ANALYSIS OF THE SIMULATION OF SINGLE PHASE FLOW
THROUGH A NATURALLY FRACTURED RESERVOIR

BY

TODD ARBOGAST

IMA Preprint Series #295

February 1987

INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS AND ITS APPLICATIONS

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

514 Vincent Hall

206 Church Street S.E.

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

#	Author(s)	Title	#	Author(s)	Title
165	D. Arnold and R.S. Falk,	Continuous Dependence on the Elastic Coefficients for a Class of Anisotropic Materials	203	G. Buttazzo, G. Dal Maso and U. Mosco,	A Derivation Theorem for Capacities with Respect to a Radon Measure
166	I.J. Bakelman,	The Boundary Value Problems for Non-linear Elliptic Equation and the Maximum Principle for Euler-Lagrange Equations	204	S. Cowin, M. Mehrabadi,	On the Identification of Material Symmetry for Anisotropic Elastic Materials
167	Ingo Müller,	Gases and Rubbers	205	R.W.R. Darling,	Constructing Nonhomeomorphic Stochastic Flows.
168	Ingo Müller,	Pseudoelasticity in Shape Memory Alloys - an Extreme Case of Thermoelasticity	206	M. Chipot,	On the Reynolds Lubrication Equation
169	Luis Magalhães,	Persistence and Smoothness of Hyperbolic Invariant Manifolds for Functional Differential Equations	207	R.V. Kohn and G.W. Milfon,	On Bounding the Effective Conductivity of Anisotropic Composites
170	A. Damiljan and M. Vogelius,	Homogenization limits of the Equations of Elasticity in Thin Domains	208	I.-J. Bakelman,	Notes Concerning the Torsion of Hardening Rods and its N-Dimensional Generalizations
171	H.C. Simpson and S.J. Spector,	On Hadamard Stability in Finite Elasticity	209	I.-J. Bakelman,	The Boundary Value Problems for Non-linear Elliptic Equations
172	J.-L. Vazquez and C. Yarur,	Isolated Singularities of the Solutions of the Schrödinger Equation with a Radial Potential	210	Guanglu Gong and Mingping Qian,	On the Large Deviation Functions of Markov Chains
173	G. Dal Maso and U. Mosco,	Wiener's Criterion and Γ -Convergence	211	Arie Leizarowitz,	Control Problems with Random and Progressively Known Targets
174	John H. Maddocks,	Stability and Folds	212	R.W.R. Darling,	Ergodicity of a Measure-Valued Markov Chain Induced by Random Transformations
175	R. Hardt and D. Kinderlehrer,	Existence and Partial Regularity of Static Liquid Crystal Configurations	213	G. Gong, M. Qian and Zhongxin Zhao,	Killed Diffusions and its Conditioning
176	M. Nerukar,	Construction of Smooth Ergodic Cocycles for Systems with Fast Periodic Approximations	214	Arie Leizarowitz,	Controlling Diffusion Processes on Infinite Horizon with the Overtaking Criterion
177	J.L. Ericksen,	Stable Equilibrium Configurations of Elastic Crystals	215	Milard Beatty,	The Poisson Function of Finite Elasticity
178	Patricio Aviles,	Local Behavior of Solutions of Some Elliptic Equations	216	David Terman,	Traveling Wave Solutions Arising From a Combustion Model
179	S.-N. Chow and R. Lauterbach,	A Bifurcation Theorem for Critical Points of Variational Problems	217	Yuh-Jia Lee,	Sharp Inequalities and Regularity of Heat Semi-Group on Infinite Dimensional Spaces
180	R. Pego,	Phase Transitions: Stability and Admissibility in One Dimensional Nonlinear Viscoelasticity	218	D. Stroock,	Lecture Notes
181	Mariano Gagliardo,	Quadratic Functions and Partial Regularity	219	Claudio Canuto,	Spectral Methods and Maximum Principle
182	J. Bona, Fully Discrete Galerkin Methods for the Korteweg De Vries Equation	220	Thomas O'Brien,	A Two Parameter Family of Pension Contribution Functions and Stochastic Optimization	
183	J. Maddocks and J. Keller,	Mechanics of Robes	221	Takeyuki Hida,	Analysis of Brownian Functionals
184	F. Bernis,	Qualitative Properties for some nonlinear higher order Nonlinear Higher Order Parabolic Equations with Absorption	222	Leonid Hurwicz,	On Informational Decentralization and Efficiency of Resource Allocation Mechanisms
185	F. Bernis,	Finite Speed of Propagation and Asymptotic Rates for some Nonlinear Higher Order Parabolic Equations with Absorption	223	E.B. Fabes and D.W. Stroock,	A New Proof of Moser's Parabolic Harnack Inequality via the Old Ideas of Nash
186	S. Reichelstein and S. Reiter,	Game Forms with Minimal Strategy Spaces	224	Minoru Murata,	Structure of Positive Solution to $(-\Delta + V)u = 0$ in R^n
187	An Answer to Littlewood's Problem on Boundedness	225	Paul Dupuis,	Large Deviations Analysis of Reflected Diffusion Constrained Stochastic Approximation Algorithms in Convex Sets	
188	J. Rubinstein and R. Maury,	Dispersion and Convection in Periodic Media	226	F. Bernis,	Existence Results for Doubly Nonlinear Higher Order Parabolic Equations on Unbounded Domains.
189	W.H. Fleming and P.E. Souganidis,	Asymptotic Series and the Method of Vanishing Viscosity	227	S. Orey and S. Pelikan,	Large Deviations Principles for Stationary Processes
190	H. Beltrao Da Veiga,	Existence and Asymptotic Behavior for Strong Solutions of Navier-Stokes Equations in the Whole Space	228	R. Gulliver and S. Hildebrandt,	Boundary Configurations Spanning Continua of Minimal Surfaces.
191	L.A. Caffarelli, J.L. Vazquez, and N.L. Wolanski,	Lipschitz Continuity of Solutions and Interfaces of the N-Dimensional Porous Medium Equation	229	J. Baxter, G. Dal Maso & U. Mosco,	Stopping Times and Γ -Convergence.
192	R. Johnson,	m-Functions and Floquet Exponents for Linear Differential Systems	230	Julio Bouillet,	Self-Similar Solutions, Having Jumps and Intervals of Constancy of a Diffusion-heat Conduction Equation
193	F.V. Atkinson and L.A. Peletier,	Ground States and Dirichlet Problems for $-\Delta = F(u)$ in R^n	231	R. Hardt, D. Kinderlehrer & F.-H. Lin,	A Remark About the Stability of Smooth Equilibrium Configurations of Static Liquid Crystal
194	G. Dal Maso, U. Mosco,	The Wiener Modulus of a Radial Measure	232	M. Chipot and M. Luskun,	The Compressible Reynolds Lubrication Equation
195	H. A. Levine and H.F. Weinberger,	Inequalities between Dirichlet and Neumann Eigenvalues	233	J.H. Maddocks,	A Model for Disclinations in Nematic Liquid Crystal
196	J. Rubinstein,	On the Macroscopic Description of Slow Viscous Flow Past a Reflected Mapping Problem	234	C. Fofas, G.R. Sell and R. Temam,	Inertial Manifolds for Nonlinear Evolutionary Equations
197	G. Dal Maso and U. Mosco,	Wiener Criteria and Energy Decay for Relaxed Dirichlet Problems	235	P.-L. Chow,	Expectation Functionals Associated with Some Stochastic Evolution
198	V. Ofikar and P. Walfman,	On the Monge-Ampere Equation Arising in the Reflect Mapping Problem	236	Giuseppe Buttazzo,	Reinforcement by a Thin Layer with Oscillating Thickness
199	M. Chipot, D. Kinderlehrer and L. Caffarelli,	Some Smoothness Properties of Linear Laminae	237	W.H. Fleming, S.J. Sheu and H.M. Soner,	On Existence of the Dominant Eigenfunction and its Application to the Large Deviation Properties of an Ergodic Markov Process
200	Y. Giga and R. Kohn,	Characterizing Blow-up Using Similarity Variables	238	R. Jensen and P.E. Souganidis,	A Regularity Result for Viscosity Solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi Equations in one Space Dimension
201	P. Cannarsa and H. M. Soner,	On the Singularities of the Viscosity Solutions to Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman Equations	239	B. Boczor-Karakli, J.L. Bona and D.L. Cohen,	Interaction of Shallow-Water Waves and Bottom Topography
202	Andrew Majda,	Nonlinear Geometric Optics for Hyperbolic Systems of Conservation Laws	240	F. Colonius and W. Klemann,	Infinite Time Optimal Control and Periodicity Dirichlet Problems

#	Author(s)	Title
41	Harry Kesten,	Scaling Relations for 2D-Percolation
42	A. Leizarowitz,	Infinite Horizon Optimization for Markov Process with Finite States Spaces
43	Louis H.Y. Chen,	The Rate of Convergence in A Central Limit Theorem for Dependent Random Variables with Arbitrary Index Set
44	G. Kalilapur,	Stochastic Differential Equations in Duals of Nuclear Spaces with some Applications
45	Tzuu-Shuh Chiang, Yunshong Chow and Yuh-Jia Lee,	Evaluation of Certain Functional Integrals
46	L. Karp and M. Pinsky,	The First Eigenvalue of a Small Geodesic Ball in a Riemannian Manifold
47	Chi-Sing Man,	Towards An Acoustoelastic Theory for Measurement of Residual Stress
48	Andreas Stoll,	Invariance Principles for Brownian Intersection Local Time and Polymer Measures
49	R.W.R. Darling,	Rate of Growth of the Coalescent Set in a Coalescing Stochastic Flow
50	R. Cohen, R. Hardt, D. Kinderlehrer, S.Y.-Lin, M. Luskin,	Minimum Energy for Liquid Crystals: Computational Results
51	Suzanne M. Lenhart,	Viscosity Solutions for Weakly Coupled Systems of First Order PDEs
52	M. Cranston, E. Fabes, Z. Zhao,	Condition Gauge and Potential Theory for the Schrödinger Operator
53	H. Brezis, J.M.Caron, E.H. Lieb,	Harmonic Maps with Defects
54	A. Carverhill,	Flows of Stochastic Dynamical Systems: Nontriviality of the Lyapunov Spectrum
55	A. Carverhill,	Conditioning A 'Lifted' Stochastic System in a Product Case
56	R.J. Williams,	Local Time and Excursions of Reflected Brownian Motion
57	H. Föllmer, S. Orey,	Large Deviations for the Empirical Field of a Gibbs Measure
58	A. Leizarowitz,	Characterization of Optimal Trajectories On an Infinite Horizon
59	Y.Giga, T. Miyakawa, H. Osada,	Two Dimensional Navier Stokes Flow with Measures As Initial Vorticity
60	M. Chipot, V. Ollker,	Sur Une Propriété Des Fonctions Propres De L'Operateur De Laplace Beltrami
61	V. Perez-Abreu,	Decompositions of Semimartingales On Duals of Countably Nuclear Spaces
62	J.M. Ball,	Does Rank-One Convexity Imply Quasiconvexity
63	B. Cockburn,	The Quasi-Monotone Schemes for Scalar Conservation Laws. Part I
64	K.A. Pericak-Spector,	On Radially Symmetric Simple Waves in Elasticity
65	P.N. Shivakumar, Chi-Sing Man, Simon W. Rabin,	Modelling of the Heart and Pericardium at End-Diastole
66	Jose-Luis Menaldi,	Probabilistic View of Estimates for Finite Difference Methods
67	Robert Hardt, Harold Rosenberg,	Open Book Structures and Unicity of Minimal Submanifolds
68	Bernardo Cockburn,	The Quasi-Monotone Schemes for Scalar Conservation Laws
69	H.R. Jauslin, W. Zimmermann, Jr.,	Dynamics of a Model for an Ac Josephson Effect in Superfluid ^4He
70	A.K. Kapila,	Introductory Lecture on Reacting Flows
71	J.C. Taylor,	Do Minimal Solutions of Heat Equations Characterize Diffusions?
72	J.C. Taylor,	The Minimal Eigenfunctions Characterize the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Process
73	Chi-Sing Man, Quan-Xin Sun,	On the Significance of Normal Stress Effects in the Flow of Glaciers
74	Omar Hijab,	On Partially Observed Control of Markov Processes
75	Lawrence Gray,	The Behavior of Processes with Statistical Mechanical Properties
76	R. Hardt, D. Kinderlehrer, M. Luskin,	Remarks About the Mathematical Theory of Liquid Crystals
277	Cockburn, B.	The Quasi-Monotone Schemes for Scalar Conservation Laws Part II
278	M. Chipot, T. Sideris,	On the Abelian Higgs Model
279	C. Fofas, B. Nicolaenko, G.R.Sell, R. Temam,	Inertial Manifolds for the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky Equation and an Estimate of their Lowest Dimension
280	R. Duran,	On the Approximation of Miscible Displacement in Porous Media by a Method of Characteristics Combined with a Mixed Method
281	H. Axiang, Zhang Bo,	The Convergence for Nodal Expansion Method
282	V. Twersky,	Dispersive Bulk Parameters for Coherent Propagation in Correlated Random Distributions
283	M.Th.F. den Hollander,	Mixing Properties for Random Walk in Random Scenery
284	H.R. Jauslin,	Nondifferentiable Potentials for Nonequilibrium Steady States
285	K. Meyer, G.R.Sell,	Homoclinic Orbits and Bernoulli Bundles in Almost Periodic Systems
286	J. Douglas, Jr., Y. Yuan,	Finite Difference Methods for the Transient Behavior of a Semiconductor Device
287	Li Kaitai, Yan Ningning,	The Extrapolation for Boundary Finite Elements
288	R. Durrett, R.H. Schonmann,	Stochastic Growth Models
289	David Kinderlehrer,	Remarks about Equilibrium Configurations of Crystals
290	D.G. Aronson, J.L. Vazquez,	Eventual C^∞ -Regularity and Concavity for Flows in One-Dimensional Porous Media
291	L.R. Scott, J.M. Boyle, B. Bagheri,	Distributed Data Structures for Scientific Computation
292	J. Douglas, Jr., P.J.Paes Leme, T. Arbogast, T. Schmitt,	Simulation of Flow in Naturally Fractured Petroleum Reservoirs
293	D.G. Aronson, L.A. Caffarelli,	Optimal Regularity for One-Dimensional Porous Medium Flow
294	Haim Brezis,	Liquid Crystals and Energy Estimates for S^2 -Valued Maps
295	Todd Arbogast,	Analysis of the Simulation of Single Phase Flow Through a Naturally Fractured Reservoir
296	He Yinnian, Li Kaitai,	The Coupling Method of Finite Elements and Boundary Elements for Radiation Problems
297	T. Cazenave, A. Haraux, L. Vazquez, F.B. Weissler,	Nonlinear Effects in the Wave Equation with a Cubic Restoring Force
298	M. Chipot, F.B. Weissler,	Some Blow Up Results for a Nonlinear Parabolic Parabolic Equation with a Gradient Term
299	Li Kaitai,	Perturbation Solutions of Simple and Double Bifurcation Problems for Navier-Stokes Equations
300	Chen Zhangxin, Li Kaitai,	The Convergence on the Multigrid Algorithm for Navier-Stokes Equations

ANALYSIS OF THE SIMULATION OF SINGLE PHASE FLOW THROUGH A NATURALLY FRACTURED RESERVOIR

Todd Arbogast
Department of Mathematics
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Abstract: The double porosity model for single phase flow through a naturally fractured reservoir is derived as a parabolic equation coupled to a series of parabolic equations. It is shown that the coupling term can be viewed as a positive-semidefinite perturbation of the time derivative, and hence it is verified that the model is well posed. A finite element method is presented to approximate the solution, and optimal order L^2 error estimates are derived.

Key words: porous media, fractured reservoir, parabolic equation, finite element method.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications: 35K99, 65N30, 76S05.

1. Introduction.

The double porosity model of single phase flow through a naturally fractured reservoir was first described by Barenblatt, Zheltov, and Kochina [1], and Warren and Root [11], each of whom assumed a quasi-steady state flow in the matrix. Kazemi [5] and de Swaan O. [10] considered the fully unsteady state model. We shall derive and analyze a somewhat more general form of this double porosity model.

A fractured reservoir may be idealized as a porous medium, or *matrix*, having some regular system of fractures. We consider a fractured reservoir $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d=2$ or 3 , in which the fracture system decomposes the reservoir into a disjoint union of *matrix blocks* $\Omega_i \subset \Omega$; that is, $\bar{\Omega} = \bigcup_i \bar{\Omega}_i$ and $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j = \emptyset$, $i \neq j$. For a naturally fractured reservoir, we may assume that the diameter of each block is small compared to the dimensions of the reservoir itself.

Because the reservoir is so large, both the matrix and the fracture system have a macroscopically fine structure, each of which may be viewed as a distinct porous medium. The matrix blocks are ordinary porous media (with impermeable rock grains) for which the physics is well known (see [8] and [9]).

The fracture system is a porous medium whose "grains" (the matrix blocks) are permeable. We consider the matrix blocks as sources (and sinks) within the fracture medium and apply the known physics to it. The macroscopic quantities porosity, (tensor) permeability, pressure, and density can be defined in the usual way with respect to the matrix as ϕ_m , $\mathbf{k}_m$, p_m , and ρ_m , respectively. The corresponding quantities for the fracture medium, ϕ , $\mathbf{k}$, p , and ρ , can be defined similarly by considering the matrix blocks to be impermeable (cf. [1] and [11]).

Several physical assumptions need to be made:

1. The fluid is of constant compressibility; that is, it satisfies the equation of state

$$(1.1) \quad \rho^{-1}d\rho = cdp,$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant.

2. When gravity is present, the linearization approximation

$$(1.2) \quad \rho(\underline{x}, t)^2 = [\rho_0(\underline{x}) + (\rho(\underline{x}, t) - \rho_0(\underline{x}))]^2 \approx \rho_0(\underline{x})[2\rho(\underline{x}, t) - \rho_0(\underline{x})]$$

is valid, where $\rho_0(\underline{x})$ is some standard fluid density distribution.

3. Each matrix block interacts only with the fracture system; matrix blocks do not directly interact with each other, nor do they interact with any external source (or sink).
4. The fluid is assumed to be uniform at the surface of each matrix block.
5. The matrix porosity and permeability are constant over each block. For each i , ϕ_{mi} and $\mathbf{k}_{mi}$ shall denote ϕ_m and $\mathbf{k}_m$ restricted to Ω_i , respectively.

Assumptions 1 and 2 are customarily made in reservoir simulation. Assumptions 3 through 5 reflect the usual physical situation where the matrix blocks are relatively small and the matrix has a much higher storage capacity and a much lower flow capacity than the fracture system. Assumption 5 is not necessary for the analysis below. With the obvious modifications, all the results remain true if ϕ_m and $\mathbf{k}_m$ are allowed to be smooth functions of $\underline{x}$ (except, of course, the special case considered in Theorem 2). However, we shall retain this assumption to prevent the notation from becoming cumbersome.

In the fracture system, Darcy's law, conservation of mass, (1.1), and assumption 3 give us

$$(1.3) \quad \phi(\underline{x})\rho_t(\underline{x},t) - \nabla \cdot \left[\frac{\mathbf{k}(\underline{x})}{\mu} [c^{-1} \nabla \rho(\underline{x},t) - \rho(\underline{x},t)^2 g \nabla z(\underline{x})] \right] = f(\underline{x},t) + f_m(\underline{x},t) \\ \text{for } (\underline{x},t) \in \Omega \times J,$$

where the t subscript denotes partial differentiation in time, μ is the viscosity of the fluid, g is the gravitational constant, z is the vertical coordinate, f and f_m are the external and matrix source terms, respectively, and $J=(0,T]$ is the time interval of interest. By assumption 2, we linearize (1.3) as

$$(1.4a) \quad \phi(\underline{x})\rho_t(\underline{x},t) - \nabla \cdot \left[\frac{\mathbf{k}(\underline{x})}{\mu c} \nabla \rho(\underline{x},t) - 2\rho_0(\underline{x})g \frac{\mathbf{k}(\underline{x})}{\mu} \nabla z(\underline{x}) [\rho(\underline{x},t) - 1/2 \rho_0(\underline{x})] \right] \\ = f(\underline{x},t) + f_m(\underline{x},t) \quad \text{for } (\underline{x},t) \in \Omega \times J.$$

Since the boundary of a reservoir is generally ill-defined and of little consequence, we shall simply take the no flow Neumann condition there:

$$(1.4b) \quad \left[\frac{\mathbf{k}(\underline{x})}{\mu c} \nabla \rho(\underline{x},t) - 2\rho_0(\underline{x})g \frac{\mathbf{k}(\underline{x})}{\mu} \nabla z(\underline{x}) [\rho(\underline{x},t) - 1/2 \rho_0(\underline{x})] \right] \cdot \underline{\nu}(\underline{x}) = 0 \\ \text{for } (\underline{x},t) \in \partial\Omega \times J,$$

where $\underline{\nu}$ is the outer normal to $\partial\Omega$. Finally, the initial fluid density

$$(1.4c) \quad \rho(\underline{x},0) = \rho^0(\underline{x}) \quad \text{for } \underline{x} \in \Omega$$

must be given.

The i th matrix block transmits through its surface an average flow of fluid

$$(1.5a) \quad f_{mi}(t) = - \frac{1}{|\Omega_i|} \int_{\partial\Omega_i} \frac{\mathbf{k}_{mi}}{\mu c} \nabla \rho_m \cdot \underline{\nu} \, ds \quad \text{for } t \in J,$$

where we use the notation $|\Omega_i| = \int_{\Omega_i} dx$ for the volume of Ω_i . This flow should enter the fracture system near the block. In the continuous medium hypothesis, we locally average fine structure effects. This is implicitly done in defining the various macroscopic quantities above. To model the interchange between the two fine structures, we must explicitly describe the local averaging of the finer matrix structure with respect to the coarser fracture structure. Choose some partition of unity $\{\chi_i(\underline{x})\}$ over Ω such that each χ_i is approximately the characteristic function of Ω_i (i.e. each χ_i is supported near Ω_i , $0 \leq \chi_i$, $\int \chi_i dx = |\Omega_i|$, and

$\sum_j \chi_j = 1$). Now we can define the matrix source term as

$$(1.5b) \quad f_m(\underline{x}, t) = \sum_i f_{mi}(t) \chi_i(\underline{x}) \quad \text{for } (\underline{x}, t) \in \Omega \times J.$$

The particular partition of unity used determines the exact manner in which the literal fracture flow around $\partial\Omega_i$ is macroscopically spread out over the domain Ω . The effect of this choice is to smooth out sharp variations in the solution p that would otherwise arise near the boundary of each Ω_i (see Theorem 4 below). In practice, one never looks at the solution in such detail, so this choice is not actually very important.

Analogous to (1.3), we have in the i th matrix block

$$(1.6a) \quad \phi_{mi} \rho_{m,t}(\underline{x}, t) - \nabla \cdot \left[\frac{\mathbf{k}_m}{\mu c} \nabla \rho_m(\underline{x}, t) \right] = 0 \quad \text{for } (\underline{x}, t) \in \Omega_i \times J.$$

Here we have omitted the gravitational term, since the effects of assumption 4 completely dominate it. Continuity of pressure requires that the block and fracture densities be equal at the surface of the block, while initial equilibrium requires the same equality at time zero. By assumption 4, at each time t , we can simply take a constant, $\hat{p}_i(t)$, to represent the density of the fluid in the fractures surrounding the i th block. That is, we can write

$$(1.6b) \quad \rho_m = \hat{p}_i \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_i \times J$$

(where the trace is taken from inside Ω_i) and

$$(1.6c) \quad \rho_m(\underline{x}, 0) = \hat{p}_i^0 \quad \text{for } \underline{x} \in \Omega_i.$$

Finally, we should define these constants according to

$$(1.7) \quad \hat{u}_i = |\Omega_i|^{-1} \int_{\Omega} u \chi_i \, dx \quad \text{for } u \in L^1(\Omega).$$

This definition gives us consistency between the local (i th block) behavior of the fracture flow in (1.5b) and in (1.6b,c).

Equations (1.4) through (1.7) constitute our model. In the next section, we shall specify the mathematical assumptions as well as define some general notation. In section 3 we analyze the matrix source term. In particular, we show that it is positive-semidefinite in some sense. In section 4 we show that

the model is mathematically well posed. A finite element method of approximating the solution p (and p_m) is presented and analyzed in sections 5 and 6.

2. General assumptions and notations.

In the rest of the paper we shall use the following assumptions and notations concerning the coefficients. Assume that f , ρ_0 , ρ^0 , and the χ_i are smoothly distributed over the reservoir and sufficiently regular. The (unphysical) assumption on f will ensure that the solution p has the necessary smoothness and L^2 -norm properties for the analysis below. Let $\phi(\underline{x})$ and ϕ_m be bounded above and below by positive constants over Ω and Ω_m (where $\Omega_m = \cup_i \Omega_i$), respectively, and suppose that ϕ is smooth. Let $\kappa(\underline{x}) = \mathbf{k}(\underline{x})/\mu c$ and $\kappa_m = \mathbf{k}_m/\mu c$ be symmetric and uniformly positive-definite matrices over Ω and Ω_m , respectively, such that κ is smooth and sufficiently regular. Finally, let $\chi(\underline{x}) = 2\rho_0(\underline{x})g\mathbf{k}(\underline{x})\nabla z(\underline{x})/\mu$.

We will assume that Ω is a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Obviously we may not make the same assumption on Ω_i ; instead, we will assume that Ω_i is a convex domain, for each i . Hence, $\partial\Omega_i$ is piecewise smooth.

$W^{p,r}$, $0 \leq p$ and $1 \leq r \leq \infty$, will denote the usual Sobolev space of p times differentiable functions in L^r . Let $H^p = W^{p,2}$. H^{-p} will denote the dual of H^p . $H^q(J; H^p)$, q a nonnegative integer, will denote the Banach space of H^p -valued functions (of $\underline{x}$) that are in H^q (as functions of t). The norm of $u(\underline{x}, t) \in H^q(J; H^p)$ is given by

$$\|u\|_{H^q(J; H^p)} = \left\| \sum_{j=0}^q \|\partial^j u / \partial t^j\|_{H^p} \right\|_{L^2(J)}.$$

Similarly we have the space $L^\infty(J; H^p)$. We will also need the spaces $H^1_0(\Omega_i) = \{v \in H^1(\Omega_i) : v=0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega_i\}$.

We will denote by $(\cdot, \cdot)$ the inner product on $L^2(\Omega)$ or $(L^2(\Omega))^d$, whichever is appropriate. We will similarly denote by $(\cdot, \cdot)_i$ the inner product on $L^2(\Omega_i)$ or $(L^2(\Omega_i))^d$, and by $(\cdot, \cdot)_m$ the inner product on $L^2(\Omega_m)$ or $(L^2(\Omega_m))^d$. Define the symmetric bilinear forms

$$B(u_1, u_2) = (\kappa \nabla u_1, \nabla u_2) \quad \text{for any } u_1, u_2 \in H^1(\Omega),$$

$$B_i(v_1, v_2) = (\kappa_m \nabla v_1, \nabla v_2)_i \quad \text{for any } v_1, v_2 \in H^1(\Omega_i), \text{ for each } i,$$

and

$$B_m(v_1, v_2) = (\kappa_m \nabla v_1, \nabla v_2)_m \quad \text{for any } v_1, v_2 \in H^1(\Omega_m).$$

Finally, C and ϵ will denote generic positive constants.

Let us write the differential equations of the model in weak form with the above notation. First, note that by applying the divergence theorem to (1.6a), we can rewrite (1.5a) as

$$(2.1) \quad f_{mi}(t) = -\phi_{mi} \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}.$$

with the notation

$$\bar{v}_i = |\Omega_i|^{-1} \int_{\Omega_i} v \, dx$$

for the average of $v \in L^1(\Omega_i)$ over Ω_i . Now we can write (1.4a,b) and (1.5) as

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\phi \rho_t, \varphi) + \sum_i \phi_{mi} \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i} \hat{\phi}_i |\Omega_i| + B(\rho, \varphi) - (\alpha \rho, \nabla \varphi) \\ & = (f, \varphi) - 1/2 (\alpha \rho_0, \nabla \varphi) \quad \text{for } \varphi \in H^1(\Omega), \end{aligned}$$

and, for each i , (1.6a) as

$$(2.3) \quad \phi_{mi} (\rho_{m,t}, \psi)_i + B_i(\rho_m, \psi) = 0 \quad \text{for } \psi \in H_0^1(\Omega_i).$$

Of course, the boundary condition (1.6b) must be imposed on ρ_m .

3. Description of the matrix source term.

For a given ρ in $H^1(J; L^2(\Omega))$, the solution ρ_m of (1.6) (or (2.3), (1.6b,c)) exists and is unique as a function in $H^1(J; L^2(\Omega_m)) \cap L^2(J; H^2(\Omega_m))$, since Ω_i is convex for each i . As a consequence, we can define the matrix source term operator $F_m: L^2(J; L^2(\Omega)) \rightarrow L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))$ as

$$(3.1) \quad F_m(u_*) = \sum_i \phi_{mi} \bar{v}_{t,i} \chi_i$$

where, on Ω_i , v satisfies

$$(3.2a) \quad \phi_{mi}(v_t, \psi)_i + B_i(v, \psi) = 0 \quad \text{for } \psi \in H^1_0(\Omega_i)$$

$$(3.2b) \quad v = \int_0^t \hat{u}_{*,i}(\tau) d\tau \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_i \times J$$

$$(3.2c) \quad v(\underline{x}, 0) = 0 \quad \text{for } \underline{x} \in \Omega_i.$$

Note that $u_* = \rho_t$ implies that $v_t = \rho_{m,t}$; hence, $F_m(\rho_t) = -f_m$ represents flow from the fracture system to the matrix. We should expect that ρ_t and $F_m(\rho_t)$ behave similarly, at least in some average sense. This is expressed as

Theorem 1:

F_m is a bounded linear positive-semidefinite operator from $L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))$ to $L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))$ for any subinterval $\tilde{J} = (0, \tau] \subset J$. That is,

$$(3.3) \quad \|F_m(u_*)\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))} \leq C \|u_*\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))}$$

and

$$(3.4) \quad 0 \leq \int_0^\tau (F_m(u_*), u_*) dt$$

for any $u_* \in L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))$. Moreover,

$$(3.5) \quad -C \|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \int_0^\tau (F_m(u_t), u) dt$$

for any $u \in H^1(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))$.

Proof:

Take $\psi = v_t - \hat{u}_{*,i}$ in (3.2a) and integrate over $\tilde{J}$ to see

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \phi_{mi} \|v_t\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega_i))}^2 + \frac{1}{2} B_i(v, v)(\tau) \\ &= \phi_{mi} \int_0^\tau \overline{v}_{t,i} \hat{u}_{*,i} dt |\Omega_i| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \phi_{mi} \|v_t\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega_i))}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \phi_{mi} \|u_* \chi_i^{1/2}\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Canceling terms above, we obtain boundedness:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|F_m(u_*)\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))} \\
& = \left\| \sum_i \phi_{mi} \bar{v}_{t,i} \chi_i \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|_{L^2(\tilde{J})} \\
(3.7) \quad & \leq \sum_i \phi_{mi} \|v_t\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega_i))} \\
& \leq C \|u_*\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using only the equality in (3.6), we get positive-semidefiniteness:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^\tau (F_m(u_*), u_*) \, dt \\
(3.8) \quad & = \sum_i \phi_{mi} \int_0^\tau \bar{v}_{t,i} \hat{u}_{*,i} \, dt \, |\Omega_i| \\
& \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

To obtain (3.5), take $\psi = v - \int_0^t \hat{u}_{t,i} \, d\tau = (v + \hat{u}_i(0)) - \hat{u}_i$ in (3.2a) and integrate over $\tilde{J}$ to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.9) \quad & \frac{1}{2} \phi_{mi} \|v + \hat{u}_i(0)\|_{L^2(\Omega_i)}^2(\tau) - \frac{1}{2} \phi_{mi} (\hat{u}_i(0))^2 |\Omega_i| + \int_0^\tau B_i(v, v) \, dt \\
& = \phi_{mi} \int_0^\tau \bar{v}_{t,i} \hat{u}_i \, dt \, |\Omega_i|,
\end{aligned}$$

and then estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^\tau (F_m(u_t), u) \, dt \\
(3.10) \quad & = \sum_i \phi_{mi} \int_0^\tau \bar{v}_{t,i} \hat{u}_i \, dt \, |\Omega_i| \\
& \geq -C \|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

A more complete understanding of the matrix source term operator may be obtained by expressing it explicitly in terms of the auxiliary function θ which, on Ω_i , is the solution to

$$(3.11a) \quad \phi_{mi} \theta_t - \nabla \cdot (\kappa_m \nabla \theta) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega_i \times J,$$

$$(3.11b) \quad \theta = 1 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_i \times J,$$

$$(3.11c) \quad \theta(\underline{x}, 0) = 0 \quad \text{for } \underline{x} \in \Omega_i.$$

The solution of (1.6) is the convolution in time

$$(3.12) \quad \rho_m(\underline{x}, t) = \int_0^t \theta(\underline{x}, t-\tau) \hat{\rho}_{t,i}(\tau) d\tau + \hat{\rho}_i^0 \quad \text{for } (\underline{x}, t) \in \Omega_i \times J,$$

and so

$$(3.13) \quad F_m(\rho_t)(\underline{x}, t) = \sum_i \phi_{mi} \int_0^t \bar{\theta}_{t,i}(t-\tau) \hat{\rho}_{t,i}(\tau) d\tau \chi_i(\underline{x}).$$

This, in fact, allows us to decouple the system (1.4) through (1.7). Since $\bar{\theta}_{t,i}$ is positive, decreasing, and convex, the Fourier transform of its even extension to $\mathbb{R}$ is positive. An application of Fourier analysis to (3.13) gives an alternate proof of (3.4). This approach enables us to see that, in fact, $\{\int_0^T (F_m(\cdot), \cdot) dt\}^{1/2}$ is a seminorm on $L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))$ equivalent to the sum on i of the $H^{-1/4}$ -norms in time of the local space averages, at least in the following special (but very reasonable) case:

Theorem 2:

Suppose that each Ω_i is a rectangular parallelepiped whose edges are parallel to the coordinate axes, and that each $\mathbf{x}_{mi}$ is diagonal. Then there exist positive constants C_1 and C_2 (independent of ρ_t) such that

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & C_1 \sum_i \|\hat{\rho}_{t,i}\|_{H^{-1/4}(J)}^2 |\Omega_i| \\ & \leq \int_0^T (F_m(\rho_t), \rho_t) dt \\ & \leq C_2 \sum_i \|\hat{\rho}_{t,i}\|_{H^{-1/4}(J)}^2 |\Omega_i|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof:

For each i , an appropriate scaling allows us to assume that $\Omega_i = (0, \pi)^d + \underline{c}_i$. Write

$$\frac{1}{\phi_{mi}} \mathbf{x}_{mi} = \begin{bmatrix} k_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & k_d \end{bmatrix}.$$

Separation of variables applied to (3.11) gives us

$$(3.15) \quad \bar{\theta}_{t,i} = \left[\frac{8}{\pi^2} \right]^d \sum_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d} \frac{\sum_j \lambda_j^2 k_j}{\prod_j \lambda_j^2} \exp(-\sum_j \lambda_j^2 k_j t),$$

where $\sum_0$ denotes the sum over positive odd indices.

Let $\omega(t) = \bar{\theta}_{t,i}(|t|)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $\mathbf{F}$ denote the Fourier transform operator. It is trivial to calculate

$$(3.16) \quad \mathbf{F}\omega(s) = 2 \left[\frac{8}{\pi^2} \right]^d \sum_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d} \frac{(\sum_j \lambda_j^2 k_j)^2}{(\prod_j \lambda_j^2) [(\sum_j \lambda_j^2 k_j)^2 + s^2]}.$$

We will now show that there exist positive constants $\tilde{C}_1$ and $\tilde{C}_2$ such that

$$(3.17) \quad \tilde{C}_1 (1 + s^2)^{-1/4} \leq \mathbf{F}\omega(s) \leq \tilde{C}_2 (1 + s^2)^{-1/4}.$$

Since $\mathbf{F}\omega$ is continuous (Riemann-Lebesgue lemma) and even, it suffices to show the result for s large. In that case,

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}\omega(s) &\geq C \sum_{\lambda_1} \frac{(\lambda_1^2 + d - 1)^2}{\lambda_1^2 [(\lambda_1^2 + d - 1)^2 + s^2]} \\ &\geq C \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1 \\ 1/2s \leq \lambda_1^2 \leq 3/2s}} \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\lambda_1^4 + s^2} \\ &\geq C s^{-1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

as $\lambda_1 = O(s^{1/2})$ and there are $O(s^{1/2})$ terms in the last sum, and

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}\omega(s) &\leq C \sum_{\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d} \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1 \\ \lambda_1 \geq \max(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d)}} \frac{(\lambda_1^2 + \sum_{j=2}^d \lambda_j^2)^2}{\lambda_1^2 (\prod_{j=2}^d \lambda_j^2) [(\lambda_1^2 + \sum_{j=2}^d \lambda_j^2)^2 + s^2]} \\ &\leq C \left[\sum_{\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=2}^d \lambda_j^2} \right] \left[\sum_{\lambda_1} \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\lambda_1^4 + s^2} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1 \\ 2^m s \leq \lambda_1^2 \leq 2^{m+1} s}} \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\lambda_1^4 + s^2} \\
&\leq C \left[\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{2^m}{(2^{2m+1})} 2^{m/2} \right] s^{-1/2} \\
&\leq C s^{-1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This establishes (3.17).

Our estimate (3.14) now follows directly from (3.13), some Fourier analysis, and (3.17):

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.20) \quad &\int_0^T (F_m(\rho_t), \rho_t) dt \\
&= \sum_i \int_0^T \int_0^t \omega(t-\tau) \hat{\rho}_{t,i}(\tau) \hat{\rho}_{t,i}(t) d\tau dt |\Omega_i| \\
&= \sum_i \iint [\omega(t-\tau) \chi_{(0,\infty)}(t-\tau)] [\hat{\rho}_{t,i}(\tau) \chi_J(\tau)] \times \\
&\quad \times [\hat{\rho}_{t,i}(t) \chi_J(t)] d\tau dt |\Omega_i| \\
&= \sum_i \int \mathbf{F}(\omega \chi_{(0,\infty)})(s) |\mathbf{F}(\hat{\rho}_{t,i} \chi_J)(s)|^2 ds |\Omega_i| \\
&= 1/2 \sum_i \int \mathbf{F}\omega(s) |\mathbf{F}(\hat{\rho}_{t,i} \chi_J)(s)|^2 ds |\Omega_i|
\end{aligned}$$

which is then equivalent to

$$\sum_i \int (1+s^2)^{-1/4} |\mathbf{F}(\hat{\rho}_{t,i} \chi_J)(s)|^2 ds |\Omega_i|.$$

Since the integral above is equivalent to the square of the $H^{-1/4}$ -norm, the proof is complete. $\square$

As a final remark in this section, we will compare the so called Warren and Root model ([1] and [11]) with the present model. The quasi-steady state assumption, that $\rho_{m,t} = -\alpha(\rho_m - \rho)$, simply says that

$$(3.21) \quad \rho_m(\underline{x}, t) = \int_0^t (1 - e^{-\alpha(t-\tau)}) \rho_t(\underline{x}, \tau) d\tau + \rho^0(\underline{x}) \quad \text{for } (\underline{x}, t) \in \Omega \times J.$$

A glance at (3.12) shows that this assumption essentially amounts to a one parameter approximation of θ (or $\bar{\theta}_i$) by a single time exponential.

4. Demonstration that the model is well posed.

We will now show the existence, uniqueness, and continuous dependence on the data (f, ρ_0, p^0) of the solution (p, ρ_m) . This will be accomplished by applying the method of continuity to the problem (1.4) decoupled from (1.6) via (3.13). The linearization assumption (1.2) creates some difficulties when gravity is present. The equations are not strictly linear, and a given solution u can arise from many different sets of data, as the reference density function ρ_0 is allowed to be arbitrary. To resolve these difficulties, we shall analyze the equation over a smaller data space. We must be careful to determine the dependence on $\underline{\chi}$, since $\underline{\chi}$ is proportional to ρ_0 .

For each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, consider the problem

$$(4.1a) \quad \phi(\underline{x})u_t(\underline{x}, t) + \lambda F_m(u_t)(\underline{x}, t) - \nabla \cdot [\kappa(\underline{x})\nabla u(\underline{x}, t) - \underline{\chi}(\underline{x})u(\underline{x}, t)] = F(\underline{x}, t) \\ \text{for } (\underline{x}, t) \in \Omega \times J,$$

$$(4.1b) \quad [\kappa(\underline{x})\nabla u(\underline{x}, t) - \underline{\chi}(\underline{x})u(\underline{x}, t)] \cdot \underline{\nu}(\underline{x}) = u_0(\underline{x}) \quad \text{for } (\underline{x}, t) \in \partial\Omega \times J,$$

$$(4.1c) \quad u(\underline{x}, 0) = u^0(\underline{x}) \quad \text{for } \underline{x} \in \Omega.$$

When $\lambda=0$, we have a standard well posed problem (see [6], Theorem 5.3, p. 32); when $\lambda=1$, we have our problem (1.4), where $F(\underline{x}, t) = f(\underline{x}, t) + 1/2 \nabla \cdot [\rho_0(\underline{x})\underline{\chi}(\underline{x})]$, $u_0(\underline{x}) = -1/2 \rho_0(\underline{x})\underline{\chi}(\underline{x}) \cdot \underline{\nu}(\underline{x})$, and $u^0(\underline{x}) = p^0(\underline{x})$.

Let

$$\mathcal{V} = \{ u \in H^1(J; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(J; H^2(\Omega)) : \\ (\kappa \nabla u - \underline{\chi} u) \cdot \underline{\nu} \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times J \text{ is independent of } t \}$$

and

$$\mathcal{W} = \{ (F, u_0, u^0) \in L^2(J; L^2(\Omega)) \times H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega) : \\ (\kappa \nabla u^0 - \underline{\chi} u^0) \cdot \underline{\nu} = u_0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \}.$$

We can define for each λ the linear operator

$$\Phi_\lambda : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$$

representing (4.1) as

$$\Phi_\lambda(u) = (\phi u_t + \lambda F_m(u_t) - \nabla \cdot (\kappa \nabla u - \underline{\chi} u), (\kappa \nabla u - \underline{\chi} u) \cdot \underline{\nu}, u(\cdot, 0)),$$

where the two trace operators are known to be bounded ([6], Theorem 2.1, p. 9).

Lemma:

The Φ_λ are bounded above and below with bounds that are independent of $\lambda \in [0,1]$. These bounds depend on $\underline{\chi}$ only through its $H^1(\Omega)$ -norm.

The following technical lemma will enable us to verify the $\underline{\chi}$ dependence. It will be used with $\psi = \underline{\chi}$ several times in the proof of the lemma.

Technical lemma:

If the dimension $d \leq 3$, then, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$(4.2) \quad (\psi \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^4 \|\varphi_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \epsilon \{ \|\varphi_1\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\varphi_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \}$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad \|\nabla(\psi \varphi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \epsilon \|\varphi\|_{H^2(\Omega)}.$$

Proof:

By Hölder's inequality and the Sobolev imbedding theorem, we have:

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} (\psi \varphi_1, \varphi_2) &\leq \|\psi\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\varphi_1\|_{L^3(\Omega)} \|\varphi_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|\psi\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\varphi_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\varphi_1\|_{L^6(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\varphi_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\varphi_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\varphi_1\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\varphi_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^4 \|\varphi_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \epsilon \{ \|\varphi_1\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\varphi_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\nabla(\psi \varphi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \|(\nabla \psi) \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\psi(\nabla \varphi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|\nabla \psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\ &\quad + \|\psi\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^6(\Omega)}^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\varphi\|_{H^2(\Omega)}^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \epsilon \|\varphi\|_{H^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of the lemma:

That the Φ_λ are bounded above follows directly from Theorem 1 and the boundedness of the trace operators. The second part of the technical lemma

shows that the bound is proportional to $1 + \lambda + \|\underline{\chi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq 2 + \|\underline{\chi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2$.

Multiplying (4.1a) by u and integrating over $\Omega \times \tilde{J}$, $\tilde{J} = (0, \tau] \subset J$, yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{2}(\phi u, u)(\tau) + \lambda \int_0^\tau (F_m(u_t), u) dt + \int_0^\tau B(u, u) dt \\
 & = \int_0^\tau (F, u) dt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0 u ds dt + \int_0^\tau (\underline{\chi} u, \nabla u) dt \\
 & + \frac{1}{2}(\phi u^0, u^0) \\
 (4.6) \quad & \leq C \{ \|F\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|u_0\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \|u^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
 & + \int_0^\tau (\phi u, u) dt \} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\tau B(u, u) dt,
 \end{aligned}$$

since the $H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ -norm of the trace of u is bounded by the $H^1(\Omega)$ -norm of u . The first part of the technical lemma shows that C depends on the $H^1(\Omega)$ -norm of $\underline{\chi}$. By (3.5), we may simply omit the matrix source term on the far left side of (4.6) with respect to the inequality. Then, Gronwall's inequality gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.7) \quad & \|u\|_{L^\infty(J; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))}^2 \\
 & \leq C \{ \|F\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|u_0\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \|u^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Next, multiplying (4.1a) by u_t and integrating over $\Omega \times \tilde{J}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_0^\tau (\phi u_t, u_t) dt + \lambda \int_0^\tau (F_m(u_t), u_t) dt + \frac{1}{2} B(u, u)(\tau) \\
 (4.8) \quad & = \int_0^\tau (F, u_t) dt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0 u_t ds dt + \int_0^\tau (\underline{\chi} u, \nabla u_t) dt \\
 & + \frac{1}{2} B(u^0, u^0).
 \end{aligned}$$

Integrating in time straightforwardly and by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_0^\tau \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0 u_t ds dt + \int_0^\tau (\underline{\chi} u, \nabla u_t) dt \\
 & = \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0 [u(x, \tau) - u^0] ds \\
 & + (\underline{\chi} u, \nabla u)(\tau) - (\underline{\chi} u^0, \nabla u^0) - \int_0^\tau (\underline{\chi} u_t, \nabla u) dt \\
 (4.9) \quad & \leq C \{ \|u_0\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \|u^0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
 & + \|u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))}^2 \} \\
 & + \frac{1}{4} B(u, u)(\tau) + \frac{1}{4} \int_0^\tau (\phi u_t, u_t) dt + \epsilon \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; H^1(\Omega))}^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

where ϵ is as small as we like and, again, C depends on $\|\underline{\chi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ by the technical lemma. Combining (4.8) with (3.4), (4.9), and (4.7), we see

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\tau (\phi u_t, u_t) dt + \frac{1}{4} B(u, u)(\tau) \\
 (4.10) \quad & \leq C \{ \|F\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|u_0\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \|u^0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \} \\
 & + \epsilon \|u\|_{L^2(J; H^2(\Omega))}^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Next, from (4.1a) itself, Theorem 1, and the technical lemma,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|\nabla \cdot \kappa \nabla u\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} \\
 (4.11) \quad & \leq C \{ (1 + \lambda) \|u_t\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} + \|u\|_{L^2(J; H^1(\Omega))} + \|F\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} \} \\
 & + \epsilon \|u\|_{L^2(J; H^2(\Omega))}^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

So, for ϵ having been chosen small enough above, (4.11) combines with elliptic regularity, (4.10), and (4.7) to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|u\|_{L^2(J; H^2(\Omega))} \leq C \{ \|\nabla \cdot \kappa \nabla u\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} + \|u\|_{L^2(J; H^1(\Omega))} \} \\
 (4.12) \quad & \leq C \{ \|F\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|u_0\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \|u^0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, (4.12) can be used to complete the estimate (4.10) and finish the proof. $\square$

Since $\Phi_\lambda = \lambda \Phi_1 + (1 - \lambda) \Phi_0$, we can now use the method of continuity to deform the solution $\tilde{u}$ of $\Phi_0(\tilde{u}) = (F, u_0, u^0)$ continuously to a solution u of $\Phi_1(u) = (F, u_0, u^0)$. That is, from the lemma, if Φ_{λ_0} is an isomorphism, then $\Psi(u; \lambda, \lambda_0) = \Phi_{\lambda_0}^{-1}((F, u_0, u^0) + (\Phi_{\lambda_0} - \Phi_\lambda)(u))$ is a contraction mapping on $\mathcal{V}$ for $|\lambda - \lambda_0|$ small enough independently of λ and λ_0 . The fixed point of Ψ is the solution to (4.1), so Φ_λ is also an isomorphism. After a finite number of steps from $\lambda_0 = 0$, we have:

Corollary:

Φ_1 is an isomorphism.

Theorem 3:

If $f \in L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))$ and $(\rho_0)^2, \rho^0 \in H^1(\Omega)$ are such that $[\kappa \nabla \rho^0 - \chi(\rho^0 - \frac{1}{2} \rho_0)] \cdot \nu = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, then the double porosity model (1.4) through (1.7) has a unique solution $(\rho, \rho_m) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}_m$, $\mathcal{V}_m = H^1(J; L^2(\Omega_m)) \cap L^2(J; H^2(\Omega_m))$, which varies continuously with the data:

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.13) \quad & \|p\|_{H^1(J;L^2(\Omega))} + \|p\|_{L^2(J;H^2(\Omega))} + \|p_m\|_{H^1(J;L^2(\Omega_m))} \\
& + \|p_m\|_{L^2(J;H^2(\Omega_m))} \\
& \leq C \{ \|f\|_{L^2(J;L^2(\Omega))} + \|(\rho_0)^2\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\rho^0\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \},
\end{aligned}$$

where C depends on $\|\rho_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ and, for solutions $(p_j, p_{m,j})$ arising from data $(f_j, \rho_{0,j}, \rho^0_j)$, $j=1$ and 2 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.14) \quad & \|p_1 - p_2\|_{H^1(J;L^2(\Omega))} + \|p_1 - p_2\|_{L^2(J;H^2(\Omega))} \\
& + \|p_{m,1} - p_{m,2}\|_{H^1(J;L^2(\Omega_m))} + \|p_{m,1} - p_{m,2}\|_{L^2(J;H^2(\Omega_m))} \\
& \leq C \{ \|f_1 - f_2\|_{L^2(J;L^2(\Omega))} + \|(\rho_{0,1})^2 - (\rho_{0,2})^2\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\
& + \|\rho_{0,1} - \rho_{0,2}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\rho^0_1 - \rho^0_2\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \},
\end{aligned}$$

where C depends on $\|\rho_{0,2}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ and $\|p_1\|_{L^2(J;H^2(\Omega))}$.

Note that Hölder's inequality and the Sobolev imbedding theorem imply that

$$(4.15) \quad \|\psi \phi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|\psi\|_{W^{1,12/5}(\Omega)} \|\phi\|_{W^{1,12/5}(\Omega)}.$$

Hence, we can replace the norm of $(\rho_0)^2$ in (4.13) by $\|\rho_0\|_{W^{1,12/5}(\Omega)}^2$, and we can replace the norms involving $\rho_{0,1}$ and $\rho_{0,2}$ in (4.14) by $(1 + \|\rho_{0,1}\|_{W^{1,12/5}(\Omega)} + \|\rho_{0,2}\|_{W^{1,12/5}(\Omega)})\|\rho_{0,1} - \rho_{0,2}\|_{W^{1,12/5}(\Omega)}$.

Proof:

The claims for p and $p_1 - p_2$ follow directly from the remarks following (4.1) and the lemma with its corollary. Now, since p exists and is unique, p_m exists and is unique. If we finish the energy estimates (3.6) and (3.9) (with $u_* = p_t$ and $u = p$ so that $p_m = v + \hat{p}^0_j$), and if we use (1.6a) itself and elliptic regularity, we can bound p_m in $H^1(J;L^2(\Omega_m))$ and in $L^2(J;H^2(\Omega_m))$ by $\|p\|_{H^1(J;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\rho^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Since (1.6) is a linear equation, the bounds for p finish the proof. $\square$

Later we will want to take higher Sobolev norms of p and p_m , so it is appropriate at least to say something about their smoothness here. From (1.6a)

we see that ρ_m is infinitely differentiable on $\Omega_m \times J$. Then (2.1) and (1.5b) tell us that f_m is infinitely differentiable in time and as smooth in space as the χ_i are. Finally, then, (1.4a) tells us (see [4], Chapter 3, Theorem 11, p. 74)

Theorem 4:

If each of $\partial^{|\alpha|} \chi_i / \partial x^\alpha$, $\partial^{|\alpha|+j} [f + 1/2 \nabla \cdot (\rho_0 \underline{x})] / \partial x^\alpha \partial t^j$, $\partial^{|\alpha|} \phi / \partial x^\alpha$, $\partial^{|\alpha|} \mathbf{x} / \partial x^\alpha$, $\partial^{|\alpha|} (\underline{x} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{x}) / \partial x^\alpha$, and $\partial^{|\alpha|} (\nabla \cdot \underline{x}) / \partial x^\alpha$ are Hölder continuous of order $\beta \in (0,1)$ on Ω or $\Omega \times J$, as appropriate, for $0 \leq |\alpha| + 2j \leq l$ and $0 \leq j \leq m$ (where α is a multi-index), then $\partial^{|\alpha|+j} \rho / \partial x^\alpha \partial t^j$ is Hölder continuous of order β on $\Omega \times J$ for $0 \leq |\alpha| + 2j \leq l+2$ and $0 \leq j \leq m+1$.

5. Formulation of the finite element method.

For each h and h_m in $(0,1]$, let $\mathbf{M} \subset H^1(\Omega)$ and, for each i , $\mathbf{N}_i \subset H^1_0(\Omega_i)$ be standard Galerkin finite dimensional H^1 -approximation spaces of order r in h and s in h_m , respectively. That is, let

$$(5.1) \quad \inf_{\varphi \in \mathbf{M}} \|u - \varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|u\|_{H^p(\Omega)} h^{p-j}, \quad 1 \leq p \leq r, \quad j = -1, 0, 1;$$

for any $u \in H^r(\Omega)$ and, for each i ,

$$(5.2) \quad \inf_{\psi \in \mathbf{N}_i} \|v - \psi\|_{H^1(\Omega_i)} \leq C \|v\|_{H^q(\Omega_i)} h_m^{q-j}, \quad 1 \leq q \leq s, \quad j = -1, 0, 1;$$

for any $v \in H^s(\Omega_i) \cap H^1_0(\Omega_i)$ (where the constants C are independent of u , v , h , and h_m). To avoid trivialities below, we will assume that $\mathbf{M}$ contains the constant functions. We will also let $\mathbf{N}_i^* = \{v^* = v + c : v \in \mathbf{N}_i \text{ and } c \in \mathbb{R}\}$. In both (5.1) and (5.2), the result for $j=1$ implies the result for $j=-1$ and $j=0$ (see (6.6) and (6.7) below).

For $u \in H^1(\Omega)$, let $u' \in \mathbf{M}$ denote the elliptic projection defined by

$$(5.3a) \quad B(u - u', \varphi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathbf{M}$$

and

$$(5.3b) \quad \int_{\Omega} (u - u') \, dx = 0.$$

For each positive integer N , let $\Delta t = T/N$. We will use the following notation (where u is any function of time):

$$t_n = n\Delta t$$

and

$$u^n = u(t_n)$$

for $n=0, 1, \dots, N$, and

$$u^{n-1/2} = \frac{u^n + u^{n-1}}{2}$$

and

$$\partial u^n = \frac{u^n - u^{n-1}}{\Delta t}$$

for $n=1, 2, \dots, N$.

We shall now describe our finite element procedure. We seek a map $U: \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_N\} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ and, on each Ω_i , a map $W: \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N\} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}_i^*$ and a function $Z \in \mathbf{N}_i^*$ that satisfy the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} (5.4a) \quad & (\phi \partial U^n, \varphi) + \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{V}_i^n \hat{\phi}_i |\Omega_i| + B(U^{n-1/2}, \varphi) - (\underline{\alpha} U^{n-1/2}, \underline{\nabla} \varphi) \\ & = (f^{n-1/2}, \varphi) - 1/2 (\underline{\alpha} \rho_0, \underline{\nabla} \varphi) \quad \text{for } \varphi \in \mathbf{M}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.4b) \quad U^0 = \rho^0,$$

$$(5.5a) \quad \phi_{mi} \left[\frac{w^n - v^{n-1}}{\Delta t}, \psi \right]_i + B_i \left[\frac{w^n + v^{n-1}}{2}, \psi \right] = 0 \quad \text{for } \psi \in \mathbf{N}_i,$$

$$(5.5b) \quad w^n = \hat{U}_i^{n-1} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_i,$$

$$(5.6a) \quad \phi_{mi} \left[\frac{Z}{\Delta t}, \psi \right]_i + B_i \left[\frac{Z}{2}, \psi \right] = 0 \quad \text{for } \psi \in \mathbf{N}_i,$$

$$(5.6b) \quad Z = \Delta t \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_i,$$

$$(5.7a) \quad v^n = w^n + \partial \hat{u}_i^n z \quad \text{on } \Omega_i,$$

and

$$(5.7b) \quad v^0 = \hat{u}^0_i.$$

First, we solve (5.4b) for U^0 and (5.6) for Z . Then, successively for $n=1, 2, \dots, N$, we solve (5.5) for w^n , (5.7a) for v^n (with its explicit dependence on U^n), (5.4a) for U^n , and, finally, we return to (5.7a) to remove the U^n dependence from v^n . Since uniqueness implies existence, it is not terribly hard to see that the equations can indeed be solved, provided that, if gravity is present, Δt is not too large. This, in fact, follows from the analysis below.

It will be shown in the next section that U and V approximate ρ and ρ_m , respectively.

Because of the enormous number of matrix blocks, the approximation procedure appears at first glance to require a massive amount of calculation. However, in actual reservoir simulation, h is of necessity taken to be much larger than the diameters of the matrix blocks: consequently, the triangulation over each matrix block should be rather coarse (see Theorem 5 below), and thus the linear systems arising from (5.5) and (5.6) should be small. Since one is generally only interested in effects that are on the scale of the discretization of the fracture system, it is sufficient to solve (5.5) and (5.6) only on the blocks that sit over the quadrature points of (5.4a). If Ω_i is symmetric about its center, the solution V is also symmetric over Ω_i , so, with some care, one can further reduce the size of the linear systems in (5.5) and (5.6). Finally, the block problems are independent of each other by assumption 3, so naturally fractured reservoir simulation (and, in particular, our finite element procedure) is well suited to parallel type computing machines.

6. Analysis of the approximation error.

Let us define the error functions

$$(6.1) \quad \zeta = \rho - U$$

and

$$(6.2) \quad \xi = \rho_m - V.$$

Subtract (5.4a) from the average of (2.2) at times t_n and t_{n-1} to obtain the error equation

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.3a) \quad & (\phi \partial \zeta^n, \varphi) + \sum_i \phi_{m_i} \partial \bar{\xi}_i^n \hat{\phi}_i | \Omega_i | + B(\zeta^{n-1/2}, \varphi) - (\chi \zeta^{n-1/2}, \nabla \varphi) \\
 & = (\phi (\partial \rho^n - \rho_t^{n-1/2}), \varphi) + \sum_i \phi_{m_i} (\partial \bar{\rho}_{m,i}^n - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}) \hat{\phi}_i | \Omega_i | \\
 & \quad \text{for } \varphi \in \mathbf{M},
 \end{aligned}$$

$$(6.3b) \quad \zeta^0 = \rho^0 - \rho^{0'}.$$

Now subtract the sum of (5.5a) and $\partial \hat{U}_i^n$ times (5.6a) from the average of (2.3) at times t_n and t_{n-1} to obtain the other error equation

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.4a) \quad & \phi_{m_i} (\partial \xi^n, \psi)_i + B_i(\xi^{n-1/2}, \psi) \\
 & = \phi_{m_i} (\partial \rho_m^n - \rho_{m,t}^{n-1/2}, \psi)_i \quad \text{for } \psi \in \mathbf{N}_i,
 \end{aligned}$$

$$(6.4b) \quad \xi^n = \hat{\xi}_i^n \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega_i,$$

$$(6.4c) \quad \xi^0 = \hat{\xi}_i^0.$$

Note [12] that $\zeta = \rho - \rho' + \rho' - U = (\rho - \rho') + \zeta'$. Similarly, we can write $\xi = (\rho_m - \rho_m'') + \xi''$, where we extend the following definition to all of Ω_m : for any $v \in H^1(\Omega_i)$ that is constant on $\partial \Omega_i$, $v'' \in \mathbf{N}_i^*$ is the elliptic projection given by

$$(6.5a) \quad B_i(v - v'', \psi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \mathbf{N}_i.$$

and

$$(6.5b) \quad v'' = v \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega_i.$$

Elliptic theory tells us that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.6a) \quad & \|\partial^k(\rho - \rho') / \partial t^k\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|\partial^k \rho / \partial t^k\|_{H^p(\Omega)} h^{p-j}, \\
 & 1 \leq p \leq r; \quad j = -1, 0; \quad k = 0, 1;
 \end{aligned}$$

$$(6.6b) \quad \|\nabla(\rho - \rho')\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|\rho\|_{H^p(\Omega)} h^{p-1}, \quad 1 \leq p \leq r;$$

$$(6.7a) \quad \|\partial^k(\rho_m - \rho_m'')/\partial t^k\|_{H^j(\Omega_m)} \leq C \|\partial^k \rho_m / \partial t^k\|_{H^q(\Omega_m)} h_m^{q-j},$$

$$1 \leq q \leq s; j = -1, 0; k = 0, 1;$$

and

$$(6.7b) \quad \|\nabla(\rho_m - \rho_m'')\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)} \leq C \|\rho_m\|_{H^q(\Omega_m)} h_m^{q-1}, \quad 1 \leq q \leq s.$$

In deriving (6.6a), the standard Nitsche duality argument [7] applies, as the smoothness of $\partial\Omega$ ensures the regularity of the dual problem. In deriving (6.7a), since Ω_i is convex, the dual problem is regular enough when $j=0$, but not necessarily so when $j=-1$. However, in this case, the duality argument can still be performed by posing the dual problem on a larger domain Ω_i^* with smooth boundary via the (bounded) Calderón extension operator $E: H^1(\Omega_i) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_i^*)$ [2] as

$$(6.8a) \quad -\nabla \cdot [(E\chi_m)\nabla\varphi] = E\psi, \quad \text{on } \Omega_i^*,$$

$$(6.8b) \quad \varphi = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_i^*,$$

to obtain the needed regularity:

$$(6.9) \quad \|\varphi\|_{H^3(\Omega_i)} \leq \|\varphi\|_{H^3(\Omega_i^*)} \leq C \|E\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega_i^*)} \leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega_i)}.$$

The boundary term from the integration by parts, which is normally zero by the dual problem, is now zero simply because $\rho_m - \rho_m'' = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_i$.

It remains to estimate the errors ζ' and ξ'' . Rewrite the error equations (6.3) and (6.4) in terms of these elliptic projections:

$$(6.10a) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\phi \partial \zeta'^n, \varphi) + \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{\xi}''_i{}^n \hat{\phi}_i | \Omega_i | + B(\zeta'^{n-1/2}, \varphi) - (\chi \zeta'^{n-1/2}, \nabla \varphi) \\ & = (\phi(\partial \rho'^n - \rho_t^{n-1/2}), \varphi) + \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\partial \bar{\rho}_m''_i{}^n - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}) \hat{\phi}_i | \Omega_i | \\ & \quad - (\chi(\rho'^{n-1/2} - \rho^{n-1/2}), \nabla \varphi) \quad \text{for } \varphi \in \mathbf{M}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(6.10b) \quad \zeta'^0 = 0,$$

and

$$(6.11a) \quad \begin{aligned} & \phi_{mi}(\partial \xi''^n, \psi)_i + B_i(\xi''^{n-1/2}, \psi) \\ & = \phi_{mi}(\partial \rho_m''^n - \rho_{m,t}''^{n-1/2}, \psi)_i \quad \text{for } \psi \in \mathbf{N}_i, \end{aligned}$$

$$(6.11b) \quad \xi''^n = \xi'_i{}^n - (\hat{\rho}'_i{}^n - \hat{\rho}_i{}^n) \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_i,$$

$$(6.11c) \quad \xi''^0 = -(\hat{\rho}^0{}_i - \hat{\rho}_i{}^0).$$

It is well known how to analyze every term above ([3] and [12]) except those that represent the matrix source. We will combine these known ideas with generalizations of the ideas presented in sections 3 and 4 to accomplish our error analysis.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} E_1(p, q, j) = & \{ \|p\|_{L^\infty(J; H^{p+j}(\Omega))} h^{j-1} + \|p_t\|_{L^2(J; H^p(\Omega))} \} h^{p+1} \\ & + \|\rho_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J; H^q(\Omega_m))} h_m^{q+1} \\ & + \{ \|\partial^3 p / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; H^{-1}(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 \rho_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; H^{-1}(\Omega_m))} \} (\Delta t)^2 \end{aligned}$$

where, always, $1 \leq p \leq r-j$, $1 \leq q \leq s$, and $j=0$ or 1 . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (6.12) \quad & \sum_{n=1}^N \{ \|\partial \rho''^n - \rho_t''^{n-1/2}\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}^2 + \|\partial \rho_m''^n - \rho_{m,t}''^{n-1/2}\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega_m)}^2 \\ & + \sum_i [(\partial \hat{\rho}'_i{}^n - \partial \hat{\rho}_i{}^n)^2 + (\partial \bar{\rho}_m''_i{}^n - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}''^{n-1/2})^2] \} \Delta t \\ & + \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\rho''^n - \rho^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \leq C E_1^2(p, q, j). \end{aligned}$$

In obtaining the optimal bound on the third term on the left side above, we have used that $\chi_i \in H^1(\Omega)$, for all i .

First, take $\psi = \xi''^{n-1/2} - [\xi'_i{}^{n-1/2} - (\hat{\rho}'_i{}^{n-1/2} - \hat{\rho}_i{}^{n-1/2})]$ in (6.11a). After manipulating, summing on n from 1 to η , $\eta \leq N$, and summing on i , we see

$$\begin{aligned}
& 1/2(\phi_m \xi''^\eta, \xi''^\eta)_m - \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{\xi}''^n_i \xi_i^{n-1/2} |\Omega_i| \Delta t \\
& + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} B_m(\xi''^{n-1/2}, \xi''^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \\
& = 1/2(\phi_m \xi''^0, \xi''^0)_m \\
& - \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{\xi}''^n_i (\hat{\rho}'_i^{n-1/2} - \hat{\rho}_i^{n-1/2}) |\Omega_i| \Delta t \\
& + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \{ (\phi_m (\partial \rho_m''^n - \rho_{m,t}^{n-1/2}), \xi''^{n-1/2})_m \\
& \quad - \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\partial \bar{\rho}_m''^n_i - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}) [\xi_i^{n-1/2} - (\hat{\rho}'_i^{n-1/2} - \hat{\rho}_i^{n-1/2})] |\Omega_i| \} \Delta t \\
(6.13) \quad & = -1/2 \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\hat{\rho}'_i^0 - \hat{\rho}_i^0)^2 |\Omega_i| \\
& - \sum_i \phi_{mi} \bar{\xi}''^\eta_i (\hat{\rho}'_i^\eta - \hat{\rho}_i^\eta) |\Omega_i| \\
& + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \sum_i \phi_{mi} \bar{\xi}''^{n-1/2}_i (\partial \hat{\rho}'_i^n - \partial \hat{\rho}_i^n) |\Omega_i| \Delta t \\
& + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \{ (\phi_m (\partial \rho_m''^n - \rho_{m,t}^{n-1/2}), \xi''^{n-1/2})_m \\
& \quad - \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\partial \bar{\rho}_m''^n_i - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}) [\xi_i^{n-1/2} - (\hat{\rho}'_i^{n-1/2} - \hat{\rho}_i^{n-1/2})] |\Omega_i| \} \Delta t \\
& \leq C E_1^2(p, q, j) + \epsilon \{ \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi_m \xi''^{n-1/2}, \xi''^{n-1/2})_m \Delta t \\
& \quad + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi \xi_i^{n-1/2}, \xi_i^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \} \\
& + 1/4(\phi_m \xi''^\eta, \xi''^\eta)_m + 1/2 \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} B_m(\xi''^{n-1/2}, \xi''^{n-1/2}) \Delta t,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used summation by parts in the second equality above.

Next, estimate the sum on n of (6.10a) with $\varphi = \zeta^{n-1/2}$ to see

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.14) \quad & \frac{1}{2}(\phi \zeta', \zeta') + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{\xi}_i''^n \zeta_i^{n-1/2} |\Omega_i| \Delta t \\
 & + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} B(\zeta^{n-1/2}, \zeta^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \\
 & = \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\chi \zeta^{n-1/2}, \nabla \zeta^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \\
 & + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \{ (\phi(\partial \rho^n - \rho_t^{n-1/2}), \zeta^{n-1/2}) \\
 & \quad + \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\partial \bar{\rho}_m''^n - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}) \zeta_i^{n-1/2} |\Omega_i| \\
 & \quad - (\chi(\rho^{n-1/2} - \rho^{n-1/2}), \nabla \zeta^{n-1/2}) \} \Delta t \\
 & \leq C \{ E_1^2(p, q, j) + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi \zeta^{n-1/2}, \zeta^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \} \\
 & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} B(\zeta^{n-1/2}, \zeta^{n-1/2}) \Delta t.
 \end{aligned}$$

We remove the coupling term between (6.13) and (6.14) by adding the two equations together. With the obvious cancellations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.15) \quad & \frac{1}{2}(\phi \zeta', \zeta') + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} B(\zeta^{n-1/2}, \zeta^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \\
 & + \frac{1}{4}(\phi_m \xi''^n, \xi''^n)_m + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} B_m(\xi^{n-1/2}, \xi^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \\
 & \leq C \{ E_1^2(p, q, j) + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi \zeta^{n-1/2}, \zeta^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \} \\
 & \quad + \epsilon \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi_m \xi^{n-1/2}, \xi^{n-1/2})_m \Delta t.
 \end{aligned}$$

If Δt is not too large, the discrete form of Gronwall's inequality can be applied to (6.15) to yield, after some manipulation, the error estimates

$$(6.16) \quad \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\xi''^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)}^2 + \sum_{n=1}^N \|\nabla \xi''^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)}^2 \Delta t \leq CE_1^2(p, q, j)$$

and

$$(6.17) \quad \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\xi'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{n=1}^N \|\nabla \xi'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \Delta t \leq CE_1^2(p, q, j).$$

For the next set of error estimates, let

$$\begin{aligned} E_2(p, q) = & \{ \|p\|_{L^\infty(J; H^p(\Omega))} + \|p_t\|_{L^2(J; H^p(\Omega))} \} h^p \\ & + \|p_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J; H^q(\Omega_m))} h_m^q \\ & + \{ \|\partial^3 p / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 p_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega_m))} \} (\Delta t)^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $1 \leq p \leq r$ and $1 \leq q \leq s$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (6.18) \quad & \sum_{n=1}^N \{ \|\partial p'^n - p_t^{n-1/2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\partial p'^n - \partial p^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & + \|\partial p_m'^n - p_{m,t}^{n-1/2}\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)}^2 \} \Delta t \\ & + \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|p'^n - p^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + E_1^2(p, q, 0) \\ & \leq CE_2^2(p, q). \end{aligned}$$

This time, take $\psi = \partial \xi''^n - [\partial \xi_i'^n - (\partial \hat{p}_i'^n - \partial \hat{p}_i^n)]$ in (6.11a). Again, manipulation and summation on n and i yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=1}^N (\phi_m \partial \xi''^n, \partial \xi''^n)_m \Delta t - \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \xi_i''^n \partial \xi_i'^n |\Omega_i| \Delta t \\ & + 1/2 B_m(\xi''^N, \xi''^N) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.19) \quad &= -\sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{\xi}_i''^n (\partial \hat{\rho}_i'^n - \partial \hat{\rho}_i^n) |\Omega_i| \Delta t \\
&+ \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \sum_i (\phi_{mi} (\partial \rho_m''^n - \rho_{m,t}^{n-1/2}), \\
&\quad \partial \xi''^n - [\partial \xi_i'^n - (\partial \hat{\rho}_i'^n - \partial \hat{\rho}_i^n)]_i) \Delta t \\
&\leq C E_2^2(p, q) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi_m \partial \xi''^n, \partial \xi''^n)_m \Delta t \\
&+ \frac{1}{4} \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi \partial \xi_i'^n, \partial \xi_i'^n) \Delta t.
\end{aligned}$$

Also, take $\varphi = \partial \xi_i'^n$ in (6.10a) and sum on n to see

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.20) \quad &\sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi \partial \xi_i'^n, \partial \xi_i'^n) \Delta t + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{\xi}_i''^n \partial \xi_i'^n |\Omega_i| \Delta t \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} B(\xi_i'^\eta, \xi_i'^\eta) \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\chi \xi_i'^{n-1/2}, \nabla \partial \xi_i'^n) \Delta t \\
&+ \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \{ (\phi (\partial \rho_i'^n - \rho_t^{n-1/2}), \partial \xi_i'^n) \\
&\quad + \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\partial \bar{\rho}_m''^n - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}) \partial \xi_i'^n |\Omega_i| \\
&\quad - (\chi (\rho_i'^{n-1/2} - \rho^{n-1/2}), \nabla \partial \xi_i'^n) \} \Delta t \\
&= (\chi \xi_i'^\eta, \nabla \xi_i'^\eta) - \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\chi \partial \xi_i'^n, \nabla \xi_i'^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \\
&+ \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \{ (\phi (\partial \rho_i'^n - \rho_t^{n-1/2}), \partial \xi_i'^n) \\
&\quad + \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\partial \bar{\rho}_m''^n - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}) \partial \xi_i'^n |\Omega_i|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (\chi(\partial p'^n - \partial p^n), \nabla \zeta'^{n-1/2}) \} \Delta t \\
& - (\chi(p'^n - p^n), \nabla \zeta'^n) \\
& \leq C \{ E_2^2(p, q) + \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\zeta'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{n=1}^N \|\nabla \zeta'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \Delta t \} \\
& + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{n=1}^N (\phi \partial \zeta'^n, \partial \zeta'^n) \Delta t + \frac{1}{4} B(\zeta'^N, \zeta'^N),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use summation by parts twice in the second equality above.

Now, by adding (6.19) and (6.20) together, making the obvious cancellations, and using the previous estimate (6.17) (with $j=0$), we get the other set of error estimates:

$$(6.21) \quad \sum_{n=1}^N \|\partial \zeta'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \Delta t + \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\nabla \zeta'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C E_2^2(p, q)$$

and

$$(6.22) \quad \sum_{n=1}^N \|\partial \xi'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)}^2 \Delta t + \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\nabla \xi'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)}^2 \leq C E_2^2(p, q).$$

Finally, if we combine (6.16), (6.17), (6.21), and (6.22) with the elliptic estimates (6.6) and (6.7), we obtain the approximation error estimates:

Theorem 5:

For Δt sufficiently small, the solution (U, V) of the finite element method (5.4) through (5.7) approximates the solution (p, p_m) of the double porosity model (1.4) through (1.7) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.23a) \quad & \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|p^n - U^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C \{ [\|p\|_{L^\infty(J; H^p(\Omega))} + \|p_t\|_{L^2(J; \tilde{H}^{p-1}(\Omega))}] h^p \\
& \quad + \|p_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J; H^q(\Omega_m))} h_m^{q+1} \\
& \quad + [\|\partial^3 p / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; H^{-1}(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 p_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; H^{-1}(\Omega_m))}] (\Delta t)^2 \}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\nabla(\rho - U)^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
 (6.23b) \quad & \leq C \{ [\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(J; H^p(\Omega))} + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2(J; \tilde{H}^{p-1}(\Omega))}] h^p \\
 & \quad + \|\rho_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J; H^q(\Omega_m))} h_m^q \\
 & \quad + [\|\partial^3 \rho / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 \rho_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega_m))}] (\Delta t)^2 \}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^N \|\partial(\rho - U)^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \Delta t} \\
 (6.23c) \quad & \leq C \{ [\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(J; H^p(\Omega))} + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2(J; H^p(\Omega))}] h^p \\
 & \quad + \|\rho_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J; H^q(\Omega_m))} h_m^q \\
 & \quad + [\|\partial^3 \rho / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 \rho_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega_m))}] (\Delta t)^2 \}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\rho_m^n - v^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)} \\
 (6.24a) \quad & \leq C \{ [\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(J; H^p(\Omega))} + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2(J; \tilde{H}^{p-1}(\Omega))}] h^p \\
 & \quad + [\|\rho_m\|_{L^\infty(J; H^q(\Omega_m))} + \|\rho_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J; \tilde{H}^{q-1}(\Omega_m))}] h_m^q \\
 & \quad + [\|\partial^3 \rho / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; H^{-1}(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 \rho_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; H^{-1}(\Omega_m))}] (\Delta t)^2 \}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\nabla(\rho_m - v)^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)} \\
 (6.24b) \quad & \leq C \{ [\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(J; H^p(\Omega))} + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2(J; H^p(\Omega))}] h^p \\
 & \quad + [\|\rho_m\|_{L^\infty(J; H^q(\Omega_m))} + \|\rho_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J; \tilde{H}^{q-1}(\Omega_m))}] h_m^{q-1} \\
 & \quad + [\|\partial^3 \rho / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 \rho_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega_m))}] (\Delta t)^2 \}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^N \|\partial(\rho_m - v)^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)}^2 \Delta t} \\
 (6.24c) \quad & \leq C \{ [\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(J; H^p(\Omega))} + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2(J; H^p(\Omega))}] h^p
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \|\rho_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J;H^q(\Omega_m))} h_m^q \\
& + \{ \|\partial^3 \rho / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 \rho_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J;L^2(\Omega_m))} \} (\Delta t)^2 \}
\end{aligned}$$

where $1 \leq p \leq r$, $1 \leq q \leq s$, and $\tilde{H}^j = H^{\max(1,j)}$.

Note that the error estimates are optimal with respect to both the discretization parameters and the regularity required of the solution.

The restriction on Δt arises from the use of Gronwall's inequality, which was, in fact, only used to bound the main gravitational term in (6.10a). The size of this restriction is independent of h and h_m , and it is proportional to the reciprocal of the magnitude of the gravity coefficient $\underline{\alpha}$. Since the effect of gravity is small (assumption 2), the restriction on the size of Δt should not be very important in practice. Further, if gravity is neglected, a careful analysis of the above proof shows that no restriction on Δt arises at all.

Acknowledgement.

The author would like to thank his advisor, Jim Douglas, Jr., for his encouragement and guidance, as well as specifically for his help in the formulation of the model and the finite element procedure.

References.

- [1] G. I. Barenblatt, Iu. P. Zheltov, and I. N. Kochina, *Basic concepts in the theory of seepage of homogeneous liquids in fissured rocks [strata]*, Prikl. Mat. Mekh., 24 (1960), pp. 852-864. J. Appl. Math. Mech., 24 (1960), pp. 1286-1303.
- [2] A. P. Calderón, *Lebesgue spaces of differentiable functions and distributions*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 4 (1961), pp. 33-49.
- [3] J. Douglas, Jr. and T. Dupont, *Galerkin methods for parabolic equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 7 (1970), pp. 575-626.
- [4] A. Friedman, *Partial Differential Equations of Parabolic Type*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964.
- [5] H. Kazemi, *Pressure transient analysis of naturally fractured reservoirs with uniform fracture distribution*, Soc. Pet. Eng. J. (Dec. 1969), pp. 451-462.
- [6] J. L. Lions and E. Magenes, *Non-homogeneous Boundary Value Problems and Applications*, v. 2, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972.

- [7] J. A. Nitsche, *Ein Kriterium für die quasi-Optimalität des Ritzschen Verfahrens*, Numer. Math., 11 (1968), pp. 346-348.
- [8] D. W. Peaceman, *Fundamentals of Numerical Reservoir Simulation*, Elsevier, New York, 1977.
- [9] A. E. Scheidegger, *The Physics of Flow Through Porous Media*, 3rd edition, Univ. of Toronto Press, Toronto and Buffalo, 1974.
- [10] A. de Swaan O., *Analytic solutions for determining naturally fractured reservoir properties by well testing*, Soc. Pet. Eng. J. (June 1976), pp. 117-122.
- [11] J. E. Warren and P. J. Root, *The behavior of naturally fractured reservoirs*, Soc. Pet. Eng. J. (Sept. 1963), pp. 245-255.
- [12] M. F. Wheeler, *A priori L_2 error estimates for Galerkin approximations to parabolic partial differential equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 10 (1973), pp. 723-759.

ANALYSIS OF THE SIMULATION OF SINGLE PHASE FLOW THROUGH A NATURALLY FRACTURED RESERVOIR

Todd Arbogast
Department of Mathematics
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Abstract: The double porosity model for single phase flow through a naturally fractured reservoir is derived as a parabolic equation coupled to a series of parabolic equations. It is shown that the coupling term can be viewed as a positive-semidefinite perturbation of the time derivative, and hence it is verified that the model is well posed. A finite element method is presented to approximate the solution, and optimal order L^2 error estimates are derived.

Key words: porous media, fractured reservoir, parabolic equation, finite element method.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications: 35K99, 65N30, 76S05.

1. Introduction.

The double porosity model of single phase flow through a naturally fractured reservoir was first described by Barenblatt, Zheltov, and Kochina [1], and Warren and Root [11], each of whom assumed a quasi-steady state flow in the matrix. Kazemi [5] and de Swaan O. [10] considered the fully unsteady state model. We shall derive and analyze a somewhat more general form of this double porosity model.

A fractured reservoir may be idealized as a porous medium, or *matrix*, having some regular system of fractures. We consider a fractured reservoir $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d=2$ or 3 , in which the fracture system decomposes the reservoir into a disjoint union of *matrix blocks* $\Omega_i \subset \Omega$; that is, $\bar{\Omega} = \bigcup_i \bar{\Omega}_i$ and $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j = \emptyset$, $i \neq j$. For a naturally fractured reservoir, we may assume that the diameter of each block is small compared to the dimensions of the reservoir itself.

Because the reservoir is so large, both the matrix and the fracture system have a macroscopically fine structure, each of which may be viewed as a distinct porous medium. The matrix blocks are ordinary porous media (with impermeable rock grains) for which the physics is well known (see [8] and [9]).

The fracture system is a porous medium whose "grains" (the matrix blocks) are permeable. We consider the matrix blocks as sources (and sinks) within the fracture medium and apply the known physics to it. The macroscopic quantities porosity, (tensor) permeability, pressure, and density can be defined in the usual way with respect to the matrix as ϕ_m , $\mathbf{k}_m$, p_m , and ρ_m , respectively. The corresponding quantities for the fracture medium, ϕ , $\mathbf{k}$, p , and ρ , can be defined similarly by considering the matrix blocks to be impermeable (cf. [1] and [11]).

Several physical assumptions need to be made:

1. The fluid is of constant compressibility; that is, it satisfies the equation of state

$$(1.1) \quad \rho^{-1} d\rho = c dp,$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant.

2. When gravity is present, the linearization approximation

$$(1.2) \quad \rho(\underline{x}, t)^2 = [\rho_0(\underline{x}) + (\rho(\underline{x}, t) - \rho_0(\underline{x}))]^2 \approx \rho_0(\underline{x})[2\rho(\underline{x}, t) - \rho_0(\underline{x})]$$

is valid, where $\rho_0(\underline{x})$ is some standard fluid density distribution.

3. Each matrix block interacts only with the fracture system; matrix blocks do not directly interact with each other, nor do they interact with any external source (or sink).
4. The fluid is assumed to be uniform at the surface of each matrix block.
5. The matrix porosity and permeability are constant over each block. For each i , ϕ_{mi} and $\mathbf{k}_{mi}$ shall denote ϕ_m and $\mathbf{k}_m$ restricted to Ω_i , respectively.

Assumptions 1 and 2 are customarily made in reservoir simulation. Assumptions 3 through 5 reflect the usual physical situation where the matrix blocks are relatively small and the matrix has a much higher storage capacity and a much lower flow capacity than the fracture system. Assumption 5 is not necessary for the analysis below. With the obvious modifications, all the results remain true if ϕ_m and $\mathbf{k}_m$ are allowed to be smooth functions of $\underline{x}$ (except, of course, the special case considered in Theorem 2). However, we shall retain this assumption to prevent the notation from becoming cumbersome.

In the fracture system, Darcy's law, conservation of mass, (1.1), and assumption 3 give us

$$(1.3) \quad \phi(\underline{x})\rho_t(\underline{x},t) - \nabla \cdot \left[\frac{\mathbf{k}(\underline{x})}{\mu} [c^{-1}\nabla p(\underline{x},t) - \rho(\underline{x},t)^2 g \nabla z(\underline{x})] \right] = f(\underline{x},t) + f_m(\underline{x},t) \\ \text{for } (\underline{x},t) \in \Omega \times J,$$

where the t subscript denotes partial differentiation in time, μ is the viscosity of the fluid, g is the gravitational constant, z is the vertical coordinate, f and f_m are the external and matrix source terms, respectively, and $J=(0,T]$ is the time interval of interest. By assumption 2, we linearize (1.3) as

$$(1.4a) \quad \phi(\underline{x})\rho_t(\underline{x},t) - \nabla \cdot \left[\frac{\mathbf{k}(\underline{x})}{\mu c} \nabla p(\underline{x},t) - 2\rho_0(\underline{x})g \frac{\mathbf{k}(\underline{x})}{\mu} \nabla z(\underline{x}) [\rho(\underline{x},t) - 1/2\rho_0(\underline{x})] \right] \\ = f(\underline{x},t) + f_m(\underline{x},t) \quad \text{for } (\underline{x},t) \in \Omega \times J.$$

Since the boundary of a reservoir is generally ill-defined and of little consequence, we shall simply take the no flow Neumann condition there:

$$(1.4b) \quad \left[\frac{\mathbf{k}(\underline{x})}{\mu c} \nabla p(\underline{x},t) - 2\rho_0(\underline{x})g \frac{\mathbf{k}(\underline{x})}{\mu} \nabla z(\underline{x}) [\rho(\underline{x},t) - 1/2\rho_0(\underline{x})] \right] \cdot \underline{\nu}(\underline{x}) = 0 \\ \text{for } (\underline{x},t) \in \partial\Omega \times J,$$

where $\underline{\nu}$ is the outer normal to $\partial\Omega$. Finally, the initial fluid density

$$(1.4c) \quad \rho(\underline{x},0) = \rho^0(\underline{x}) \quad \text{for } \underline{x} \in \Omega$$

must be given.

The i th matrix block transmits through its surface an average flow of fluid

$$(1.5a) \quad f_{mi}(t) = - \frac{1}{|\Omega_i|} \int_{\partial\Omega_i} \frac{\mathbf{k}_{mi}}{\mu c} \nabla p_m \cdot \underline{\nu} \, ds \quad \text{for } t \in J,$$

where we use the notation $|\Omega_i| = \int_{\Omega_i} dx$ for the volume of Ω_i . This flow should enter the fracture system near the block. In the continuous medium hypothesis, we locally average fine structure effects. This is implicitly done in defining the various macroscopic quantities above. To model the interchange between the two fine structures, we must explicitly describe the local averaging of the finer matrix structure with respect to the coarser fracture structure. Choose some partition of unity $\{\chi_i(\underline{x})\}$ over Ω such that each χ_i is approximately the characteristic function of Ω_i (i.e. each χ_i is supported near Ω_i , $0 \leq \chi_i$, $\int \chi_i dx = |\Omega_i|$, and

$\sum_j \chi_j \equiv 1$). Now we can define the matrix source term as

$$(1.5b) \quad f_m(\underline{x}, t) = \sum_i f_{mi}(t) \chi_i(\underline{x}) \quad \text{for } (\underline{x}, t) \in \Omega \times J.$$

The particular partition of unity used determines the exact manner in which the literal fracture flow around $\partial\Omega_i$ is macroscopically spread out over the domain Ω . The effect of this choice is to smooth out sharp variations in the solution p that would otherwise arise near the boundary of each Ω_i (see Theorem 4 below). In practice, one never looks at the solution in such detail, so this choice is not actually very important.

Analogous to (1.3), we have in the i th matrix block

$$(1.6a) \quad \phi_{mi} \rho_{m,t}(\underline{x}, t) - \nabla \cdot \left[\frac{\mathbf{k}_m}{\mu c} \nabla \rho_m(\underline{x}, t) \right] = 0 \quad \text{for } (\underline{x}, t) \in \Omega_i \times J.$$

Here we have omitted the gravitational term, since the effects of assumption 4 completely dominate it. Continuity of pressure requires that the block and fracture densities be equal at the surface of the block, while initial equilibrium requires the same equality at time zero. By assumption 4, at each time t , we can simply take a constant, $\hat{p}_i(t)$, to represent the density of the fluid in the fractures surrounding the i th block. That is, we can write

$$(1.6b) \quad \rho_m = \hat{p}_i \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_i \times J$$

(where the trace is taken from inside Ω_i) and

$$(1.6c) \quad \rho_m(\underline{x}, 0) = \hat{p}_i^0 \quad \text{for } \underline{x} \in \Omega_i.$$

Finally, we should define these constants according to

$$(1.7) \quad \hat{u}_i = |\Omega_i|^{-1} \int_{\Omega} u \chi_i \, dx \quad \text{for } u \in L^1(\Omega).$$

This definition gives us consistency between the local (i th block) behavior of the fracture flow in (1.5b) and in (1.6b,c).

Equations (1.4) through (1.7) constitute our model. In the next section, we shall specify the mathematical assumptions as well as define some general notation. In section 3 we analyze the matrix source term. In particular, we show that it is positive-semidefinite in some sense. In section 4 we show that

the model is mathematically well posed. A finite element method of approximating the solution p (and p_m) is presented and analyzed in sections 5 and 6.

2. General assumptions and notations.

In the rest of the paper we shall use the following assumptions and notations concerning the coefficients. Assume that f , ρ_0 , ρ^0 , and the χ_i are smoothly distributed over the reservoir and sufficiently regular. The (unphysical) assumption on f will ensure that the solution p has the necessary smoothness and L^2 -norm properties for the analysis below. Let $\phi(\underline{x})$ and ϕ_m be bounded above and below by positive constants over Ω and Ω_m (where $\Omega_m = \cup_i \Omega_i$), respectively, and suppose that ϕ is smooth. Let $\underline{\kappa}(\underline{x}) = \underline{\kappa}(\underline{x})/\mu c$ and $\underline{\kappa}_m = \underline{\kappa}_m/\mu c$ be symmetric and uniformly positive-definite matrices over Ω and Ω_m , respectively, such that $\underline{\kappa}$ is smooth and sufficiently regular. Finally, let $\underline{\alpha}(\underline{x}) = 2\rho_0(\underline{x})g\underline{\kappa}(\underline{x})\underline{\nabla}z(\underline{x})/\mu$.

We will assume that Ω is a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Obviously we may not make the same assumption on Ω_i ; instead, we will assume that Ω_i is a convex domain, for each i . Hence, $\partial\Omega_i$ is piecewise smooth.

$W^{p,r}$, $0 \leq p$ and $1 \leq r \leq \infty$, will denote the usual Sobolev space of p times differentiable functions in L^r . Let $H^p = W^{p,2}$. H^{-p} will denote the dual of H^p . $H^q(J; H^p)$, q a nonnegative integer, will denote the Banach space of H^p -valued functions (of $\underline{x}$) that are in H^q (as functions of t). The norm of $u(\underline{x}, t) \in H^q(J; H^p)$ is given by

$$\|u\|_{H^q(J; H^p)} = \left\| \sum_{j=0}^q \|\partial^j u / \partial t^j\|_{H^p} \right\|_{L^2(J)}.$$

Similarly we have the space $L^\infty(J; H^p)$. We will also need the spaces $H^1_0(\Omega_i) = \{v \in H^1(\Omega_i) : v=0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega_i\}$.

We will denote by $(\cdot, \cdot)$ the inner product on $L^2(\Omega)$ or $(L^2(\Omega))^d$, whichever is appropriate. We will similarly denote by $(\cdot, \cdot)_i$ the inner product on $L^2(\Omega_i)$ or $(L^2(\Omega_i))^d$, and by $(\cdot, \cdot)_m$ the inner product on $L^2(\Omega_m)$ or $(L^2(\Omega_m))^d$. Define the symmetric bilinear forms

$$B(u_1, u_2) = (\underline{\kappa} \underline{\nabla} u_1, \underline{\nabla} u_2) \quad \text{for any } u_1, u_2 \in H^1(\Omega),$$

$$B_i(v_1, v_2) = (\underline{\kappa}_m \underline{\nabla} v_1, \underline{\nabla} v_2)_i \quad \text{for any } v_1, v_2 \in H^1(\Omega_i), \text{ for each } i,$$

and

$$B_m(v_1, v_2) = (\kappa_m \nabla v_1, \nabla v_2)_m \quad \text{for any } v_1, v_2 \in H^1(\Omega_m).$$

Finally, C and ϵ will denote generic positive constants.

Let us write the differential equations of the model in weak form with the above notation. First, note that by applying the divergence theorem to (1.6a), we can rewrite (1.5a) as

$$(2.1) \quad f_{mi}(t) = -\phi_{mi} \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i},$$

with the notation

$$\bar{v}_i = |\Omega_i|^{-1} \int_{\Omega_i} v \, dx$$

for the average of $v \in L^1(\Omega_i)$ over Ω_i . Now we can write (1.4a,b) and (1.5) as

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\phi \rho_t, \varphi) + \sum_i \phi_{mi} \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i} \hat{\phi}_i |\Omega_i| + B(\rho, \varphi) - (\chi \rho, \nabla \varphi) \\ & = (f, \varphi) - 1/2 (\chi \rho_0, \nabla \varphi) \quad \text{for } \varphi \in H^1(\Omega), \end{aligned}$$

and, for each i , (1.6a) as

$$(2.3) \quad \phi_{mi}(\rho_{m,t}, \psi)_i + B_i(\rho_m, \psi) = 0 \quad \text{for } \psi \in H^1_0(\Omega_i).$$

Of course, the boundary condition (1.6b) must be imposed on ρ_m .

3. Description of the matrix source term.

For a given ρ in $H^1(J; L^2(\Omega))$, the solution ρ_m of (1.6) (or (2.3), (1.6b,c)) exists and is unique as a function in $H^1(J; L^2(\Omega_m)) \cap L^2(J; H^2(\Omega_m))$, since Ω_i is convex for each i . As a consequence, we can define the matrix source term operator $F_m: L^2(J; L^2(\Omega)) \rightarrow L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))$ as

$$(3.1) \quad F_m(u_*) = \sum_i \phi_{mi} \bar{v}_{t,i} \chi_i$$

where, on Ω_i , v satisfies

$$(3.2a) \quad \phi_{mi}(v_t, \psi)_i + B_i(v, \psi) = 0 \quad \text{for } \psi \in H^1_0(\Omega_i)$$

$$(3.2b) \quad v = \int_0^t \hat{u}_{*,i}(\tau) d\tau \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_i \times J$$

$$(3.2c) \quad v(\underline{x}, 0) = 0 \quad \text{for } \underline{x} \in \Omega_i.$$

Note that $u_* = \rho_t$ implies that $v_t = \rho_{m,t}$; hence, $F_m(\rho_t) = -f_m$ represents flow from the fracture system to the matrix. We should expect that ρ_t and $F_m(\rho_t)$ behave similarly, at least in some average sense. This is expressed as

Theorem 1:

F_m is a bounded linear positive-semidefinite operator from $L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))$ to $L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))$ for any subinterval $\tilde{J} = (0, \tau] \subset J$. That is,

$$(3.3) \quad \|F_m(u_*)\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))} \leq C \|u_*\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))}$$

and

$$(3.4) \quad 0 \leq \int_0^\tau (F_m(u_*), u_*) dt$$

for any $u_* \in L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))$. Moreover,

$$(3.5) \quad -C \|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \int_0^\tau (F_m(u_t), u) dt$$

for any $u \in H^1(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))$.

Proof:

Take $\psi = v_t - \hat{u}_{*,i}$ in (3.2a) and integrate over $\tilde{J}$ to see

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \phi_{mi} \|v_t\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega_i))}^2 + \frac{1}{2} B_i(v, v)(\tau) \\ &= \phi_{mi} \int_0^\tau \overline{v}_{t,i} \hat{u}_{*,i} dt |\Omega_i| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \phi_{mi} \|v_t\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega_i))}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \phi_{mi} \|u_* \chi_i^{1/2}\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Canceling terms above, we obtain boundedness:

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.7) \quad & \|F_m(u_*)\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))} \\
&= \left\| \sum_i \phi_{mi} \bar{v}_{t,i} \chi_i \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|_{L^2(\tilde{J})} \\
&\leq \sum_i \phi_{mi} \|v_t\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega_i))} \\
&\leq C \|u_*\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using only the equality in (3.6), we get positive-semidefiniteness:

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.8) \quad & \int_0^\tau (F_m(u_*), u_*) \, dt \\
&= \sum_i \phi_{mi} \int_0^\tau \bar{v}_{t,i} \hat{u}_{*,i} \, dt \, |\Omega_i| \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

To obtain (3.5), take $\psi = v - \int_0^t \hat{u}_{t,i} \, d\tau = (v + \hat{u}_i(0)) - \hat{u}_i$ in (3.2a) and integrate over $\tilde{J}$ to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.9) \quad & \frac{1}{2} \phi_{mi} \|v + \hat{u}_i(0)\|_{L^2(\Omega_i)}^2(\tau) - \frac{1}{2} \phi_{mi} (\hat{u}_i(0))^2 |\Omega_i| + \int_0^\tau B_i(v, v) \, dt \\
&= \phi_{mi} \int_0^\tau \bar{v}_{t,i} \hat{u}_i \, dt \, |\Omega_i|,
\end{aligned}$$

and then estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.10) \quad & \int_0^\tau (F_m(u_t), u) \, dt \\
&= \sum_i \phi_{mi} \int_0^\tau \bar{v}_{t,i} \hat{u}_i \, dt \, |\Omega_i| \\
&\geq -C \|u(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

A more complete understanding of the matrix source term operator may be obtained by expressing it explicitly in terms of the auxiliary function θ which, on Ω_i , is the solution to

$$(3.11a) \quad \phi_{mi} \theta_t - \nabla \cdot (\kappa_m \nabla \theta) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega_i \times J,$$

$$(3.11b) \quad \theta = 1 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_i \times J,$$

$$(3.11c) \quad \theta(\underline{x}, 0) = 0 \quad \text{for } \underline{x} \in \Omega_i.$$

The solution of (1.6) is the convolution in time

$$(3.12) \quad \rho_m(\underline{x}, t) = \int_0^t \theta(\underline{x}, t-\tau) \hat{\rho}_{t,i}(\tau) d\tau + \hat{\rho}_i^0 \quad \text{for } (\underline{x}, t) \in \Omega_i \times J,$$

and so

$$(3.13) \quad F_m(\rho_t)(\underline{x}, t) = \sum_i \phi_{mi} \int_0^t \bar{\theta}_{t,i}(t-\tau) \hat{\rho}_{t,i}(\tau) d\tau \chi_i(\underline{x}).$$

This, in fact, allows us to decouple the system (1.4) through (1.7). Since $\bar{\theta}_{t,i}$ is positive, decreasing, and convex, the Fourier transform of its even extension to $\mathbb{R}$ is positive. An application of Fourier analysis to (3.13) gives an alternate proof of (3.4). This approach enables us to see that, in fact, $\{\int_0^T (F_m(\cdot), \cdot) dt\}^{1/2}$ is a seminorm on $L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))$ equivalent to the sum on i of the $H^{-1/4}$ -norms in time of the local space averages, at least in the following special (but very reasonable) case:

Theorem 2:

Suppose that each Ω_i is a rectangular parallelepiped whose edges are parallel to the coordinate axes, and that each $\mathbf{x}_{mi}$ is diagonal. Then there exist positive constants C_1 and C_2 (independent of ρ_t) such that

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & C_1 \sum_i \|\hat{\rho}_{t,i}\|_{H^{-1/4}(J)}^2 |\Omega_i| \\ & \leq \int_0^T (F_m(\rho_t), \rho_t) dt \\ & \leq C_2 \sum_i \|\hat{\rho}_{t,i}\|_{H^{-1/4}(J)}^2 |\Omega_i|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof:

For each i , an appropriate scaling allows us to assume that $\Omega_i = (0, \pi)^d + \underline{c}_i$. Write

$$\frac{1}{\phi_{mi}} \mathbf{x}_{mi} = \begin{bmatrix} k_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & k_d \end{bmatrix}.$$

Separation of variables applied to (3.11) gives us

$$(3.15) \quad \bar{\theta}_{t,i} = \left[\frac{8}{\pi^2} \right]^d \sum_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d} \frac{\sum_j \lambda_j^2 k_j}{\prod_j \lambda_j^2} \exp\left(-\sum_j \lambda_j^2 k_j t\right),$$

where $\sum_o$ denotes the sum over positive odd indices.

Let $\omega(t) = \bar{\theta}_{t,i}(|t|)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $\mathbf{F}$ denote the Fourier transform operator. It is trivial to calculate

$$(3.16) \quad \mathbf{F}\omega(s) = 2 \left[\frac{8}{\pi^2} \right]^d \sum_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d} \frac{\left(\sum_j \lambda_j^2 k_j\right)^2}{\left(\prod_j \lambda_j^2\right) \left[\left(\sum_j \lambda_j^2 k_j\right)^2 + s^2\right]}.$$

We will now show that there exist positive constants $\tilde{C}_1$ and $\tilde{C}_2$ such that

$$(3.17) \quad \tilde{C}_1 (1 + s^2)^{-1/4} \leq \mathbf{F}\omega(s) \leq \tilde{C}_2 (1 + s^2)^{-1/4}.$$

Since $\mathbf{F}\omega$ is continuous (Riemann-Lebesgue lemma) and even, it suffices to show the result for s large. In that case,

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}\omega(s) &\geq C \sum_{\lambda_1} \frac{(\lambda_1^2 + d - 1)^2}{\lambda_1^2 [(\lambda_1^2 + d - 1)^2 + s^2]} \\ &\geq C \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1 \\ 1/2s \leq \lambda_1^2 \leq 3/2s}} \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\lambda_1^4 + s^2} \\ &\geq C s^{-1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

as $\lambda_1 = O(s^{1/2})$ and there are $O(s^{1/2})$ terms in the last sum, and

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}\omega(s) &\leq C \sum_{\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d} \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1 \\ \lambda_1 \geq \max(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d)}} \frac{(\lambda_1^2 + \sum_{j=2}^d \lambda_j^2)^2}{\lambda_1^2 \left(\prod_{j=2}^d \lambda_j^2\right) [(\lambda_1^2 + \sum_{j=2}^d \lambda_j^2)^2 + s^2]} \\ &\leq C \left[\sum_{\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=2}^d \lambda_j^2} \right] \left[\sum_{\lambda_1} \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\lambda_1^4 + s^2} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1 \\ 2^m s \leq \lambda_1^2 \leq 2^{m+1} s}} \frac{\lambda_1^2}{\lambda_1^4 + s^2} \\
&\leq C \left[\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{2^m}{(2^{2m+1})} 2^{m/2} \right] s^{-1/2} \\
&\leq C s^{-1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This establishes (3.17).

Our estimate (3.14) now follows directly from (3.13), some Fourier analysis, and (3.17):

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.20) \quad &\int_0^T (F_m(\rho_t), \rho_t) dt \\
&= \sum_i \int_0^T \int_0^t \omega(t-\tau) \hat{\rho}_{t,i}(\tau) \hat{\rho}_{t,i}(t) d\tau dt |\Omega_i| \\
&= \sum_i \iint [\omega(t-\tau) \chi_{(0,\infty)}(t-\tau)] [\hat{\rho}_{t,i}(\tau) \chi_J(\tau)] \times \\
&\quad \times [\hat{\rho}_{t,i}(t) \chi_J(t)] d\tau dt |\Omega_i| \\
&= \sum_i \int \mathbf{F}(\omega \chi_{(0,\infty)})(s) |\mathbf{F}(\hat{\rho}_{t,i} \chi_J)(s)|^2 ds |\Omega_i| \\
&= 1/2 \sum_i \int \mathbf{F}\omega(s) |\mathbf{F}(\hat{\rho}_{t,i} \chi_J)(s)|^2 ds |\Omega_i|
\end{aligned}$$

which is then equivalent to

$$\sum_i \int (1 + s^2)^{-1/4} |\mathbf{F}(\hat{\rho}_{t,i} \chi_J)(s)|^2 ds |\Omega_i|.$$

Since the integral above is equivalent to the square of the $H^{-1/4}$ -norm, the proof is complete. $\square$

As a final remark in this section, we will compare the so called Warren and Root model ([1] and [11]) with the present model. The quasi-steady state assumption, that $\rho_{m,t} = -\alpha(\rho_m - \rho)$, simply says that

$$(3.21) \quad \rho_m(\underline{x}, t) = \int_0^t (1 - e^{-\alpha(t-\tau)}) \rho_t(\underline{x}, \tau) d\tau + \rho^0(\underline{x}) \quad \text{for } (\underline{x}, t) \in \Omega \times J.$$

A glance at (3.12) shows that this assumption essentially amounts to a one parameter approximation of θ (or $\bar{\theta}_i$) by a single time exponential.

4. Demonstration that the model is well posed.

We will now show the existence, uniqueness, and continuous dependence on the data (f, ρ_0, ρ^0) of the solution (ρ, ρ_m) . This will be accomplished by applying the method of continuity to the problem (1.4) decoupled from (1.6) via (3.13). The linearization assumption (1.2) creates some difficulties when gravity is present. The equations are not strictly linear, and a given solution u can arise from many different sets of data, as the reference density function ρ_0 is allowed to be arbitrary. To resolve these difficulties, we shall analyze the equation over a smaller data space. We must be careful to determine the dependence on $\underline{\rho}$, since $\underline{\rho}$ is proportional to ρ_0 .

For each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, consider the problem

$$(4.1a) \quad \phi(\underline{x})u_t(\underline{x}, t) + \lambda F_m(u_t)(\underline{x}, t) - \nabla \cdot [\underline{\kappa}(\underline{x})\nabla u(\underline{x}, t) - \underline{\rho}(\underline{x})u(\underline{x}, t)] = F(\underline{x}, t) \\ \text{for } (\underline{x}, t) \in \Omega \times J,$$

$$(4.1b) \quad [\underline{\kappa}(\underline{x})\nabla u(\underline{x}, t) - \underline{\rho}(\underline{x})u(\underline{x}, t)] \cdot \underline{\nu}(\underline{x}) = u_0(\underline{x}) \quad \text{for } (\underline{x}, t) \in \partial\Omega \times J,$$

$$(4.1c) \quad u(\underline{x}, 0) = u^0(\underline{x}) \quad \text{for } \underline{x} \in \Omega.$$

When $\lambda=0$, we have a standard well posed problem (see [6], Theorem 5.3, p. 32); when $\lambda=1$, we have our problem (1.4), where $F(\underline{x}, t) = f(\underline{x}, t) + 1/2 \nabla \cdot [\rho_0(\underline{x})\underline{\rho}(\underline{x})]$, $u_0(\underline{x}) = -1/2 \rho_0(\underline{x})\underline{\rho}(\underline{x}) \cdot \underline{\nu}(\underline{x})$, and $u^0(\underline{x}) = \rho^0(\underline{x})$.

Let

$$\mathcal{V} = \{ u \in H^1(J; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(J; H^2(\Omega)) : \\ (\underline{\kappa}\nabla u - \underline{\rho}u) \cdot \underline{\nu} \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times J \text{ is independent of } t \}$$

and

$$\mathcal{W} = \{ (F, u_0, u^0) \in L^2(J; L^2(\Omega)) \times H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega) : \\ (\underline{\kappa}\nabla u^0 - \underline{\rho}u^0) \cdot \underline{\nu} = u_0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \}.$$

We can define for each λ the linear operator

$$\Phi_\lambda : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$$

representing (4.1) as

$$\Phi_\lambda(u) = (\phi u_t + \lambda F_m(u_t) - \nabla \cdot (\underline{\kappa}\nabla u - \underline{\rho}u), (\underline{\kappa}\nabla u - \underline{\rho}u) \cdot \underline{\nu}, u(\cdot, 0)),$$

where the two trace operators are known to be bounded ([6], Theorem 2.1, p. 9).

Lemma:

The Φ_λ are bounded above and below with bounds that are independent of $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. These bounds depend on $\underline{\chi}$ only through its $H^1(\Omega)$ -norm.

The following technical lemma will enable us to verify the $\underline{\chi}$ dependence. It will be used with $\psi = \underline{\chi}$ several times in the proof of the lemma.

Technical lemma:

If the dimension $d \leq 3$, then, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$(4.2) \quad (\psi \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^4 \|\varphi_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \epsilon \{ \|\varphi_1\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\varphi_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \}$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad \|\nabla(\psi \varphi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \epsilon \|\varphi\|_{H^2(\Omega)}.$$

Proof:

By Hölder's inequality and the Sobolev imbedding theorem, we have:

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} (\psi \varphi_1, \varphi_2) &\leq \|\psi\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\varphi_1\|_{L^3(\Omega)} \|\varphi_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|\psi\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\varphi_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\varphi_1\|_{L^6(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\varphi_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\varphi_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\varphi_1\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\varphi_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^4 \|\varphi_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \epsilon \{ \|\varphi_1\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\varphi_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\nabla(\psi \varphi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \|(\nabla \psi) \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\psi(\nabla \varphi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|\nabla \psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\ &\quad + \|\psi\|_{L^6(\Omega)} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^6(\Omega)}^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^{1/2} \|\varphi\|_{H^2(\Omega)}^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \|\varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \epsilon \|\varphi\|_{H^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Proof of the lemma:

That the Φ_λ are bounded above follows directly from Theorem 1 and the boundedness of the trace operators. The second part of the technical lemma

shows that the bound is proportional to $1 + \lambda + \|\underline{\chi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq 2 + \|\underline{\chi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2$.

Multiplying (4.1a) by u and integrating over $\Omega \times \tilde{J}$, $\tilde{J} = (0, \tau] \subset J$, yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.6) \quad & \frac{1}{2}(\phi u, u)(\tau) + \lambda \int_0^\tau (F_m(u_t), u) dt + \int_0^\tau B(u, u) dt \\
 & = \int_0^\tau (F, u) dt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0 u ds dt + \int_0^\tau (\underline{\chi} u, \underline{\nabla} u) dt \\
 & \quad + \frac{1}{2}(\phi u^0, u^0) \\
 & \leq C \{ \|F\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|u_0\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \|u^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
 & \quad + \int_0^\tau (\phi u, u) dt \} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\tau B(u, u) dt,
 \end{aligned}$$

since the $H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ -norm of the trace of u is bounded by the $H^1(\Omega)$ -norm of u . The first part of the technical lemma shows that C depends on the $H^1(\Omega)$ -norm of $\underline{\chi}$. By (3.5), we may simply omit the matrix source term on the far left side of (4.6) with respect to the inequality. Then, Gronwall's inequality gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.7) \quad & \|u\|_{L^\infty(J; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|\underline{\nabla} u\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))}^2 \\
 & \leq C \{ \|F\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|u_0\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \|u^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Next, multiplying (4.1a) by u_t and integrating over $\Omega \times \tilde{J}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.8) \quad & \int_0^\tau (\phi u_t, u_t) dt + \lambda \int_0^\tau (F_m(u_t), u_t) dt + \frac{1}{2} B(u, u)(\tau) \\
 & = \int_0^\tau (F, u_t) dt + \int_0^\tau \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0 u_t ds dt + \int_0^\tau (\underline{\chi} u, \underline{\nabla} u_t) dt \\
 & \quad + \frac{1}{2} B(u^0, u^0).
 \end{aligned}$$

Integrating in time straightforwardly and by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.9) \quad & \int_0^\tau \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0 u_t ds dt + \int_0^\tau (\underline{\chi} u, \underline{\nabla} u_t) dt \\
 & = \int_{\partial\Omega} u_0 [u(\underline{x}, \tau) - u^0] ds \\
 & \quad + (\underline{\chi} u, \underline{\nabla} u)(\tau) - (\underline{\chi} u^0, \underline{\nabla} u^0) - \int_0^\tau (\underline{\chi} u_t, \underline{\nabla} u) dt \\
 & \leq C \{ \|u_0\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \|u^0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
 & \quad + \|u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|\underline{\nabla} u\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; L^2(\Omega))}^2 \} \\
 & \quad + \frac{1}{4} B(u, u)(\tau) + \frac{1}{4} \int_0^\tau (\phi u_t, u_t) dt + \epsilon \|\underline{\nabla} u\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}; H^1(\Omega))}^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

where ϵ is as small as we like and, again, C depends on $\|\underline{\chi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ by the technical lemma. Combining (4.8) with (3.4), (4.9), and (4.7), we see

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\tau (\phi_{u_t}, u_t) dt + \frac{1}{4} B(u, u)(\tau) \\
(4.10) \quad & \leq C \{ \|F\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|u_0\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \|u^0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \} \\
& \quad + \epsilon \|u\|_{L^2(J; H^2(\Omega))}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, from (4.1a) itself, Theorem 1, and the technical lemma,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{x} \nabla u\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} \\
(4.11) \quad & \leq C \{ (1 + \lambda) \|u_t\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} + \|u\|_{L^2(J; H^1(\Omega))} + \|F\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} \} \\
& \quad + \epsilon \|u\|_{L^2(J; H^2(\Omega))}.
\end{aligned}$$

So, for ϵ having been chosen small enough above, (4.11) combines with elliptic regularity, (4.10), and (4.7) to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|u\|_{L^2(J; H^2(\Omega))} \leq C \{ \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{x} \nabla u\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} + \|u\|_{L^2(J; H^1(\Omega))} \} \\
(4.12) \quad & \leq C \{ \|F\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))}^2 + \|u_0\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \|u^0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, (4.12) can be used to complete the estimate (4.10) and finish the proof. $\square$

Since $\Phi_\lambda = \lambda \Phi_1 + (1 - \lambda) \Phi_0$, we can now use the method of continuity to deform the solution $\tilde{u}$ of $\Phi_0(\tilde{u}) = (F, u_0, u^0)$ continuously to a solution u of $\Phi_1(u) = (F, u_0, u^0)$. That is, from the lemma, if Φ_{λ_0} is an isomorphism, then $\Psi(u; \lambda, \lambda_0) = \Phi_{\lambda_0}^{-1}((F, u_0, u^0) + (\Phi_{\lambda_0} - \Phi_\lambda)(u))$ is a contraction mapping on $\mathcal{V}$ for $|\lambda - \lambda_0|$ small enough independently of λ and λ_0 . The fixed point of Ψ is the solution to (4.1), so Φ_λ is also an isomorphism. After a finite number of steps from $\lambda_0 = 0$, we have:

Corollary:

Φ_1 is an isomorphism.

Theorem 3:

If $f \in L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))$ and $(p_0)^2, p^0 \in H^1(\Omega)$ are such that $[\mathbf{x} \nabla p^0 - \chi(p^0 - \frac{1}{2} p_0)] \cdot \underline{\nu} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, then the double porosity model (1.4) through (1.7) has a unique solution $(p, p_m) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}_m$, $\mathcal{V}_m = H^1(J; L^2(\Omega_m)) \cap L^2(J; H^2(\Omega_m))$, which varies continuously with the data:

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.13) \quad & \|p\|_{H^1(J;L^2(\Omega))} + \|p\|_{L^2(J;H^2(\Omega))} + \|p_m\|_{H^1(J;L^2(\Omega_m))} \\
& + \|p_m\|_{L^2(J;H^2(\Omega_m))} \\
& \leq C \{ \|f\|_{L^2(J;L^2(\Omega))} + \|(\rho_0)^2\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\rho^0\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \},
\end{aligned}$$

where C depends on $\|\rho_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ and, for solutions $(p_j, p_{m,j})$ arising from data $(f_j, \rho_{0,j}, \rho^0_j)$, $j=1$ and 2 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.14) \quad & \|p_1 - p_2\|_{H^1(J;L^2(\Omega))} + \|p_1 - p_2\|_{L^2(J;H^2(\Omega))} \\
& + \|p_{m,1} - p_{m,2}\|_{H^1(J;L^2(\Omega_m))} + \|p_{m,1} - p_{m,2}\|_{L^2(J;H^2(\Omega_m))} \\
& \leq C \{ \|f_1 - f_2\|_{L^2(J;L^2(\Omega))} + \|(\rho_{0,1})^2 - (\rho_{0,2})^2\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\
& + \|\rho_{0,1} - \rho_{0,2}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\rho^0_1 - \rho^0_2\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \},
\end{aligned}$$

where C depends on $\|\rho_{0,2}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ and $\|p_1\|_{L^2(J;H^2(\Omega))}$.

Note that Hölder's inequality and the Sobolev imbedding theorem imply that

$$(4.15) \quad \|\psi \varphi\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|\psi\|_{W^{1,12/5}(\Omega)} \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,12/5}(\Omega)}.$$

Hence, we can replace the norm of $(\rho_0)^2$ in (4.13) by $\|\rho_0\|_{W^{1,12/5}(\Omega)}^2$, and we can replace the norms involving $\rho_{0,1}$ and $\rho_{0,2}$ in (4.14) by $(1 + \|\rho_{0,1}\|_{W^{1,12/5}(\Omega)} + \|\rho_{0,2}\|_{W^{1,12/5}(\Omega)})\|\rho_{0,1} - \rho_{0,2}\|_{W^{1,12/5}(\Omega)}$.

Proof:

The claims for p and $p_1 - p_2$ follow directly from the remarks following (4.1) and the lemma with its corollary. Now, since p exists and is unique, p_m exists and is unique. If we finish the energy estimates (3.6) and (3.9) (with $u_* = p_t$ and $u = p$ so that $p_m = v + \hat{p}^0_j$), and if we use (1.6a) itself and elliptic regularity, we can bound p_m in $H^1(J;L^2(\Omega_m))$ and in $L^2(J;H^2(\Omega_m))$ by $\|p\|_{H^1(J;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\rho^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Since (1.6) is a linear equation, the bounds for p finish the proof. $\square$

Later we will want to take higher Sobolev norms of p and p_m , so it is appropriate at least to say something about their smoothness here. From (1.6a)

we see that p_m is infinitely differentiable on $\Omega_m \times J$. Then (2.1) and (1.5b) tell us that f_m is infinitely differentiable in time and as smooth in space as the χ_i are. Finally, then, (1.4a) tells us (see [4], Chapter 3, Theorem 11, p. 74)

Theorem 4:

If each of $\partial^{|\alpha|} \chi_i / \partial x^\alpha$, $\partial^{|\alpha|+j} [f + 1/2 \nabla \cdot (p_0 \underline{g})] / \partial x^\alpha \partial t^j$, $\partial^{|\alpha|} \phi / \partial x^\alpha$, $\partial^{|\alpha|} \mathbf{k} / \partial x^\alpha$, $\partial^{|\alpha|} (\underline{g} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{k}) / \partial x^\alpha$, and $\partial^{|\alpha|} (\nabla \cdot \underline{g}) / \partial x^\alpha$ are Hölder continuous of order $\beta \in (0,1)$ on Ω or $\Omega \times J$, as appropriate, for $0 \leq |\alpha| + 2j \leq \ell$ and $0 \leq j \leq m$ (where α is a multi-index), then $\partial^{|\alpha|+j} p / \partial x^\alpha \partial t^j$ is Hölder continuous of order β on $\Omega \times J$ for $0 \leq |\alpha| + 2j \leq \ell + 2$ and $0 \leq j \leq m + 1$.

5. Formulation of the finite element method.

For each h and h_m in $(0,1]$, let $\mathbf{M} \subset H^1(\Omega)$ and, for each i , $\mathbf{N}_i \subset H^1_0(\Omega_i)$ be standard Galerkin finite dimensional H^1 -approximation spaces of order r in h and s in h_m , respectively. That is, let

$$(5.1) \quad \inf_{\varphi \in \mathbf{M}} \|u - \varphi\|_{H^j(\Omega)} \leq C \|u\|_{H^p(\Omega)} h^{p-j}, \quad 1 \leq p \leq r, \quad j = -1, 0, 1;$$

for any $u \in H^r(\Omega)$ and, for each i ,

$$(5.2) \quad \inf_{\psi \in \mathbf{N}_i} \|v - \psi\|_{H^j(\Omega_i)} \leq C \|v\|_{H^q(\Omega_i)} h_m^{q-j}, \quad 1 \leq q \leq s, \quad j = -1, 0, 1;$$

for any $v \in H^s(\Omega_i) \cap H^1_0(\Omega_i)$ (where the constants C are independent of u , v , h , and h_m). To avoid trivialities below, we will assume that $\mathbf{M}$ contains the constant functions. We will also let $\mathbf{N}_i^* = \{v^* = v + c : v \in \mathbf{N}_i \text{ and } c \in \mathbb{R}\}$. In both (5.1) and (5.2), the result for $j=1$ implies the result for $j=-1$ and $j=0$ (see (6.6) and (6.7) below).

For $u \in H^1(\Omega)$, let $u' \in \mathbf{M}$ denote the elliptic projection defined by

$$(5.3a) \quad B(u - u', \varphi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathbf{M}$$

and

$$(5.3b) \quad \int_{\Omega} (u - u') \, dx = 0.$$

For each positive integer N , let $\Delta t = T/N$. We will use the following notation (where u is any function of time):

$$t_n = n\Delta t$$

and

$$u^n = u(t_n)$$

for $n=0, 1, \dots, N$, and

$$u^{n-1/2} = \frac{u^n + u^{n-1}}{2}$$

and

$$\partial u^n = \frac{u^n - u^{n-1}}{\Delta t}$$

for $n=1, 2, \dots, N$.

We shall now describe our finite element procedure. We seek a map $U: \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_N\} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ and, on each Ω_i , a map $W: \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N\} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}_i^*$ and a function $Z \in \mathbf{N}_i^*$ that satisfy the following equations:

$$(5.4a) \quad (\phi \partial U^n, \varphi) + \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{V}_i^n \hat{\phi}_i |\Omega_i| + B(U^{n-1/2}, \varphi) - (\underline{\alpha} U^{n-1/2}, \underline{\nabla} \varphi) \\ = (f^{n-1/2}, \varphi) - 1/2 (\underline{\alpha} p_0, \underline{\nabla} \varphi) \quad \text{for } \varphi \in \mathbf{M},$$

$$(5.4b) \quad U^0 = p^0,$$

$$(5.5a) \quad \phi_{mi} \left[\frac{w^n - v^{n-1}}{\Delta t}, \psi \right]_i + B_i \left[\frac{w^n + v^{n-1}}{2}, \psi \right] = 0 \quad \text{for } \psi \in \mathbf{N}_i,$$

$$(5.5b) \quad w^n = \hat{U}_i^{n-1} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_i,$$

$$(5.6a) \quad \phi_{mi} \left[\frac{Z}{\Delta t}, \psi \right]_i + B_i \left[\frac{Z}{2}, \psi \right] = 0 \quad \text{for } \psi \in \mathbf{N}_i,$$

$$(5.6b) \quad Z = \Delta t \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_i,$$

$$(5.7a) \quad v^n = w^n + \partial \hat{U}_j^n z \quad \text{on } \Omega_j,$$

and

$$(5.7b) \quad v^0 = \hat{U}^0_j.$$

First, we solve (5.4b) for U^0 and (5.6) for Z . Then, successively for $n=1, 2, \dots, N$, we solve (5.5) for w^n , (5.7a) for v^n (with its explicit dependence on U^n), (5.4a) for U^n , and, finally, we return to (5.7a) to remove the U^n dependence from v^n . Since uniqueness implies existence, it is not terribly hard to see that the equations can indeed be solved, provided that, if gravity is present, Δt is not too large. This, in fact, follows from the analysis below.

It will be shown in the next section that U and V approximate ρ and ρ_m , respectively.

Because of the enormous number of matrix blocks, the approximation procedure appears at first glance to require a massive amount of calculation. However, in actual reservoir simulation, h is of necessity taken to be much larger than the diameters of the matrix blocks: consequently, the triangulation over each matrix block should be rather coarse (see Theorem 5 below), and thus the linear systems arising from (5.5) and (5.6) should be small. Since one is generally only interested in effects that are on the scale of the discretization of the fracture system, it is sufficient to solve (5.5) and (5.6) only on the blocks that sit over the quadrature points of (5.4a). If Ω_j is symmetric about its center, the solution V is also symmetric over Ω_j , so, with some care, one can further reduce the size of the linear systems in (5.5) and (5.6). Finally, the block problems are independent of each other by assumption 3, so naturally fractured reservoir simulation (and, in particular, our finite element procedure) is well suited to parallel type computing machines.

6. Analysis of the approximation error.

Let us define the error functions

$$(6.1) \quad \zeta = \rho - U$$

and

$$(6.2) \quad \xi = \rho_m - V.$$

Subtract (5.4a) from the average of (2.2) at times t_n and t_{n-1} to obtain the error equation

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.3a) \quad & (\phi \partial \zeta^n, \varphi) + \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{\xi}_i^n \hat{\phi}_i |\Omega_i| + B(\zeta^{n-1/2}, \varphi) - (\chi \zeta^{n-1/2}, \nabla \varphi) \\
 & = (\phi (\partial \rho^n - \rho_t^{n-1/2}), \varphi) + \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\partial \bar{\rho}_{m,i}^n - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}) \hat{\phi}_i |\Omega_i| \\
 & \quad \text{for } \varphi \in \mathbf{M}.
 \end{aligned}$$

$$(6.3b) \quad \zeta^0 = \rho^0 - \rho^{0'}.$$

Now subtract the sum of (5.5a) and $\partial \hat{U}_i^n$ times (5.6a) from the average of (2.3) at times t_n and t_{n-1} to obtain the other error equation

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.4a) \quad & \phi_{mi} (\partial \xi^n, \psi)_i + B_i(\xi^{n-1/2}, \psi) \\
 & = \phi_{mi} (\partial \rho_m^n - \rho_{m,t}^{n-1/2}, \psi)_i \quad \text{for } \psi \in \mathbf{N}_i.
 \end{aligned}$$

$$(6.4b) \quad \xi^n = \xi_i^n \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega_i,$$

$$(6.4c) \quad \xi^0 = \xi^0_i.$$

Note [12] that $\zeta = \rho - \rho' + \rho' - U = (\rho - \rho') + \zeta'$. Similarly, we can write $\xi = (\rho_m - \rho_m'') + \xi''$, where we extend the following definition to all of Ω_m : for any $v \in H^1(\Omega_i)$ that is constant on $\partial \Omega_i$, $v'' \in \mathbf{N}_i^*$ is the elliptic projection given by

$$(6.5a) \quad B_i(v - v'', \psi) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \mathbf{N}_i.$$

and

$$(6.5b) \quad v'' = v \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega_i.$$

Elliptic theory tells us that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.6a) \quad & \|\partial^k (\rho - \rho') / \partial t^k\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|\partial^k \rho / \partial t^k\|_{H^p(\Omega)} h^{p-j}, \\
 & \quad 1 \leq p \leq r; \quad j = -1, 0; \quad k = 0, 1;
 \end{aligned}$$

$$(6.6b) \quad \|\nabla (\rho - \rho')\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|\rho\|_{H^p(\Omega)} h^{p-1}, \quad 1 \leq p \leq r;$$

$$(6.7a) \quad \|\partial^k(\rho_m - \rho_m'')/\partial t^k\|_{H^1(\Omega_m)} \leq C \|\partial^k \rho_m / \partial t^k\|_{H^q(\Omega_m)} h_m^{q-j},$$

$$1 \leq q \leq s; \quad j = -1, 0; \quad k = 0, 1;$$

and

$$(6.7b) \quad \|\nabla(\rho_m - \rho_m'')\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)} \leq C \|\rho_m\|_{H^q(\Omega_m)} h_m^{q-1}, \quad 1 \leq q \leq s.$$

In deriving (6.6a), the standard Nitsche duality argument [7] applies, as the smoothness of $\partial\Omega$ ensures the regularity of the dual problem. In deriving (6.7a), since Ω_j is convex, the dual problem is regular enough when $j=0$, but not necessarily so when $j=-1$. However, in this case, the duality argument can still be performed by posing the dual problem on a larger domain Ω_j^* with smooth boundary via the (bounded) Calderón extension operator $E: H^1(\Omega_j) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega_j^*)$ [2] as

$$(6.8a) \quad -\nabla \cdot [(E\kappa_m)\nabla\varphi] = E\psi, \quad \text{on } \Omega_j^*,$$

$$(6.8b) \quad \varphi = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_j^*.$$

to obtain the needed regularity:

$$(6.9) \quad \|\varphi\|_{H^3(\Omega_j)} \leq \|\varphi\|_{H^3(\Omega_j^*)} \leq C \|E\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega_j^*)} \leq C \|\psi\|_{H^1(\Omega_j)}.$$

The boundary term from the integration by parts, which is normally zero by the dual problem, is now zero simply because $\rho_m - \rho_m'' = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_j$.

It remains to estimate the errors ζ' and ξ'' . Rewrite the error equations (6.3) and (6.4) in terms of these elliptic projections:

$$(6.10a) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\phi \partial \zeta'^n, \varphi) + \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{\xi}''_i{}^n \phi_i |\Omega_i| + B(\zeta'^{n-1/2}, \varphi) - (\underline{\chi} \zeta'^{n-1/2}, \nabla \varphi) \\ & = (\phi(\partial \rho'^n - \rho_t^{n-1/2}), \varphi) + \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\partial \bar{\rho}_m''_i{}^n - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}) \phi_i |\Omega_i| \\ & \quad - (\underline{\chi}(\rho'^{n-1/2} - \rho^{n-1/2}), \nabla \varphi) \quad \text{for } \varphi \in \mathcal{M}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(6.10b) \quad \zeta'^0 = 0,$$

and

$$(6.11a) \quad \begin{aligned} & \phi_{mi}(\partial \xi''^n, \psi)_i + B_i(\xi''^{n-1/2}, \psi) \\ & = \phi_{mi}(\partial \rho_m''^n - \rho_{m,t}^{n-1/2}, \psi)_i \quad \text{for } \psi \in \mathbf{N}_i, \end{aligned}$$

$$(6.11b) \quad \xi''^n = \xi_i'^n - (\hat{\rho}_i'^n - \hat{\rho}_i^n) \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_i,$$

$$(6.11c) \quad \xi''^0 = -(\hat{\rho}_i^0 - \hat{\rho}_i^0).$$

It is well known how to analyze every term above ([3] and [12]) except those that represent the matrix source. We will combine these known ideas with generalizations of the ideas presented in sections 3 and 4 to accomplish our error analysis.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} E_1(p, q, j) = & \{ \|\rho\|_{L^\infty(J; H^{p+j}(\Omega))} h^{j-1} + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2(J; H^p(\Omega))} \} h^{p+1} \\ & + \|\rho_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J; H^q(\Omega_m))} h_m^{q+1} \\ & + \{ \|\partial^3 \rho / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; H^{-1}(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 \rho_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; H^{-1}(\Omega_m))} \} (\Delta t)^2 \end{aligned}$$

where, always, $1 \leq p \leq r-j$, $1 \leq q \leq s$, and $j=0$ or 1 . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (6.12) \quad & \sum_{n=1}^N \{ \|\partial \rho'^n - \rho_t^{n-1/2}\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}^2 + \|\partial \rho_m''^n - \rho_{m,t}^{n-1/2}\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega_m)}^2 \\ & + \sum_i [(\partial \hat{\rho}_i'^n - \partial \hat{\rho}_i^n)^2 + (\partial \bar{\rho}_m''^n - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2})^2] \} \Delta t \\ & + \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\rho'^n - \rho^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \leq C E_1^2(p, q, j). \end{aligned}$$

In obtaining the optimal bound on the third term on the left side above, we have used that $\chi_i \in H^1(\Omega)$, for all i .

First, take $\psi = \xi''^{n-1/2} - [\xi_i'^{n-1/2} - (\hat{\rho}_i'^{n-1/2} - \hat{\rho}_i^{n-1/2})]$ in (6.11a). After manipulating, summing on n from 1 to η , $\eta \leq N$, and summing on i , we see

$$\begin{aligned}
& 1/2(\phi_m \xi''^\eta, \xi''^\eta)_m - \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{\xi}''^n_i \xi_i'^{n-1/2} |\Omega_i| \Delta t \\
& + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} B_m(\xi''^{n-1/2}, \xi''^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \\
& = 1/2(\phi_m \xi''^0, \xi''^0)_m \\
& - \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{\xi}''^n_i (\hat{\rho}'_i^{n-1/2} - \hat{\rho}_i^{n-1/2}) |\Omega_i| \Delta t \\
& + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \{ (\phi_m (\partial \rho_m''^n - \rho_{m,t}^{n-1/2}), \xi''^{n-1/2})_m \\
& - \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\partial \bar{\rho}_m''^n_i - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}) [\xi_i'^{n-1/2} - (\hat{\rho}'_i^{n-1/2} - \hat{\rho}_i^{n-1/2})] |\Omega_i| \} \Delta t \\
(6.13) \quad & = -1/2 \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\hat{\rho}^0_i - \hat{\rho}_i^0)^2 |\Omega_i| \\
& - \sum_i \phi_{mi} \bar{\xi}''^\eta_i (\hat{\rho}'_i^\eta - \hat{\rho}_i^\eta) |\Omega_i| \\
& + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \sum_i \phi_{mi} \bar{\xi}''^{n-1/2}_i (\partial \hat{\rho}'_i^n - \partial \hat{\rho}_i^n) |\Omega_i| \Delta t \\
& + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \{ (\phi_m (\partial \rho_m''^n - \rho_{m,t}^{n-1/2}), \xi''^{n-1/2})_m \\
& - \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\partial \bar{\rho}_m''^n_i - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}) [\xi_i'^{n-1/2} - (\hat{\rho}'_i^{n-1/2} - \hat{\rho}_i^{n-1/2})] |\Omega_i| \} \Delta t \\
& \leq CE_1^2(p, q, j) + \epsilon \{ \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi_m \xi''^{n-1/2}, \xi''^{n-1/2})_m \Delta t \\
& + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi \xi_i'^{n-1/2}, \xi_i'^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \} \\
& + 1/4(\phi_m \xi''^\eta, \xi''^\eta)_m + 1/2 \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} B_m(\xi''^{n-1/2}, \xi''^{n-1/2}) \Delta t,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used summation by parts in the second equality above.

Next, estimate the sum on n of (6.10a) with $\varphi = \zeta^{n-1/2}$ to see

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.14) \quad & \frac{1}{2}(\phi \zeta', \zeta') + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{\xi}''^n_i \zeta_i^{n-1/2} |\Omega_i| \Delta t \\
 & + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} B(\zeta^{n-1/2}, \zeta^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \\
 & = \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\underline{\alpha} \zeta^{n-1/2}, \underline{\nabla} \zeta^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \\
 & + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \{ (\phi(\partial \rho^n - \rho_t^{n-1/2}), \zeta^{n-1/2}) \\
 & \quad + \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\partial \bar{\rho}_m''^n_i - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}) \zeta_i^{n-1/2} |\Omega_i| \\
 & \quad - (\underline{\alpha}(\rho^{n-1/2} - \rho^{n-1/2}), \underline{\nabla} \zeta^{n-1/2}) \} \Delta t \\
 & \leq C \{ E_1^2(p, q, j) + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi \zeta^{n-1/2}, \zeta^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \} \\
 & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} B(\zeta^{n-1/2}, \zeta^{n-1/2}) \Delta t.
 \end{aligned}$$

We remove the coupling term between (6.13) and (6.14) by adding the two equations together. With the obvious cancellations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.15) \quad & \frac{1}{2}(\phi \zeta', \zeta') + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} B(\zeta^{n-1/2}, \zeta^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \\
 & + \frac{1}{4}(\phi_m \xi''^{\eta}, \xi''^{\eta})_m + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} B_m(\xi^{n-1/2}, \xi^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \\
 & \leq C \{ E_1^2(p, q, j) + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi \zeta^{n-1/2}, \zeta^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \} \\
 & \quad + \epsilon \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi_m \xi^{n-1/2}, \xi^{n-1/2})_m \Delta t.
 \end{aligned}$$

If Δt is not too large, the discrete form of Gronwall's inequality can be applied to (6.15) to yield, after some manipulation, the error estimates

$$(6.16) \quad \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\xi''^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)}^2 + \sum_{n=1}^N \|\nabla \xi''^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)}^2 \Delta t \leq C E_1^2(p, q, j)$$

and

$$(6.17) \quad \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\zeta'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{n=1}^N \|\nabla \zeta'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \Delta t \leq C E_1^2(p, q, j).$$

For the next set of error estimates, let

$$\begin{aligned} E_2(p, q) = & \{ \|p\|_{L^\infty(J; H^p(\Omega))} + \|p_t\|_{L^2(J; H^p(\Omega))} \} h^p \\ & + \|p_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J; H^q(\Omega_m))} h_m^q \\ & + \{ \|\partial^3 p / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 p_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega_m))} \} (\Delta t)^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $1 \leq p \leq r$ and $1 \leq q \leq s$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (6.18) \quad & \sum_{n=1}^N \{ \|\partial p'^n - p_t^{n-1/2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\partial p'^n - \partial p^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & + \|\partial p_m''^n - p_{m,t}^{n-1/2}\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)}^2 \} \Delta t \\ & + \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|p'^n - p^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + E_1^2(p, q, 0) \\ & \leq C E_2^2(p, q). \end{aligned}$$

This time, take $\psi = \partial \xi''^n - [\partial \hat{\xi}'_i{}^n - (\partial \hat{p}'_i{}^n - \partial \hat{p}_i{}^n)]$ in (6.11a). Again, manipulation and summation on n and i yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=1}^N (\phi_m \partial \xi''^n, \partial \xi''^n)_m \Delta t - \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{\xi}''_i{}^n \partial \hat{\xi}'_i{}^n |\Omega_i| \Delta t \\ & + 1/2 B_m(\xi''^N, \xi''^N) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.19) \quad &= -\sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{\xi}''^n_i (\partial \hat{\rho}'^n_i - \partial \hat{\rho}^n_i) |\Omega_i| \Delta t \\
&+ \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \sum_i (\phi_{mi} (\partial \bar{\rho}''^n_{m,i} - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}), \\
&\quad \partial \xi''^n - [\partial \xi'^n_i - (\partial \hat{\rho}'^n_i - \partial \hat{\rho}^n_i)]_i) \Delta t \\
&\leq C E_2^2(p, q) + 1/2 \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi_m \partial \xi''^n, \partial \xi''^n)_m \Delta t \\
&\quad + 1/4 \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi \partial \xi'^n, \partial \xi'^n) \Delta t.
\end{aligned}$$

Also, take $\varphi = \partial \xi'^n$ in (6.10a) and sum on n to see

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.20) \quad &\sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\phi \partial \xi'^n, \partial \xi'^n) \Delta t + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \sum_i \phi_{mi} \partial \bar{\xi}''^n_i \partial \xi'^n_i |\Omega_i| \Delta t \\
&\quad + 1/2 B(\xi'^\eta, \xi'^\eta) \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\underline{\chi} \xi'^{n-1/2}, \underline{\nabla} \partial \xi'^n) \Delta t \\
&\quad + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \{ (\phi (\partial \bar{\rho}^n - \bar{\rho}_t^{n-1/2}), \partial \xi'^n) \\
&\quad \quad + \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\partial \bar{\rho}''^n_{m,i} - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}) \partial \xi'^n_i |\Omega_i| \\
&\quad \quad - (\underline{\chi} (\bar{\rho}^{n-1/2} - \rho^{n-1/2}), \underline{\nabla} \partial \xi'^n) \} \Delta t \\
&= (\underline{\chi} \xi'^\eta, \underline{\nabla} \xi'^\eta) - \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} (\underline{\chi} \partial \xi'^n, \underline{\nabla} \xi'^{n-1/2}) \Delta t \\
&\quad + \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} \{ (\phi (\partial \bar{\rho}^n - \bar{\rho}_t^{n-1/2}), \partial \xi'^n) \\
&\quad \quad + \sum_i \phi_{mi} (\partial \bar{\rho}''^n_{m,i} - \bar{\rho}_{m,t,i}^{n-1/2}) \partial \xi'^n_i |\Omega_i|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (\underline{\chi}(\partial p'^n - \partial p^n), \underline{\nabla} \zeta'^{n-1/2}) \} \Delta t \\
& - (\underline{\chi}(\rho'^n - \rho^n), \underline{\nabla} \zeta'^n) \\
& \leq C \{ E_2^2(p, q) + \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\zeta'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{n=1}^N \|\underline{\nabla} \zeta'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \Delta t \} \\
& + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{n=1}^N (\phi \partial \zeta'^n, \partial \zeta'^n) \Delta t + \frac{1}{4} B(\zeta'^N, \zeta'^N),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use summation by parts twice in the second equality above.

Now, by adding (6.19) and (6.20) together, making the obvious cancellations, and using the previous estimate (6.17) (with $j=0$), we get the other set of error estimates:

$$(6.21) \quad \sum_{n=1}^N \|\partial \zeta'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \Delta t + \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\underline{\nabla} \zeta'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C E_2^2(p, q)$$

and

$$(6.22) \quad \sum_{n=1}^N \|\partial \xi'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)}^2 \Delta t + \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\underline{\nabla} \xi'^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)}^2 \leq C E_2^2(p, q).$$

Finally, if we combine (6.16), (6.17), (6.21), and (6.22) with the elliptic estimates (6.6) and (6.7), we obtain the approximation error estimates:

Theorem 5:

For Δt sufficiently small, the solution (U, V) of the finite element method (5.4) through (5.7) approximates the solution (p, p_m) of the double porosity model (1.4) through (1.7) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.23a) \quad & \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|p^n - U^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C \{ [\|p\|_{L^\infty(J; H^p(\Omega))} + \|p_t\|_{L^2(J; \tilde{H}^{p-1}(\Omega))}] h^p \\
& + \|p_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J; H^q(\Omega_m))} h_m^{q+1} \\
& + [\|\partial^3 p / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; H^{-1}(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 p_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; H^{-1}(\Omega_m))}] (\Delta t)^2 \}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\nabla(\rho - U)^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
(6.23b) \quad & \leq C \{ [\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(J; H^p(\Omega))} + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2(J; \tilde{H}^{p-1}(\Omega))}] h^p \\
& \quad + \|\rho_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J; H^q(\Omega_m))} h_m^q \\
& \quad + [\|\partial^3 \rho / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 \rho_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega_m))}] (\Delta t)^2 \}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^N \|\partial(\rho - U)^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \Delta t} \\
(6.23c) \quad & \leq C \{ [\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(J; H^p(\Omega))} + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2(J; H^p(\Omega))}] h^p \\
& \quad + \|\rho_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J; H^q(\Omega_m))} h_m^q \\
& \quad + [\|\partial^3 \rho / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 \rho_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega_m))}] (\Delta t)^2 \}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\rho_m^n - v^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)} \\
(6.24a) \quad & \leq C \{ [\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(J; H^p(\Omega))} + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2(J; \tilde{H}^{p-1}(\Omega))}] h^p \\
& \quad + [\|\rho_m\|_{L^\infty(J; H^q(\Omega_m))} + \|\rho_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J; \tilde{H}^{q-1}(\Omega_m))}] h_m^q \\
& \quad + [\|\partial^3 \rho / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; H^{-1}(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 \rho_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; H^{-1}(\Omega_m))}] (\Delta t)^2 \}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \|\nabla(\rho_m - v)^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)} \\
(6.24b) \quad & \leq C \{ [\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(J; H^p(\Omega))} + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2(J; H^p(\Omega))}] h^p \\
& \quad + [\|\rho_m\|_{L^\infty(J; H^q(\Omega_m))} + \|\rho_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J; \tilde{H}^{q-1}(\Omega_m))}] h_m^{q-1} \\
& \quad + [\|\partial^3 \rho / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 \rho_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J; L^2(\Omega_m))}] (\Delta t)^2 \}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^N \|\partial(\rho_m - v)^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_m)}^2 \Delta t} \\
(6.24c) \quad & \leq C \{ [\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(J; H^p(\Omega))} + \|\rho_t\|_{L^2(J; H^p(\Omega))}] h^p
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \|\rho_{m,t}\|_{L^2(J;H^q(\Omega_m))} h_m^q \\
& + \left[\|\partial^3 \rho / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial^3 \rho_m / \partial t^3\|_{L^2(J;L^2(\Omega_m))} \right] (\Delta t)^2 \}
\end{aligned}$$

where $1 \leq p \leq r$, $1 \leq q \leq s$, and $\tilde{H}^j = H^{\max(1,j)}$.

Note that the error estimates are optimal with respect to both the discretization parameters and the regularity required of the solution.

The restriction on Δt arises from the use of Gronwall's inequality, which was, in fact, only used to bound the main gravitational term in (6.10a). The size of this restriction is independent of h and h_m , and it is proportional to the reciprocal of the magnitude of the gravity coefficient $\underline{\alpha}$. Since the effect of gravity is small (assumption 2), the restriction on the size of Δt should not be very important in practice. Further, if gravity is neglected, a careful analysis of the above proof shows that no restriction on Δt arises at all.

Acknowledgement.

The author would like to thank his advisor, Jim Douglas, Jr., for his encouragement and guidance, as well as specifically for his help in the formulation of the model and the finite element procedure.

References.

- [1] G. I. Barenblatt, Iu. P. Zheltov, and I. N. Kochina, *Basic concepts in the theory of seepage of homogeneous liquids in fissured rocks [strata]*, Prikl. Mat. Mekh., 24 (1960), pp. 852-864. J. Appl. Math. Mech., 24 (1960), pp. 1286-1303.
- [2] A. P. Calderón, *Lebesgue spaces of differentiable functions and distributions*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 4 (1961), pp. 33-49.
- [3] J. Douglas, Jr. and T. Dupont, *Galerkin methods for parabolic equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 7 (1970), pp. 575-626.
- [4] A. Friedman, *Partial Differential Equations of Parabolic Type*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964.
- [5] H. Kazemi, *Pressure transient analysis of naturally fractured reservoirs with uniform fracture distribution*, Soc. Pet. Eng. J. (Dec. 1969), pp. 451-462.
- [6] J. L. Lions and E. Magenes, *Non-homogeneous Boundary Value Problems and Applications*, v. 2, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972.

- [7] J. A. Nitsche, *Ein Kriterium für die quasi-optimalität des Ritzschen Verfahrens*, Numer. Math., 11 (1968), pp. 346-348.
- [8] D. W. Peaceman, *Fundamentals of Numerical Reservoir Simulation*, Elsevier, New York, 1977.
- [9] A. E. Scheidegger, *The Physics of Flow Through Porous Media*, 3rd edition, Univ. of Toronto Press, Toronto and Buffalo, 1974.
- [10] A. de Swaan O., *Analytic solutions for determining naturally fractured reservoir properties by well testing*, Soc. Pet. Eng. J. (June 1976), pp. 117-122.
- [11] J. E. Warren and P. J. Root, *The behavior of naturally fractured reservoirs*, Soc. Pet. Eng. J. (Sept. 1963), pp. 245-255.
- [12] M. F. Wheeler, *A priori L_2 error estimates for Galerkin approximations to parabolic partial differential equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 10 (1973), pp. 723-759.