

# Numerical Recovery of the Diffusion Coefficient in Diffusion Equations from Terminal Measurement\*

Bangti Jin<sup>†</sup>      Xiliang Lu<sup>‡</sup>      Qimeng Quan<sup>§</sup>      Zhi Zhou<sup>¶</sup>

May 20, 2024

## Abstract

In this work, we investigate a numerical procedure for recovering a space-dependent diffusion coefficient in a (sub)diffusion model from the given terminal data, and provide a rigorous numerical analysis of the procedure. By exploiting decay behavior of the observation in time, we establish a novel Hölder type stability estimate for a large terminal time  $T$ . This is achieved by novel decay estimates of the (fractional) time derivative of the solution. To numerically recover the diffusion coefficient, we employ the standard output least-squares formulation with an  $H^1(\Omega)$ -seminorm penalty, and discretize the regularized problem by the Galerkin finite element method with continuous piecewise linear finite elements in space and backward Euler convolution quadrature in time. Further, we provide an error analysis of discrete approximations, and prove a convergence rate that matches the stability estimate. The derived  $L^2(\Omega)$  error bound depends explicitly on the noise level, regularization parameter and discretization parameter(s), which gives a useful guideline of the *a priori* choice of discretization parameters with respect to the noise level in practical implementation. The error analysis is achieved using the conditional stability argument and discrete maximum-norm resolvent estimates. Several numerical experiments are also given to illustrate and complement the theoretical analysis.

**Keywords:** inverse diffusion problem, parameter identification, terminal observation, conditional stability, Tikhonov regularization, error estimate.

## 1 Introduction

In this work, we study the inverse problem of recovering a space-dependent diffusion coefficient in (sub)diffusion equation from a terminal observation. Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  ( $d = 1, 2, 3$ ) be a simply connected convex bounded domain with a smooth boundary  $\partial\Omega$ . The governing equation is given by

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^\alpha u - \nabla \cdot (q \nabla u) = f, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ u(0) = u_0, & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $T > 0$  is the final time and the notation  $\partial_t^\alpha u$  denotes the standard left-sided Djrbashian–Caputo fractional derivative of order  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$  in the time variable  $t$  defined by [27, p. 92]:

$$\partial_t^\alpha u(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\alpha} \partial_s u(s) \, ds, & \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1), \\ \partial_t u(t), & \text{for } \alpha = 1, \end{cases}$$

\*The work of B. Jin is supported by UK EPSRC grant EP/V026259/1, Hong Kong Research Council grant (No. 14306423) and a start-up fund from The Chinese University of Hong Kong, X. Lu by the National Science Foundation of China (No. 11871385), and that of Z. Zhou by Hong Kong Research Grants Council grant (No. 15303021) and an internal grant of The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (Project ID: P0045708, Work Programme: 4-ZZP7).

<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong, P. R. China. (b.jin@cuhk.edu.hk, bangti.jin@gmail.com)

<sup>‡</sup>School of Mathematics and Statistics, and Hubei Key Laboratory of Computational Science, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, P. R. China (xllv.math@whu.edu.cn)

<sup>§</sup>School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, P. R. China (quanqm@whu.edu.cn)

<sup>¶</sup>Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Kowloon, Hong Kong, P. R. China (zhizhou@polyu.edu.hk)

with  $\Gamma(z) = \int_0^\infty e^{-s} s^{z-1} ds$ ,  $\Re(z) > 0$ , being Euler's Gamma function. The functions  $f$  and  $u_0$  in (1.1) are given time-independent source and initial data, respectively. Due to its extraordinary modeling capability for describing the dynamics of subdiffusion processes (in which the mean square variance grows sublinearly with the time  $t$ ), the model (1.1) has attracted much attention in physics, biology and finance etc. It has been successfully applied to many important research fields, e.g., subsurface flow [17, 34], thermal diffusion in media with fractal geometry [35], transport in column experiments [18] and highly heterogeneous aquifer [1]. The classical diffusion model (i.e.,  $\alpha = 1$ ) represents the most popular to describe transport phenomena found in the nature.

In this work, the concerned inverse problem of the model (1.1) is to recover the unknown diffusion coefficient  $q^\dagger$  from a noisy terminal observation  $z^\delta$ :

$$z^\delta(x) = u(q^\dagger)(x, T) + \xi(x), \quad x \in \Omega,$$

where the exact data  $u(q^\dagger)(T)$  denotes the solution of problem (1.1) (corresponding to  $q^\dagger$ ) and  $\xi$  denotes the pointwise measurement noise. The accuracy of the data  $z^\delta$  is measured by the noise level  $\delta = \|u(q^\dagger)(T) - z^\delta\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ . The admissible set  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined by  $\mathcal{A} = \{q \in H^1(\Omega) : c_0 \leq q(x) \leq c_1 \text{ a.e. in } \Omega\}$ , with  $0 < c_0 < c_1 < \infty$ . Due to the ill-posedness and highly nonlinearity, the numerical recovery of the diffusion coefficient is challenging.

The study of diffusion coefficient identification in anomalous diffusion has a notable history, dating back to at least the work [10]. In the one-dimensional case, Cheng et al. [10] proved the uniqueness for determining a spatially-dependent diffusion coefficient and the fractional order  $\alpha$ , given the lateral Cauchy data and the Dirac delta function as initial condition. The proof makes use of the Laplace transform and Gel'fand-Leviton theory for inverse Sturm-Liouville problems. Zhang [42] proved the unique recovery of a time dependent diffusion coefficient from lateral Cauchy data. The study with terminal data, despite being highly practical, is still not well understood. Indeed, analyzing terminal data in the standard parabolic case where  $\alpha = 1$  [3] has long been a challenging task, and has only been sparingly studied [4, 19]. In the one-dimensional case, Isakov [19] analyzed this inverse problem under some special assumptions on the boundary data. More recently, normal diffusion with a zero source ( $f = 0$ ), Triki [39] established a Lipschitz stability result

$$\|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c_T \|(u(q_1) - u(q_2))(T)\|_{H^2(\Omega)}. \quad (1.2)$$

This result holds for sufficiently large  $T$  under certain positivity conditions on the initial data  $u_0$ , achieved by using careful spectral perturbation estimates (see Remark 2.1 for further details). However, this spectral perturbation argument in [39] is not directly applicable in the error analysis of fully discrete schemes. Moreover, this analysis relies heavily on the exponential decay property of the parabolic problem's solution operator, making it unsuitable for the subdiffusion model with  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , where the solution operator decays only linearly. In this paper, we aim to address this gap by proposing a novel conditional stability result for the inverse problem. This result leverages a weighted energy estimate and is applicable for both normal diffusion ( $\alpha = 1$ ) and subdiffusion ( $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ). Additionally, the strategy is amenable with the numerical analysis of discrete schemes.

Numerically, Li et al [30, 31] presented the first numerical recovery of the diffusion coefficient in the fractional case, including both smooth and nonsmooth data, but without an error analysis of the discrete scheme. Note that in practical computation, the regularized formulation is often discretized with the Galerkin FEM. The convergence of discrete approximations as the discretization parameters tend to zero has been analyzed; See [26, 41] for the standard parabolic case. However, deriving a convergence rate is far more challenging, due to the high degree of nonlinearity of the forward map and strong nonconvexity of the regularized functional. Thus there have been only very few error bounds on discrete approximations in the existing literature [22, 25, 40, 43], even though such *a priori* estimates can provide useful guidelines for the proper choice of discretization parameters. The analysis techniques in all these existing works require that the observational data is available over a time interval (for  $\alpha = 1$ ) or whole space-time interval (for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ). The main technical tools include conditional stability and smoothing properties of solution operator. The current work aims to significantly extend the argument to cover terminal data, which is notably more practical.

In this work, we develop a numerical procedure for recovering the diffusion coefficient  $q$  using a regularized formulation [15, 20] and establish error bounds on the approximation. We make two new contributions in the work. First, under mild conditions on the problem data ( $u_0, f, T, q_1, q_2$  and  $\Omega$ ), we prove a Hölder type conditional stability in Theorem 2.2:

$$\|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c \|\nabla(u(q_1) - u(q_2))(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (1.3)$$

The overall proof relies only on a weighted energy argument (inspired by Bonito et al. [8]), some nonstandard smoothing properties and asymptotics of solution operators [21], and maximum-norm resolvent estimates [6, 7, 37]. To the

best of our knowledge, this is the first stability result addressing the inverse problem for both the integer-order and fractional-order cases. Moreover, the analysis strategy also plays an essential role in the error analysis of the inversion scheme.

Second, we employ the standard output least square formulation to identify the diffusion coefficient. Motivated by the conditional stability analysis, an  $H^1(\Omega)$ -seminorm penalty is used in the formulation. Numerically, both Tikhonov functional and PDE constraint, i.e., problem (1.1), are discretized using the standard Galerkin finite element method (FEM) with continuous piecewise linear finite elements in space and backward Euler convolution quadrature in time; see e.g., [33] and [24, Chapter 4]. In particular, let  $h$  be the spatial mesh size,  $\tau$  the time step size,  $\gamma$  the regularization parameter, and  $q_h^*$  denote the numerical reconstruction of the diffusion coefficient  $q^\dagger$ . We derive the following error estimate for the numerical approximation in Theorem 3.2:

$$\|q^\dagger - q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c(h\gamma^{-1}\eta^2 + \min(1, h^{-1}\eta)\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\eta + h^2 + \tau)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

with  $\eta = \delta + h^2 + \tau + \gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . The technical proof heavily relies on the conditional stability estimate (1.3) and several new smoothing properties and asymptotics of semi- and fully-discrete solution operators. Note that the analysis does not involve standard source type conditions, as is commonly done for nonlinear inverse problem [15, 20]. The derived  $L^2(\Omega)$  error bound is given explicitly in terms of the discretization parameters  $h$  and  $\tau$ , the noise level  $\delta$  and the regularization parameter  $\gamma$  when the fixed value  $T$  is relatively large. Compared with existing works [22, 25, 40, 43], the present work requires overcoming new technical challenges. The key techniques for deriving conditional stability (1.3) include decay estimate in Lemma 2.3 and decay Lipschitz stability in Lemma 2.4 of  $\partial_t^\alpha u$ . Moreover, in the error analysis of the fully discrete scheme, the crucial discrete decay Lipschitz stability estimate does not follow as the continuous case, e.g., maximum-norm resolvent estimates. We develop innovative techniques to overcome the challenge, e.g., the decay estimates of the semi- and fully discrete solution operators (and their derivatives). The argument is applicable to both normal diffusion ( $\alpha = 1$ ) and subdiffusion ( $0 < \alpha < 1$ ), thereby significantly broadening the scope of existing works. Numerical experiments indicate that the conditional stability does not hold for small  $T$ , cf. Table 1, confirming the sharpness of the theoretical result.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we show the conditional stability of the inverse problem. Then in Section 3, we describe the numerical reconstruction scheme, and provide a complete error analysis for discrete approximations. Finally, in Section 4, we present one- and two-dimensional numerical experiments to complement the theoretical results. Last, we give some useful notations. For any  $m \geq 0$  and  $p \geq 1$ , we denote by  $W^{m,p}(\Omega)$  and  $W_0^{m,p}(\Omega)$  the standard Sobolev spaces of order  $m$ , equipped with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{W^{m,p}(\Omega)}$  [2]. We denote by  $W^{-m,p'}(\Omega)$  the dual space of  $W_0^{m,p}(\Omega)$ , with  $p'$  being the conjugate exponent of  $p$ . Further, we write  $H^m(\Omega)$  and  $H_0^m(\Omega)$  with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{H^m(\Omega)}$  if  $p = 2$  and write  $L^p(\Omega)$  with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$  if  $m = 0$ . The notation  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes the  $L^2(\Omega)$  inner product. We also use Bochner spaces: for a Banach space  $B$ , let

$$W^{m,p}(0, T; B) = \{v : v(\cdot, t) \in B \text{ for a.e. } t \in (0, T) \text{ and } \|v\|_{W^{m,p}(0, T; B)} < \infty\}.$$

The space  $L^\infty(0, T; B)$  is defined similarly. Throughout, we denote by  $c$ , with or without a subscript, a generic constant which may differ at each occurrence but is always independent of the discretization parameters  $h$  and  $\tau$ , the noise level  $\delta$ , the regularization parameter  $\gamma$  and the terminal time  $T$ .

## 2 Conditional stability

In this section, we establish a novel conditional stability estimate for the inverse conductivity problem with the terminal data. Let the operator  $A(q)$  be the realization of  $-\nabla \cdot (q \nabla \cdot)$  with a zero Dirichlet boundary condition, with a domain  $\text{Dom}(A(q)) := H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ . Then the solution  $u(q)$  to problem (1.1) is given by

$$u(q) = F(t; q)u_0 + \int_0^t E(s; q)f \, ds, \quad (2.1)$$

where the solution operators  $F(t; q)$  and  $E(t; q)$  are given respectively by [21, Section 6.2.1]

$$\begin{aligned} F(t; q) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{\theta, \sigma}} e^{zt} z^{\alpha-1} (z^\alpha + A(q))^{-1} \, dz \quad \text{and} \\ E(t; q) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{\theta, \sigma}} e^{zt} (z^\alpha + A(q))^{-1} \, dz, \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

with the contour  $\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma} \subset \mathbb{C}$  (oriented with an increasing imaginary part) given by  $\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = \sigma, |\arg(z)| \leq \theta\} \cup \{z \in \mathbb{C} : z = \rho e^{\pm i\theta}, \rho \geq \sigma\}$ . Throughout, we fix  $\theta \in (\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi)$  so that  $z^\alpha \in \Sigma_{\alpha\theta} \subset \Sigma_\theta$  for all  $z \in \Sigma_\theta := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} : |\arg(z)| \leq \theta\}$ . The following identity holds:  $\partial_t F(t; q) = -A(q)E(t; q)$  [21, Lemma 6.2].

The next lemma gives useful smoothing properties of the operators  $F(t; q)$  and  $E(t; q)$ . For any  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , the notation  $A(q)^s$  denotes the fractional power of  $A(q)$ , defined by spectral decomposition. The cases  $s = 0, 1$  are known [21, Theorem 6.4], and the case  $0 < s < 1$  follows from standard interpolation theory [32, Proposition 2.3].

**Lemma 2.1.** *For any  $q \in \mathcal{A}$ , and any  $s \in [0, 1]$ , there exists  $c > 0$  independent of  $q$  such that*

$$t^{s\alpha} \|A(q)^s F(t; q)\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} + t^{1-(1-s)\alpha} \|A(q)^s E(t; q)\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \leq c.$$

The following maximum norm resolvent estimate will be used extensively. See [37, Theorem 1], [6, Theorem 1.1] and [7, Theorem 2.1] for the proof.

**Lemma 2.2.** *For  $q \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}$ , there holds for any  $z \in \Sigma_\theta$  and  $\theta \in (\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi)$*

$$|z| \| (z + A(q))^{-1} \|_{L^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)} + |z|^{\frac{1}{2}} \| (z + A(q))^{-1} \|_{L^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq c. \quad (2.3)$$

Using Lemma 2.2, we can derive an *a priori* estimate for the time-fractional derivative  $\partial_t^\alpha u$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $u_0 \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ ,  $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ , and  $q \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}$ , and let  $u(q)$  be the solution to problem (1.1). Then there exists  $c > 0$ , independent of  $t$  and  $q$ , such that*

$$\|\partial_t^\alpha u(q)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq ct^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.2 and letting  $\sigma = t^{-1}$  in the contour  $\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(t; q)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} &\leq c \int_{\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}} |e^{zt}| |z|^{\alpha-1} \| (z^\alpha + A(q))^{-1} \|_{L^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} |dz| \\ &\leq c \int_{\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}} |e^{zt}| |z|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1} |dz| \leq ct^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Let  $w(t) = \partial_t^\alpha u(q) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ . Then it satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^\alpha w - \nabla \cdot (q \nabla w) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ w = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ w(0) = \nabla \cdot (q \nabla u_0) + f, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

It follows from the representation (2.1) that  $\partial_t^\alpha u(q) = F(t; q)(\nabla \cdot (q \nabla u_0) + f)$ . This, the estimate (2.4) and the assumption on  $u_0$  and  $f$  lead to

$$\|\partial_t^\alpha u(q)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq c \|F(t; q)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \|\nabla \cdot (q \nabla u_0) + f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq ct^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Next we provide a crucial Lipschitz stability estimate of the time (fractional) derivative with respect to the  $L^2(\Omega)$  norm of the diffusion coefficient.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $u_0 \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$  and  $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ , and let  $u(q_1)$  and  $u(q_2)$  be the solutions of problem (1.1) with  $q_1 \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $q_2 \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}$ , respectively. Then for any small  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $c > 0$ , independent of  $q_1$  and  $t$ , such that*

$$\|\partial_t^\alpha (u(q_1) - u(q_2))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c \max(t^{-\alpha}, t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}(1-2\epsilon)}) \|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

*Proof.* Let  $u_i = u(q_i)$  and  $w(t) = \partial_t^\alpha (u_1 - u_2)$ . Then  $w$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^\alpha w - \nabla \cdot (q_1 \nabla w) = \nabla \cdot ((q_1 - q_2) \nabla \partial_t^\alpha u_2), & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ w = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ w(0) = \nabla \cdot ((q_1 - q_2) \nabla u_0), & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

The solution representation (2.1) leads to

$$w(t) = F(t; q_1) (\nabla \cdot ((q_1 - q_2) \nabla u_0)) + \int_0^t E(t-s; q_1) (\nabla \cdot ((q_1 - q_2) \nabla \partial_s^\alpha u_2(s))) \, ds := I_1 + I_2.$$

Since  $q_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ , there exist constants  $c$  and  $c'$  independent of  $q_1$  such that

$$c \|A(q_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c' \|A(q_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Then the self-adjointness of the operator  $F(t; q_1)$ , and integration by parts imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &= \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1} (F(t; q_1) \nabla \cdot ((q_1 - q_2) \nabla u_0), \varphi) \\ &= \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1} (\nabla \cdot ((q_1 - q_2) \nabla u_0), F(t; q_1) \varphi) \\ &= \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1} ((q_2 - q_1) \nabla u_0, \nabla A(q_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} F(t; q_1) A(q_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Then Lemma 2.1 and the boundedness of the operator  $A(q_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$  (uniform in  $q_1$ ) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq c \|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|A(q_1) F(t; q_1)\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1} \|A(q_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq c t^{-\alpha} \|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by the boundedness of the operator  $A(q_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$  (uniform in  $q_1$ ) for small  $\epsilon > 0$  and Lemmas 2.1-2.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|E(t-s; q_1) (\nabla \cdot ((q_1 - q_2) \nabla \partial_s^\alpha u_2(s)))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &= \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1} ((q_2 - q_1) \nabla \partial_s^\alpha u_2(s), \nabla A(q_1)^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} E(t-s; q_1) A(q_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \varphi) \\ &\leq c \|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla \partial_s^\alpha u_2(s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|A(q_1)^{1-\epsilon} E(t-s; q_1)\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1} \|A(q_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq c (t-s)^{\epsilon\alpha-1} s^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \int_0^t \|E(t-s; q_1) (\nabla \cdot ((q_1 - q_2) \nabla \partial_s^\alpha u_2(s)))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \, ds \\ &\leq c \|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \int_0^t (t-s)^{\epsilon\alpha-1} s^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \, ds \leq c t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}(1-2\epsilon)} \|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

The bounds on  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  and the triangle inequality complete the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Next we give a novel conditional stability estimate. First we state the standing assumption.

**Assumption 2.1.**  $q^\dagger \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}$ ,  $u_0 \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ , and  $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ .

Under Assumption 2.1, the following regularity results hold. Let  $p > \max(d, 2)$ . Then for any  $\theta < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{d}{2p}$  and  $r > \frac{1}{\alpha\theta}$ , the solution  $u = u(q^\dagger)$  to problem (1.1) satisfies [25, (2.5)–(2.6)]

- (i)  $u \in W^{\alpha\theta, r}(0, T; W^{2(1-\theta), p}) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(0, T; W^{1,\infty}(\Omega));$
- (ii)  $\|u(t)\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\partial_t^\alpha u(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + t^{1-\alpha} \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + t \|\partial_t u(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c, \text{ a.e. } t \in (0, T].$

Additionally, we assume that the following positivity condition holds:

$$(q^\dagger |\nabla u(q^\dagger)|^2 + (f - \partial_t^\alpha u(q^\dagger))u(q^\dagger))(T) \geq c > 0. \quad (2.5)$$

This condition was proved in [22] for parabolic equations (i.e.,  $\alpha = 1$ ) and in [25] for time-fractional diffusion (i.e.,  $0 < \alpha < 1$ ). For example, if  $\Omega$  is a  $C^{2,\mu}$  domain with  $\mu \in (0, 1)$ ,  $q^\dagger \in C^{1,\mu}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}$ ,  $f \in C^\mu(\Omega)$  with  $f \geq c_f > 0$  and  $u_0 \in C^{2,\mu}(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$  with  $u_0 \geq 0$  in  $\Omega$ , and  $f + \nabla \cdot (q^\dagger \nabla u_0) \leq 0$  in  $\Omega$ , then condition (2.5) holds. See [22, Section 4.3] and [25, Proposition 3.5] for detailed discussions.

Now we give a Hölder type conditional stability estimate for the inverse problem. The estimate is conditional since the coefficients are required to have extra regularity. To the best of our knowledge, this appears to be the first result of the kind for the time-fractional model (1.1) with a terminal observation. The analysis strategy will also guide the error analysis of the fully discrete scheme in Section 3 below.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let Assumption 2.1 hold, and  $q \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $\|q\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c$ . Then for small  $\epsilon > 0$ , the following conditional stability estimate holds*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{q^\dagger - q}{q^\dagger} \right)^2 (q^\dagger |\nabla u(q^\dagger)|^2 + (f - \partial_t^\alpha u(q^\dagger))u(q^\dagger))(T) \, dx \\ & \leq c \|\nabla(u(q) - u(q^\dagger))(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + c \max(T^{-\alpha}, T^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}(1-2\epsilon)}) \|q^\dagger - q\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

with  $c > 0$  independent of  $q$  and  $T$ . Moreover, if condition (2.5) holds, then there exist  $T_0 > 0$  and  $c > 0$ , independent of  $q$ , such that for all  $T \geq T_0$ ,

$$\|q - q^\dagger\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c \|\nabla(u(q) - u(q^\dagger))(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $u^\dagger = u(q^\dagger)$  and  $u = u(q)$ . Then by the weak formulations of  $u^\dagger$  and  $u$ , there holds for any  $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$

$$((q^\dagger - q)\nabla u^\dagger(T), \nabla \varphi) = -(q\nabla(u^\dagger - u)(T), \nabla \varphi) - (\partial_t^\alpha(u^\dagger - u)(T), \varphi) =: I_1 + I_2.$$

Let  $\varphi \equiv \frac{q^\dagger - q}{q^\dagger} u^\dagger(T) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ . Upon repeating the argument in [8, 22], we obtain

$$((q^\dagger - q)\nabla u^\dagger(T), \nabla \varphi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{q^\dagger - q}{q^\dagger} \right)^2 (q^\dagger |\nabla u^\dagger|^2 + (f - \partial_t^\alpha u^\dagger)u^\dagger)(T) \, dx.$$

Meanwhile, direct computation yields

$$\nabla \varphi = \nabla \left( \frac{q^\dagger - q}{q^\dagger} \right) u^\dagger(T) + \left( \frac{q^\dagger - q}{q^\dagger} \right) \nabla u^\dagger(T).$$

Now Assumption 2.1 implies  $\|u^\dagger(T)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u^\dagger(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c$ . This, the box constraint on  $q^\dagger, q \in \mathcal{A}$  and the *a priori* bound  $\|\nabla q\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c$  yield

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c \|q - q^\dagger\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c.$$

Hence, by Lemma 2.4 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| & \leq c \|\nabla(u - u^\dagger)(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \\ |I_2| & \leq c \|\partial_t^\alpha(u - u^\dagger)(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|q - q^\dagger\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ & \leq c \max(T^{-\alpha}, T^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}(1-2\epsilon)}) \|q - q^\dagger\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, under the condition (2.5), we apply the box constraint on  $q, q^\dagger \in \mathcal{A}$  and derive

$$\|q - q^\dagger\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq c \|\nabla(u - u^\dagger)(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + c \max(T^{-\alpha}, T^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}(1-2\epsilon)}) \|q - q^\dagger\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Let  $T_0$  be sufficiently large such that  $c \max(T^{-\alpha}, T^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}(1-2\epsilon)}) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . Then for any  $T \geq T_0$ , the desired estimate follows.  $\square$

**Remark 2.1.** Theorem 2.2 extends several existing works. The weighted stability results of the type for observation over a space-time domain were implicitly obtained in [22, 25]. The only result for the terminal data case was obtained by Triki [39, Theorem 1.1] for the standard parabolic problem, who proved the following Lipschitz stability for a large  $T$ : for  $q, q^\dagger \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ , there holds

$$\|q - q^\dagger\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c \|u(q^\dagger)(T) - u(q)(T)\|_{H^2(\Omega)},$$

where the constant  $c$  depends on the terminal time  $T$  (exponentially) and the domain  $\Omega$ . This result was shown for the case  $f \equiv 0$  and  $u_0$  satisfying a mild positivity condition, and the proof relies on the decay estimate on  $\partial_t u$ , which itself was proved using refined spectral perturbation estimates. Theorem 2.2 provides a novel Hölder stability estimate using an energy estimate and can be adapted to the error analysis of numerical approximations in Section 3.

### 3 Numerical approximation and error analysis

Now we develop a numerical procedure based on the regularized output least-squares formulation, and discretize the regularized problem using backward Euler convolution quadrature (BECQ) in time and Galerkin FEM with continuous piecewise linear elements in space. Furthermore, we provide a complete error analysis of the fully discrete scheme.

#### 3.1 Regularized problem and numerical approximation

To identify the diffusion coefficient  $q$ , we employ the standard Tikhonov regularization with an  $H^1(\Omega)$  seminorm penalty [15, 20], which gives the following minimization problem:

$$\min_{q \in \mathcal{A}} J_\gamma(q) = \frac{1}{2} \|u(q)(T) - z^\delta\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\nabla q\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\gamma > 0$  is the regularization parameter and  $u(t) \equiv u(q)(t) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  with  $u(0) = u_0$  satisfies

$$(\partial_t^\alpha u(t), \varphi) + (q \nabla u(t), \nabla \varphi) = (f, \varphi), \quad \forall \varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega), \text{ a.e. } t \in (0, T). \quad (3.2)$$

By a standard argument [15, 20], it can be proved that problem (3.1)–(3.2) has at least one global minimizer  $q_\gamma^\delta$ , which is continuous with respect to the perturbations in the data  $z^\delta$ . Moreover, as the noise level  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ , the sequence  $\{q_\gamma^\delta\}_{\delta > 0}$  of minimizers contains a subsequence that converges to the exact coefficient  $q^\dagger$  in  $H^1(\Omega)$  if  $\gamma$  is chosen properly.

In practice, one needs to discretize the regularized formulation (3.1)–(3.2) suitably. For time discretization, we divide the interval  $[0, T]$  uniformly into  $N$  subintervals, with a time step size  $\tau := T/N$  and grid  $t_n := n\tau$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots, N$ . To approximate the fractional derivative  $\partial_t^\alpha v(t_n)$ , we employ backward Euler convolution quadrature (BECQ) defined by

$$\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha v^n := \tau^{-\alpha} \sum_{j=0}^n b_j^{(\alpha)} (v^{n-j} - v^0), \quad \text{with } v^j = v(t_j),$$

where the weights  $b_j^{(\alpha)}$  are generated by the power series expansion  $(1 - \zeta)^\alpha = \sum_{j=0}^\infty b_j^{(\alpha)} \zeta^j$ . The weights  $b_j^{(\alpha)}$  are given by  $b_j^{(\alpha)} = (-1)^j \alpha(\alpha - 1) \cdots (\alpha - j + 1)/j!$ , with  $b_0^{(\alpha)} = 1$  and  $b_j^{(\alpha)} < 0$  for  $j \geq 1$ . When  $\alpha = 1$ , it reduces to the standard backward Euler scheme.

For the spatial discretization, we employ the standard Galerkin FEM. Let  $h \in (0, h_0]$  for some  $h_0 > 0$  and  $\mathcal{T}_h := \cup \{T_j\}_{j=1}^{N_h}$  be a shape regular quasi-uniform simplicial triangulation of the domain  $\Omega$  into mutually disjoint open face-to-face subdomains  $T_j$ , such that  $\Omega_h := \text{Int}(\cup_j \{\bar{T}_j\}) \subset \Omega$  with all the boundary vertices of the domain  $\Omega_h$  locating on  $\partial\Omega$  and  $\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \leq ch^2$  for  $x \in \partial\Omega_h$  [28, Section 5.3]. On the triangulation  $\mathcal{T}_h$ , we define the space  $V_h$  of continuous piecewise linear finite element functions by

$$V_h := \{v_h \in H^1(\Omega_h) : v_h|_T \text{ is a linear polynomial, } \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}.$$

Note that the functions in  $V_h$  can be naturally extended to the entire domain  $\Omega$  by linear polynomials, and we denote the space of extended functions also by  $V_h$ . Moreover, we define the space  $X_h$  (that vanish outside  $\Omega_h$ ) by

$$X_h := \{v_h \in H_0^1(\Omega_h) : v_h|_T \text{ is a linear polynomial } \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h \text{ and } v_h|_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_h} = 0\}$$



The spaces  $V_h$  and  $X_h$  are used to discretize the diffusion coefficient  $q$  and the state  $u$ , respectively. Note that if  $\Omega$  is a convex polygon, then  $X_h = V_h \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ . Next we recall several useful estimates. We denote by  $\Pi_h$  the Lagrange nodal interpolation operator on  $V_h$ . Since  $\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \leq ch^2$  for  $x \in \partial\Omega_h$ , we have (see [9, Theorem 4.4.20] for a convex polyhedral domain and Lemma A.1 for a convex domain with a curved boundary):

$$\|v - \Pi_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + h\|\nabla(v - \Pi_h v)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq ch^2\|v\|_{H^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall v \in H^2(\Omega), \quad (3.3)$$

$$\|v - \Pi_h v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + h\|\nabla(v - \Pi_h v)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq ch\|v\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}, \quad \forall v \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega). \quad (3.4)$$

Moreover, we define the standard  $L^2(\Omega)$ -projection operator  $P_h : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow X_h$  by

$$(P_h v, \varphi_h) = (v, \varphi_h), \quad \forall v \in L^2(\Omega), \varphi_h \in X_h,$$

Then for  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$  and  $s = 0, 1, 2$ ,  $k = 0, 1$  with  $k \leq s$  [6, 13]:

$$\|v - P_h v\|_{W^{k,p}(\Omega)} \leq Ch^{s-k}\|v\|_{W^{s,p}(\Omega)}, \quad \forall v \in W^{s,p}(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega). \quad (3.5)$$

Now we can formulate a fully discrete scheme for the regularized problem (3.1)-(3.2) as

$$\min_{q_h \in \mathcal{A}_h} J_{\gamma,h,\tau}(q_h) = \frac{1}{2}\|U_h^N(q_h) - z^\delta\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\gamma}{2}\|\nabla q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad (3.6)$$

with  $\mathcal{A}_h = \mathcal{A} \cap V_h$ , where  $U_h^n \equiv U_h^n(q_h) \in X_h$  satisfies  $U_h^0 = P_h u_0$  and

$$(\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^n, \varphi_h) + (q_h \nabla U_h^n, \nabla \varphi_h) = (f, \varphi_h), \quad \forall \varphi_h \in X_h, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, N. \quad (3.7)$$

The discrete problem (3.6)-(3.7) is well-posed: there exists at least one global minimizer  $q_h^* \in \mathcal{A}_h$ , and it depends continuously on the data. Further, as the discretization parameters  $h$  and  $\tau$  tend to zero, the numerical approximation  $q_h^*$  converges to the regularized solution to problem (3.1)-(3.2). We aim to establish a bound on the error  $q_h^* - q^\dagger$  in terms of the noise level  $\delta$ , discretization parameters  $h$  and  $\tau$  and regularization parameter  $\gamma$ . For the error analysis, we need the following assumption on the problem data.

**Assumption 3.1.**  $q^\dagger \in H^2(\Omega) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}$ ,  $u_0 \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ , and  $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ .

Now we give the main result in this section, i.e., a weighted  $L^2(\Omega)$  error bound on the approximation  $q_h^*$ . The proof heavily relies on some technical estimates, whose proofs are deferred to Section 3.2.

**Theorem 3.2.** Let Assumption 3.1 hold, and  $\{(q_h^*, u_h^n(q_h^*))\}_{n=0}^N$  be the solutions of problem (3.6)-(3.7). Then with  $\eta_T = T^{\alpha-1}\tau + \max(1, T^{-\alpha})h^2 + \delta + \gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}$  there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_\Omega \left( \frac{q^\dagger - q_h^*}{q^\dagger} \right)^2 (q^\dagger |\nabla u(q^\dagger)|^2 + (f - \partial_t^\alpha u(q^\dagger))u(q^\dagger))(T) \, dx \\ & \leq c(h\gamma^{-1}\eta_T^2 + \min(1, h^{-1}\eta_T)\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\eta_T + h^2 \max(T^{-\alpha}, T^{-2\alpha}) + \tau T^{-\alpha-1}) \\ & \quad + c \max(T^{-\alpha}, T^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}(1-2\epsilon)}, T^{-\alpha(1-\epsilon)}, T^{-\alpha(2-\epsilon)}) \|q^\dagger - q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

where the generic constants are independent of  $h$ ,  $\tau$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $T$ . Moreover, under condition (2.5), with  $\eta := \tau + h^2 + \delta + \gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , there exists  $T_0 > 0$  such that for any  $T \geq T_0$ ,

$$\|q^\dagger - q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq c(h\gamma^{-1}\eta^2 + \min(1, h^{-1}\eta)\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\eta + h^2 + \tau).$$

*Proof.* The proof proceeds similarly to the conditional stability estimate in Theorem 2.2 and requires several (new) technical estimates proved in the propositions below. Let  $u^\dagger \equiv u(q^\dagger)$ . For any test function  $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ , using the weak formulations of  $u^\dagger$  and  $U_h^N(q_h^*)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & ((q^\dagger - q_h^*) \nabla u^\dagger(T), \nabla \varphi) \\ & = ((q^\dagger - q_h^*) \nabla u^\dagger(T), \nabla(\varphi - P_h \varphi)) + ((q^\dagger - q_h^*) \nabla u^\dagger(T), \nabla P_h \varphi) \\ & = ((q^\dagger - q_h^*) \nabla u^\dagger(T), \nabla(\varphi - P_h \varphi)) + (q_h^* \nabla(U_h^N(q_h^*) - u^\dagger(T)), \nabla P_h \varphi) \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& + (q^\dagger \nabla u^\dagger(T) - q_h^* \nabla U_h^N(q_h^*), \nabla P_h \varphi) \\
& = -(\nabla \cdot ((q^\dagger - q_h^*) \nabla u^\dagger(T)), \varphi - P_h \varphi) + (q_h^* \nabla (U_h^N(q_h^*) - u^\dagger(T)), \nabla P_h \varphi) \\
& + (\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^N(q_h^*) - \partial_t^\alpha u^\dagger(T), P_h \varphi) =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we bound the three terms  $I_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , separately. Let  $\varphi = \frac{q^\dagger - q_h^*}{q^\dagger} u^\dagger(T)$ . Then by the box constraint  $q^\dagger, q_h^* \in \mathcal{A}$  and Proposition 3.1 below,  $\varphi$  satisfies

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c, \quad \|P_h \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c(1 + \|\nabla q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}). \quad (3.8)$$

By Assumption 3.1, we have

$$\|\Delta u^\dagger(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u^\dagger\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq c.$$

Thus, direct computation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\nabla \cdot ((q^\dagger - q_h^*) \nabla u^\dagger(T))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
& \leq \|q^\dagger - q_h^*\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\Delta u^\dagger(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla q^\dagger\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\nabla u^\dagger(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
& + \|\nabla q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla u^\dagger(T)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq c(1 + \|\nabla q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}).
\end{aligned}$$

This, the estimate (3.8) and Proposition 3.1 below imply

$$|I_1| \leq ch(1 + \|\nabla q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq ch(1 + \|\nabla q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2) \leq ch\gamma^{-1}\eta_T^2.$$

Next, by the triangle inequality, the inverse inequality in the space  $X_h$  [38, equation (1.12)], Proposition 3.1 below and the approximation property of  $P_h$  in (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_2| & \leq (\|\nabla(U_h^N(q_h^*) - P_h u^\dagger(T))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla(u^\dagger(T) - P_h u^\dagger(T))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
& \leq c(h^{-1} \|U_h^N(q_h^*) - P_h u^\dagger(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla(u^\dagger(T) - P_h u^\dagger(T))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
& \leq c(h + h^{-1}\eta_T)\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\eta_T.
\end{aligned}$$

This and the *a priori* estimate  $\|\nabla(U_h^N(q_h^*) - u^\dagger(T))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c$  imply

$$|I_2| \leq c \min(1, h^{-1}\eta_T)\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\eta_T.$$

Next, to bound the term  $I_3$ , we employ the splitting

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^N(q_h^*) - \partial_t^\alpha u^\dagger(T), P_h \varphi) \\
& = (\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^N(q_h^*) - \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^N(q^\dagger), P_h \varphi) + (\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^N(q^\dagger) - \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha u^\dagger(T), P_h \varphi) \\
& + (\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha u^\dagger(T) - \partial_t^\alpha u^\dagger(T), P_h \varphi) =: I_3^1 + I_3^2 + I_3^3,
\end{aligned}$$

and then bound the three terms separately. It follows from Lemmas 3.4-3.5 below and the estimate (3.8) that

$$|I_3^1| \leq ch^2 \max(T^{-\alpha}, T^{-2\alpha}) \quad \text{and} \quad |I_3^3| \leq c\tau T^{-\alpha-1}.$$

Meanwhile, Proposition 3.2 below and the estimate (3.8) lead to

$$|I_3^2| \leq c \max(T^{-\alpha}, T^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}(1-2\epsilon)}, T^{-\alpha(1-\epsilon)}, T^{-\alpha(2-\epsilon)}) \|q^\dagger - q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Upon combining these estimates with the identity [8, 22]

$$((q^\dagger - q_h^*) \nabla u^\dagger(T), \nabla \varphi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \left( \frac{q^\dagger - q_h^*}{q^\dagger} \right)^2 (q^\dagger |\nabla u^\dagger|^2 + (f - \partial_t^\alpha u^\dagger) u^\dagger)(T) \, dx,$$

we prove the first assertion. Since  $\eta_T \leq c\eta$  for large  $T$ , the second assertion follows exactly as Theorem 2.2.  $\square$

**Remark 3.1.** The estimate in Theorem 3.2 provides useful guidelines for choosing the algorithmic parameters: Given the noise level  $\delta$ , we may choose  $\gamma \sim \delta^2$  and  $h \sim \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . The choice  $\gamma \sim \delta^2$  differs from the usual condition for Tikhonov regularization, i.e.,  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\delta^2}{\gamma(\delta)} = 0$ , but it agrees with that with conditional stability (see, e.g., [14, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2]). It is noteworthy that the error bound in Theorem 3.2 is comparable with that for the standard parabolic case [22, Theorem 4.5] and the time fractional case [23, 25]. Theorem 3.2 requires only the terminal data, whereas previous results [23, 25] in the fractional case require full space-time data. Thus it represents a substantial improvement for the concerned inverse problem.

### 3.2 Preliminary technical estimates

In this part, we derive crucial *a priori* bounds on  $u(q^\dagger)(T) - U_h^N(q_h^*)$  and  $\nabla q_h^*$ ; see Proposition 3.1 for the precise statement. For any  $q \in \mathcal{A}$ , we define a discrete elliptic operator  $A_h(q) : X_h \rightarrow X_h$  by

$$(A_h(q)v_h, \varphi_h) = (q\nabla v_h, \nabla \varphi_h), \quad \forall v_h, \varphi_h \in X_h.$$

Then problem (3.7) is equivalent to an operator equation in  $X_h$ :

$$\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^n + A_h(q_h)U_h^n = P_h f, \quad \text{with } U_h^0 = P_h u_0, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

Using the discrete Laplace transform, the solution  $U_h^n(q_h)$  is given by

$$U_h^n(q_h) = F_{h,\tau}^n(q_h)U_h^0 + \tau \sum_{j=1}^n E_{h,\tau}^j(q_h)P_h f = F_{h,\tau}^n(q_h)P_h u_0 + (I - F_{h,\tau}^n(q_h))A_h(q_h)^{-1}P_h f,$$

where the fully discrete solution operators  $F_{h,\tau}^n(q_h)$  and  $E_{h,\tau}^n(q_h)$  are defined respectively by [24, Section 3.2]

$$\begin{aligned} F_{h,\tau}^n(q_h) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau} e^{zt_n-1} \delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^{\alpha-1} (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q_h))^{-1} dz, \\ E_{h,\tau}^n(q_h) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau} e^{zt_n-1} (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q_h))^{-1} dz, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

with the kernel function  $\delta_\tau(\zeta) := \tau^{-1}(1 - \zeta)$  and the contour  $\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau := \{z \in \Gamma_{\theta,\sigma} : |\Im(z)| \leq \frac{\pi}{\tau}\}$  (oriented with an increasing imaginary part). Like in the continuous case, we need suitable smoothing properties of the fully discrete solution operators  $F_{h,\tau}^n(q)$  and  $E_{h,\tau}^n(q)$ . Recall that for any fixed  $\theta \in (\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi)$ , there exists  $\theta' \in (\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi)$  such that for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$  and  $z \in \Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau$  [24, Lemma 3.1]:

$$c_1|z| \leq |\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})| \leq c_2|z|, \quad \delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau}) \in \Sigma_{\theta'}, \quad |\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha - z^\alpha| \leq c_3\tau|z|^{1+\alpha}, \quad (3.10)$$

where the constants  $c_1, c_2$  and  $c_3$  are independent of  $\tau$ . Further, for any fixed  $q \in \mathcal{A}$ , let  $\lambda(q)$  and  $\lambda_h(q)$  be the smallest eigenvalues of operators  $A(q)$  and  $A_h(q)$ , respectively. Then by Courant-Fischer-Weyl minmax theorem, there exists  $c_0 > 0$ , independent of  $q$ , such that  $c_0 \leq \lambda(q) \leq \lambda_h(q)$ . The following discrete resolvent estimate holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q))^{-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} &\leq c \min(|z|^{-\alpha}, \lambda_h(q)^{-1}) \\ &\leq c \min(|z|^{-\alpha}, 1), \quad \forall z \in \Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Now we can give smoothing properties of the solution operators  $F_{h,\tau}^n(q)$  and  $E_{h,\tau}^n(q)$ . The proof of the cases  $s = 0$  and  $s = 1$  can be found in [43, Lemma 4.3], and the case  $0 < s < 1$  follows from standard interpolation theory.

**Lemma 3.1.** *For any  $q \in \mathcal{A}$  and any  $s \in [0, 1]$ , there exists  $c$ , independent of  $h, \tau, t_n$  and  $q$ , such that for all  $v_h \in X_h$*

$$t_n^{s\alpha} \|A_h(q)^s F_{h,\tau}^n(q)v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + t_n^{1-(1-s)\alpha} \|A_h(q)^s E_{h,\tau}^n(q)v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c \|v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

The analysis uses frequently the following discrete  $L^p(\Omega)$  resolvent estimate. Note that the estimate (3.12) is different from that in Lemma 2.2 in that the latter allows also mappings to the space  $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ . This difference has important consequences in the error analysis, and it has to be overcome alternatively.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a smooth domain or a convex polygon and  $q \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ . Then for any  $p \in [1, \infty]$  and  $v_h \in X_h$ , there holds*

$$(1 + |z|) \|(z + A_h(q))^{-1}v_h\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq c \|v_h\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad \forall z \in \Sigma_\theta, \quad \theta \in (\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi). \quad (3.12)$$

*Proof.* See [12, Theorem 1.1] for the case  $d = 1$ , and [29, Theorem 1.1] for the case  $d = 2, 3$ . Note that for  $d = 2, 3$ , the work [29] discussed only the case  $p = \infty$ . The case  $p = 1$  follows by a duality argument

$$\|(z + A_h(q))^{-1}v_h\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = \sup_{\|w\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}=1} ((z + A_h(q))^{-1}v_h, w)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sup_{\|w\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}=1} (v_h, (z + A_h(q))^{-1} P_h w) \\
&\leq \sup_{\|w\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}=1} \|v_h\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \|(z + A_h(q))^{-1} P_h w\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\
&\leq c(1 + |z|)^{-1} \|v_h\|_{L^1(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The intermediate case  $p \in (1, \infty)$  follows from Riesz–Thorin interpolation theorem.  $\square$

Now we can give an error bound on the FEM approximation  $U_h^N(\Pi_h q^\dagger)$  by problem (3.7) with  $q_h = \Pi_h q^\dagger$ . This estimate plays a central role in establishing Proposition 3.1.

**Lemma 3.3.** *If Assumption 3.1 holds, then there exists  $c > 0$ , independent of  $\tau$ ,  $h$  and  $t_n$ , such that*

$$\|u(q^\dagger)(t_n) - U_h^n(\Pi_h q^\dagger)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c(t_n^{\alpha-1}\tau + \max(1, t_n^{-\alpha})h^2), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

*Proof.* Let  $u^n \equiv u(q^\dagger)(t_n)$  and  $U_h^n \equiv U_h^n(q^\dagger)$ . Then the following estimate holds [25, Lemma A.1]

$$\|u^n - U_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c(\tau t_n^{\alpha-1} + h^2), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

Next we prove

$$\|U_h^n - U_h^n(\Pi_h q^\dagger)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c \max(1, t_n^{-\alpha})h^2, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

Using the operator  $F_{h,\tau}^n(q)$  in (3.9),  $U_h^n$  and  $U_h^n(\Pi_h q^\dagger)$  can be represented respectively by

$$\begin{aligned}
U_h^n &= F_{h,\tau}^n(q^\dagger)U_h^0 + (I - F_{h,\tau}^n(q^\dagger))A_h(q^\dagger)^{-1}P_h f, \\
U_h^n(\Pi_h q^\dagger) &= F_{h,\tau}^n(\Pi_h q^\dagger)U_h^0 + (I - F_{h,\tau}^n(\Pi_h q^\dagger))A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger)^{-1}P_h f.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the error  $e_h^n := U_h^n - U_h^n(\Pi_h q^\dagger)$  satisfies  $e_h^0 = 0$  and for  $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$

$$\begin{aligned}
e_h^n &= (F_{h,\tau}^n(q^\dagger) - F_{h,\tau}^n(\Pi_h q^\dagger))U_h^0 + (A_h(q^\dagger)^{-1} - A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger)^{-1})P_h f \\
&\quad + (-F_{h,\tau}^n(q^\dagger)A_h(q^\dagger)^{-1} + F_{h,\tau}^n(\Pi_h q^\dagger)A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger)^{-1})P_h f := I_1 + I_2 + I_3.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to bound the three terms separately. For the term  $I_1$ , by the definition of  $F_{h,\tau}^n(q^\dagger)$  (with  $\sigma = t_n^{-1}$  in  $\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau$ ), we have

$$I_1 = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau} e^{zt_{n-1}} \delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^{\alpha-1} ((\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q^\dagger))^{-1} - (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger))^{-1}) U_h^0 dz.$$

It follows directly from the identity  $B_1^{-1} - B_2^{-1} = B_1^{-1}(B_2 - B_1)B_2^{-1}$  that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q^\dagger))^{-1} - (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger))^{-1}\|_{L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= \|(\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q^\dagger))^{-1} (A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger) - A_h(q^\dagger)) (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger))^{-1}\|_{L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \|(\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q^\dagger))^{-1} A_h(q^\dagger)\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \|A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger)^{-1} - A_h(q^\dagger)^{-1}\|_{L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad \times \|(\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger))^{-1} A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger)\|_{L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Upon recalling the estimates (3.3)–(3.4) and using the argument of [22, Lemma A.1], we obtain

$$\|A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger)^{-1} - A_h(q^\dagger)^{-1}\|_{L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \leq ch^2, \quad \text{with } p > \max(d + \epsilon, 2). \quad (3.13)$$

Meanwhile, the discrete resolvent estimate (3.12) implies

$$\|(\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q))^{-1} A_h(q)\|_{L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega)} \leq c, \quad \forall q \in \mathcal{A}. \quad (3.14)$$

Combining the estimates (3.13) and (3.14) gives

$$\|(\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q^\dagger))^{-1} - (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger))^{-1}\|_{L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \leq ch^2.$$

Consequently, the following bound on  $I_1$  holds:

$$\|I_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq ch^2 \|u_0\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \int_{\Gamma_{\bar{\theta}, \sigma}^+} |e^{zt_n}| |z|^{\alpha-1} |dz| \leq ct_n^{-\alpha} h^2.$$

For the term  $I_2$ , by the estimate (3.13) and the  $L^p(\Omega)$  stability of  $P_h$ , cf. (3.5), we obtain

$$\|I_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|A_h(q^\dagger)^{-1} - A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger)^{-1}\|_{L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \|P_h f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq ch^2.$$

Last, for the term  $I_3$ , we use the splitting

$$\begin{aligned} & -F_{h,\tau}^n(q^\dagger) A_h(q^\dagger)^{-1} + F_{h,\tau}^n(\Pi_h q^\dagger) A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger)^{-1} \\ & = (F_{h,\tau}^n(\Pi_h q^\dagger) - F_{h,\tau}^n(q^\dagger)) A_h(q^\dagger)^{-1} - F_{h,\tau}^n(\Pi_h q^\dagger) (A_h(q^\dagger)^{-1} - A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger)^{-1}) = I_3^1 + I_3^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then the argument for the term  $I_1$  and the boundedness of the operator  $A_h(q^\dagger)^{-1} P_h$  in  $L^p(\Omega)$  [9, Section 8.5] imply

$$\|I_3^1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq ch^2 t_n^{-\alpha} \|A_h(q^\dagger)^{-1} P_h f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq ch^2 t_n^{-\alpha} \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

Meanwhile, Lemma 3.1, the  $L^p(\Omega)$  stability of  $P_h$  and the estimate (3.13) lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_3^2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} & \leq c \min(1, t_n^{-\alpha}) \|(A_h(\Pi_h q^\dagger)^{-1} - A_h(q^\dagger)^{-1}) P_h f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ & \leq c \min(1, t_n^{-\alpha}) h^2 \|P_h f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq c \min(1, t_n^{-\alpha}) h^2 \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

The desired estimate now follows by combining the preceding estimates.  $\square$

Next we provide a crucial *a priori* estimate of  $u(q^\dagger)(T) - U_h^N(q_h^*)$  and  $\nabla q_h^*$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let Assumption 3.1 hold, and  $q_h^*$  be a minimizer of problem (3.6)-(3.7). Then there exists  $c$ , independent of  $\tau$ ,  $h$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $T$ , such that*

$$\|u(q^\dagger)(T) - U_h^N(q_h^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c(T^{\alpha-1} \tau + \max(1, T^{-\alpha}) h^2 + \delta + \gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $u \equiv u(q^\dagger)$ . Since  $q_h^*$  minimizes problem (3.6)-(3.7) and  $\Pi_h q^\dagger \in \mathcal{A}_h$ , we have

$$J_{\gamma, h, \tau}(q_h^*) \leq J_{\gamma, h, \tau}(\Pi_h q^\dagger).$$

By the  $H^1(\Omega)$  stability of the operator  $\Pi_h$ , cf. (3.3), and Lemma 3.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|U_h^N(q_h^*) - z^\delta\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \gamma \|\nabla q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \leq \|U_h^N(\Pi_h q^\dagger) - z^\delta\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \gamma \|\nabla \Pi_h q^\dagger\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \leq c(\|U_h^N(\Pi_h q^\dagger) - u(T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|u(T) - z^\delta\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \gamma) \\ & \leq c(T^{2\alpha-2} \tau^2 + \max(1, T^{-2\alpha}) h^4 + \delta^2 + \gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Then the triangle inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u(T) - U_h^N(q_h^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \gamma \|\nabla q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \leq c(\|u(T) - z^\delta\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|z^\delta - U_h^N(q_h^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \gamma \|\nabla q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2) \\ & \leq c(T^{2\alpha-2} \tau^2 + \max(1, T^{-2\alpha}) h^4 + \delta^2 + \gamma). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

### 3.3 Bound on the error $\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^n(q_h^*) - \partial_t^\alpha u(q^\dagger)(t_n)$

Next, we estimate the decay of the discrete (fractional) derivative  $\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^n(q_h^*)$  and bound the term  $\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^n(q_h^*) - \partial_t^\alpha u(q^\dagger)(t_n)$  in terms of  $\|q_h^* - q^\dagger\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ ; see Lemma 3.6 and Proposition 3.2 for the precise statement. These estimates play a central role in establishing Theorem 3.2. We need the following time semidiscrete scheme for problem (1.1): Find  $U^n \equiv U^n(q) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$  with  $U^0 = u_0$  such that

$$\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U^n(q) + A(q)U^n(q) = f, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, N. \quad (3.15)$$

The discrete Laplace transform gives

$$U^n = F_\tau^n(q)u_0 + \tau \sum_{j=1}^n E_\tau^j(q)f = F_\tau^n(q)u_0 + (I - F_\tau^n(q))A(q)^{-1}f, \quad (3.16)$$

where the time-semidiscrete solution operators  $F_\tau^n(q)$  and  $E_\tau^n(q)$  are defined respectively by [24, Section 3.2]

$$\begin{aligned} F_\tau^n(q) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{\theta, \sigma}^\tau} e^{zt_n-1} \delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^{\alpha-1} (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A(q))^{-1} dz, \\ E_\tau^n(q) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{\theta, \sigma}^\tau} e^{zt_n-1} (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A(q))^{-1} dz. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

The next lemma gives a temporal error estimate for the approximate time (fractional) derivative.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let Assumption 3.1 hold, and  $u(q^\dagger)$  and  $\{U^n(q^\dagger)\}_{n=0}^N$  be the solutions of problems (1.1) and (3.15) for  $q^\dagger$ , respectively. Then there exists  $c > 0$ , independent of  $\tau$ ,  $t_n$  and  $q^\dagger$ , such that*

$$\|\partial_t^\alpha u(q^\dagger)(t_n) - \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U^n(q^\dagger)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c\tau t_n^{-\alpha-1}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $u \equiv u(q^\dagger)$  and  $U^n \equiv U^n(q^\dagger)$ . Then  $W^n := \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U^n$  satisfies  $W^0 = f - A(q^\dagger)u_0$  and

$$\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha W^n + A(q^\dagger)W^n = 0, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

It follows from the solution representations (2.1) and (3.16) that

$$\partial_t^\alpha u(t_n) = F(t_n; q^\dagger)(f - A(q^\dagger)u_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U^n = F_\tau^n(q^\dagger)(f - A(q^\dagger)u_0).$$

It follows from the estimate  $\|F(t_n; q) - F_\tau^n(q)\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \leq cn^{-1}t_n^{-\alpha}$  [24, Lemma 15.6] and Assumption 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t^\alpha u(q^\dagger)(t_n) - \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U^n(q^\dagger)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \|F(t_n; q^\dagger) - F_\tau^n(q^\dagger)\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \|f - A(q^\dagger)u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq c\tau t_n^{-\alpha-1} (\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u_0\|_{H^2(\Omega)}) \leq c\tau t_n^{-\alpha-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

The next lemma bounds the error between the discrete (fractional) derivative due to spatial discretization.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let Assumption 3.1 hold, and  $\{U^n(q^\dagger)\}_{n=0}^N$  and  $\{U_h^n(q^\dagger)\}_{n=0}^N$  be the solutions of problem (3.15) with  $q^\dagger$  and problem (3.7) with  $q^\dagger$ , respectively. Then there exists  $c > 0$ , independent of  $\tau$ ,  $h$ ,  $t_n$  and  $q^\dagger$ , such that*

$$\|\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha (U^n(q^\dagger) - U_h^n(q^\dagger))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq ch^2 \max(t_n^{-\alpha}, t_n^{-2\alpha}).$$

Moreover, if  $u_0 \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$ , then with  $\ell_h := |\log h|$ ,

$$\|\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha (U^n(q^\dagger) - U_h^n(q^\dagger))\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq cht_n^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} + ch^2 \ell_h^2 \max(t_n^{-\alpha}, t_n^{-2\alpha}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $U^n \equiv U^n(q^\dagger)$  and  $U_h^n \equiv U_h^n(q^\dagger)$ , and  $e_{h,\tau}^n := \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha (U^n - U_h^n)$ . To bound  $e_{h,\tau}^n$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$ , the solution representation (3.16) yields

$$\begin{aligned} e_{h,\tau}^n &= F_\tau^n(q^\dagger)(f - A(q^\dagger)u_0) - F_{h,\tau}^n(q^\dagger)(P_h f - A_h(q^\dagger)P_h u_0) \\ &= (F_\tau^n(q^\dagger) - F_{h,\tau}^n(q^\dagger)P_h)f + (F_{h,\tau}^n(q^\dagger)A_h(q^\dagger)P_h - F_\tau^n(q^\dagger)A(q^\dagger))u_0 \\ &:= I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Now we bound the two terms  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  separately. Let  $B_{h,\tau} = (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A(q^\dagger))^{-1} - (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q^\dagger))^{-1} P_h$ . It follows from the estimates in (3.10) that for all  $z \in \Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau$  [16, Theorem 5.2 and Remark 7.4]

$$\|B_{h,\tau}\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \leq ch^2. \quad (3.19)$$

Then choosing  $\sigma = t_n^{-1}$  in the contour  $\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau$  leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq c\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \int_{\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau} |e^{zt_n}| |\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})|^{\alpha-1} \|B_{h,\tau}\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} |dz| \\ &\leq ch^2 \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \int_{\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau} |e^{zt_n}| |z|^{\alpha-1} |dz| \leq ch^2 t_n^{-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the term  $I_2$ , by the identity  $(\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q^\dagger))^{-1} A_h(q^\dagger) P_h - (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A(q^\dagger))^{-1} A(q^\dagger) = (P_h - I) + \delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha B_{h,\tau}$ , we derive

$$I_2 = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau} e^{zt_n} \delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^{\alpha-1} (P_h - I) u_0 dz + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau} e^{zt_n} \delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^{2\alpha-1} B_{h,\tau} u_0 dz.$$

Then with  $\sigma = t_n^{-1}$  in the contour  $\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau$ , by the estimates (3.19), (3.10), and (3.5), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq ch^2 \int_{\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau} |e^{zt_n}| (|z|^{\alpha-1} \|u_0\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + |z|^{2\alpha-1} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) |dz| \\ &\leq ch^2 t_n^{-\alpha} \|u_0\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + ch^2 t_n^{-2\alpha} \|u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq ch^2 \max(t_n^{-\alpha}, t_n^{-2\alpha}). \end{aligned}$$

To bound  $\|e_{h,\tau}^n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ , we split  $e_{h,\tau}^n$  into

$$e_{h,\tau}^n := (\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U^n - P_h \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U^n) + (P_h \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U^n - \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^n) := I_3 + I_4.$$

It follows from the estimates in (3.10), (2.3), and the argument of Lemma 2.3 that

$$\|F_\tau^n(q^\dagger)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \leq ct_n^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}.$$

From the approximation property of  $P_h$  in (3.5) and the assumption  $u_0 \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_3\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\leq ch \|\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U^n\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq ch \|F_\tau^n(q^\dagger)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} (\|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|A(q^\dagger)u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}) \leq cht_n^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to bound the term  $I_4$ . From the representation (3.18), we obtain

$$I_4 = (P_h F_\tau^n(q^\dagger) - F_{h,\tau}^n(q^\dagger) P_h) f + (F_{h,\tau}^n(q^\dagger) A_h(q^\dagger) P_h - P_h F_\tau^n(q^\dagger) A(q^\dagger)) u_0.$$

Let  $R_h$  be the standard Ritz projection. Then direct computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} &P_h (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A(q^\dagger))^{-1} - (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q^\dagger))^{-1} P_h \\ &= A_h(q^\dagger) (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q^\dagger))^{-1} (P_h - R_h) (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A(q^\dagger))^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_h F_\tau^n(q^\dagger) - F_{h,\tau}^n(q^\dagger) P_h &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau} e^{zt_{n-1}} \delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^{\alpha-1} \\ &\quad \times [A_h(q^\dagger) (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q^\dagger))^{-1} (P_h - R_h) (\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A(q^\dagger))^{-1}] dz \end{aligned}$$

and

$$F_{h,\tau}^n(q^\dagger) A_h(q^\dagger) P_h - P_h F_\tau^n(q^\dagger) A(q^\dagger) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{\theta,\sigma}^\tau} e^{zt_{n-1}} \delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^{2\alpha-1}$$

$$\times [A_h(q^\dagger)(\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q^\dagger))^{-1}(P_h - R_h)(\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A(q^\dagger))^{-1}] dz.$$

The resolvent estimates (3.12) and (2.3) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_h(q^\dagger)(\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A_h(q^\dagger))^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)} &\leq c, \\ \|A(q^\dagger)(\delta_\tau(e^{-z\tau})^\alpha + A(q^\dagger))^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)} &\leq c. \end{aligned}$$

Now the estimate  $\|(P_h - R_h)A(q^\dagger)^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq ch^2\ell_h^2$  holds ([36, p. 1658] and [6, p. 220]). Then letting  $\sigma = t_n^{-1}$  in the contour  $\Gamma_{\theta, \sigma}^\tau$  leads to

$$\|P_h F_\tau^n(q^\dagger) - F_{h, \tau}^n(q^\dagger)P_h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq ch^2\ell_h^2 t_n^{-\alpha},$$

and

$$\|F_{h, \tau}^n(q^\dagger)A_h(q^\dagger)P_h - P_h F_\tau^n(q^\dagger)A(q^\dagger)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega) \rightarrow L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq ch^2\ell_h^2 t_n^{-2\alpha},$$

which implies

$$\|I_4\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq ch^2\ell_h^2 t_n^{-\alpha} \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + ch^2\ell_h^2 t_n^{-2\alpha} \|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq ch^2\ell_h^2 \max(t_n^{-\alpha}, t_n^{-2\alpha}).$$

Combining the preceding estimates completes the proof.  $\square$

The next result gives a discrete analogue of Lemma 2.3.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a convex  $C^2$  domain, and Assumption 3.1 hold. Let  $\{U_h^n(q^\dagger)\}_{n=0}^N$  be the solution of problem (3.7) with  $q^\dagger$ . Then for small  $h > 0$ , there exists  $c > 0$ , independent of  $\tau, h, t_n$  and  $q^\dagger$ , such that*

$$\|\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^n(q^\dagger)\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)} \leq c \max(t_n^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, t_n^{-\alpha}, t_n^{-2\alpha}), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

*Proof.* It follows from the inverse estimate on the FEM space  $X_h$  [38, equation (1.12)], Lemma 3.5 and the approximation property and  $W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)$  stability of  $P_h$  in (3.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^n(q^\dagger)\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)} &\leq \|\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^n(q^\dagger) - P_h \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U^n(q^\dagger)\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)} + \|P_h \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U^n(q^\dagger)\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq ch^{-1} \|\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^n(q^\dagger) - \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U^n(q^\dagger)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + c \|\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U^n(q^\dagger)\|_{W^{1, \infty}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq ct_n^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} + ch\ell_h^2 \max(t_n^{-\alpha}, t_n^{-2\alpha}) \leq c \max(t_n^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, t_n^{-\alpha}, t_n^{-2\alpha}). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

We also have a discrete version of Lemma 2.4. This estimate is crucial to the error analysis.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a convex  $C^2$  domain, and Assumption 3.1 hold. Let  $\{U_h^n(q^\dagger)\}_{n=0}^N$  and  $\{U_h^n(q_h^*)\}_{n=0}^N$  be the solutions of problem (3.7) with  $q^\dagger$  and  $q_h^*$ , respectively. Then for small  $\epsilon, h > 0$ , there exists  $c > 0$ , independent of  $\tau, h$ , and  $t_n$ , such that for all  $n = 1, \dots, N$*

$$\|\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha (U_h^n(q^\dagger) - U_h^n(q_h^*))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c \max(t_n^{-\alpha}, t_n^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}(1-2\epsilon)}, t_n^{-\alpha(1-\epsilon)}, t_n^{-\alpha(2-\epsilon)}) \|q^\dagger - q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

*Proof.* Let  $W_h^n := \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha (U_h^n(q_h^*) - U_h^n(q^\dagger))$ . Then  $W_h^0 = (A_h(q^\dagger) - A_h(q_h^*))U_h^0$  and

$$\bar{\partial}_\tau W_h^n + A_h(q_h^*)W_h^n = (A_h(q^\dagger) - A_h(q_h^*))\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^n(q^\dagger), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

By the discrete Laplace transform, we obtain

$$W_h^n = F_{h, \tau}^n(q_h^*)(A_h(q^\dagger) - A_h(q_h^*))U_h^0 + \tau \sum_{j=1}^n E_{h, \tau}^{n-j}(q_h^*)(A_h(q^\dagger) - A_h(q_h^*))\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^j(q^\dagger).$$

Next we bound the two terms separately. Note that the following inequality holds

$$c_1 \|A_h(q_h^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\nabla v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c_2 \|A_h(q_h^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall v_h \in X_h.$$



This, Lemma 3.1, the  $W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$  stability of  $P_h$  in (3.5), and the boundedness of  $A_h(q_h^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$  imply

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|F_{h,\tau}^n(q_h^*)(A_h(q^\dagger) - A_h(q_h^*))U_h^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= \sup_{\|\varphi_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1} ((q^\dagger - q_h^*)\nabla P_h u_0, \nabla A_h(q_h^*)^{\frac{1}{2}} F_{h,\tau}^n(q_h^*) A_h(q_h^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_h) \\
&\leq c\|q^\dagger - q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla P_h u_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|A_h(q_h^*) F_{h,\tau}^n(q_h^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad \times \sup_{\|\varphi_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1} \|A_h(q_h^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq ct_n^{-\alpha} \|q^\dagger - q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the boundedness of the operator  $A(q_h^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$  and Lemmas 3.1-3.6 lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|E_{h,\tau}^{n-j}(q_h^*)(A_h(q^\dagger) - A_h(q_h^*))\bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^j(q^\dagger)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= \sup_{\|\varphi_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1} ((q^\dagger - q_h^*)\nabla \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^j(q^\dagger), \nabla A_h(q_h^*)^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} E_{h,\tau}^{n-j}(q_h^*) A_h(q_h^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \varphi_h) \\
&\leq c\|q^\dagger - q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla \bar{\partial}_\tau^\alpha U_h^j(q^\dagger)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|A_h(q_h^*)^{1-\epsilon} E_{h,\tau}^{n-j}(q_h^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad \times \sup_{\|\varphi_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1} \|A_h(q_h^*)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \varphi_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq ct_n^{-1+\epsilon\alpha} \max(t_j^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, t_j^{-\alpha}, t_j^{-2\alpha}) \|q^\dagger - q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the preceding two estimates and the triangle inequality imply

$$\begin{aligned}
\|W_h^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq ct_n^{-\alpha} \|q^\dagger - q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + c\|q^\dagger - q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \tau \sum_{j=1}^n t_{n-j}^{-1+\epsilon\alpha} \max(t_j^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, t_j^{-\alpha}, t_j^{-2\alpha}) \\
&\leq c \max(t_n^{-\alpha}, t_n^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}(1-2\epsilon)}, t_n^{-\alpha(1-\epsilon)}, t_n^{-\alpha(2-\epsilon)}) \|q^\dagger - q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

## 4 Numerical experiments and discussions

Now we present numerical results for the time fractional diffusion model. We employ the conjugate gradient method [5] to solve the discrete optimization problem. The gradient  $J'_\gamma$  is computed using an alternative adjoint technique [11, Section 5]. The details of the algorithm are described in Algorithm 1 in the appendix for completeness. The lower and upper bounds of the admissible set  $\mathcal{A}$  are taken to be 0.5 and 5.0. The noise data  $z^\delta$  is generated by

$$z^\delta(x) = u(q^\dagger)(x, T) + \epsilon \|u(q^\dagger)(T)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \xi(x), \quad x \in \Omega,$$

where  $\xi$  follows the standard Gaussian distribution and  $\epsilon > 0$  is the relative noise level. To measure the convergence of the approximation  $q_h^*$ , we employ two metrics, i.e.,  $e_q = \|q^\dagger - q_h^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$  and  $e_u = \|u(q^\dagger)(T) - u_h^N(q_h^*)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ .

First, we consider the one-dimension case with varying terminal time  $T$  and fractional order  $\alpha$ .

**Example 4.1.** Let  $\Omega = (0, 1)$ ,  $q^\dagger(x) = \max(\min(1 + \frac{1}{4} \sin(\pi x), \frac{319}{256}), \frac{67}{64})$ ,  $u_0(x) = x(1-x)$  and  $f \equiv 1$ . Consider the following two cases: (a)  $T = 1.00$  and  $\alpha = 0.25, 0.50$  and  $0.75$ ; (b)  $\alpha = 0.50$  and  $T = 10^{-5}, 3.00$  and  $5.00$ .

The exact data is obtained using a finer grid with a mesh size  $h = 1/1600$  and the number  $N = 1280$  of time steps. The numerical results for Example 4.1 are presented in Table 1. Note that when  $T$  is large, the theory predicts a convergence rate  $O(\delta^{\frac{1}{4}})$  at best for  $e_q$ , and  $O(\delta)$  for  $e_u$  of the state approximation (if the parameters are chosen properly). For case (a), both  $e_q$  and  $e_u$  exhibit a clear decay property as the noise level  $\delta$  tends to zero but the empirical rate of  $e_q$  is faster than the theoretical one, indicating room for further improvement in convergence analysis. In Fig. 1, we present the numerical reconstructions of case (a) at different noise levels. The results for case (b) in Table 1 show that the convergence behaviors of both  $e_q$  and  $e_u$  fail to hold due to the loss of conditional stability in Theorems 2.2 and 3.2 when the terminal time  $T$  is sufficiently small.

Next we give a two-dimensional example.

Table 1: Numerical results for Example 4.1, initialized with  $M = 113$  and the total time step  $N = 30$ .

(a) Results for case (a), with $T$ fixed at $T = 1.00$ , and varying $\alpha$ .						
$\alpha$	$\epsilon$	1.00e-2	5.00e-3	2.50e-3	1.00e-3	rate
	$\gamma$	4.00e-8	1.00e-8	2.50e-9	4.00e-10	
0.25	$e_q$	2.67e-2	1.76e-2	1.54e-2	8.42e-3	0.48
	$e_u$	2.53e-4	1.26e-4	7.90e-5	3.50e-5	0.86
0.50	$e_q$	2.56e-2	1.85e-2	1.40e-2	6.28e-3	0.58
	$e_u$	2.77e-4	1.17e-4	6.51e-5	3.29e-5	0.94
0.75	$e_q$	2.57e-2	1.72e-2	1.46e-2	6.37e-3	0.57
	$e_u$	2.60e-4	1.03e-4	7.22e-5	3.97e-5	0.83
(b) Results for case (b) with $\alpha$ fixed at 0.5, and varying $T$ .						
$T$	$\epsilon$	1.00e-2	5.00e-3	2.50e-3	1.00e-3	trend
	$\gamma$	4.00e-6	1.00e-6	2.50e-7	4.00e-8	
$10^{-5}$	$e_q$	9.06e-2	9.93e-2	9.82e-2	1.00e-1	—
	$e_u$	8.27e-4	7.79e-4	7.63e-4	7.61e-4	—
3.00	$e_q$	4.31e-2	2.42e-2	1.87e-2	1.48e-2	$\searrow$
	$e_u$	5.83e-4	2.43e-4	1.43e-4	6.71e-5	$\searrow$
5.00	$e_q$	3.66e-2	2.94e-2	1.84e-2	1.51e-2	$\searrow$
	$e_u$	4.46e-4	2.97e-4	1.16e-4	7.05e-5	$\searrow$

**Example 4.2.** Let  $\Omega$  be the unit disk centered at the origin  $(0, 0)$ ,  $q^\dagger(x, y) = \max(\min(1 + \frac{1}{4} \cos(\frac{\pi}{2}(x^2 + y^2)), \frac{319}{256}), \frac{71}{64})$ ,  $u_0(x, y) = 1 - x^2 - y^2$  and  $f \equiv 1$ . Fix  $T = 2.00$ , and  $\alpha = 0.25, 0.50$  and  $0.75$ .

Like before, the exact data is generated using a finer mesh and the discrete optimization problem is solved on coarser meshes. We observe a steady convergence for both  $e_q$  and  $e_u$ : the convergence rate of  $e_u$  is slightly slower than the first order; but the convergence rate of  $e_q$  is again much higher than theoretical one. Fig 2 shows exemplary reconstructions and the pointwise error  $e := q^\dagger - q_h^*$  at two noise levels  $\epsilon = 5.19\text{e-}3$  and  $8.75\text{e-}4$ .

Table 2: Numerical results for Example 4.2, initialized with a mesh with 209 elements and the total time step  $N = 10$ .

$\alpha$	$\epsilon$	1.00e-2	5.19e-3	2.14e-3	8.75e-4	rate
	$\gamma$	1.00e-6	2.69e-7	4.51e-8	7.65e-9	
0.25	$e_q$	2.40e-2	1.84e-2	9.37e-3	5.95e-3	0.56
	$e_u$	2.78e-3	1.24e-3	6.11e-4	2.14e-4	1.07
0.50	$e_q$	1.97e-2	1.43e-2	7.58e-3	4.52e-3	0.59
	$e_u$	8.31e-4	5.50e-4	2.02e-4	9.97e-5	0.85
0.75	$e_q$	2.20e-2	1.71e-2	9.69e-3	4.95e-3	0.59
	$e_u$	2.04e-3	1.03e-3	4.58e-4	1.97e-4	0.97

## A Approximation property of Lagrange interpolation

In this appendix, we prove the approximation property (3.3) and (3.4) of the Lagrange nodal interpolation operator  $\Pi_h$  in a convex smooth domain.




Figure 1: The numerical reconstructions for Example 4.1(a) at three noise levels. From top to bottom, the results are for  $\alpha = 0.25, 0.50$  and  $0.75$ .

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a convex and smooth domain. Let the polygon  $\Omega_h$ , the FEM space  $V_h$ , and the Langrange interpolation operator  $\Pi_h : C(\overline{\Omega}) \rightarrow V_h$  be defined in Section 3.1. Then the estimates (3.3) and (3.4) hold.*

*Proof.* To show the estimate (3.4), it suffices to show

$$\|v - \Pi_h v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Omega_h)} + h \|\nabla(v - \Pi_h v)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Omega_h)} \leq ch \|v\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}.$$

By the construction of the space  $V_h$ , we observe

$$\|\nabla \Pi_h v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Omega_h)} \leq \|\nabla \Pi_h v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_h)} \leq \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_h)} \leq \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Moreover, since  $\text{dist}(x, \Omega_h) \leq ch^2$  for all  $x \in \partial\Omega$ , from the estimate (A.1), we derive

$$\|v - \Pi_h v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Omega_h)} \leq \|v - \Pi_h v\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega_h)} + ch^2 \|\nabla(v - \Pi_h v)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \setminus \Omega_h)}$$




Figure 2: The numerical reconstructions for Example 4.2 with  $\epsilon = 5.19\text{e-}3$  (top two rows) and  $8.75\text{e-}4$  (bottom two rows) and the pointwise error  $e := q^\dagger - q_h^*$ . From left to right, the results are for  $\alpha = 0.25, 0.50$  and  $0.75$ .

$$\leq ch\|v\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_h)} + ch^2\|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega\setminus\Omega_h)} + ch^2\|\nabla \Pi_h v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega\setminus\Omega_h)} \leq ch\|v\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}.$$

Next, we prove the estimate (3.3). The standard trace lemma [9, Theorem 1.6.6] implies

$$\|v - \Pi_h v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_h)} + h\|\nabla(v - \Pi_h v)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_h)} \leq ch^{\frac{3}{2}}\|v\|_{H^2(\Omega_h)} \leq ch^{\frac{3}{2}}\|v\|_{H^2(\Omega)}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Since  $\text{dist}(x, \Omega_h) \leq ch^2$  for all  $x \in \partial\Omega$  and  $\Pi_h v$  is piecewise linear, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v - \Pi_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus\Omega_h)}^2 &\leq ch\|v - \Pi_h v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_h)}^2 + ch^2\|\nabla(v - \Pi_h v)\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus\Omega_h)}^2 \\ &\leq ch\|v - \Pi_h v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_h)}^2 + ch^3\|\nabla(v - \Pi_h v)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_h)}^2 + ch^4\|v\|_{H^2(\Omega\setminus\Omega_h)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then applying (A.2) gives  $\|v - \Pi_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega\setminus\Omega_h)} \leq ch^2\|v\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$ . The bound on  $\|\nabla(v - \Pi_h v)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$  follows similarly.  $\square$

## B Conjugate gradient method

Now we briefly describe the conjugate gradient algorithm [5] for minimizing the regularized problem. The main effort of the algorithm at each step is to compute the gradient  $J'_\gamma(q)$  of the objective  $J_\gamma$ . This can be achieved using the adjoint technique. Specifically, let  $v(q)$  solve the modified adjoint equation [11]

$$\begin{cases} {}^R\partial_{T+\tau}^\alpha v - \nabla \cdot (q\nabla v) = (u(q)(T) - z^\delta)\delta_T(t), & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T + \tau), \\ v = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T + \tau), \\ v(T + \tau) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Here  $\delta_T(\cdot)$  is Dirac function in  $t$  concentrated at  $t = T$ , and  ${}^R\partial_T^\alpha v$  is defined by  ${}^R\partial_T^\alpha v(t) = -\frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_t^T (s - t)^{-\alpha} u(s) ds$ . Then the  $L^2(\Omega)$  gradient  $J'_\gamma(q)$  is given by

$$J'_\gamma(q) = \nabla u(q)(T) \cdot \nabla v(q)(0) - \gamma \Delta q, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

and the descent direction  $g^k = -(-\Delta)^{-1} J'_\gamma(q^k)$ . The conjugate gradient direction  $d_k$  is given by

$$d_k = \beta_k d_{k-1} + g^k, \quad \text{with } \beta_k = \|g^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 / \|g^{k-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

with the convention  $\beta_0 = 0$ . To select the step size  $s$  at Step 6, we employ a simple strategy by linearizing the direct problem (1.1) along the direction  $d_k$ . The operator  $P_{\mathcal{A}}$  at line 7 denotes the pointwise projection into the set  $\mathcal{A}$ .

---

**Algorithm 1** Conjugate gradient method for problem (3.1)–(3.2).

---

- 1: Set the maximum iteration number  $K$ , and choose  $q^0$ .
  - 2: **for**  $k = 1, \dots, K$  **do**
  - 3:   Solve for  $u(q^k)$  the solution to problem (1.1) with  $q = q^k$ .
  - 4:   Solve for  $v(q^k)$  the solution to the modified adjoint problem (B.1) with  $q = q^k$ ;
  - 5:   Compute the gradient  $J'_\gamma(q^k)$  via (B.2), and the descent direction  $d_k$  via (B.3);
  - 6:   Compute the step length  $s_k$ ;
  - 7:   Update the diffusion coefficient by  $q^{k+1} = P_{\mathcal{A}}(q^k + s_k d_k)$ ;
  - 8:   Check the stopping criterion.
  - 9: **end for**
- 

## References

- [1] E. E. Adams and L. W. Gelhar. Field study of dispersion in a heterogeneous aquifer: 2. spatial moments analysis. *Water Resources Res.*, 28(12):3293–3307, 1992.

- [2] R. A. Adams and J. J. F. Fournier. *Sobolev Spaces*. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, second edition, 2003.
- [3] G. Alessandrini. A small collection of open problems. *Rend. Istit. Mat. Univ. Trieste*, 52:591–600, 2020.
- [4] G. Alessandrini and S. Vessella. Error estimates in an identification problem for a parabolic equation. *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. C (6)*, 4(1):183–203, 1985.
- [5] O. M. Alifanov, E. A. Artyukhin, and S. V. Rumyantsev. *Extreme Methods for Solving Ill-Posed Problems with Applications to Inverse Heat Transfer Problems*. Begell House, New York, 1995.
- [6] N. Y. Bakaev. Maximum norm resolvent estimates for elliptic finite element operators. *BIT*, 41(2):215–239, 2001.
- [7] N. Y. Bakaev, V. Thomée, and L. B. Wahlbin. Maximum-norm estimates for resolvents of elliptic finite element operators. *Math. Comp.*, 72(244):1597–1610, 2003.
- [8] A. Bonito, A. Cohen, R. DeVore, G. Petrova, and G. Welper. Diffusion coefficients estimation for elliptic partial differential equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 49(2):1570–1592, 2017.
- [9] S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott. *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*. Springer, New York, third edition, 2008.
- [10] J. Cheng, J. Nakagawa, M. Yamamoto, and T. Yamazaki. Uniqueness in an inverse problem for a one-dimensional fractional diffusion equation. *Inverse problems*, 25(11):115002, 2009.
- [11] X. Cheng, L. Yuan, and K. Liang. Inverse source problem for a distributed-order time fractional diffusion equation. *J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl.*, 28(1):17–32, 2020.
- [12] M. Crouzeix, S. Larsson, and V. Thomée. Resolvent estimates for elliptic finite element operators in one dimension. *Math. Comp.*, 63(207):121–140, 1994.
- [13] M. Crouzeix and V. Thomée. The stability in  $L_p$  and  $W_p^1$  of the  $L_2$ -projection onto finite element function spaces. *Math. Comp.*, 48(178):521–532, 1987.
- [14] H. Egger and B. Hofmann. Tikhonov regularization in Hilbert scales under conditional stability assumptions. *Inverse Problems*, 34(11):115015, 17, 2018.
- [15] H. W. Engl, M. Hanke, and A. Neubauer. *Regularization of Inverse Problems*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1996.
- [16] H. Fujita and T. Suzuki. Evolution problems. In *Handbook of Numerical Analysis, Vol. II*, Handb. Numer. Anal., II, pages 789–928. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991.
- [17] M. Giona and H. E. Roman. Fractional diffusion equation for transport phenomena in random media. *Phys. A: Stat. Mech. Appl.*, 185(1-4):87–97, 1992.
- [18] Y. Hatano and N. Hatano. Dispersive transport of ions in column experiments: An explanation of long-tailed profiles. *Water Resources Res.*, 34(5):1027–1033, 1998.
- [19] V. Isakov. Inverse parabolic problems with the final overdetermination. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 44(2):185–209, 1991.
- [20] K. Ito and B. Jin. *Inverse Problems: Tikhonov Theory and Algorithms*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2015.
- [21] B. Jin. *Fractional Differential Equations—an Approach via Fractional Derivatives*, volume 206 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, Cham, 2021.
- [22] B. Jin and Z. Zhou. Error analysis of finite element approximations of diffusion coefficient identification for elliptic and parabolic problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 59(1):119–142, 2021.

- [23] B. Jin and Z. Zhou. Numerical estimation of a diffusion coefficient in subdiffusion. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 59(2):1466–1496, 2021.
- [24] B. Jin and Z. Zhou. *Numerical Treatment and Analysis of Time-Fractional Evolution Equations*. Springer, Cham, 2023.
- [25] B. Jin and Z. Zhou. Recovery of a space-time-dependent diffusion coefficient in subdiffusion: stability, approximation and error analysis. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 43(4):2496–2531, 2023.
- [26] Y. L. Keung and J. Zou. Numerical identifications of parameters in parabolic systems. *Inverse Problems*, 14(1):83–100, 1998.
- [27] A. A. Kilbas, H. M. Srivastava, and J. J. Trujillo. *Theory and Applications of Fractional Differential Equations*. Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, 2006.
- [28] S. Larsson and V. Thomée. *Partial Differential Equations with Numerical Methods*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- [29] B. Li and W. Sun. Maximal  $L^p$  analysis of finite element solutions for parabolic equations with nonsmooth coefficients in convex polyhedra. *Math. Comp.*, 86(305):1071–1102, 2017.
- [30] G. Li, W. Gu, and X. Jia. Numerical inversions for space-dependent diffusion coefficient in the time fractional diffusion equation. *J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl.*, 20(3):339–366, 2012.
- [31] G. Li, D. Zhang, X. Jia, and M. Yamamoto. Simultaneous inversion for the space-dependent diffusion coefficient and the fractional order in the time-fractional diffusion equation. *Inverse Problems*, 29(6):065014, 36, 2013.
- [32] J.-L. Lions and E. Magenes. *Non-Homogeneous Boundary Value Problems and Applications. Vol. I*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 181. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972. Translated from the French by P. Kenneth.
- [33] C. Lubich. Discretized fractional calculus. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 17(3):704–719, 1986.
- [34] R. Metzler and J. Klafter. The random walk’s guide to anomalous diffusion: a fractional dynamics approach. *Phys. Rep.*, 339(1):1–77, 2000.
- [35] R. R. Nigmatullin. The realization of the generalized transfer equation in a medium with fractal geometry. *Physica Status Solidi (b)*, 133(1):425–430, 1986.
- [36] C. Palencia. Maximum norm analysis of completely discrete finite element methods for parabolic problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 33(4):1654–1668, 1996.
- [37] H. B. Stewart. Generation of analytic semigroups by strongly elliptic operators. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 199:141–162, 1974.
- [38] V. Thomée. *Galerkin Finite Element Methods for Parabolic Problems*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2006.
- [39] F. Triki. Coefficient identification in parabolic equations with final data. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 148:342–359, 2021.
- [40] L. Wang and J. Zou. Error estimates of finite element methods for parameter identifications in elliptic and parabolic systems. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 14(4):1641–1670, 2010.
- [41] M. Yamamoto and J. Zou. Simultaneous reconstruction of the initial temperature and heat radiative coefficient. *Inverse problems*, 17(4):1181, 2001.
- [42] Z. Zhang. An undetermined coefficient problem for a fractional diffusion equation. *Inverse Problems*, 32(1):015011, 21, 2016.
- [43] Z. Zhang, Z. Zhang, and Z. Zhou. Identification of potential in diffusion equations from terminal observation: analysis and discrete approximation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 60(5):2834–2865, 2022.