with (3.2) replaced by the expression below

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\partial u^{n}, x\right)+\gamma\left(D^{2} u^{n+1 / 2} \cdot D^{2} x\right)=\left(\varphi\left(\frac{3}{2} u^{n}-\frac{1}{2} u^{n-1}\right), D^{2} x\right) . \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Again the nonlinear term is "time lagged" . A Crank-Nicholson predictor-corrector method has two steps. The prediction function is found by (3.3). Labelling this solution $\mathbf{W}^{\mathbf{n + 1}}$ the correction function is found by the expression

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\partial \mathbf{U}^{n}, \chi\right)+\gamma\left(D^{2} u^{n+1 / 2} \cdot D^{2} \chi\right)=\left(\varphi\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(w^{n+1}+U^{n}\right)\right), D^{2} \chi\right) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

as above.
On each time step all the methods discussed above define a unique selection $U^{n+1}$ given $U^{n}$ We can prove there exist constants $C, \varepsilon_{0}$ and $h_{0}$ such that
(i) If $\left\{U^{n}\right\}$ is given by the backward Euler method (3.2), $h \leq h_{0}$ and $k \leq \varepsilon_{0} h$ then
(3. 5)

$$
\left|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}\left(\cdot \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{n}}\right)\right|_{0} \leq C\left(\mathbf{h}^{\bar{r}}+k\right)
$$

(ii) If $\left\{\mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{n}}\right\}$ is given by either of the Crank-Nicholson methods, $h \leq h_{0}$ and $k \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon_{0} h}$ then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{n}}-\mathbf{u}\left(\cdot, \mathrm{t}_{\mathbf{n}}\right)\right|_{0} \leq \mathbf{C}\left(\mathbf{h}^{\overline{\mathbf{r}}}+\mathbf{k}^{2}\right) \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$
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