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Abstract. In this paper we study the global convergence of the implicit residual-based a posteriori error estimates for a discontinuous Galerkin method applied to one-dimensional linear hyperbolic problems. We apply a new optimal superconvergence result [Y. Yang and C.-W. Shu, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 50 (2012), pp. 3110-3133] to prove that, for smooth solutions, these error estimates at a fixed time converge to the true spatial errors in the $L^2$-norm under mesh refinement. The order of convergence is proved to be $k + 2$, when $k$-degree piecewise polynomials with $k \geq 1$ are used. As a consequence, we prove that the DG method combined with the a posteriori error estimation procedure yields both accurate error estimates and $O(h^{k+2})$ superconvergent solutions. We perform numerical experiments to demonstrate that the rate of convergence is optimal. We further prove that the global effectivity indices in the $L^2$-norm converge to unity under mesh refinement. The order of convergence is proved to be 1. These results improve upon our previously published work in which the order of convergence for the a posteriori error estimates and the global effectivity index are proved to be $k + 3/2$ and $1/2$, respectively. Our proofs are valid for arbitrary regular meshes using $P^k$ polynomials with $k \geq 1$ and for both the periodic boundary condition and the initial-boundary value problem. Several numerical simulations are performed to validate the theory.
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1. Introduction

In this paper we analyze a residual-based a posteriori error estimates of the spatial errors for the semi-discrete discontinuous Galerkin (DG) method applied to the following one-dimensional linear hyperbolic conservation laws

\[
\begin{align*}
(1.1a) & \quad u_t + cu_x = f(x, t), \quad x \in [a, b], \quad t \in [0, T], \quad c > 0, \\
(1.1b) & \quad u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad x \in [a, b], \\
(1.1c) & \quad u(a, t) = g(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \\
(1.1d) & \quad u(a, t) = u(b, t), \quad t \in [0, T].
\end{align*}
\]

Here $c > 0$ is a constant speed and $[0, T]$ is a finite time interval. In this paper, we consider, without loss of generality, (1.1) with $c = 1$. In our analysis we select
the initial and boundary conditions and the source, \( f(x,t) \), such that the exact solution, \( u(x,t) \), is a smooth function on \([a,b] \times [0,T]\).

The DG method considered here is a class of finite element methods using completely discontinuous piecewise polynomials for the numerical solution and the test functions. DG method combines many attractive features of the classical finite element and finite volume methods. It is a powerful tool for approximating some partial differential equations which model problems in physics, especially in fluid dynamics or electrodynamics. In particular, it provides an appealing approach to address problems having discontinuities, such as those that arise in hyperbolic conservation laws. DG method was initially introduced by Reed and Hill in 1973 as a technique to solve neutron transport problems [30]. In 1974, LaSaint and Raviart [29] presented the first numerical analysis of the method for a linear advection equation. Since then, DG methods have been used to solve ordinary differential equations [5, 18, 28, 29], hyperbolic [14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, 26, 27] and diffusion and convection-diffusion [12, 13, 31] partial differential equations. Consult [22] and the references cited therein for a detailed discussion of the history of DG method and a list of important citations on the DG method and its applications.

In recent years, the study of superconvergence and \textit{a posteriori} error estimates of DG methods has been an active research field in numerical analysis. \textit{A posteriori} error estimators employ the known numerical solution to derive estimates of the actual solution errors. They are also used to steer adaptive schemes where either the mesh is locally refined (\( h \)-refinement) or the polynomial degree is raised (\( p \)-refinement). For an introduction to the subject of \textit{a posteriori} error estimation see the monograph of Ainsworth and Oden [9]. A knowledge of superconvergence properties can be used to (i) construct simple and asymptotically exact \textit{a posteriori} estimates of discretization errors like the one considered in this paper and (ii) help detect discontinuities to find elements needing limiting, stabilization and/or refinement. Superconvergence properties for DG methods have been studied in [5, 8, 25, 29] for ordinary differential equations, [4, 10, 5, 7, 21, 32] for hyperbolic problems and [2, 3, 6, 7, 11, 19, 20, 21] for diffusion and convection-diffusion problems.

The first superconvergence result for standard DG solutions of ordinary differential equations appeared in Adjerid \textit{et al.} [5]. They proved that the \( k \)-degree DG solution of \( u' - au = 0 \) is \( O(h^{k+2}) \) superconvergent at the roots of \((k+1)\)-degree right Radau polynomial. Numerical computations indicate that these superconvergence results extend to DG solutions of transient convection problems. However no analysis has been carried out for these results. Later, Cheng and Shu [21] studied the superconvergence property for the DG methods for solving one-dimensional time-dependent linear conservation laws. They proved superconvergence towards a particular projection of the exact solution when the upwind flux is used. The order of superconvergence is proved to be \( k + 3/2 \), when \( k \)-degree piecewise polynomials with \( k \geq 1 \) are used. However, the superconvergence rate obtained in [21] is not optimal. Adjerid and Baccouch [4] investigated the global convergence of the implicit residual-based \textit{a posteriori} error estimates of Adjerid \textit{et al.} [5]. They applied the superconvergence results of Cheng and Shu [21] and proved that these estimates at a fixed time \( t \) converge to the true spatial error in the \( L^2 \)-norm under mesh refinement. The order of superconvergence is proved to be \( k + 3/2 \). They further proved that the global effectivity indices converge to unity at \( O(h^{1/2}) \) rate. In this paper, we improve upon the result in [4]. A new optimal superconvergence
result is used to obtain optimal convergence rate in the $L^2$-norm for the \textit{a posteriori} error estimates and higher convergence rate for the global effectivity index.

More recently, Y. Yang and C.-W. Shu [32] studied the superconvergence of the error for the DG method for linear conservation laws. They proved that the error between the $k$-degree DG solution and the exact solution is $(k+2)$th order superconvergent at the downwind-biased Radau points with suitable initial discretization. They further proved that the DG solution is $(k+2)$th order superconvergent both for the cell averages and for the error to a particular projection of the exact solution. Their analysis is valid for arbitrary regular meshes and for $P^k$ polynomials with arbitrary $k \geq 1$, and for both periodic boundary conditions and for initial-boundary value problems. They performed numerical experiments to demonstrate that the superconvergence rate is optimal.

In this paper, we study the global convergence of the implicit residual-based \textit{a posteriori} error estimates for scalar linear hyperbolic problems. We apply the new optimal superconvergence result [32] to prove that these estimates at a fixed time $t$ converge to the true spatial errors in the $L^2$-norm under mesh refinement. The order of convergence is proved to be $k+2$. As a consequence, we prove that the DG method combined with the \textit{a posteriori} error estimation procedure yields both accurate error estimates and $O(h^{k+2})$ superconvergent solutions. Numerical evidences suggest that the rate of convergence is optimal. We further prove that the global effectivity indices converge to unity under mesh refinement. The order of convergence is proved to be 1. These results improve upon our previously published work [4] in which the order of convergence in the $L^2$-norm for the \textit{a posteriori} error estimates and the global effectivity index are proved to be $k+3/2$ and $1/2$, respectively. Even though our proofs are given for a simple initial-boundary value problem, the same results can be easily obtained for one-dimensional linear systems along the same lines. Furthermore, our proofs are valid for any regular meshes any using piecewise polynomials of degree $k \geq 1$ and for both the periodic boundary condition and the initial-boundary value problem. Several numerical simulations are performed to validate the theory.

This paper is organized as follows: In section 2 we present the semi-discrete DG method for solving the one-dimensional linear hyperbolic problem and recall some superconvergence results needed for our analysis. In section 3, we present our \textit{a posteriori} error estimation procedure and prove that these error estimates converge to the true errors under mesh refinement in $L^2$-norm. In section 4, we present several numerical examples to demonstrate the asymptotic exactness of the \textit{a posteriori} error estimates under mesh refinement in $L^2$-norm. We conclude and discuss our results in section 5.

2. The DG method for conservation laws

In order to obtain the semi-discrete DG method, we divide $I = [a, b]$ into $N$ subintervals $I_i = [x_{i-1}, x_i]$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$, where $a = x_0 < \cdots < x_N = b$. Throughout this paper, the length $I_i$ is denoted by $h_i = x_i - x_{i-1}$. We denote $h = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} h_i$ and $h_{\text{min}} = \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} h_i$ as the length of the largest and smallest subinterval. Here, we consider regular meshes, that is $h \leq Kh_{\text{min}}$, where $K \geq 1$ is a constant during mesh refinement. If $K = 1$, then the mesh is uniformly distributed. Throughout
In order to obtain the weak DG formulation, we multiply (1.1a) by a test function \( v \), integrate over an arbitrary element \( I_i \), and use integration by parts to write

\[
\int_{I_i} u v \, dx - \int_{I_i} u v_x \, dx + uv_i \big|_{i-1}^{i} = \int_{I_i} f v \, dx.
\]

We construct a finite dimensional space \( V_h^k \) of discontinuous piecewise polynomials such that

\[
\forall i = 1, \ldots, N,
\]

\[
\int_{I_i} (u_h)_x v \, dx - \int_{I_i} u_h v_x \, dx + \tilde{u}_h v^-_{i} - \tilde{u}_h v^+_{i-1} = \int_{I_i} f v \, dx, \quad \forall v \in V_h^k,
\]

where \( \tilde{u}_h \) is the so-called numerical flux, which is yet to be determined. This numerical flux is nothing but discrete approximation to the trace of \( u \) at \( x = x_i \).

The semi-discrete DG method consists of finding \( u_h(t) \in V_h^k \) such that:

\[
\forall i = 1, \ldots, N,
\]

\[
\int_{I_i} (u_h)_x v \, dx - \int_{I_i} u_h v_x \, dx + \tilde{u}_h v^-_{i} - \tilde{u}_h v^+_{i-1} = \int_{I_i} f v \, dx, \quad \forall v \in V_h^k,
\]

where \( \tilde{u}_h \) is the so-called numerical flux, which is yet to be determined. This numerical flux is nothing but discrete approximation to the trace of \( u \) at \( x = x_i \).

If the periodic boundary condition (1.1d) is chosen, the numerical flux \( \tilde{u}_h \) can be taken as

\[
\tilde{u}_h_{|0} = g(t), \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{u}_h_{|i} = u_h^-_{|i}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N.
\]

The initial condition \( u_h(x, 0) \in V_h^k \) is obtained using a special projection of the exact initial condition \( u(x, 0) \). This particular projection will be defined later.

Expressing \( u_h(x, t) = \sum_{j=0}^{k} c_j(t) \phi_j(x) \), \( x \in I_i \) as a linear combination of orthogonal basis \( \phi_j(x) \), \( j = 0, \ldots, k \) (in our numerical examples \( \phi_j \) is the \( j \)-th-degree Legendre polynomial on \( I_i \)), and testing against functions \( v = \phi_j \), \( j = 0, \ldots, k \), we obtain a system of ordinary differential equations which can be solved for the coefficients \( c_j \).

Notations, definitions, and preliminary results. For \( k \geq 1 \), we will consider a special projection operator, \( P_h^- \), which is defined as follows: For any smooth function \( u \), the restriction of \( P_h^- u \) to \( I_i \) is defined as the unique element of \( P^k(I_i) \) satisfying

\[
\int_{I_i} (P_h^- u - u)v dx = 0, \quad \forall v \in P^{k-1}(I_i), \quad \text{and} \quad (P_h^- u)_{|i} = u^-_{|i}.
\]
In this paper, we define the $L^2$-integrable functions on $\| x \|$ for convenience, we use $\| \cdot \|$ on $I$. Let $H_0$ be the standard Sobolev norm $\| u \|_1$ for clarity. Thus we use $\| \cdot \|_x$. We also define the norms on the whole computational domain $I$ as follows:

$$
\| u(.,t) \|_{x,t} = \left( \sum_{j=0}^s \| \frac{\partial^j u(.,t)}{\partial x^j} \|_{I,t}^2 \right)^{1/2}.
$$

We also define the norms on the whole computational domain $I$ as follows:

$$
\| u(.,t) \|_I = \left( \sum_{j=1}^N \| u(.,t) \|_{I}^2 \right)^{1/2},
\| u(.,t) \|_{s,I} = \left( \sum_{j=1}^N \| u(.,t) \|_{s,I}^2 \right)^{1/2}.
$$

We note that if $u \in H^s(I)$, $s = 1, 2, \ldots$, the norms $\| u(.,t) \|_{s,I}$ on the whole computational domain is the standard Sobolev norm $\left( \sum_{j=0}^s \| \frac{\partial^j u(.,t)}{\partial x^j} \|_I^2 \right)^{1/2}$.

For convenience, we use $\| u \|$ to denote $\| u \|_I$. Also, in the remainder of this paper, we will omit the notation $(.,t)$ used in the subsequent induced norms unless needed for clarity. Thus we use $\| u \|_{s,I}$ instead of $\| u(.,t) \|_{s,I}$ etc.

In our analysis we need the $k^{th}$-degree Legendre polynomial defined by Rodrigues formula [1]

$$
\tilde{L}_k(\xi) = \frac{1}{2^k k!} \frac{d^k}{d\xi^k}[(\xi^2 - 1)^k], \; -1 \leq \xi \leq 1,
$$

which satisfies the following properties: $\tilde{L}_k(1) = 1$, $\tilde{L}_k(-1) = (-1)^k$ and the orthogonality relation

$$
(2.5) \int_{-1}^1 \tilde{L}_k(\xi) \tilde{L}_p(\xi) d\xi = \frac{2}{2k + 1} \delta_{kp}, \; \text{where } \delta_{kp} \text{ is the Kronecker symbol.}
$$

The $(k+1)$-degree Legendre polynomial on $[-1,1]$ can be written as

$$
\tilde{L}_{k+1}(\xi) = \frac{(2k+2)!}{2^{k+1}[(k+1)!]^2} \xi^{k+1} + \tilde{q}_k(\xi), \; \text{where } \tilde{q}_k \in P^k.
$$

Next, we define the $(k+1)$-degree right Radau polynomial as

$$
(2.6a) \quad \tilde{R}_{k+1}(\xi) = \tilde{L}_{k+1}(\xi) - \tilde{L}_k(\xi), \; -1 \leq \xi \leq 1,
$$

which has $k+1$ real distinct roots, $-1 < \xi_0 < \cdots < \xi_k = 1$.

Mapping the element $I_i = [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ into a reference element $[-1,1]$ by the standard affine mapping

$$
x(\xi, h_i) = \frac{x_i + x_{i-1}}{2} + \frac{h_i}{2} \xi,
$$

This special projection is used in the error estimates of the DG methods to derive optimal $L^2$ error bounds in the literature; see e.g., [21].
we obtain the shifted right Radau polynomial on $I_i$
\[ R_{k+1,i}(x) = \tilde{R}_{k+1}(\frac{2x - x_i - x_{i-1}}{h_i}) = \frac{(2k + 2)!}{h_i^{k+1}[(k + 1)]^2} x^{k+1} + r_k(x), \quad \text{where } r_k \in P^k. \]

Next, we define the monic right Radau polynomial, $\psi_{k+1,i}(x)$, on $I_i$ as
\[
(2.6c) \psi_{k+1,i}(x) = \frac{[(k + 1)]^2}{(2k + 2)!} h_i^{k+1} R_{k+1,i}(x) = c_k h_i^{k+1} R_{k+1,i}(x) = \prod_{j=0}^{k}(x - x_{i,j}),
\]
where $c_k = \frac{[(k + 1)]^2}{(2k + 2)!}$ and $x_{i,j} = \frac{x_i + x_{i-1}}{2} + \frac{h_i}{2} \xi_j$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, k$, are the roots of $R_{k+1,i}(x)$ shifted to $I_i$.

Next we state and prove the following result which will be needed in our a posteriori error analysis.

**Lemma 2.1.** The $(k+1)$-degree monic Radau polynomial on $I_i$, $\psi_{k+1,i}(x)$, satisfies
\[
(2.7a) \quad (\psi_{k+1,i}', \psi_{k+1,i})_{I_i} = -2c_k^2 h_i^{2k+2},
\]
\[
(2.7b) \quad \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2 = d_k h_i^{2k+3},
\]
where
\[
(2.7c) \quad c_k = \frac{[(k + 1)]^2}{(2k + 2)!}, \quad d_k = \frac{2(2k + 2)}{(2k + 1)(2k + 3)} c_k^2.
\]

**Proof.** Since $\tilde{L}_k(1) = 1$ and $\tilde{L}_k(-1) = (-1)^k$, we have $\tilde{R}_{k+1}(1) = R_{k+1}(x_i) = \psi_{k+1,i}(x_i) = 0$ and $\tilde{R}_{k+1}(-1) = R_{k+1}(x_{i-1}) = 2(-1)^{k+1}$. Thus,
\[
(\psi_{k+1,i}', \psi_{k+1,i})_{I_i} = \int_{I_i} \psi_{k+1,i}'(x) \psi_{k+1,i}(x) \, dx = \frac{1}{2} \psi_{k+1,i}^2(x_i) - \frac{1}{2} \psi_{k+1,i}^2(x_{i-1}) = -\frac{1}{2} \psi_{k+1,i}^2(x_{i-1}) = -\frac{1}{2} \left[ c_k h_i^{k+1} R_{k+1,i}(x_{i-1}) \right]^2 = -c_k^2 h_i^{2k+2}.
\]

Next, we will prove (2.7b). Using (2.6b) and the orthogonality relation (2.5), we have
\[
\|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2 = \int_{I_i} \psi_{k+1,i}^2(x) \, dx = c_k^2 h_i^{2k+2},
\]
\[
= \frac{c_k^2 h_i^{2k+2}}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} \left( \tilde{L}_{k+1}(\xi) - \tilde{L}_k(\xi) \right)^2 d\xi = \frac{c_k^2 h_i^{2k+3}}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} (\tilde{L}^2_{k+1}(\xi) + \tilde{L}^2_k(\xi)) d\xi = \frac{c_k^2 h_i^{2k+3}}{2} \left[ \frac{2}{2k + 3} + \frac{2}{2k + 1} \right] = \frac{2(2k + 2)}{(2k + 1)(2k + 3)} c_k^2 h_i^{2k+3} = d_k h_i^{2k+3}.
\]

Next, we consider an interpolation operator $\pi$ which is defined as follows: For any function $u = u(x,t)$ with $t \in [0, T]$ kept fixed, $\pi u \big|_{I_i} \in P^k(I_i)$ and interpolates $u$ at the roots $x_{i,j}$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, k$, of $(k+1)$-degree right Radau polynomial shifted to $I_i$. 

\[ \square \]
Lemma 2.2. Let $u \in H^{k+2}$, $t \in [0, T]$ fixed, and $P_h^-$ and $\pi$ as defined above. Then

\begin{align}
(2.8a) & \quad u - \pi u = \phi_i + \gamma_i, \text{ on } I_i, \\
(2.8b) & \quad \phi_i(x, t) = \alpha_i(t) \psi_{k+1,i}(x), \quad \psi_{k+1,i}(x) = \prod_{j=0}^{k} (x - x_{i,j}), \\
(2.8c) & \quad \|\phi_i\|_{s,I_i} \leq Ch_i^{k+1-s} \|u\|_{k+1,I_i}, \quad s = 0, \ldots, k, \\
(2.8d) & \quad \|\gamma_i\|_{s,I_i} \leq Ch_i^{k+2-s} \|u\|_{k+2,I_i}, \quad s = 0, \ldots, k+1.
\end{align}

Moreover,

\begin{align}
(2.9) & \quad \|\pi u - P_h^- u\|_{I_i} \leq Ch_h^{k+2} \|u\|_{k+2,I_i}.
\end{align}

Proof. The proof of these results can be found in the paper by Adjerid and Baccouch [4].

Throughout this paper, we use $e$, $\epsilon$, and $\bar{e}$ to denote, respectively, the error between the exact solution of (1.1) and the numerical solution defined in (2.2), the projection error, and the error between the numerical solution and the projection of the exact solution, i.e.,

\begin{align}
& e = u - u_h, \\
& \epsilon = u - P_h^- u, \\
& \bar{e} = P_h^- u - u_h.
\end{align}

We note that the true error can be split as $e = \epsilon + \bar{e}$.

In [32], the authors analyzed the same semi-discrete DG method considered here. They selected a special projection of the initial condition $u_h(x, 0) \in V_h$ and proved that the DG solution is $O(h^{k+2})$ super close to $P_h^- u$. This special projection is designed to better control the error of the initial condition. In particular, in their analysis, they designed the initial condition $u_h(x, 0)$ so that the following two requirements hold: (i) $\bar{e}_i(x, 0) = 0$ and (ii) $\|\bar{e}(x, 0)\| = O(h^{k+2})$. See [32] for the exact implementation of the initial discretization.

For the sake of completeness, we summarize their results in the next theorem [32].

Theorem 2.1. Let $u$ be the exact solution of (1.1). If $k \geq 1$ and $u_h$ is the DG solution defined in (2.2), then there exist positive constants $C_1, C_2, C_3$ independent of $h$ such that $\forall t \in [0, T]\n
\begin{align}
(2.10a) & \quad \|\bar{e}\| \leq C_1 h^{k+2}, \\
(2.10b) & \quad \|\epsilon\| \leq C_2 h^{k+1}, \\
(2.10c) & \quad \|\epsilon_\pi\| \leq C_3 h^{k+1}.
\end{align}

Here $C_1 = \tilde{C}_1(T+1) \|u\|_{k+4,I}, C_2 = \tilde{C}_2(T+1) \|u\|_{k+3,I}, C_3 = \tilde{C}_3(T+1) \|u\|_{k+3,I}$, and the constants $\tilde{C}_j, j = 1, 2, 3$ are independent of $h$, $T$, and $u$.

Proof. These results have been proved in [32]. More precisely, the estimate (2.10a) can be found in its Corollary 2.1. The results (2.10b) and (2.10c) can be found in the proof of the main result of its Theorem 2.1 (page 3118).
From now on, the notation $C$, $C_1$, $C_2$, etc. will be used to denote positive constants that are independent of the discretization parameter $h$, but which may depend upon the exact solution $u$. Furthermore, all the constants will be generic, i.e., they may represent different constant quantities in different occurrences.

In the next theorem, we state and prove the following superconvergence result.

**Theorem 2.2.** Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, then there exists a positive constant $C$ independent of $h$ such that

\[(2.11) \quad \|u_h - \pi u\| \leq Ch^{k+2}.\]

Moreover, the true error can be divided into a significant part and a less significant part as

\[(2.12a) \quad e(x, t) = \alpha_i(t)\psi_{k+1,i}(x) + \omega_i(x, t), \quad \text{on } I_i,\]

where

\[(2.12b) \quad \omega_i = \gamma_i + \pi u - u_h,\]

and

\[(2.12c) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\omega_i\|^2_{L^2} \leq Ch^{2(k+2)}, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|(\omega_i)_x\|^2_{L^2} \leq Ch^{2(k+1)}.\]

Finally,

\[(2.13) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|e_x\|^2_{L^2} \leq Ch^{2k} \quad \text{and} \quad \|e\|_{L^1} \leq Ch^k.\]

**Proof.** Adding and subtracting $P_h^+ u$ to $u_h - \pi u$, we write

\[u_h - \pi u = u_h - P_h^- u + P_h^- u - \pi u = \tilde{e} + P_h^- u - \pi u.\]

Taking the $L^2$-norm and applying the triangle inequality, we obtain

\[\|u_h - \pi u\| \leq \|\tilde{e}\| + \|P_h^- u - \pi u\|.

Using the estimates (2.10a) and (2.9) we establish (2.11).

Next, we add and subtract $\pi u$ to $e$, we have

\[(2.14) \quad e = u - \pi u + \pi u - u_h.\]

Furthermore, one can split the interpolation errors $u - \pi u$ on $I_i$ as in (2.8a) to obtain

\[(2.15) \quad e = \phi_i + \gamma_i + \pi u - u_h = \phi_i + \omega_i, \quad \text{where} \quad \omega_i = \gamma_i + \pi u - u_h.

Next, we use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the inequality $|ab| \leq \frac{1}{2}(a^2 + b^2)$ to write

\[(2.16) \quad \|\omega_i\|^2_{L^2} = (\gamma_i + \pi u - u_h, \gamma_i + \pi u - u_h)_{I_i} = \|\gamma_i\|^2_{L^2} + 2(\gamma_i, \pi u - u)_{I_i} + \|\pi u - u_h\|^2_{L^2} \leq 2\left(\|\gamma_i\|^2_{L^2} + \|\pi u - u_h\|^2_{L^2}\right).\]

Summing over all elements and applying (2.8d) with $s = 0$ and (2.11) yields the first estimate in (2.12c).
Next we will prove the second estimate in (2.12c). Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the inequality $|ab| \leq \frac{1}{2} (a^2 + b^2)$, we write

$$\| (\omega_i)_x \|_{I_i}^2 = ( (\gamma_i)_x + (\pi u - u_h)_x, (\gamma_i)_x + (\pi u - u_h)_x )_{I_i} \leq 2 \left( \| (\gamma_i)_x \|_{I_i}^2 + \| (\pi u - u_h)_x \|_{I_i}^2 \right).$$

Using the inverse inequality $\| (\pi u - u_h)_x \|_{I_i} \leq C h^{-1} \| (\pi u - u_h) \|_{I_i}$, we obtain the estimate

$$\| (\omega_i)_x \|_{I_i}^2 \leq C \left( \| (\gamma_i)_x \|_{I_i}^2 + h^{-2} \| (\pi u - u_h) \|_{I_i}^2 \right).$$

Summing over all elements and applying (2.11) and the standard error estimates (2.8d) with $s = 1$ we establish the second estimate in (2.12c).

In order to show (2.13), we note that

$$\| e \|_{1, I}^2 = \| e \|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \| e_x \|_{I_i}^2.$$

Differentiating (2.15) with respect to $x$, taking the $L^2$-norm, and applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the inequality $|ab| \leq \frac{1}{2} (a^2 + b^2)$, we get

$$\| e_x \|_{I_i}^2 = \left( (\phi_i)_x + (\omega_i)_x, (\phi_i)_x + (\omega_i)_x \right)_{I_i} \leq 2 \left( \| (\phi_i)_x \|_{I_i}^2 + \| (\omega_i)_x \|_{I_i}^2 \right).$$

Summing over all elements and applying (2.8c) and (2.12c), we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \| e_x \|_{I_i}^2 \leq C h^{2k}.$$

Finally, substituting (2.10b) and (2.19) into (2.18) establishes (2.13). \hfill \square

The results of the previous theorem show that the $k$-degree DG solution is $\mathcal{O}(h^{k+2})$ superconvergent at the roots of $(k+1)$-degree right Radau polynomial. This proves the observed numerical results in [5]. This error analysis allows us to obtain optimal convergence rate for the a posteriori error estimates [4] to the true spatial errors in the $L^2$-norm under mesh refinement.

3. A posteriori error estimation

We first present the weak finite element formulation to compute the a posteriori error estimate for the scalar hyperbolic equation [5]. Replacing $u$ by $u_h + e$, equation (1.1) yields

$$e_x + e_t = r_h,$$

where the residual is given by

$$r_h = f - (u_h)_t - (u_h)_x.$$

Multiplying (3.1a) by arbitrary smooth test function $v$ and integrating over an arbitrary element $I_i$, we obtain

$$(e_x, v)_{I_i} = (r_h - e_t, v)_{I_i}.$$  (3.2)

Substituting (2.12a) into the left-hand sides of (3.2) and choosing $v = \psi_{k+1,i}(x)$ we obtain

$$\alpha_i (\psi'_{k+1,i}, \psi_{k+1,i})_{I_i} = (r_h - e_t - (\omega_i)_x, \psi_{k+1,i})_{I_i}.$$  (3.3a)
Using the property (2.7a) and solving (3.3a) for $\alpha_i$, we get

\begin{equation}
(3.4) \quad \alpha_i(t) = -\frac{1}{2c^2_k h_i^{2k+2}} (r_h - e_t - (\omega_i)_x, \psi_{k+1,i})_{I_i}.
\end{equation}

Our error estimate procedure consists of approximating the true error on each element $I_i$ as

$$e(x,t) \approx E(x,t) = a_i(t)\psi_{k+1,i}(x), \quad x \in I_i,$$

where $a_i(t)$ is an approximation of $\alpha_i(t)$ and is obtained from (3.4) by neglecting the terms involving $\omega_i$ and $e_t$, i.e.,

\begin{equation}
(3.5) \quad a_i(t) = -\frac{1}{2c^2_k h_i^{2k+2}} (r_h, \psi_{k+1,i})_{I_i}.
\end{equation}

We note that $E(x,t) = a_i(t)\psi_{k+1,i}(x), \quad x \in I_i$ is a computable quantity since it only depends on the numerical solution $u_h$ and $f$. Thus, our DG error estimates are computationally simple and are obtained by solving a local steady problem with no boundary conditions on each element.

Next, we will show that the error estimate $E$ converges to the exact error $e$ in the $L^2$-norm as $h \to 0$. Before stating our main result we state and prove the following preliminary results.

**Theorem 3.1.** Suppose that $u$ and $u_h$ respectively, are solutions of (1.1) and (2.2). If $\alpha_i$ and $a_i$ are given by (3.4) and (3.5), then there exists a positive constant $C$ independent of $h$ such that

\begin{align}
(3.6) \quad &\sum_{i=1}^{N} (a_i - \alpha_i)^2 \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2 \leq C h^{2k+4}, \\
(3.7) \quad &\sum_{i=1}^{N} (\alpha^2_i - \alpha^2_i) \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2 \leq C h^{2k+2}.
\end{align}

**Proof.** Subtracting (3.5) from (3.4), we obtain

$$a_i - \alpha_i = -\frac{1}{2c^2_k h_i^{2k+2}} (e_t + (\omega_i)_x, \psi_{k+1,i})_{I_i}.$$

Applying the inequality $(a + b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)$, we obtain

\begin{equation}
(3.8) \quad (a_i - \alpha_i)^2 \leq \frac{1}{4c^4_k h_i^{4k+4}} \left[ (e_t + (\omega_i)_x, \psi_{k+1,i})_{I_i} \right]^2 \leq \frac{1}{2c^4_k h_i^{4k+4}} \left[ (e_t, \psi_{k+1,i})_{I_i}^2 + ((\omega_i)_x, \psi_{k+1,i})_{I_i}^2 \right].
\end{equation}

Applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $(x,y)^2 \leq \|x\|^2 \|y\|^2$, yields

\begin{equation}
(3.9) \quad (a_i - \alpha_i)^2 \leq \frac{\|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2}{2c^4_k h_i^{4k+4}} \left[ (e_t)_{I_i}^2 + ((\omega_i)_x)_{I_i}^2 \right].
\end{equation}

Multiplying (3.8) by $\|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2$ and using (2.7) we get

\begin{equation}
(3.9a) \quad (a_i - \alpha_i)^2 \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2 \leq \frac{\|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^4}{2c^4_k h_i^{4k+4}} \left[ (e_t)_{I_i}^2 + ((\omega_i)_x)_{I_i}^2 \right] = \tilde{c}_k h_i^2 \left[ (e_t)_{I_i}^2 + ((\omega_i)_x)_{I_i}^2 \right],
\end{equation}

where $\tilde{c}_k = \frac{1}{2c^4_k h_i^{4k+4}}$.\]
where \( \tilde{c}_k \) is a constant given by

\[
(3.9b) \quad \tilde{c}_k = \frac{d_k^2}{2c_k^4} = \frac{2(2k+2)^2}{(2k+1)^2(2k+3)^2}.
\]

Finally, summing over all elements and use the fact that \( h = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} h_i \), we obtain

\[
(3.10) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N} (a_i - \alpha_i)^2 \| \psi_{k+1,i} \|^2 \leq \tilde{c}_k h^2 \left[ \| e \|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \| (\omega_i)_{x} \|^2 \right].
\]

Combining this estimate with (2.10c) and (2.12c), with \( t \) kept fixed, we establish (3.6).

In order to prove (3.7), we combine (3.1a) and (3.5) to write

\[
(3.11) \quad a_i^2 = \frac{1}{4c_k^4h_i^{4k+4}} (r_{bh}, \psi_{k+1,i})_I^2 = \frac{1}{4c_k^4h_i^{4k+4}} (e_t + e_x, \psi_{k+1,i})_I^2.
\]

Applying the inequality \((a + b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)\) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

\[
(3.12) \quad a_i^2 \leq \frac{1}{2c_k^4h_i^{4k+4}} \left[ (e_t, \psi_{k+1,i})_I^2 + (e_x, \psi_{k+1,i})_I^2 \right]
\]

Multiplying (3.12) by \( \| \psi_{k+1,i} \|^2 \) and using (2.7), we obtain

\[
(3.13) \quad a_i^2 \| \psi_{k+1,i} \|^2 \leq \frac{\| \psi_{k+1,i} \|^4}{2c_k^4h_i^{4k+4}} \left[ \| e_t \|^2 \| e_x \|^2 \right]
\]

where \( \tilde{c}_k \) is defined in (3.9b).

Summing over all elements and use the fact that \( h = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} h_i \), we write

\[
(3.14) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i^2 \| \psi_{k+1,i} \|^2 \leq \tilde{c}_k h^2 \left[ \| e \|^2 + \| e \|_{1,I}^2 \right].
\]

By the estimates (2.10c) and (2.13), we obtain

\[
(3.15) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i^2 \| \psi_{k+1,i} \|^2 \leq Ch^{2k+2}.
\]

Taking the \( L^2 \) inner product of \( \psi_{k+1,i} \) and \( \phi_i \), defined in (2.8b), and applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

\[
| \alpha_i | \| \psi_{k+1,i} \|^2_{I_i} = \left| (\phi_i, \psi_{k+1,i})_I \right| \leq \| \psi_{k+1,i} \|_{I_i} \| \phi_i \|_{I_i}.
\]

Hence, we have

\[
| \alpha_i | \| \psi_{k+1,i} \|_{I_i} \leq \| \phi_i \|_{I_i} \Rightarrow a_i^2 \| \psi_{k+1,i} \|^2_{I_i} \leq \| \phi_i \|^2_{I_i}.
\]

Summing over all elements and applying (2.8c) we have

\[
(3.16) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i^2 \| \psi_{k+1,i} \|^2_{I_i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} \| \phi_i \|^2_{I_i} \leq Ch^{2k+2}.
\]
Adding (3.15) and (3.16) yields (3.7). □

The main results of this section are stated in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.2.** Assume that the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied. If \( a_i, i = 1, \ldots, N, \) are given by (3.5) and \( E(x,t) = a_i(t)\psi_{k+1,i}(x), x \in I_i, \) then there exists a positive constant \( C \) independent of \( h \) such that

\[
\|e - E\|^2 \leq C h^{2k+4}.
\]

As a consequence, the DG method combined with the a posteriori error estimation procedure yields \( O(h^{k+2}) \) superconvergent solution i.e.,

\[
\|u - (u_h + E)\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|u - (u_h + a_i\psi_{k+1,i})\|^2_{I_i} \leq C h^{2k+4}.
\]

Furthermore,

\[
\|e\|^2 = \|E\|^2 + \epsilon = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i^2 \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|^2_{I_i} + \epsilon, \quad \text{where } |\epsilon| \leq C h^{2k+3},
\]

and as \( h \to 0 \) with \( t \) kept fixed,

\[
\frac{\|E\|}{\|e\|} = 1 + O(h).
\]

**Proof.** First, we will prove (3.17) and (3.18). Since \( e = a_i\psi_{k+1,i} + \omega_i \) and \( E = a_i\psi_{k+1,i} \) on \( I_i, \) we have

\[
\|e - E\|^2_{I_i} = \|(a_i - a_i)\psi_{k+1,i} + \omega_i\|^2_{I_i} \leq 2(\alpha_i - a_i)^2 \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|^2_{I_i} + 2 \|\omega_i\|^2_{I_i},
\]

where we used the inequality \((a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2\). Summing over all elements and applying the estimates (2.12c) and (3.6) yields

\[
\|e - E\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|e - E\|^2_{I_i} \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\alpha_i - a_i)^2 \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|^2_{I_i} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\omega_i\|^2_{I_i}
\leq 2C_1 h^{2k+4} + 2C_2 h^{2k+4} = Ch^{2k+4}.
\]

Using the relation \( e = u - u_h \) and the estimate (3.17), we obtain

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{N} \|u - (u_h + a_i\psi_{k+1,i})\|^2_{I_i} = \|u - (u_h + E)\|^2 = \|e - E\|^2 \leq C h^{2k+4}.
\]

Next, we will prove (3.19). From (2.15) the DG error can be split as \( e = \phi_i + \omega_i \) on \( I_i. \) Taking the \( L^2 \)-norm of the DG error and using (2.8b) we have

\[
\|e\|^2_{I_i} = \|\phi_i\|^2_{I_i} + 2(\phi_i, \omega_i)_{I_i} + \|\omega_i\|^2_{I_i} = \alpha_i^2 \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|^2_{I_i} + \epsilon_i,
\]

where

\[
\epsilon_i = 2(\phi_i, \omega_i)_{I_i} + \|\omega_i\|^2_{I_i}.
\]

Summing over all elements, we obtain

\[
\|e\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i^2 \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|^2_{I_i} + \tilde{\epsilon}, \quad \text{where } \tilde{\epsilon} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \epsilon_i.
\]
Next, we write the DG error as
\begin{equation}
|e|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i^2 \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2 + \hat{\epsilon}, \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{\epsilon} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\alpha_i^2 - a_i^2) \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2 + \hat{\epsilon}.
\end{equation}

From (3.21b), we apply Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to obtain
\begin{equation}
|\epsilon_i| \leq 2 \|\phi_i\|_{I_i} \|\omega_i\|_{I_i} + \|\omega_i\|_{I_i}^2.
\end{equation}

Summing over all elements and applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality with the estimates (2.8c) and (2.12c), we get
\begin{equation}
|\tilde{\epsilon}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} |\epsilon_i| \leq C_1 h^{2k+3}.
\end{equation}

Next, we bound the first term in \( \hat{\epsilon} \) using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the inequality \((a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2\) as
\begin{align*}
\sum_{i=1}^{N} (\alpha_i^2 - a_i^2) \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2
\leq& \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\alpha_i - a_i)^2 \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\alpha_i + a_i)^2 \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
\leq& \sqrt{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\alpha_i - a_i)^2 \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\alpha_i^2 + a_i^2) \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2 \right)^{1/2}.
\end{align*}

Applying the estimates (3.6) and (3.7), we get
\begin{equation}
\sum_{i=1}^{N} (\alpha_i^2 - a_i^2) \|\psi_{k+1,i}\|_{I_i}^2 \leq C_1 h^{2k+3}.
\end{equation}

Finally, combining (3.23), (3.25) and (3.26) completes the proof of (3.19).

In order to prove (3.20) we use (3.19) to write
\begin{equation}
|e|^2 = \|E\|^2 + \hat{\epsilon}.
\end{equation}

Dividing by \(|e|^2\) and using the fact that \(|e|^2 = O(h^{2k+2})\) and \(\hat{\epsilon} = O(h^{2k+3}) = K h^{2k+3}\), for some constant \(K\), we obtain
\begin{equation}
\frac{\|E\|^2}{|e|^2} = 1 - K h,
\end{equation}

which, after taking the square root and using the Maclaurin series with respect to \(h\) of \((1 - K h)^{1/2} = 1 - \frac{K}{2} h + \cdots = 1 + O(h)\), completes the proof of (3.20).

An accepted efficiency measure of an \textit{a posteriori} error estimate is the global effectivity index defined as follows:
\begin{equation}
\theta(t) = \frac{\|E\|}{|e|}.
\end{equation}

Ideally, the global effectivity index should stay close to one and should converge to one under mesh refinement.
In the previous theorem, we proved that the global a posteriori error estimates at a fixed time \( t \) converge to the true spatial errors at \( O(h^{k+2}) \) rate. We further proved that the global effectivity index in the \( L^2 \)-norm converges to unity at \( O(h) \) rate. We note that the computable quantity \( u_h + E \) converge to the exact solution \( u \) at \( O(h^{k+2}) \) rate. We emphasize that this accuracy enhancement is achieved by adding the error estimate \( E \) to the approximate solution \( u_h \) only once at the end of the computation i.e., at \( t = T \). This leads to very efficient computations of the post-processed approximation \( u_h + E \). Additionally, it is computationally efficient because our DG error estimates are obtained by solving a local steady problem with no boundary conditions on each element.

4. Numerical examples

In this section, we present several numerical examples to demonstrate the global convergence of the residual-based a posteriori error estimates. The initial condition is determined by \( u_h(x, 0) = P_h u(x, 0), \ x \in I_i, \ i = 1, \cdots, N \). Even though Theorem 2.1 requires the initial condition designed in [32], we have observed similar results if we use the projection \( P_h \) and the standard \( L^2 \) projection of the initial condition instead. See the numerical experiments in [32] for some discussion related to initial conditions for conservation laws. Temporal integration is performed by the fourth-order classical explicit Runge-Kutta method. A time step \( \Delta t \) is chosen so that temporal errors are small relative to spatial errors.

Let \( \delta e \) and \( \delta \theta \) be defined as
\[
\delta e(t) = \| e^i - \| E \|, \quad \delta \theta(t) = | \theta(t) - 1 |, \quad \text{where} \quad \theta(t) = \frac{\| E \|}{\| e^i \|}.
\]

Example 4.1. We consider the following initial-boundary value problem
\[
\begin{cases}
  u_t + u_x = 0, & x \in [-1, 1], \ t \in [0, 1], \\
  u(x, 0) = \sin(\pi x), & x \in [-1, 1], \\
  u(-1, t) = \sin(\pi t), & t \in [0, 1].
\end{cases}
\]

The exact solution is given by \( u(x, t) = \sin(\pi(x - t)) \). We solve this problem using the DG method on uniform meshes obtained by partitioning the domain \([-1, 1]\) into \( N \) subintervals with \( N = 5, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 \) and using the spaces \( P^k \) with \( k = 1 - 3 \). In Figure 1 we plot, in log-log scale, the \( L^2 \) errors \( \| e^i \| \) at time \( t = 1 \) versus \( h \). For each \( P^k \) space, we fit, in a least-squares sense, the data sets with a linear function and then calculate from the fitting result the slopes of the fitting lines. The slopes of the fitting lines are shown on the graph. We observe that \( \| e^i \| = O(h^{k+1}) \).

On each element, we apply the error estimation procedure (3.5) to compute the error estimates for the DG solution. In Figure 1, we present the convergence rates for the global errors \( \| e - E \| \) using the spaces \( P^k \) with \( k = 1 - 3 \). These results indicate that \( \| e - E \| = O(h^{k+2}) \). This is in full agreement with the theory. This example demonstrates that the superconvergence rate proved in this paper is optimal. We note that
\[
\| e - E \| = \| u - u_h - E \| = \| u - (u_h + E) \| = O(h^{k+2}).
\]

Thus, the computable quantities \( u_h + E \) converge to the exact solution \( u \) at \( O(h^{k+2}) \) rate. We note that this accuracy enhancement is achieved by adding the error
estimate $E$ to the DG solution only once at the end of the computation i.e., at $t = T$. This leads to a very efficient computation of the post-processed approximation $u_h + E$. Also, we note that $u_h + E$ is computationally efficient because our DG error estimate $E$, $x \in I_i$ is obtained by solving a local steady problem with no boundary conditions on each element.

The true $L^2$ errors and the global effectivity indices shown in Table 1 indicate that our a posteriori error estimates converge to the true errors under both $h$- and $p$-refinements. The results shown in Figure 2 indicate that the numerical convergence rate at $t = 1$ for $\delta e$ is $O(h^{k+3})$. The observed rate is higher than the theoretical rate which is proved to be of order $k+3/2$. The errors $\delta \theta$ and their orders of convergence shown in Figure 2 suggest that the convergence rate at $t = 1$ for $\delta \theta$ is $O(h^2)$ under mesh refinement. These results indicate that the observed numerical convergence rate is higher than the theoretical rate established in Theorem 3.2 which is proved to be of order $O(h)$. We note that the effectivity indices stay close to unity for all times as shown in Figure 3 and converge under $h$- and $p$-refinements. Numerical results further indicate that the error estimates converge to the true errors with decreasing mesh size and increasing polynomial degree $k$.

**Example 4.2.** In this example, we test the global convergence of our error estimates using nonuniform meshes. We repeat the problem in example 4.1 with all
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Figure 2: Convergence rates at $t = 1$ for $\delta e$ (left) and $\delta \theta$ (right) for example 4.1 on uniform meshes having $N = 5, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50$ elements using $P^k$, $k = 1$ to 3. The slopes of the fitting lines are shown on the graph.

Figure 3: Global effectivity index $\theta(t)$ versus time for Example 4.1 on uniform meshes having $N = 10$ elements using $P^2$ (left) and $P^3$ (right).

parameters kept unchanged except for meshes where we consider nonuniform meshes constructed as follows: First, we partition the entire domain $[-1, 1]$ into nodes $-1 = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_N = 1$ with $N = 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 42$ to form $N$ subintervals, where $N$ is a multiple of three, each of length $h_0 = \frac{6}{N}$. Each subinterval is then divided into three nonuniform subintervals of length $\frac{2}{5} h_0$, $\frac{2}{5} h_0$, and $\frac{2}{5} h_0$, respectively.

The $L^2$ errors as well as their order of convergence at $t = 1$ are shown in Figure 4. These results show the DG method yields $O(h^{k+1})$ convergent solution. The $L^2$ DG errors $||e - E||$ at time $t = 1$ shown in Figure 4 suggest optimal $O(h^{k+2})$ convergence rate. Next, we present the true $L^2$ errors and the global effectivity indices in Table 2. We observe that the error estimates converge to the true errors in the $L^2$-norm under both $h$- and $p$-refinements. The results shown in Figure 5 indicate that the numerical convergence rate at $t = 1$ for $\delta e$ is $O(h^{k+3})$. The observed rate is again higher than the theoretical rate which is proved to be of order $k+3/2$. The errors $\delta \theta$ and their orders of convergence shown in Figure 5 suggest that the global effectivity indices converge to the true errors under $h$- and $p$-refinements. The convergence rate at $t = 1$ for $\delta \theta$ is $O(h^2)$. Again, the observed numerical convergence rate is higher than the theoretical rate established in Theorem 3.2.
Figure 4: Convergence rates at $t = 1$ for $||e||$ (left) and $||e - E||$ (right) for example 4.2 on nonuniform meshes having $N = 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 42$ elements using $P^k$, $k = 1$ to 3. The slopes of the fitting lines are shown on the graph.

Table 2. $L^2$ errors and global effectivity indices for Example 4.2 on nonuniform meshes having $N = 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 42$ elements using $P^k$, $k = 1$ to 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>$k = 1$</th>
<th>$k = 2$</th>
<th>$k = 3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0371e-2</td>
<td>0.9132</td>
<td>1.7468e-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.3192e-2</td>
<td>0.9580</td>
<td>5.1784e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.3448e-3</td>
<td>0.9757</td>
<td>2.1555e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.6763e-3</td>
<td>0.9842</td>
<td>1.1192e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.2378e-3</td>
<td>0.9890</td>
<td>6.4773e-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.3744e-3</td>
<td>0.9918</td>
<td>4.0793e-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Convergence rates at $t = 1$ for $\delta e$ (left) and $\delta \theta$ (right) for example 4.2 on nonuniform meshes having $N = 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 42$ elements using $P^k$, $k = 1$ to 3. The slopes of the fitting lines are shown on the graph.

Example 4.3. In this example, we demonstrate that our results hold true when using periodic boundary condition (1.1d) instead of (1.1c). For this, we solve the following problem

$$\begin{align*}
&\{ u_t + u_x = 0, & x \in [-1, 1], \ t \in [0, 1], \\
&u(x, 0) = \sin(\pi x), & x \in [-1, 1],
\end{align*}$$

with periodic boundary condition $u(-1, t) = u(1, t)$. The exact solution to this problem is $u(x, t) = \sin(\pi(x - t))$. 

Example 4.3. In this example, we demonstrate that our results hold true when using periodic boundary condition (1.1d) instead of (1.1c). For this, we solve the following problem

$$\begin{align*}
&\{ u_t + u_x = 0, & x \in [-1, 1], \ t \in [0, 1], \\
&u(x, 0) = \sin(\pi x), & x \in [-1, 1],
\end{align*}$$

with periodic boundary condition $u(-1, t) = u(1, t)$. The exact solution to this problem is $u(x, t) = \sin(\pi(x - t))$. 

We solve this problem using the DG method on uniform meshes having \( N = 5, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 \) elements and using the spaces \( P^k \) with \( k = 1, 2 \) and 3. We present the true errors in Figure 6 at time \( t = 1 \). These results indicate that \( ||e|| = O(h^{k+1}) \), where \( h = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} h_i \). The \( L^2 \) DG errors \( ||e - E|| \) at time \( t = 1 \) shown in Figure 6 suggest optimal \( O(h^{k+2}) \) convergence rate. The results presented in Table 3 indicate that the global effectivity indices converge to the true errors under mesh refinement. The results shown in Figure 7 indicate that the numerical convergence rate at \( t = 1 \) for \( \delta e \) and \( \delta \theta \) is \( O(h^2) \) under mesh refinement. Again the observed numerical convergence rates for \( \delta e \) and \( \delta \theta \) are higher than the theoretical rates which are proved to be \( O(h^{k+3/2}) \) and \( O(h) \), respectively. We conclude that our results for uniform meshes also hold true for this random mesh. We have also used a random mesh which is a random perturbation of the uniform mesh and observed similar results. These numerical results, which are not included to save space, still show the same rates of convergence for \( ||e - E|| \), \( \delta e \), and \( \delta \theta \).

![Figure 6](image-url)  
Figure 6: Convergence rates at \( t = 1 \) for \( ||e|| \) (left) and \( ||e - E|| \) (right) at time \( t = 1 \) versus mesh sizes \( h \) for Example 4.3 on uniform meshes having \( N = 5, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 \) elements using \( P^k \), \( k = 1 \) to 3. The slopes of the fitting lines are shown on the graph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>( k = 1 )</th>
<th>( k = 2 )</th>
<th>( k = 3 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1115e-1</td>
<td>0.7491</td>
<td>9.6203e-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5330e-2</td>
<td>0.9199</td>
<td>1.2093e-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.1006e-3</td>
<td>0.9780</td>
<td>1.5126e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.6889e-3</td>
<td>0.9900</td>
<td>4.4824e-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.5079e-3</td>
<td>0.9943</td>
<td>1.8911e-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.6363e-4</td>
<td>0.9963</td>
<td>9.6825e-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. \( L^2 \) errors and global effectivity indices for Example 4.3 on uniform meshes having \( N = 5, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 \) elements using \( P^k \), \( k = 1 \) to 3.
Figure 7: Convergence rates at $t = 1$ for $\delta e$ (left) and $\delta \theta$ (right) for example 4.3 on uniform meshes having $N = 5, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50$ elements using $P^k$, $k = 1$ to 3. The slope of the fitting line is indicated on the top of each figure.

5. Concluding remarks

In this paper we analyzed the global convergence of the implicit residual-based $a posteriori$ error estimates for the DG method applied to one-dimensional linear hyperbolic problems. We used a new optimal superconvergence result [32] to prove that these $a posteriori$ error estimates converge to the true spatial errors at $O(h^{k+2})$ rate. We also proved that the global effectivity indices in the $L^2$-norm converge to unity at $O(h)$ rate. These results improve upon our previously published work in which the orders of convergence for the $a posteriori$ error estimates and the global effectivity indices are proved to be $k + 3/2$ and $1/2$, respectively. Furthermore, we proved that the DG method combined with the $a posteriori$ error estimation procedure yields both accurate error estimates and $O(h^{k+2})$ superconvergent solutions. Our proofs are valid for arbitrary regular meshes, for $P^k$ polynomials with $k \geq 1$, and for both the periodic boundary condition and the initial-boundary value problem. We are currently investigating the superconvergence properties of the local DG method applied to two-dimensional convection-diffusion problems and two-dimensional wave equations on rectangular and triangular meshes. Superconvergence on more general meshes and nonlinear problems will be investigated in the future.
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