

HYBRID LOCALIZED SPECTRAL DECOMPOSITION FOR MULTISCALE PROBLEMS

ALEXANDRE L. MADUREIRA AND MARCUS SARKIS

ABSTRACT. We consider a finite element method for elliptic equations with heterogeneous and possibly high-contrast coefficients based on primal hybrid formulation. We assume minimal regularity of the solutions. A space decomposition as in FETI and BDCC induces an embarrassingly parallel pre-processing and leads to a final system of size independent of the coefficients. The resulting solution is in equilibrium, and all PDEs involved are elliptic. One of the problems in the pre-processing step is non-local but with exponentially decaying solutions, enabling a practical scheme where the basis functions have an extended, but still local, support.

To make the method robust with respect to high-contrast coefficients, we enrich the space solution via local eigenvalue problems, obtaining optimal a priori error estimate that mitigates the effect of having coefficients with different magnitudes. The technique developed is dimensional independent and easy to extend to other elliptic problems such as elasticity.

1. INTRODUCTION

¹ Consider the problem of finding the weak solution $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} -\operatorname{div} \mathcal{A} \nabla u &= g \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $d = 2$ or 3 for simplicity, and is an open bounded domain with polyhedral boundary $\partial\Omega$, the symmetric tensor $\mathcal{A} \in [L^\infty(\Omega)]_{\text{sym}}^{d \times d}$ is uniformly positive definite and bounded, and g is part of the given data.

It is hard to approximate such problem in its full generality using numerical methods, in particular because of the low regularity of the solution and its multiscale behavior. Most convergent proofs either assume extra regularity or special properties of the coefficients [2–4, 6, 7, 21, 22, 32, 37, 53, 61, 62, 68–70]. Some methods work even considering that the solution has low regularity [5, 24, 36, 52, 63] but are based on ideas that differ considerably from what we advocate here and do not cover in depth the high-contrast case.

Date: November 30, 2020.

¹Some of the methods analyzed here have been previously discussed in the 8-page proceeding paper [50].

As in many multiscale methods previously considered, our starting point is the decomposition of the solution space into *fine* and *coarse* spaces that are adapted to the problem of interest. The exact definition of some basis functions requires solving global problems, but, based on decaying properties, only local computations are required, although these are not restricted to a single element. It is interesting to notice that, although the formulation is based on hybridization, the final numerical solution is defined by a sequence of elliptic problems.

The idea of using exponential decay to localize global problems was already considered by the interesting approach developed under the name of *Localized Orthogonal Decomposition* (LOD) [45–47, 59] which are related to ideas of *Variational Multiscale Methods* [38, 39]. In their case, convergence follows from a special orthogonality property.

One difficulty that hinders the development of efficient methods is the presence of high-contrast coefficients [12, 14, 24, 31, 36, 63]. When LOD or VMS methods are considered, high-contrast coefficients might slow down the exponential decay of the solutions, making the method not so practical. Here in this paper, in the presence of rough coefficients, spectral techniques are employed to overcome such hurdle, and by solving local eigenvalue problems we define a space where the exponential decay of solutions is insensitive to high-contrast coefficients. Additionally, the spectral techniques remove macro-elements corner singularities that occur in LOD methods based on mixed finite elements. We note the proposal in [15] of generalized multiscale finite element methods based on eigenvalue problems inside the macro elements, with basis functions with support weakly dependent of the log of the contrast. Here, we propose eigenvalue problems based on edges of macro element removing the dependence of the contrast.

We now further detail the problem under consideration. For almost all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ let the positive constants a_{\min} and a_{\max} be such that

$$(2) \quad a_{\min}|\mathbf{v}|^2 \leq a_-(\mathbf{x})|\mathbf{v}|^2 \leq \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v} \leq a_+(\mathbf{x})|\mathbf{v}|^2 \leq a_{\max}|\mathbf{v}|^2 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $a_-(\mathbf{x})$ and $a_+(\mathbf{x})$ are the smallest and largest eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{x})$.

The remainder of the this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes a suitable primal hybrid formulation for the problem (1), which is followed in Section 3 by its a discrete formulation. A discrete space decomposition is introduced to transform the discrete saddle-point problem into a sequence of elliptic discrete problems. The analysis of the exponential decay of the multiscale basis function is considered in Section 3.2. To overcome the possible deterioration of the exponential decay for high-contrast coefficients, in Section 3.1 the *Localized Spectral Decomposition* (LSD) method is designed and fully analyzed. To allow an

efficient pre-processing numerical scheme, Section 4 discusses how to reduce the right-hand side space dimension without losing a target accuracy, and also develops $L^2(\Omega)$ a priori error estimates. Section 5 gives a global overview of the LSD *algorithm* proposed. Appendix A provides some mathematical tools and Appendix B refers to a notation library for the paper.

2. CONTINUOUS PROBLEM USING HYBRID FORMULATION

We start by recasting the continuous problem in a weak formulation that depends on a polyhedral regular mesh \mathcal{T}_H and let \mathcal{F}_H be the set of faces on \mathcal{T}_H — we assume that each element has diameter smaller than H , and at most N^f faces. Without loss of generality we adopt above and in the remainder of the text the terminology of three-dimensional domains, denoting for instance the boundaries of the elements by faces. For a given element $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H$ let $\partial\tau$ denote its boundary and \mathbf{n}^τ the unit size normal vector that points outward τ . We denote by \mathbf{n} the outward normal vector on $\partial\Omega$. Consider now the following spaces:

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} H^1(\mathcal{T}_H) &= \{v \in L^2(\Omega) : v|_\tau \in H^1(\tau), \tau \in \mathcal{T}_H\}, \\ \Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H) &= \left\{ \prod_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} \boldsymbol{\tau} \cdot \mathbf{n}^\tau|_{\partial\tau} : \boldsymbol{\tau} \in H(\text{div}; \Omega) \right\} \subsetneq \prod_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} H^{-1/2}(\partial\tau). \end{aligned}$$

For $w, v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$ and $\mu \in \Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H)$ define

$$(w, v)_{\mathcal{T}_H} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} \int_{\tau} wv \, d\mathbf{x}, \quad (\mu, v)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\mu, v)_{\partial\tau},$$

where $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\partial\tau}$ is the dual product involving $H^{-1/2}(\partial\tau)$ and $H^{1/2}(\partial\tau)$. Then

$$(\mu, v)_{\partial\tau} = \int_{\tau} \text{div } \boldsymbol{\sigma} v \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\tau} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \nabla v \, d\mathbf{x}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in H(\text{div}; \tau)$ such that $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}^\tau = \mu$. We also define

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{div}; \Omega)}^2 &= \|\mathcal{A}^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{0, \Omega}^2 + H^2 \|\text{div } \boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{0, \Omega}^2, \\ |v|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} \|\mathcal{A}^{1/2} \nabla v\|_{0, \tau}^2, \quad \|\mu\|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathcal{T}_H)} = \inf_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in H(\text{div}; \Omega) \\ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}^\tau = \mu \text{ on } \partial\tau, \tau \in \mathcal{T}_H}} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{div}; \Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

We use analogous definitions on subsets of \mathcal{T}_H , in particular when the subset consists of a single element τ (and in this case we write τ instead of $\{\tau\}$). We note that since a_{\min} is positive and a_{\max} is bounded, then $\|\cdot\|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{div}; \Omega)}$ and $|\cdot|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}$ are equivalent to the usual norms $\|\cdot\|_{H(\text{div}; \Omega)}$ and $|\cdot|_{H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}$.

In the primal hybrid formulation [60], $u \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H)$ are such that

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} (\mathcal{A} \nabla u, \nabla v)_{\mathcal{T}_H} - (\lambda, v)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= (g, v)_{\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H), \\ (\mu, u)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= 0 \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H). \end{aligned}$$

Following [60, Theorem 1], it is possible to show that the solution (u, λ) of (5) is such that $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ satisfies (1) in the weak sense and $\lambda = \mathcal{A} \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}^\tau$ for all elements τ .

In the spirit of the Multiscale Hybrid Methods [2, 32, 33, 53] and FETI methods [18, 26, 28, 44, 66], we consider the decomposition

$$H^1(\mathcal{T}_H) = \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H) \oplus \tilde{H}^1(\mathcal{T}_H),$$

where $\mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)$ is the space of piecewise constants, and $\tilde{H}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$ is its $L^2(\tau)$ orthogonal complement, i.e., the space of functions with zero average within each element $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H$:

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H) &= \{v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H) : v|_\tau \text{ is constant, } \tau \in \mathcal{T}_H\}, \\ \tilde{H}^1(\mathcal{T}_H) &= \{\tilde{v} \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H) : \int_\tau \tilde{v} d\mathbf{x} = 0, \tau \in \mathcal{T}_H\}, \quad \tilde{H}^1(\tau) = \{\tilde{v}|_\tau : \tilde{v} \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We then write $u = u^0 + \tilde{u}$, where $u^0 \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)$ and $\tilde{u} \in \tilde{H}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$, and find from (5) that

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} (\lambda, v^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= -(g, v^0)_{\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } v^0 \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H), \\ (\mu, u^0 + \tilde{u})_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= 0 \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H), \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$(8) \quad (\mathcal{A} \nabla \tilde{u}, \nabla \tilde{v})_{\mathcal{T}_H} = (\lambda, \tilde{v})_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} + (g, \tilde{v})_{\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{v} \in \tilde{H}^1(\mathcal{T}_H).$$

Let $T : \Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H) \rightarrow \tilde{H}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$ and $\tilde{T} : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \tilde{H}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$ be such that, for $\mu \in \Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H)$, $g \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H$,

$$(9) \quad \int_\tau \mathcal{A} \nabla(T\mu) \cdot \nabla \tilde{v} d\mathbf{x} = (\mu, \tilde{v})_{\partial\tau}, \quad \int_\tau \mathcal{A} \nabla(\tilde{T}g) \cdot \nabla \tilde{v} d\mathbf{x} = (g, \tilde{v})_\tau \quad \text{for all } \tilde{v} \in \tilde{H}^1(\mathcal{T}_H).$$

It follows from the above definition that $\tilde{T}g = 0$ if $g \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)$, and that, for all $\mu \in \Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H)$,

$$(10) \quad (\mu, \tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} \int_\tau \mathcal{A} \nabla(T\mu) \cdot \nabla(\tilde{T}g) d\mathbf{x} = (g, T\mu)_{\mathcal{T}_H}.$$

Note from (8) that $\tilde{u} = T\lambda + \tilde{T}g$, and substituting in (7), we have that $u^0 \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H)$ solve

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} (\mu, T\lambda)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} + (\mu, u^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= -(\mu, \tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H), \\ (\lambda, v^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= -(g, v^0)_{\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } v^0 \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H). \end{aligned}$$

We use these unknowns u^0 and λ to reconstruct u and the flux $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ as follows:

$$(12) \quad u = u^0 + \tilde{u} = u^0 + T\lambda + \tilde{T}g, \quad \boldsymbol{\sigma} = \mathcal{A} \nabla(T\lambda + \tilde{T}g).$$

Remark 1. *With the above definitions, it is possible to rewrite the energy norm as below:*

$$|T\lambda|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\lambda, T\lambda)_{\partial\tau} = \|\mathcal{A}^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}_\lambda\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad \text{where } \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\lambda = \mathcal{A}\nabla T\lambda.$$

3. HYBRID LOCALIZED FINITE ELEMENTS

In this section we decompose the space $\Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H)$ into a direct sum of subspaces, and then rewrite problem (11) into an equivalent form that is convenient for our purposes. Consider \mathcal{F}_h be a partition of the faces of elements in \mathcal{T}_H , refining them in the sense that every (coarse) face of the elements in \mathcal{T}_H can be written as a union of faces of \mathcal{F}_h . Let $\Lambda_h \subset \Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H)$ be the space of piecewise constants on \mathcal{F}_h , i.e.,

$$(13) \quad \Lambda_h = \left\{ \prod_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} \boldsymbol{\tau} \cdot \mathbf{n}^\tau|_{\partial\tau} : \boldsymbol{\tau} \in H(\text{div}; \Omega), \boldsymbol{\tau} \cdot \mathbf{n}^\tau|_{F_h} \text{ is constant on each face } F_h \in \mathcal{F}_h \right\} \subsetneq \Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H).$$

There is a delicate aspect regarding the space $\Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H)$, since their elements are *functionals*. In particular, an element $\mu_h \in \Lambda_h \subset \Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H)$ have “different values,” with opposite signs at each side of a face $F_h \in \mathcal{F}_h$, if F_h is not a subset of $\partial\Omega$. However, to simplify notation, we write $\mu_h|_{F_h}$ to indicate the restriction of μ_h to F_h .

To simplify the presentation we do not discretize $H^1(\tau)$ and $H(\text{div}; \tau)$ for $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H$. We remark that the method developed here extends easily when we discretize $H(\text{div}; \tau)$ by simplices or cubic elements with lowest order Raviart–Thomas spaces [71], or discretize $H^1(\tau)$ fine enough to resolve the heterogeneities of $\mathcal{A}(x)$ and to satisfy inf-sup conditions with respect to the space Λ_h .

We pose then the problem of finding $u_h^0 \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)$ and $\lambda_h \in \Lambda_h$ such that

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} (\mu_h, T\lambda_h)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} + (\mu_h, u_h^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= -(\mu_h, \tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \mu_h \in \Lambda_h, \\ (\lambda_h, v^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= -(g, v^0)_{\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } v^0 \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H). \end{aligned}$$

Since (14) is finite dimensional, it is well-posed if and only if it is injective. Assuming that $g = 0$, we easily gather that $\lambda_h = 0$ and $u_h^0 = 0$; see Lemma 10. We define our approximation as in (12), by

$$(15) \quad u_h = u_h^0 + T\lambda_h + \tilde{T}g, \quad \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h = \mathcal{A}\nabla(T\lambda_h + \tilde{T}g).$$

Simple substitutions yield that u_h, λ_h solve (5) if Λ is replaced by Λ_h , i.e.,

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} (\mathcal{A}\nabla u_h, \nabla v)_{\mathcal{T}_H} - (\lambda_h, v)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= (g, v)_{\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H), \\ (\mu_h, u_h)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= 0 \quad \text{for all } \mu_h \in \Lambda_h. \end{aligned}$$

We assume that Λ_h is chosen fine enough so that

$$(17) \quad |u - u_h|_{H^1_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = (\lambda - \lambda_h, T(\lambda - \lambda_h))_{\mathcal{T}_H} \leq \mathcal{H}^2 \|g\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

where \mathcal{H} represents a ‘‘target precision’’ the method should achieve. For instance, one could choose $\mathcal{H} = H$ or h^s , for $0 < s \leq 1$. It must be mentioned that λ_h is never computed, the main goal of this paper is to develop an efficient approximation of order \mathcal{H} for λ_h using $O(H^{-d})$ degrees of freedom.

Above, and in what follows, c denotes an arbitrary constant that does not depend on H , \mathcal{H} , h , \mathcal{A} , depending only on the shape regularity of the elements of \mathcal{T}_H .

Taking a further step, we decompose Λ_h into a space of ‘‘constants’’ plus ‘‘zero-average’’ functionals over the border of the elements of \mathcal{T}_H . For each $\tau_i \in \mathcal{T}_H$, let $\lambda_i^0 \in \Lambda_h$ such that

$$(18) \quad (\lambda_i^0, v)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = \int_{\partial\tau_i} \llbracket v \rrbracket d\mathbf{x} \quad \text{for all } v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H),$$

where $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ denotes the jump operator, defined as follows. For each face F belonging to the boundaries of two different elements τ_i, τ_j , fix \mathbf{n}_F as the constant unitary normal vector pointing either inward or outward. If \mathbf{n}_F is oriented from τ_i to τ_j , let $\llbracket v \rrbracket = v_i|_F - v_j|_F$, where $v_i = v|_{\tau_i}$, if not $\llbracket v \rrbracket = v_j|_F - v_i|_F$. As usual, if F belongs to $\partial\Omega$, then $\mathbf{n}_F = \mathbf{n}$ points outward and $\llbracket v \rrbracket = v$.

Remark 2. *It is also possible to define λ_i^0 explicitly, given $\tau_i \in \mathcal{T}_H$. Consider the face $F \in \mathcal{F}_H$. If F does not belong to $\partial\tau_i$ then $\lambda_i^0|_F = 0$. If it does, $\lambda_i^0|_{F \cap \partial\tau_i} = -\lambda_i^0|_{F \cap \partial\tau_i} = 1$ or -1 depending whether \mathbf{n}_F points outward or inward of τ_i , respectively. Note that $\lambda_i^0 \in \Lambda_h$.*

Let N be the number of elements of \mathcal{T}_H and

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} \Lambda^0 &= \text{span}\{\lambda_i^0 : i = 1, \dots, N\}, \\ \tilde{\Lambda}_h &= \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)^\perp = \{\mu_h \in \Lambda_h : (\mu_h, v^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = 0 \text{ for all } v^0 \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We can now decompose $\Lambda_h = \Lambda^0 \oplus \tilde{\Lambda}_h$ as follows [11]. Given $\mu_h \in \Lambda_h$, let $\mu^0 \in \Lambda^0$ and $\tilde{\mu}_h \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h$ such that

$$(\mu^0, v^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\mu_h, v^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}, \quad (\tilde{\mu}_h, v)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\mu_h, v)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} - (\mu^0, v)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H},$$

for all $v^0 \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)$ and $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$. Note that $\tilde{\mu}_h \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h$ since $(\tilde{\mu}_h, v^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\mu_h, v^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} - (\mu^0, v^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = 0$, and $\mu_h = \mu^0 + \tilde{\mu}_h$.

We also decompose $\tilde{\Lambda}_h = \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0 \oplus \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$. Basically, the elements of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^0$ are constants on each element face of \mathcal{T}_h but still with zero average over the element boundaries, and the elements

of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ have zero average on each face:

$$(20) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0 &= \{\mu_h \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h : \mu_h|_F \text{ is constant for each face } F \subset \partial\tau, \tau \in \mathcal{T}_H\}, \\ \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f &= \{\mu_h \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h : \int_F \mu_h ds = 0 \text{ for each face } F \subset \partial\tau, \tau \in \mathcal{T}_H\}. \end{aligned}$$

Considering again (14), from the decomposition for Λ_h , we gather that $\lambda_h = \lambda^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^f$. Thus, $u_h^0 \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)$, $\lambda^0 \in \Lambda^0$, $\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_h \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ solve

$$(21) \quad \begin{aligned} (\lambda^0, v^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= -(g, v^0)_{\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } v^0 \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H), \\ (\tilde{\mu}_h^f, T\lambda^0 + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^f)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= -(\tilde{\mu}_h^f, \tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^f \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f, \\ (\tilde{\mu}_h^0, T\lambda^0 + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^f)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= -(\tilde{\mu}_h^0, \tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^0 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0, \\ (\mu^0, T\lambda^0 + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^f)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} + (\mu^0, u_h^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= -(\mu^0, \tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \mu^0 \in \Lambda^0. \end{aligned}$$

It is possible to compute the unknowns step-by-step as we detail below. After that we discuss the well-posedness of each problem. The first equation of (21) determines λ^0 . To deal with the second equation, we define the operator $P : H^1(\mathcal{T}_H) \rightarrow \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ such that, for $w \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$,

$$(22) \quad (\tilde{\mu}_h^f, TPw)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\tilde{\mu}_h^f, w)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^f \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f,$$

i.e., $(\tilde{\mu}_h^f, (I - TP)w)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = 0$. Note that PT is an orthogonal projection from Λ_h to $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ since

$$(\tilde{\mu}_h^f, TPT\lambda_h)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\tilde{\mu}_h^f, T\lambda_h)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^f \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f.$$

The second equation of (21) becomes

$$(23) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_h^f = -P(T\lambda^0 + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 + \tilde{T}g).$$

Solving (22) efficiently is crucial for the good performance of the method, since it is the only large dimensional system of (21), in the sense that its size grows with order of h^{-d} . This issue is treated in Section 3.2 by taking into account the exponential decay of $PT(\lambda^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^0)$. It is also required to compute or to approximate $\tilde{T}g$ and $P\tilde{T}g$ efficiently. These issues are treated in Sections 3.2 and 4.

Now, we can write the third equation of (21) as

$$(24) \quad (\tilde{\mu}_h^0, T\tilde{\lambda}_h^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = -(\tilde{\mu}_h^0, \tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} - (\tilde{\mu}_h^0, T\lambda^0 - TP(T\lambda^0 + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 + \tilde{T}g))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}$$

and then

$$(\tilde{\mu}_h^0, T\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 - TPT\tilde{\lambda}_h^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = -(\tilde{\mu}_h^0, \tilde{T}g - TP\tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} - (\tilde{\mu}_h^0, T\lambda^0 - TPT\lambda^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}.$$

Since $PT\tilde{\mu}_h^0 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\tilde{\mu}_h^0 - PT\tilde{\mu}_h^0, (I - TP)T\tilde{\lambda}_h^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \\ &= -(\tilde{\mu}_h^0 - PT\tilde{\mu}_h^0, (I - TP)\tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} - (\tilde{\mu}_h^0 - PT\tilde{\mu}_h^0, (I - TP)T\lambda^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\tilde{\lambda}_h^0$ is computed from

$$(25) \quad \begin{aligned} ((I - PT)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, T(I - PT)\tilde{\lambda}_h^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= -((I - PT)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, (I - TP)\tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \\ &\quad - ((I - PT)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, T(I - PT)\lambda^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^0 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0, \end{aligned}$$

and $\tilde{\lambda}_h^f$ is recovered from (23).

We note that $((I - PT)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, TP\tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = 0$ since

$$(PT\tilde{\mu}_h^0, TP\tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (TPT\tilde{\mu}_h^0, P\tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (T\tilde{\mu}_h^0, P\tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\tilde{\mu}_h^0, TP\tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}$$

where we have used the symmetry of T , the definition of P and again the symmetry of T . This simplification in (25) is very important since $P\tilde{T}g$ cannot be pre-processed. Finally, the fourth equation of (21) yields u_h^0 , and the post-processing (15) recovers the main variables:

$$(26) \quad u_h = u_h^0 + T(\lambda^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^f) + \tilde{T}g, \quad \sigma_h = \mathcal{A}\nabla[T(\lambda^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^f) + \tilde{T}g],$$

yielding u_h and $\lambda_h = \lambda^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^f$, solutions of (14).

To show the existence and uniqueness of solutions for (21), we proceed by parts. The existence of solution for the first equation follows from Lemma 10. Solving the second equation is equivalent to (22), and such system is well-posed due to the coercivity of $(\cdot, T\cdot)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}$ on $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$; see [2, 32] and [27, 43, 66]. The same arguments hold for the third equation of (21), rewritten in (24). Another way to see this is to consider (25) with zero right hand side. From the coercivity of $(\cdot, T\cdot)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}$ on $\tilde{\Lambda}$ we have $(I - PT)\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 = 0$. But since $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^0 \cap \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f = \{0\}$, then $\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 = 0$. Finally, the fourth equation of (21) is again finite dimension, and if $(\mu^0, u_h^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = 0$ for all $\mu^0 \in \Lambda^0$, then, from Lemma 10, $u_h^0 = 0$.

Henceforth, we consider the following algorithm, based on (21):

- (i) **Find** $\lambda^0 \in \Lambda^0$ **from the first equation of** (21).
- (ii) **Find** $\tilde{\lambda}_h^0$ **from** (25).
- (iii) **Find** $\tilde{\lambda}_h^f$ **from** (23).
- (iv) **Find** u_h^0 **from the fourth equation of** (21).
- (v) **Compute** u_h **and** σ_h **from** (26).

Except for (ii), all steps above can be performed efficiently as the matrices involved are sparse and either local or independent of h . Solving (25) on the other hand involves

computing the h -dependent, global operator P , leading to a dense matrix in (25). From now on, we concentrate on approximating P so that (25) can be accurately and efficiently solved.

The key to approximate (25) is the exponential decay of Pw , as long as $w \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$ has local support. That allows replacing P by a semi-local operator P^j . That works fine for low-contrast coefficients and is the subject of Section 3.2. For high-contrast coefficients however, the exponential decay rate is smaller, and to circumvent that we consider in Section 3.1 a spectral decomposition of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$.

3.1. Decaying High-Contrast. It is essential for the performing method that the static condensation is done efficiently. The solutions of (22) decay exponentially fast if w has local support, so instead of solving the problems in the whole domain it would be reasonable to solve it locally using patches of elements. We note that the idea of performing global static condensation goes back to the Variational Multiscale Finite Element Method–VMS [38, 39]. Recently variations of the VMS and denoted by Localized Orthogonal Decomposition Methods–LOD were introduced and analyzed in [45–47, 59].

The main bottle-neck in dealing with high-contrast coefficients is that the decay is slower, albeit still exponential, forcing the use of larger patches. To deal with this situation, we use a subspace of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ to augment $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^0$ by selecting eigenfunctions associated to a proper generalized eigenvalue problem associated to each face of the mesh \mathcal{T}_H . We then remove the “slow decaying modes” from $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$. To define these generalized eigenvalue problems, we first introduce some theoretical tools for high-contrast coefficients.

For $K \in \mathcal{T}_H$, define $\mathcal{T}_0(K) = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{T}_1(K) = \{K\}$, and for $j = 1, 2, \dots$ let

$$(27) \quad \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) = \{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H : \bar{\tau} \cap \bar{\tau}_j \neq \emptyset \text{ for some } \tau_j \in \mathcal{T}_j(K)\}.$$

Let $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H$, F a face of $\partial\tau$, and let $F_\tau^c = \partial\tau \setminus F$. Define

$$(28) \quad \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\tau = \{\tilde{\mu}_h|_{\partial\tau} : \tilde{\mu}_h \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f\}, \quad \tilde{\Lambda}_h^F = \{\tilde{\mu}_h|_F : \tilde{\mu}_h \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f\}, \quad \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F_\tau^c} = \{\tilde{\mu}_h|_{F_\tau^c} : \tilde{\mu}_h \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f\}.$$

Abusing the notation, we identify $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\tau = \tilde{\Lambda}_h^F \times \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F_\tau^c}$, and for any given $\tilde{\mu}_h^\tau \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\tau$, denote $\tilde{\mu}_h^\tau = \{\tilde{\mu}_h^F, \tilde{\mu}_h^{F_\tau^c}\} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^F \times \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F_\tau^c}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} T_{FF}^\tau : \tilde{\Lambda}_h^F &\rightarrow (\tilde{\Lambda}_h^F)', & T_{F^c F}^\tau : \tilde{\Lambda}_h^F &\rightarrow (\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F_\tau^c})', \\ T_{FF^c}^\tau : \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F_\tau^c} &\rightarrow (\tilde{\Lambda}_h^F)', & T_{F^c F^c}^\tau : \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F_\tau^c} &\rightarrow (\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F_\tau^c})', \end{aligned}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\mu}_h, T\tilde{\mu}_h)_{\partial\tau} &=: (\{\tilde{\mu}_h^F, \tilde{\mu}_h^{F_\tau^c}\}, T\{\tilde{\mu}_h^F, \tilde{\mu}_h^{F_\tau^c}\})_{\partial\tau} \\ &= (\tilde{\mu}_h^F, T_{FF}^\tau \tilde{\mu}_h^F)_F + (\tilde{\mu}_h^F, T_{FF^c}^\tau \tilde{\mu}_h^{F_\tau^c})_F + (\tilde{\mu}_h^{F_\tau^c}, T_{F^c F}^\tau \tilde{\mu}_h^F)_{F_\tau^c} + (\tilde{\mu}_h^{F_\tau^c}, T_{F^c F^c}^\tau \tilde{\mu}_h^{F_\tau^c})_{F_\tau^c}. \end{aligned}$$

We remind that $T : \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\tau \rightarrow \tilde{H}^1(\tau)$, satisfies

$$(29) \quad (\mathcal{A} \nabla(T \tilde{\mu}_h^\tau), \nabla v)_\tau = (\tilde{\mu}_h^\tau, v)_{\partial\tau} \quad \text{for all } v \in \tilde{H}^1(\tau),$$

and $\mathcal{A} \nabla(T \tilde{\mu}_h^\tau) \cdot \mathbf{n}^\tau = \tilde{\mu}_h$ on $\partial\tau$.

It follows from the properties of T that both T_{FF}^τ and $T_{F^c F^c}^\tau$ are symmetric and positive definite matrices, and follow from Schur complement arguments that for any $\{\tilde{\mu}_h^F, \tilde{\mu}_h^{F^c}\} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\tau$

$$(30) \quad (\tilde{\mu}_h^F, \hat{T}_{FF}^\tau \tilde{\mu}_h^F)_F = \min_{\tilde{\nu}_h^{F^c} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F^c}} (\{\tilde{\mu}_h^F, \tilde{\nu}_h^{F^c}\}, T\{\tilde{\mu}_h^F, \tilde{\nu}_h^{F^c}\})_{\partial\tau} \\ \leq (\{\tilde{\mu}_h^F, \tilde{\mu}_h^{F^c}\}, T\{\tilde{\mu}_h^F, \tilde{\mu}_h^{F^c}\})_{\partial\tau} = (\tilde{\mu}_h^\tau, T \tilde{\mu}_h^\tau)_{\partial\tau},$$

where

$$\hat{T}_{FF}^\tau = T_{FF}^\tau - T_{FF^c}^\tau (T_{F^c F^c}^\tau)^{-1} T_{F^c F}^\tau,$$

and the minimum is attained at $\tilde{\nu}_h^{F^c} = -(T_{F^c F^c}^\tau)^{-1} T_{F^c F}^\tau \tilde{\mu}_h^F$. In what follows, to take into account high contrast coefficients, we consider the following generalized eigenvalue problem: Find eigenpairs $(\alpha_i^F, \tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F) \in (\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\Lambda}_h^F)$, where $\alpha_1^F \leq \alpha_2^F \leq \alpha_3^F, \dots$, such that

I) If the face F is shared by elements τ and τ' we solve

$$(31) \quad (\tilde{\nu}_h^F, (T_{FF}^\tau + T_{FF}^{\tau'}) \tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F)_F = \alpha_i^F (\tilde{\nu}_h^F, (\hat{T}_{FF}^\tau + \hat{T}_{FF}^{\tau'}) \tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F)_F \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\nu}_h^F \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^F.$$

II) If the face F is on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ we solve

$$(32) \quad (\tilde{\nu}_h^F, T_{FF}^\tau \tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F)_F = \alpha_i^F (\tilde{\nu}_h^F, \hat{T}_{FF}^\tau \tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F)_F, \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\nu}_h^F \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^F.$$

Let $\alpha_{\text{stab}} \geq 1$ be a user-defined constant, aiming to ‘‘control’’ the localization of basis functions. Roughly, the basis functions become more localized with smaller α_{stab} , in a sense that we make clear further on.

We decompose $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^F := \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F,\Delta} \oplus \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F,\Pi}$ as

$$(33) \quad \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F,\Delta} := \text{span}\{\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F : \alpha_i^F < \alpha_{\text{stab}}\}, \quad \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F,\Pi} := \text{span}\{\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F : \alpha_i^F \geq \alpha_{\text{stab}}\}.$$

The eigenfunctions $\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F$ are chosen to be orthonormal with respect to $(\cdot, (\hat{T}_{FF}^\tau + \hat{T}_{FF}^{\tau'}) \cdot)_F$ if F is an interior face, and with $(\cdot, \hat{T}_{FF}^\tau \cdot)_F$ if $F \subset \partial\Omega$.

Generalized eigenvalue problems of this type have appeared in the literature to make preconditioners robust with respect to coefficients [8, 13, 16, 40–42, 48, 49, 55, 65]. In particular [51] shows, for a similar problem, that $\alpha_i^F - 1$ decays exponentially to zero since, when h goes to zero, the operators \hat{T}_{FF} (related to $(H^{1/2}(F))'$) and T_{FF} (related to $(H_0^{1/2}(F))'$) differ only by a compact operator. We note that in [51] and also here, the generalized eigenvalue problems have a dual algebraic relation with the parallel sums first introduced in the classical article by [1]. Additionally, since there are no degrees of freedom at the vertices (in 2D) or

edges (in 3D), we do not have generalized eigenvalue problems associated to vertices (in 2D) or edges (in 3D), respectively.

In [29] is shown that the number of eigenvalues that are very large is related to the number of connected sub-regions on $\bar{\tau} \cup \bar{\tau}'$ with large coefficients surrounded by regions with small coefficients. Generalized eigenvalue problems also have been used on overlapping domain decomposition solvers [17, 25, 29, 64]. The design of robust discretizations with respect to coefficients using domain decomposition ideas have been studied in [34, 35, 37] assuming some regularity on the solution, and in [29] for a class of problems when the weighted Poincaré constant [20, 54, 56] is not large, otherwise the exponential decay of the multiscale functions deteriorates. See also [23, 24] where a priori error estimates are obtained in terms of spectral norms.

In the following result, we provide stability estimates for T acting on certain subspaces of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$, and some upper bounds for the generalized eigenvalues.

Lemma 1. *Let F be a face of $\partial\tau$ shared by the elements $\tau, \tau' \in \mathcal{T}_H$. If F is on the boundary $\partial\Omega$, assume $\tau' = \emptyset$. Then*

$$(34) \quad |T\{\tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta}, 0\}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)}^2 + |T\{\tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta}, 0\}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau')}^2 \leq \alpha_{\text{stab}} (|T\tilde{\mu}_h^\tau|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)}^2 + |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\tau'}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau')}^2)$$

for all $\tilde{\mu}_h^\tau = \{\tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta}, \tilde{\mu}_h^{F_c^\tau}\} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F,\Delta} \times \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F_c^\tau}$ and all $\tilde{\mu}_h^{\tau'} = \{\tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta}, \tilde{\mu}_h^{F_c^{\tau'}}\} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F,\Delta} \times \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F_c^{\tau'}}$. Also,

$$(35) \quad |T\{\tilde{\mu}_h^F, 0\}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)}^2 \leq \alpha |T\tilde{\mu}_h^\tau|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)}^2 \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^\tau = \{\tilde{\mu}_h^F, \tilde{\mu}_h^{F_c^\tau}\} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^F \times \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F_c^\tau},$$

where $\alpha = \gamma\kappa\beta_{H/h}^2$, the positive constant γ depends only on the shape regularity of \mathcal{T}_H , and

$$\beta_{H/h} = 1 + \log(H/h), \quad \kappa = \max_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} \kappa^\tau, \quad \kappa^\tau = \frac{a_{\max}^\tau}{a_{\min}^\tau}, \quad a_{\max}^\tau = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \tau} a_+(\mathbf{x}), \quad a_{\min}^\tau = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \tau} a_-(\mathbf{x}).$$

Finally, if α_i^F is an eigenvalue of $(I-II)$, then $1 \leq \alpha_i^F \leq \alpha$.

Proof. Assume that F is a face shared by $\tau, \tau' \in \mathcal{T}_H$. The case when F is on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ is similar. To show (34), let $\tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F,\Delta}$. Then the eigen-expansion $\tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta} = \sum_i c_i \tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F$

holds and $\alpha_j \leq \alpha_{\text{stab}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
|T\{\tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta}, 0\}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)}^2 + |T\{\tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta}, 0\}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau')}^2 &= (\tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta}, T_{FF}^\tau \tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta})_F + (\tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta}, T_{FF}^{\tau'} \tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta})_F \\
&= \sum_{i,j} c_i c_j ((\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^{F,\Delta}, T_{FF}^\tau \tilde{\mu}_{h,j}^{F,\Delta})_F + (\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^{F,\Delta}, T_{FF}^{\tau'} \tilde{\mu}_{h,j}^{F,\Delta})_F) \\
&= \sum_{i,j} c_i c_j \alpha_j ((\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^{F,\Delta}, \hat{T}_{FF}^\tau \tilde{\mu}_{h,j}^{F,\Delta})_F + (\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^{F,\Delta}, \hat{T}_{FF}^{\tau'} \tilde{\mu}_{h,j}^{F,\Delta})_F) \\
&= \sum_j c_j^2 \alpha_j ((\tilde{\mu}_{h,j}^{F,\Delta}, \hat{T}_{FF}^\tau \tilde{\mu}_{h,j}^{F,\Delta})_F + (\tilde{\mu}_{h,j}^{F,\Delta}, \hat{T}_{FF}^{\tau'} \tilde{\mu}_{h,j}^{F,\Delta})_F) \\
&\leq \alpha_{\text{stab}} ((\tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta}, \hat{T}_{FF}^\tau \tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta})_F + (\tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta}, \hat{T}_{FF}^{\tau'} \tilde{\mu}_h^{F,\Delta})_F) \leq \alpha_{\text{stab}} ((\tilde{\mu}_h^\tau, T \tilde{\mu}_h^\tau)_{\partial\tau} + (\tilde{\mu}_h^{\tau'}, T \tilde{\mu}_h^{\tau'})_{\partial\tau'}).
\end{aligned}$$

To show (35), let us first define $T_{\mathcal{I}}$ by (9) with $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{I}$, the identity tensor, that is, $T_{\mathcal{I}}$ is the classical harmonic extension with Neumann boundary condition. From Lemma 11 in the Appendix and a direct application of [71, Lemma 4.4] since both $\tilde{\mu}_F$ and $\tilde{\mu}_h^\tau$ have zero average on $\partial\tau$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|T\{\tilde{\mu}_h^F, 0\}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)}^2 &\leq \frac{1}{a_{\min}^\tau} |T_{\mathcal{I}}\{\tilde{\mu}_h^F, 0\}|_{H^1(\tau)}^2 \leq \frac{c_1}{a_{\min}^\tau} |\{\tilde{\mu}_h^F, 0\}|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\tau)}^2 \leq \frac{c_2}{a_{\min}^\tau} \beta_{H/h}^2 |\tilde{\mu}_h^\tau|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\tau)}^2 \\
&\leq \frac{\gamma}{a_{\min}^\tau} \beta_{H/h}^2 |T_{\mathcal{I}}\tilde{\mu}_h^\tau|_{H^1(\tau)}^2 \leq \gamma \frac{a_{\max}^\tau}{a_{\min}^\tau} \beta_{H/h}^2 |T\tilde{\mu}_h^\tau|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and then (35) follows.

Next, taking $\tilde{\nu}_h^{F^c} = \tilde{\mu}_h^{F^c}$ in (I-II), we gather from (30) that $\alpha_i^F \geq 1$. Finally, without loss of generality assume that (I) holds and τ and τ' share the face F . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_i^F (\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F, (\hat{T}_{FF}^\tau + \hat{T}_{FF}^{\tau'}) \tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F)_F &= (\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F, (T_{FF}^\tau + T_{FF}^{\tau'}) \tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F)_F \\
&= (\{\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F, 0\}, T\{\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F, 0\})_{\partial\tau} + (\{\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F, 0\}, T\{\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F, 0\})_{\partial\tau'} \\
&\leq \alpha \left(\min_{\tilde{\nu}_h^{F^c} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F^c}} (\{\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F, \tilde{\nu}_h^{F^c}\}, T\{\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F, \tilde{\nu}_h^{F^c}\})_{\partial\tau} + \min_{\tilde{\nu}_h^{F^c} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F^c}} (\{\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F, \tilde{\nu}_h^{F^c}\}, T\{\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F, \tilde{\nu}_h^{F^c}\})_{\partial\tau'} \right) \\
&= \alpha (\tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F, (\hat{T}_{FF}^\tau + \hat{T}_{FF}^{\tau'}) \tilde{\mu}_{h,i}^F)_F,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (30) and (35). Thus, $\alpha_i^F \leq \alpha$. \square

To define our LSD–Localized Spectral Decomposition Method for high-contrast coefficients, let us introduce the non-localized version. Let us first define

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi &= \{\tilde{\mu}_h \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f : \tilde{\mu}_h|_F \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F,\Pi} \text{ for all } F \in \partial\mathcal{T}_H\}, \\
\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Delta &= \{\tilde{\mu}_h \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f : \tilde{\mu}_h|_F \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F,\Delta} \text{ for all } F \in \partial\mathcal{T}_H\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

From Lemma 1, if $\alpha_{\text{stab}} > \alpha$ then $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi$ is empty.

We now follow the same procedure as in (21) except that now we replace $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^0$ by

$$(37) \quad \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{0,\Pi} := \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0 \oplus \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi,$$

replace $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ by $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Delta$ and replace P by $P^\Delta : H^1(\mathcal{T}_H) \rightarrow \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Delta$ such that, for $w \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$,

$$(38) \quad (\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta, TP^\Delta w)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta, w)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Delta.$$

The outcome is that $\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{0,\Pi}$ solves (cf. with (25))

$$\begin{aligned} ((I - P^\Delta T)\tilde{\mu}_h^{0,\Pi}, T(I - P^\Delta T)\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi})_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= -((I - P^\Delta T)\tilde{\mu}_h^{0,\Pi}, (I - TP^\Delta)\tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \\ &\quad - ((I - P^\Delta T)\tilde{\mu}_h^{0,\Pi}, T(I - P^\Delta T)\lambda^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^{0,\Pi} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{0,\Pi}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(39) \quad \begin{aligned} u_h &= u_h^0 + T\lambda_h + \tilde{T}g, & \tilde{\lambda}_h^\Delta &= -P^\Delta(T\lambda^0 + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi} + \tilde{T}g), \\ \lambda_h &= \lambda^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi} + \tilde{\lambda}_h^\Delta & &= (I - P^\Delta T)(\lambda^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi}) - P^\Delta \tilde{T}g. \end{aligned}$$

Note that u_h , u_h^0 and λ^0 in (39) are the same as in (26). Also, since the space $\tilde{\Lambda}_h = \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0 \oplus \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi \oplus \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Delta$ is a direct sum,

$$(40) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi} = \tilde{\lambda}_h^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^\Pi, \quad \tilde{\lambda}_h^\Pi + \tilde{\lambda}_h^\Delta = \tilde{\lambda}_h^f,$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_h^0$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_h^f$ are the same as in (26) and $\tilde{\lambda}_h^\Pi \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi$.

The lemma that follows provides a crucial estimate for solutions of (38), allowing the establishment of the exponential decay of solutions in Theorem 3.

Lemma 2. *Let $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$ such that $\text{supp } v \subset K$, and $\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta = P^\Delta v$. Then, for any integer $j \geq 1$,*

$$|T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2 \leq N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j-1}(K))}^2,$$

where N^f is the maximum number of faces that an element might have.

Proof. Choose $\tilde{v}_h^\Delta \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Delta$ defined by $\tilde{v}_h^\Delta|_F = 0$ if F is a face of an element of $\mathcal{T}_j(K)$ and $\tilde{v}_h^\Delta|_F = \tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_F$ otherwise. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2 &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K)} (\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta, T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta)_{\partial\tau} \\ &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{v}_h^\Delta, T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta)_{\partial\tau} - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)} (\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta, T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta)_{\partial\tau} + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)} (\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta - \tilde{v}_h^\Delta, T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta)_{\partial\tau} \\ &= -|T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K))}^2 + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)} (\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta - \tilde{v}_h^\Delta, T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta)_{\partial\tau}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{v}_h^\Delta, T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta)_{\partial\tau} = 0$ due to the definition of T and the local support of v .

For each $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)$ and let $\hat{\mathcal{F}}(\tau)$ be the set of faces of τ that are also faces of an element in $\mathcal{T}_j(K)$. Let $\tau'(F) \in \mathcal{T}_j(K)$ be the element sharing F .

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)} (\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta - \tilde{v}_h^\Delta, T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta)_{\partial\tau} &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)} \sum_{\hat{F} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}(\tau)} (\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta, T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta)_{\hat{F}} \\ &\leq \alpha_{\text{stab}} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)} \sum_{\hat{F} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}(\tau)} (|T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)}^2 + |T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau'(F))}^2) \\ &\leq N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}} (|T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2 + |T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_j(K))}^2) \end{aligned}$$

from (34), and since $\hat{\mathcal{F}}(\tau)$ contains at most N^f faces. \square

Remark 3. *The conclusion of Lemma 2 also holds if $\text{supp } v \subset \mathcal{T}_i(K)$ for some positive integer $i < j$.*

Theorem 3. *Let $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$ such that $\text{supp } v \subset K$, and $\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta = P^\Delta v$. Then, for any integer $j \geq 1$,*

$$|T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2 \leq e^{-\frac{[(j+1)/2]}{1+N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}}} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2,$$

where $[s]$ is the integer part of s , and N^f is the maximum number of faces that an element might have.

Proof. Using Lemma 2 we have

$$|T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2 \leq N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j-1}(K))}^2 - N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2,$$

and then

$$|T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2 \leq \frac{N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}}{1 + N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j-1}(K))}^2 \leq e^{-\frac{1}{1+N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}}} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j-1}(K))}^2.$$

The theorem then follows from recursive applications of Lemma 2. \square

We now localize Pv since it decays exponentially when v has local support. We consider two families of localizations. The first family $\tilde{P}^{\Delta,j}$ is based on elements in \mathcal{T}_H , and utilized to localize $\tilde{T}g$, while the second family $P^{\Delta,j}$ is based on faces of \mathcal{F}_H with the purpose to localize $T\lambda_h$.

Fixing $K \in \mathcal{T}_H$ and a positive integer j , let $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta,K,j} \subset \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Delta$ be the set of functions of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Delta$ vanishing on faces of elements in $\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)$, and $P^{\Delta,K,j} : H^1(\mathcal{T}_H) \rightarrow \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta,K,j}$ such that, for $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$,

$$(41) \quad (\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K,j}, TP^{\Delta,K,j}v)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K,j}, v_K)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K,j} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta,K,j},$$

where we let v_K to be equal to v on K and zero otherwise. We define then $\tilde{P}^{\Delta,j}$ by

$$(42) \quad \tilde{P}^{\Delta,j}v = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_H} P^{\Delta,K,j}v_K.$$

We next introduce a new localization, this time based on faces. For a fixed $F \in \mathcal{F}_H$ shared by elements τ_1^F and τ_2^F or shared by only one element τ^F , define $\mathcal{T}_0(F) = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{T}_1(F) = \{\tau_1^F, \tau_2^F\}$ or $\mathcal{T}_1(F) = \{\tau^F\}$, and for $j = 1, 2, \dots$ let

$$\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(F) = \{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H : \bar{\tau} \cap \bar{\tau}_j \neq \emptyset \text{ for some } \tau_j \in \mathcal{T}_j(F)\}.$$

Let $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta,F,j} \subset \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta}$ be the set of functions of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta}$ vanishing on faces of elements in $\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{F}_j(F)$. Let us decompose $\lambda_h \in \Lambda_h$ into $\lambda_h = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_H} \lambda_h^F$ where $\lambda_h^F = \lambda_h$ on the face F and zero everywhere else on \mathcal{F}_H . The operator $P^{\Delta,F,j}T : \Lambda_h \rightarrow \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta,F,j}$ is defined by

$$(43) \quad (\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta}, TP^{\Delta,F,j}T\lambda_h)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta}, T\lambda_h^F)_{\partial\tau_1^F} + (\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta}, T\lambda_h^F)_{\partial\tau_2^F} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta,F,j}.$$

We define then $P^{\Delta,j}T\lambda_h \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta}$ by

$$(44) \quad P^{\Delta,j}T\lambda_h = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_H} P^{\Delta,F,j}T\lambda_h.$$

The reason to introduce $P^{\Delta,j}T\lambda_h$ is because we could not prove that $\tilde{P}^{\Delta,j}T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta} = \tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta}$ and this property is fundamental on what follows.

Lemma 4. *Let $j \geq 1$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta}$ and $P^{\Delta,j}$ be defined as above. Then $P^{\Delta,j}T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta} = \tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta}$.*

Proof. Let $F \in \mathcal{F}_H$ and $\lambda_h^F = \lambda_h$ on F and zero everywhere else. Since

$$(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta}, T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,F})_{\partial\tau_1^F} + (\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta}, T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,F})_{\partial\tau_2^F} = (\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta}, T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,F})_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta},$$

and $\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,F} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta,F,j}$, then it follows from the existence and uniqueness of $P^{\Delta,F,j}T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta}$ that $P^{\Delta,F,j}T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,F} = \tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,F}$. Also, $P^{\Delta,F,j}T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta} = P^{\Delta,F,j}T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,F}$, and it then follows from (44) that

$$P^{\Delta,j}T\lambda_h^{\Delta} = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_H} P^{\Delta,F,j}T\lambda_h^{\Delta,F} = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_H} \lambda_h^{\Delta,F} = \lambda_h^{\Delta}.$$

□

In Lemmas 5 and 6 we estimate the accuracy of $\tilde{P}^{\Delta,j}$ and $P^{\Delta,j}$ with respect to P^{Δ} .

Lemma 5. *Consider $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$, and the operators P^{Δ} defined by (38) and $\tilde{P}^{\Delta,j}$ by (42). Then*

$$|T(P^{\Delta} - \tilde{P}^{\Delta,j})v|_{H_{\lambda}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \leq cj^{2d}N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}^2 e^{-\frac{[(j-1)/2]}{1+N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}}} |v|_{H_{\lambda}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2,$$

where N^f is the maximum number of faces of an arbitrary element.

Proof. For $K \in \mathcal{T}_H$, let $\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K} = P^{\Delta}v_K$ and $\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K,j} = P^{\Delta,j,K}v_K$, and

$$\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta} = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K,j}).$$

For each $K \in \mathcal{T}_H$, let $\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,K} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta}$ be defined by $\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,K}|_F = 0$ if F is a face of an element of $\mathcal{T}_j(K)$ and $\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,K}|_F = \tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta}|_F$, otherwise. We obtain

$$(45) \quad |T\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_H} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta} - \tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,K}, T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K,j}))_{\partial\tau} + (\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,K}, T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K,j}))_{\partial\tau}.$$

See that the second term of (45) vanishes since

$$\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,K}, T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K,j}))_{\partial\tau} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,K}, T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K})_{\partial\tau} = 0.$$

For the first term of (45) we use a direct application of (34), yielding

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta} - \tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,K}, T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K,j}))_{\partial\tau} \\ & \leq \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K)} |T(\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta} - \tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,K})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)} |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)} \\ & \leq N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}^{1/2} |T\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))} |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\nu_h^{\Delta,K,j} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta,K,j}$ be equal to zero on all faces of elements of $\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)$ and equal to $\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K}$ otherwise. Using Galerkin best approximation property, (34), and Theorem 3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2 & \leq |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \leq |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K} - \nu_h^{\Delta,K,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \\ & \leq N^{f^2} \alpha_{\text{stab}} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j-1}(K))}^2 \leq N^{f^2} \alpha_{\text{stab}} e^{-\frac{[(j-1)/2]}{1+N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}}} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We gather the above results to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |T\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 & \leq N^{f^2} \alpha_{\text{stab}} e^{-\frac{[(j-1)/2]}{2(1+N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}})}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_H} |T\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \\ & \leq c N^{f^2} \alpha_{\text{stab}} e^{-\frac{[(j-1)/2]}{2(1+N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}})}} j^d |T\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_H} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

We finally gather that

$$|T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = (\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K}, TPv_K)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K}, v_K)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = \int_K \mathcal{A} \nabla(T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K}) \cdot \nabla(v_K) \, dx$$

and from Cauchy–Schwarz, $|T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \leq |v_K|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(K)}$, we have

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_H} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \leq |v|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2.$$

□

Lemma 6. Consider $\lambda_h \in \Lambda_h$, and the operators P^Δ defined by (38) and $P^{\Delta,j}$ by (44). Then

$$|T(P^\Delta - P^{\Delta,j})T\lambda_h|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \leq c j^{2d} N^{f^4} \alpha_{\text{stab}}^2 e^{-\frac{[(j-1)/2]}{1+N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}}} |T\lambda_h|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2$$

Proof. For $F \in \partial\mathcal{T}_H$, let $\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F} = P^\Delta T\lambda_h^F$ and $\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F,j} = P^{\Delta,F,j} T\lambda_h^F$, and

$$\tilde{\psi}_h^\Delta = \sum_{F \in \partial\mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F,j}).$$

For each $F \in \partial\mathcal{T}_H$, let $\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,F} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Delta$ be defined by $\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,F}|_{\hat{F}} = 0$ if \hat{F} is a face of an element of $\mathcal{T}_j(F)$ and $\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,F}|_{\hat{F}} = \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F}|_{\hat{F}}$, otherwise. We obtain

$$(46) \quad |T\tilde{\psi}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} \sum_{F \in \partial\mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\psi}_h^\Delta - \tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,F}, T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F,j}))_{\partial\tau} + (\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,F}, T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F,j}))_{\partial\tau}.$$

See that the second term of (46) vanishes since

$$\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,F}, T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F,j}))_{\partial\tau} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,F}, T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F})_{\partial\tau} = 0.$$

For the first term of (46) we use a direct application of (34), yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\psi}_h^\Delta - \tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,F}, T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F,j}))_{\partial\tau} &\leq \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(F)} |T(\tilde{\psi}_h^\Delta - \tilde{\psi}_h^{\Delta,F})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)} |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)} \\ &\leq N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}^{1/2} |T\tilde{\psi}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(F))} |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(F))}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\nu_h^{\Delta,K,j} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta,K,j}$ be equal to zero on all faces of elements of $\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(F)$ and equal to $\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F}$ otherwise. Using Galerkin best approximation property, (34), and Theorem 3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2 &\leq |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \leq |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F} - \nu_h^{\Delta,F,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \\ &\leq N^{f^2} \alpha_{\text{stab}} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j-1}(K))}^2 \leq N^{f^2} \alpha_{\text{stab}} e^{-\frac{[(j-1)/2]}{1+N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}}} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We combine the above results to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |T\tilde{\psi}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 &\leq N^{f^2} \alpha_{\text{stab}} e^{-\frac{[(j-1)/2]}{2(1+N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}})}} \sum_{F \in \partial\mathcal{T}_H} |T\tilde{\psi}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(F))} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \\ &\leq c N^{f^2} \alpha_{\text{stab}} e^{-\frac{[(j-1)/2]}{2(1+N^f \alpha_{\text{stab}})}} j^d |T\tilde{\psi}_h^\Delta|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \left(\sum_{F \in \partial\mathcal{T}_H} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and finally gather that

$$|T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = (\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F}, TP^\Delta T\lambda_h^F)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F}, T\lambda_h^F)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = \int_{\tau_1 \cup \tau_2} \mathcal{A} \nabla(T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F}) \cdot \nabla(T\lambda_h^F) dx.$$

From Cauchy–Schwarz and $|T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \leq |T\lambda_h^F|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau_1 \cup \tau_2)}$ we have

$$\sum_{F \in \partial\mathcal{T}_H} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{\Delta,F}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \leq |T\lambda_h^F|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2.$$

□

The LSD method is defined by computing

$$(47) \quad u_h^{\text{LSD},j} = u_h^{\text{LSD},0,j} + T\lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j} + \tilde{T}g, \quad \lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j} = \lambda^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j} + \tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,j},$$

based on modifications of (25), (23), and the fourth equation of (21). Indeed, define $\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{0,\Pi}$ from

$$(48) \quad \begin{aligned} ((I - P^{\Delta,j}T)\tilde{\mu}_h^{0,\Pi}, T(I - P^{\Delta,j}T)\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j})_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= -((I - P^{\Delta,j}T)\tilde{\mu}_h^{0,\Pi}, (I - T\tilde{P}^{\Delta,j})\tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \\ &\quad - ((I - P^{\Delta,j}T)\tilde{\mu}_h^{0,\Pi}, T(I - P^{\Delta,j}T)\lambda^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^{0,\Pi} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{0,\Pi}, \end{aligned}$$

and compute $\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,j} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta}$ and $u_h^{0,\text{LSD},j} \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)$ from

$$(49) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,j} = -P^{\Delta,j}(T\lambda^0 + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j}) - \tilde{P}^{\Delta,j}\tilde{T}g,$$

$$(50) \quad (\mu^0, u_h^{0,\text{LSD},j})_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = -(\mu^0, T\lambda^0 + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j} + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,j})_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} - (\mu^0, \tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \mu^0 \in \Lambda^0.$$

The next result presents an error estimate of the method.

Theorem 7. *Let u_h be defined by (39) or one of its equivalent formulations (14), (26), and let $u_h^{\text{LSD},j}$ be as in (47) for $j \geq 1$. Then there exists a constant c such that*

$$|u_h - u_h^{\text{LSD},j}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \leq c j^{2d} \text{Nf}^4 \alpha_{\text{stab}}^2 e^{-\frac{[(j-1)/2]}{1+\text{Nf}\alpha_{\text{stab}}}} (|T\lambda_h|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 + |\tilde{T}g|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2).$$

Proof. It follows immediately from the definitions of u_h and $u_h^{\text{LSD},j}$ that

$$|u_h - u_h^{\text{LSD},j}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = |T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = ((\lambda_h - \lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j}), T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j}))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}.$$

Defining $\nu_h^{\text{LSD},j} = (I - P^{\Delta,j}T)\lambda^0 + (I - P^{\Delta,j}T)\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi} - \tilde{P}^{\Delta,j}\tilde{T}g$, let

$$(51) \quad \begin{aligned} ((\lambda_h - \lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j}), T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j}))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \\ = ((\lambda_h - \nu_h^{\text{LSD},j}), T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j}))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} + ((\nu_h^{\text{LSD},j} - \lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j}), T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j}))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\nu_h^{\text{LSD},j} - \lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j} = (I - P^{\Delta,j}T)(\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi} - \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j})$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 - \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{0,\Pi}$, then by using (48) and (21), respectively, the second term of the right-hand side of (51) vanishes. Indeed, from (47), (48), (49),

$$((I - P^{\Delta,j}T)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, T\lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j})_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = -((I - P^{\Delta,j}T)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, \tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^0 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{0,\Pi},$$

and from (21) we have

$$((I - P^{\Delta,j}T)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, T\lambda_h)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = -((I - P^{\Delta,j}T)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, \tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}$$

since $\tilde{\mu}_h^0 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0$ and $P^{\Delta,j}T\tilde{\mu}_h^0 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$. Thus, choosing $\tilde{\mu}_h^0 = \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi} - \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j}$,

$$((\nu_h^{\text{LSD},j} - \lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j}), T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j}))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = ((I - P^{\Delta,j}T)(\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi} - \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j}), T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j}))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = 0.$$

Next, it follows from (51) and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} |u_h - u_h^{\text{LSD},j}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 &= ((\lambda_h - \nu_h^{\text{LSD},j}), T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^{\text{LSD},j}))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\lambda_h - \nu_h^{\text{LSD},j}, u_h - u_h^{\text{LSD},j})_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \\ &\leq |T(\lambda_h - \nu_h^{\text{LSD},j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} |u_h - u_h^{\text{LSD},j}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}, \end{aligned}$$

since $\lambda_h - \nu_h^{\text{LSD},j} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h$. We now use Lemma 4 where $(P^{\Delta} - P^{\Delta,j})T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta} = 0$, and then Lemmas 5 and 6 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (52) \quad |u_h - u_h^{\text{LSD},j}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 &\leq (|T(P^{\Delta} - P^{\Delta,j})T\lambda_h|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 + |T(P^{\Delta} - \tilde{P}^{\Delta,j})\tilde{T}g|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2) \\ &\leq c_j^{2d} \text{N}^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}^2 e^{-\frac{[(j-1)/2]}{1+\text{N}^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}}} (|T\lambda_h|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 + |\tilde{T}g|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2). \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 4. We note that $|T\lambda_h|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \leq 2|u_h|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 + 2|\tilde{T}g|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2$, therefore

$$|T\lambda_h|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 + |\tilde{T}g|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \leq 4|u - u_h|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 + 4|u|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 + 3|\tilde{T}g|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2.$$

Defining global and local Poincaré constants to obtain

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_{G,P} |u|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}, \quad |\tilde{T}g|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \leq c_P H \|g\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

it follows from Theorem 7 that if j is taken such that

$$c_j^{2d} \text{N}^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}^2 e^{-\frac{[(j-1)/2]}{1+\text{N}^f \alpha_{\text{stab}}}} (4\mathcal{H}^2 + 4C_{P,G}^2 + 3c_p^2 H^2) \leq \mathcal{H}^2,$$

then, from (17),

$$|u - u_h^{\text{LSD},j}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \leq \mathcal{H} \|g\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

We obtain $j = \mathcal{O}(\text{N}^f \alpha_{\text{stab}} \log((C_{P,G} + c_p H)/\mathcal{H}))$. There is a light log dependence of j on the Poincaré constants $C_{P,G}$ and c_p .

Remark 5. We remark that the post-processed stress $\sigma_h^{\text{LSD},j} = \mathcal{A} \nabla [T(\lambda^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j} + \tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,j}) + \tilde{T}g]$ is in equilibrium, in the sense that

$$(53) \quad \int_{\tau} \sigma_h^{\text{LSD},j} \cdot \nabla v \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\tau} g v \, d\mathbf{x} \quad \text{for all } v \in H_0^1(\tau).$$

Indeed, given $v \in H_0^1(\tau)$, let v^0 be constant and $\tilde{v} \in H^1(\tau)$ with zero average such that $v = v^0 + \tilde{v}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\tau} gv \, d\mathbf{x} &= \int_{\tau} \mathcal{A} \nabla \tilde{T}g \cdot \nabla \tilde{v} \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\tau} gv^0 \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\tau} [\sigma_h^{LSD,j} - \mathcal{A} \nabla T(\lambda^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j} + \tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,j})] \cdot \nabla \tilde{v} \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\tau} gv^0 \, d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

However, $\tilde{v} = -v^0$ on $\partial\tau$ since $v \in H_0^1(\tau)$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{\tau} \mathcal{A} \nabla T(\lambda^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j} + \tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,j}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{v} \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\tau} gv^0 \, d\mathbf{x} &= -(\lambda^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j} + \tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,j}, \tilde{v})_{\partial\tau} + \int_{\tau} gv^0 \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= (\lambda^0 + \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j} + \tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,j}, v^0)_{\partial\tau} + \int_{\tau} gv^0 \, d\mathbf{x} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the final estimate follows from (7). Thus, (53) holds.

3.2. Decaying Low-Contrast. The method for the low-contrast case is a particular case of the high-contrast one by choosing

$$\alpha_{\text{stab}} > \alpha.$$

It then follows from Lemma 1 that $1 \leq \alpha_i^F \leq \alpha$ for all the local eigenvalues. Thus, $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Delta} = \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{\Pi} = \emptyset$ from (33) and (36).

Of course, the numerical scheme and the estimates developed in Section 3.1 hold. However, several simplifications are possible when the coefficients have low-contrast, leading to sharper estimates. We remark that in this case, our method is similar to that of [46], with some differences. First we consider that \tilde{T} can be nonzero. Also, our scheme is defined by a sequence of elliptic problems, avoiding the annoyance of saddle point systems. We had to reconsider the proofs, in our view simplifying some of them.

We now establish the following fundamental result for low-contrast. The technique used for the proof is extended in Lemma 2 for the high contrast case. The Lemma 2 is now replaced by the following.

Lemma 2'. *Let $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$ where $\text{supp } v \subset K \in \mathcal{T}_H$, and $\tilde{\mu}_h^f = Pv$. Then, for any integer $j \geq 1$,*

$$|T\tilde{\mu}_h^f|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2 \leq N^f \alpha |T\tilde{\mu}_h^f|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K))}^2,$$

where α is defined in Lemma 1.

Proof. Choose $\tilde{\nu}_h^f \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ defined by $\tilde{\nu}_h^f|_F = 0$ if F is a face of an element of $\mathcal{T}_j(K)$ and $\tilde{\nu}_h^f|_F = \tilde{\mu}_h^f|_F$ otherwise. We obtain, as in the proof of Lemma 2,

$$|T\tilde{\mu}_h^f|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2 \leq \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)} (\tilde{\mu}_h^f - \tilde{\nu}_h^f, T\tilde{\mu}_h^f)_{\partial\tau}.$$

Next, let F be a face of an element $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)$ and let χ_F be the characteristic function of F being identically equal to one on F and zero on $\partial\tau \setminus F$. See that $\chi_F(\tilde{\mu}_h^f - \tilde{\nu}_h^f)$ vanishes for faces F on $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)$ that are not shared by an element in $\mathcal{T}_j(K)$ however it is not known a priori how many. Let $\hat{\mathcal{F}}(\tau)$ be the set of faces of τ that are also faces of an element in $\mathcal{T}_j(K)$. For the shared faces, $\chi_F(\tilde{\mu}_h^f - \tilde{\nu}_h^f) = \chi_F\tilde{\mu}_h^f$. Since it is possible that all d faces of τ share faces of elements of \mathcal{T}_j , hence, the following bound always holds:

$$|T(\tilde{\mu}_h^f - \tilde{\nu}_h^f)|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)}^2 \leq \sum_{F \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}(\tau)} |T(\chi_F\tilde{\mu}_h^f)|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)}^2.$$

It follows from (35) that $|T(\chi_F\tilde{\mu}_h^f)|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)}^2 \leq \alpha|T\tilde{\mu}_h^f|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)}^2$ and the final result holds since $\hat{\mathcal{F}}(\tau)$ has at most N^f faces. \square

Comparing Lemma 2' with Lemma 2, we see that the right hand side of the estimate depends on $\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)$ instead of $\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K) \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j-1}(K)$. This more local versions is possible due to (35) instead of (34). The result of Lemma 2' allows a better decay estimate with respect to j in Theorem 3' compared to that of Theorem 3 (cf. also Theorems 7' and 7). However, in general, the estimate is not as good since α increases with the local contrast; see Lemma 1.

Remark 6. *Even though the proof of Lemma 2' concentrates the analysis to hybrid discretization and $u_h \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$, the analysis also extends easily to mixed finite element discretizations or to finite dimensional approximations of $H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$. We also could have used the flux approach for the proof, that is, let $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^F = \mathcal{A} \nabla T\mu_F$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathcal{I}}^F = \nabla T_1\mu_F$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \mathcal{A} \nabla T\tilde{\mu}_h^f$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathcal{I}} = \nabla T_{\mathcal{I}}\tilde{\mu}_h^f$, or the corresponding ones arising from the lower-order Raviart–Thomas case (associate to a triangulation $\mathcal{T}_h(\tau)$). We would have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{A}^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}^F\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2 &\leq \frac{1}{a_{min}^\tau} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathcal{I}}^F\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2 \leq \frac{c_1}{a_{min}^\tau} |\mu_F|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\tau)}^2 \leq \frac{c_2}{a_{min}^\tau} \beta_{H/h}^2 |\tilde{\mu}_h^f|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\tau)}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\gamma}{a_{min}^\tau} \beta_{H/h}^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathcal{I}}\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2 \leq \gamma \frac{a_{max}^\tau}{a_{min}^\tau} \beta_{H/h}^2 \|\mathcal{A}^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 7. *We note that [71, Lemma 4.4] is based on $H^{-1/2}(\tau)$ norms and therefore it holds whether we use $H^1(\tau)$, $H(\text{div}; \tau)$ or corresponding discretized versions inside τ . We point out that the h in $\log(H/h)$ is related to the space Λ_h , not to the interior. The α in*

this paper is estimated as the worst case scenario, that is, using Lemma 11 and [71, Lemma 4.4]. For particular cases of coefficients \mathcal{A} and discretizations for $H^1(\tau)$ or $H(\text{div}; \tau)$, sharper estimates for α can be derived using weighted and generalized Poincaré inequalities techniques and partitions of unity that conform with \mathcal{A} in order to avoid large energies on the interior extensions [9, 10, 20, 30, 43, 54, 56–59, 63].

Following a similar analysis, we next replace Theorem 3 with α_{stab} instead of α .

Theorem 3’. *Let $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$ such that $\text{supp } v \subset K$, and $\tilde{\mu}_h^f = Pv$. Then, for any integer $j \geq 1$,*

$$(54) \quad |T\tilde{\mu}_h^f|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2 \leq e^{-\frac{j}{1+N^f\alpha}} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^f|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2.$$

Proof. If $\tilde{\mu}_h^f = Pv$ where $\text{supp } v \subset K$, then using Lemma 2’ we have

$$|T\tilde{\mu}_h^f|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2 \leq N^f\alpha |T\tilde{\mu}_h^f|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K))}^2 - N^f\alpha |T\tilde{\mu}_h^f|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2$$

and then

$$|T\tilde{\mu}_h^f|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2 \leq \frac{N^f\alpha}{1 + N^f\alpha} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^f|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K))}^2 \leq e^{-\frac{1}{1+N^f\alpha}} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^f|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K))}^2,$$

and the theorem follows. \square

Note that if the coefficient \mathcal{A} is nearly constant and isotropic inside each element τ , the exponential decay will depend only mildly on $\beta_{H/h}$. However, the decay of Pv deteriorates as the contrast κ gets larger. That is the reason for developing a contrast-free method in Section 3.1, where we consider high contrast and eliminate the α dependence.

For each fixed element K and positive integer j , let $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{f,K,j} \subset \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ be the set of functions of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ which vanish on faces of elements in $\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)$. We introduce the operator $P^{K,j} : H^1(\mathcal{T}_H) \rightarrow \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{f,K,j}$ such that, for $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$,

$$(55) \quad (\tilde{\mu}_h^f, TP^{K,j}v)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\tilde{\mu}_h^f, v_K)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^f \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{f,K,j}.$$

where v_K is equal to v on K and zero otherwise. For $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$ we define then $\tilde{P}^jTv \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ by

$$(56) \quad \tilde{P}^jv = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_H} P^{K,j}v_K.$$

We next introduce a localization based on faces. Let $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{f,F,j} \subset \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ be the set of functions of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ vanishing on faces of elements in $\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{F}_j(F)$. Let us decompose $\lambda_h \in \Lambda_h$ into $\lambda_h =$

$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_H} \lambda_h^F$ where $\lambda_h^F = \lambda_h$ on the face F and zero everywhere else on \mathcal{F}_H . The operator $P^{F,j} : \Lambda_h \rightarrow \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{f,F,j}$ is defined as

$$(57) \quad (\tilde{\mu}_h^f, TP^{F,j}T\lambda_h)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\tilde{\mu}_h^f, T\lambda_h^F)_{\partial\tau_1^F} + (\tilde{\mu}_h^f, T\lambda_h^F)_{\partial\tau_2^F} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^f \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{f,F,j}.$$

We define then $P^jT\lambda_h \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ by

$$(58) \quad P^jT\lambda_h = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_H} P^{F,j}T\lambda_h.$$

Lemma 5'. Consider $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$, and the operators P defined by (22) and \tilde{P}^j by (56). Then

$$(59) \quad |T(P - \tilde{P}^j)v|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \leq cN^{4,2d}j^2\alpha^2e^{-\frac{j-2}{1+N^f\alpha}}|v|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2.$$

Proof. We follow similar arguments of the proof of Lemma 5. For $K \in \mathcal{T}_H$, let $\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K} = Pv_K$ and $\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K,j} = P^{K,j}v_K$, and $\tilde{\psi}_h^f = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K,j})$. Let $\tilde{\psi}_h^{f,K} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ be defined by $\tilde{\psi}_h^{f,K}|_F = 0$ if F is a face of an element of $\mathcal{T}_j(K)$ and $\tilde{\psi}_h^{f,K}|_F = \tilde{\psi}_h^f|_F$, otherwise. Then

$$(60) \quad |T\tilde{\psi}_h^f|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_H} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\psi}_h^f - \tilde{\psi}_h^{f,K}, T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K,j}))_{\partial\tau} + (\tilde{\psi}_h^{f,K}, T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K,j}))_{\partial\tau}.$$

See that the second term of (60) vanishes since

$$\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\psi}_h^{f,K}, T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K,j}))_{\partial\tau} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\psi}_h^{f,K}, T\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K})_{\partial\tau} = 0.$$

For the first term of (60), as in Lemma 2' we use (35), yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} (\tilde{\psi}_h^f - \tilde{\psi}_h^{f,K}, T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K,j}))_{\partial\tau} &\leq \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K)} |T(\tilde{\psi}_h^f - \tilde{\psi}_h^{f,K})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)} |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)} \\ &\leq N^f\alpha^{1/2} |T\tilde{\psi}_h^f|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))} |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\nu_h^{f,K,j} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{f,K,j}$ be equal to zero on all faces of elements of $\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_j(K)$ and equal to $\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K}$ otherwise. Using Galerkin best approximation property, (35) and Theorem 3' we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))}^2 &\leq |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K} - \tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \leq |T(\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K} - \nu_h^{f,K,j})|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \\ &\leq N^{f2}\alpha |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H \setminus \mathcal{T}_{j-1}(K))}^2 \leq N^{f2}\alpha e^{-\frac{j-2}{1+N^f\alpha}} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We gather the above results to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |T\tilde{\psi}_h^{f,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 &\leq N^{f2}\alpha e^{-\frac{j-2}{2(1+N^f\alpha)}} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_H} |T\tilde{\psi}_h^{f,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(K))} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \\ &\leq N^{f2}\alpha e^{-\frac{j-2}{2(1+N^f\alpha)}} c_j^d |T\tilde{\psi}_h^{f,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_H} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

We finally gather that

$$|T\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = (\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K}, TPv_K)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K}, v_K)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = \int_K \mathcal{A} \nabla(T\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K}) \cdot \nabla(v_K) d\mathbf{x}$$

and from Cauchy–Schwarz, $|T\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \leq |v_K|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(K)}$, we have

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_H} |T\tilde{\mu}_h^{f,K}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \leq |v|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2.$$

□

Remark 8. *Using arguments as in the proof of Lemma 6 with estimate (35), we obtain*

$$(61) \quad |T(P - P^j)T\lambda_h|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \leq c j^{2d} \alpha^2 e^{-\frac{j-2}{1+N^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}} |T\lambda_h|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2$$

for $\lambda_h \in \Lambda_h$.

Recall from (23) and (26) that $u_h = u_h^0 + T\lambda_h + \tilde{T}g$, where

$$\lambda_h = (I - PT)\lambda^0 + (I - PT)\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 - P\tilde{T}g.$$

Motivated by the above decaying results and (21)–(25), we define the solution of the localized algorithm by

$$(62) \quad u_h^j = u_h^{0,j} + T\lambda_h^j + \tilde{T}g, \quad \text{where } \lambda_h^j = (I - P^jT)\lambda^0 + (I - P^jT)\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,j} - \tilde{P}^j\tilde{T}g,$$

and λ^0 solves the first equation of (21). Also, similarly to (48), $\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,j} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0$ solves

$$(63) \quad \begin{aligned} ((I - P^jT)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, T(I - P^jT)\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,j})_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} &= -((I - P^jT)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, (I - T\tilde{P}^j)\tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \\ &\quad - ((I - P^jT)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, T(I - P^jT)\lambda^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^0 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly to the fourth equation of (21), we obtain $u_h^{0,j}$ by

$$(\mu^0, u_h^{0,j})_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = -(\mu^0, T\lambda^0 + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,j} + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{f,j})_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} - (\mu^0, \tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \mu^0 \in \Lambda^0.$$

and as in (23) we have defined

$$(64) \quad \tilde{\lambda}_h^{f,j} = -P^j(T\lambda^0 + T\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,j}) - \tilde{P}^j\tilde{T}g.$$

A fundamental difference between our discretization and some multiscale mixed finite elements methods such as the ones in [4, 45] is that here we avoid solving a saddle point problem by computing $\lambda_h^{0,j} = \lambda^0$ using the first equation of (21), while there the equation (63) is extended to the whole space $\Lambda^0 \oplus \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0$ and solved together with an equation for $u_h^{0,j}$.

A new version of Theorem 7 follows.

Theorem 7'. *Let u_h and u_h^j be defined by (26) and (62). Then there exists a constant c such that*

$$|u_h - u_h^j|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \leq c j^{2d} N^{f^4} \alpha^2 e^{-\frac{j-2}{1+N^f \alpha}} (|T\lambda_h|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 + |\tilde{T}g|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2).$$

Proof. It follows immediately from the definitions of u_h and u_h^j that

$$|u_h - u_h^j|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = |T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^j)|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = ((\lambda_h - \lambda_h^j), T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^j))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}.$$

Defining $\nu_h^j = (I - P^j T)\lambda^0 + (I - P^j T)\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 - \tilde{P}^j \tilde{T}g$, it follows that

$$(65) \quad ((\lambda_h - \lambda_h^j), T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^j))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = ((\lambda_h - \nu_h^j), T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^j))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} + ((\nu_h^j - \lambda_h^j), T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^j))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}.$$

Since $\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 - \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,j} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0$ and $\nu_h^j - \lambda_h^j = (I - P^j T)(\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 - \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,j}) \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h$ then by using (63) and (21), respectively, the second term of the right-hand side of (65) vanishes. Indeed, from (62), (63), (64),

$$((I - P^j T)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, T\lambda_h^j)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = -((I - P^j T)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, \tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\mu}_h^0 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0,$$

and from (21) we have

$$((I - P^j T)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, T\lambda_h)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = -((I - P^j T)\tilde{\mu}_h^0, \tilde{T}g)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}$$

since $\tilde{\mu}_h^0 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0$ and $P^j T\tilde{\mu}_h^0 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$. Thus, choosing $\tilde{\mu}_h^0 = \tilde{\lambda}_h^0 - \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,j}$,

$$((\nu_h^j - \lambda_h^j), T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^j))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = ((I - P^j T)(\tilde{\lambda}_h^0 - \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,j}), T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^j))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = 0.$$

By Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have from (65) that

$$\begin{aligned} |u_h - u_h^j|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 &= ((\lambda_h - \nu_h^j), T(\lambda_h - \lambda_h^j))_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\lambda_h - \nu_h^j, u_h - u_h^j)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} \\ &\leq |T(\lambda_h - \nu_h^j)|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} |u_h - u_h^j|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}, \end{aligned}$$

since $\lambda_h - \nu_h^j \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h$. We now use Lemma 4 where $(P - P^j)T\tilde{\lambda}_h^f = 0$ and then Lemma 5' and Remark 8 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |u_h - u_h^j|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 &\leq |T(\lambda_h - \nu_h^j)|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = |T(P - P^j)T\lambda_h + T(P - \tilde{P}^j)\tilde{T}g|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 \\ &\leq c j^{2d} N^{f^4} \alpha^2 e^{-\frac{j-2}{1+N^f \alpha}} (|T\lambda_h|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 + |\tilde{T}g|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2). \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 9. *Arguing as remark 4, we gather from Theorem 7' that if j is taken such that*

$$c j^{2d} N^{f^4} \alpha^2 e^{-\frac{j-2}{1+N^f \alpha}} (4\mathcal{H}^2 + 4C_{P,G}^2 + 3c_p^2 H^2) \leq \mathcal{H}^2,$$

then,

$$|u - u_h^{LSD,j}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \leq \mathcal{H} \|g\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

We obtain $j = \mathcal{O}(N^{\text{f}^2} \kappa \log((C_{\text{P,G}} + c_{\text{p}}H)/\mathcal{H}) \log^2(H/h))$, and j is large not only in the high contrast case (κ large), but also if $h \ll H$.

4. FINITE DIMENSIONAL RIGHT-HAND SIDE

We first note that the solution given by the four steps of (21) is exact, in the sense that it solves (14) as well, and hence the solution error vanishes. To compute $\tilde{\lambda}_h^0$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\text{f}}$ is necessary to compute $P\tilde{T}g$, and that hampers efficiency, and it is the only part of algorithm that does not permit exact pre-processing. In order to allow pre-processing, we replace the space $L^2(\Omega)$, which contains g , by a finite dimensional one in such a way that the solution error is $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$. If v_i is a basis function of this finite dimensional space, $P\tilde{T}v_i$ can be built in advance as a pre-processing computation. To guarantee order \mathcal{H} convergence in the energy norm, it is enough to define the basis using elementwise generalized eigenvalues problems. For each $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H$, find eigenpairs $(\sigma_i, v_i) \in (\mathbb{R}, H^1(\tau))$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$(66) \quad \int_{\tau} \mathcal{A} \nabla v_j \cdot \nabla w \, d\mathbf{x} = \sigma_j \int_{\tau} v_j w \, d\mathbf{x} \quad \text{for all } w \in H^1(\tau)$$

Let us order the eigenvalues $0 = \sigma_1 < \sigma_2 \leq \sigma_3 \leq \dots$. First note that $\sigma_i \rightarrow \infty$ since $H^1(\tau)$ is compactly embedded in $L^2(\tau)$ and \mathcal{A} is uniformly positive definite and bounded. Define J_{τ} as the minimum integer such that $\sigma_{J_{\tau}+1}^{-1} \leq c\mathcal{H}^2$, where \mathcal{H} was introduced in (17), and define the space

$$\mathcal{F}_{J_{\tau}} = \text{span}\{v_1, \dots, v_{J_{\tau}}\}.$$

Then we obtain

$$v \in \mathcal{F}_{J_{\tau}}^{\perp L^2} \implies \int_{\tau} v^2 \, d\mathbf{x} \leq c\mathcal{H}^2 \int_{\tau} \mathcal{A} \nabla v \cdot \nabla v \, d\mathbf{x}.$$

Indeed, let $v \in \mathcal{F}_{J_{\tau}}^{\perp L^2}$. Using the fact that the eigenfunctions $v_{\tau,i}$ define an orthogonal basis in both $H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)$ semi-norm and $L^2(\tau)$ norm, we can write $v = \sum_{i \geq J_{\tau}+1} \alpha_i v_i$, and then

$$(67) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\tau} v^2 \, d\mathbf{x} &= \sum_{i \geq J_{\tau}+1} \alpha_i^2 \int_{\tau} v_i^2 \, d\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i \geq J_{\tau}+1} \alpha_i^2 \sigma_i^{-2} \int_{\tau} \mathcal{A} \nabla v_i \cdot \nabla v_i \, d\mathbf{x} \leq \\ &\sigma_{J_{\tau}+1}^{-2} \sum_{i \geq J_{\tau}+1} \alpha_i^2 \int_{\tau} \mathcal{A} \nabla v_i \cdot \nabla v_i \, d\mathbf{x} \leq (c\mathcal{H}^2)^2 \sum_{i \geq J_{\tau}+1} \alpha_i^2 \int_{\tau} \mathcal{A} \nabla v_i \cdot \nabla v_i \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= (c\mathcal{H}^2)^2 \int_{\tau} \mathcal{A} \nabla v \cdot \nabla v \, d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{F}_{J_{\tau}}$ is nonempty since it contains the constant function.

Let

$$(68) \quad \mathcal{F}_J = \{v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H) : v|_{\tau} \in \mathcal{F}_{J_{\tau}}\},$$

and let $\Pi_J g \in \mathcal{F}_J$ be the $L^2(\Omega)$ orthogonal projection of g on \mathcal{F}_J . Note that the computation of $\tilde{T}g$ becomes now trivial since, on each element τ and $i > 1$, $\tilde{T}v_i = \sigma_i^{-1}v_i$. This follows from the second equation of (9), and (66).

Lemma 8. *Consider $u_J \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ weakly satisfying $-\operatorname{div} \mathcal{A} \nabla u_J = \Pi_J g$. Then*

$$|u - u_J|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \leq c_{\mathcal{H}} \|g\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = c_{\mathcal{H}} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Note that the error $e_J = u - u_J \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ weakly satisfies $-\operatorname{div} \mathcal{A} \nabla e_J = (I - \Pi_J)g$, and note that u_J does not necessary belong to \mathcal{F}_J . We have

$$\begin{aligned} |e_J|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 &= (\mathcal{A} \nabla e_J, \nabla e_J)_{\mathcal{T}_H} = ((I - \Pi_J)g, e_J)_{\mathcal{T}_H} = ((I - \Pi_J)g, e_J - \Pi_J e_J)_{\mathcal{T}_H} \\ &\leq \|g\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|e_J - \Pi_J e_J\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c_{\mathcal{H}} \|g\|_{L^2(\Omega)} |e_J - \Pi_J e_J|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \leq c_{\mathcal{H}} \|g\|_{L^2(\Omega)} |e_J|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\Pi_J e_J \in \mathcal{F}_J$, and Π_J is an orthogonal projection in both $L^2(\Omega)$ and $H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$ inner-products. \square

Remark 10. *The above arguments can be extended to the discrete case u_h and $u_{h,J}$ solutions of (21) with g and $\Pi_J g$ as the forcing term, respectively. Denote $\delta g = (I - \Pi_J)g$. The solution error $e_{h,J} = u_h - u_{h,J}$ can be decomposed as $e_{h,J} = e_{h,J}^0 + T\delta\lambda_h + \tilde{T}\delta g$, where $\delta\lambda_h = (I - PT)\delta\tilde{\lambda}^0 - P\tilde{T}\delta g$. Note that $\delta\lambda^0$ vanishes. Using the definitions of T and \tilde{T} , and (14) we obtain*

$$(69) \quad |e_{h,J}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = |T\delta\lambda_h + \tilde{T}\delta g|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}^2 = (e_{h,J}, \delta g)_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c_{\mathcal{H}} |e_{h,J}|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \|g\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Remark 11. *On Section 3 we have assumed g as the right-hand side. In case we use $\Pi_J g$ as the right hand side, we obtain the same bound since $\|\Pi_J g\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|g\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Thus, if $u_{h,J}^j$ is the localized solution of the method with $\Pi_J g$ as the right-hand side, then*

$$\|u_h - u_{h,J}^j\|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} \leq \|u_h - u_{h,J}\|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)} + \|u_{h,J} - u_{h,J}^j\|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)},$$

and a final estimate follows from (69) and Theorem 7' or 7 with g replaced by $\Pi_J g$.

5. ALGORITHMS

In this section we give a practical guideline on how both “versions” of the method could be implemented. We highlight the high-contrast case here, commenting on simplifications for the general case afterwards. Also, for simplicity, we consider $g \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)$, i.e., g is piecewise constant; then $\tilde{T}g = 0$. If that is not the case and a pre-processing as described in Section 4 is desired, then compute $\Pi_J g$ as described in Lemma 8, and proceed with the computation replacing g by $\Pi_J g$. This is particularly useful in the case of multiple right-hand sides.

Algorithm 1 Localized Spectral Decomposition–LSD

- 1: Generate a partition \mathcal{T}_H of Ω , and a partition \mathcal{F}_h of the faces of elements in \mathcal{T}_H
 - 2: Define bases for $\mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)$, Λ^0 , $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^0$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$
 - 3: Build approximations T_h for T in (9), and compute the action of T_h on all basis functions of Λ^0 , $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^0$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$
 - 4: Compute generalized eigenvalues from (31), (32). Define $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Delta$ by (36), and set $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{0,\Pi} = \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0 \oplus \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi$
 - 5: Find $\lambda^0 \in \Lambda^0$ from the first equation of (21)
 - 6: Compute the action of $P^{\Delta,j}T$ for all basis functions of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{0,\Pi}$ from (44)
 - 7: Find $\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{0,\Pi}$ from (48)
 - 8: Find $\tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,j} \in \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Delta$ from (49)
 - 9: Find $u_h^{0,\text{LSD},j} \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)$ from (50)
 - 10: Compute $u_h^{\text{LSD},j}$ and $\sigma_h^{\text{LSD},j}$ from (47) and Remark 5
-

Remark 12. *The low-contrast case is a particular and simpler instance of the high-contrast one, and can be chosen by picking $\alpha_{\text{stab}} > \alpha$. If however one is only interested in low-contrast cases then there is no need to compute eigenvalues, and the algorithm is simpler. Indeed, Step 4 of Algorithm 1 is no longer necessary, and one should set $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Delta = \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$, $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{0,\Pi} = \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0$. Also, in Step 6 let $P^{\Delta,j} = P^j$ from (58).*

Note that the sub-problems in Algorithm 1 are either local, semi-local or global. The problems of Step 3 are local and can be solved in parallel. The eigenvalue problems of Step 4 are also local since each face F belongs to at most two elements. The computation of λ^0 in Step 5 involves a system that depends on H only. Step 6 requires solving semi-local problems, since it involves solving systems (43), posed on local patches of elements. The computation of Step 7 requires solving a global problem with dimension of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{0,\Pi}$. There are no matrix inversions for the remaining steps of the algorithm, since all the operators were pre-computed at this point.

6. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

In this section we consider numerical tests for three different problems. The first one involves a smooth problem with analytical solution, allowing exact error computation. In the second and third problem this is no longer possible, and we compare solutions obtained by the LOD or LSD methods with the exact discrete solution obtained by solving the whole system (14). In the tests that follow (with the exception of the high-contrast channel Test 6.4), we use the following notation and data:




FIGURE 1. Mesh and submesh employed in all numerical tests. We consider $H = 1/8$ and $h \approx H/9$.

- $H = 1/8$ is the maximum size of macro-elements
- $N_e = 8$ is the dimension of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^F$ on each face F
- $h \approx H/9$ is the maximum size of micro-elements.

For all tests, $\Omega = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$, and the corresponding mesh and sub-mesh with the above parameters is as in Figure 1 (the exception is Table 7).

The acronym NLOD stands for *Non-local Orthogonal Decomposition* and corresponds to the case where the system (14) is fully solved and no localization techniques are applied.

6.1. Exact Solution available. Let $\mathcal{A}(x, y) = 1$ and the exact solution $u(x, y) = x(x - 1)y(y - 1)$. For such kernel, we display in Figure 2 the energy decay of Theorem 3 if $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi$ is empty. The various relative errors with respect to the exact solution u in the energy norm follow in Tables 1 and 2. In Table 1 we compute the relative error for the NLOD, and for the the LOD with various localizations. As expected the error increases as one reduces the patch size where basis functions are computed. For Table 2 the analysis is more complex since both the localization *and* α_{stab} play important roles. For a small $\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.1$ the dimension of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi$ (=1260) becomes large compared the the total dimension of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ (=2624) and the errors are small and comparable to the NLOD. For a large $\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 3.0$ however, the dimension of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi$ is relatively small (=634), that is, about two eigenvectors per each macro-element edge, and the errors are similar to the NLOD if the patches are not too small. These two eigenvectors




FIGURE 2. Test 6.1: Log-plot of energy decay in the case of empty $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi$.

	Relative energy error
NLOD	0.0025
LOD (J=3)	0.0095
LOD (J=2)	0.0385
LOD (J=1)	0.0683

TABLE 1. Test 6.1: LOD version with no localization (NLOD), and different localizations (J=1,2,3).

	Relative energy error	
	$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.1$ ($\dim \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi = 1260$)	$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 3.0$ ($\dim \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi = 634$)
LSD (J=3)	0.0025	0.0025
LSD (J=2)	0.0025	0.0026
LSD (J=1)	0.0035	0.0229

TABLE 2. Test 6.1: Relative energy error for LSD versions with different localizations (J=1,2,3). The total dimension of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ is 2624.

are responsible for eliminating the singularities at the macro-elements corners that are found in the LOD method; see the two dominating eigenvalues in Figure 3.

For $J = 1$, there is a larger error, but the method is better than LOD (cf. Table 1).

6.2. Oscillatory kernel. Consider $f = 1$ and the oscillatory kernel

$$\mathcal{A}(x, y) = \frac{\beta - \alpha}{2} (1 + \sin(2\pi x/\epsilon) \sin(2\pi y/\epsilon)) + \alpha,$$

where $\alpha = 0.01$, $\beta = 10$ and $\epsilon = 1/16$.




FIGURE 3. Test 6.2: Eigenvalues for problems I, II.

	LOD	iLOD
J=3	0.0092	0.0040
J=2	0.0499	0.0071
J=1	0.0778	0.0186

TABLE 3. Test 6.2: Relative energy error for LOD and LOD with incomplete LU versions, with different localizations (J=1,2,3)

	$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.1$	$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 3.0$		$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.1$	$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 3.0$
LSD (J=3)	5.7080e-11	2.7741e-06	iLSD (J=3)	1.1617e-08	1.7775e-05
LSD (J=2)	3.2054e-06	7.0387e-04	iLSD (J=2)	2.3785e-07	8.1785e-05
LSD (J=1)	0.0032	0.0291	iLSD (J=1)	7.6412e-06	6.1034e-04

TABLE 4. Test 6.2: Relative energy error for LSD versions with different localizations (J=1,2,3) using LSD and LSD with incomplete LU

In this example, we also test the use of *incomplete LU Decomposition* of j -th fill-in to invert P^Δ instead of using $P^{\Delta,j}$ in the case of LSD, and to invert P instead of using P^j in the case of LOD. We name the above schemes *iLSD* and *iLOD*. As we show below, the results are encouraging, albeit the lack of theory.

The eigenvalues of problems I (equation (31)) for a fixed edge are plotted in Figure 3. Note the clustering of the eigenvalues at 1. Then, Table 3 presents the results for the LOD and iLOD (with incomplete LU) versions, with different localization levels. Finally, Tables 4 present results for LSD and iLSD (with incomplete LU) with different values of α_{stab} .




FIGURE 4. Test 6.3. Top: Exact solution and LOD with $J = 1$. Bottom: LSD solutions with $J = 1$ and $\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 3.0$ and $\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.7$.

6.3. **Beanbag test.** Consider $\Omega = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$, constant $f = 1$ and

$$\mathcal{A}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |x - 0.5| + |y - 0.25| < 0.3, \\ a_{\min} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

A refined exact solution and some approximations are depicted in Figure 4, for $a_{\min} = 10^{-4}$. The figure on the left displays the “exact” solution, computed by solving (14) without localization. On the top right we display the LOD solution for $J = 1$. On the bottom figures, two solutions for $J = 1$ are shown. On the left figure $\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 3.0$, and on the right one $\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.7$. Next, Table 5 compares the approximation results using LOD for different localization levels, and Table 6 presents the results for LSD with different localization levels and different α_{stab} . The final Table 7 is also interesting, the number of eigenvalues per macroelement edge is not very sensitive with respect to N_e , it depends more on the coefficient \mathcal{A} .

	Relative energy error
LOD (J=3)	0.0616
LOD (J=2)	0.1008
LOD (J=1)	0.5289

TABLE 5. Test 6.3: LOD version with different localizations (J=1,2,3)

	Relative energy error		
	$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.1$ (dim $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi = 1250$)	$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.7$ (dim $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi = 734$)	$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 3.0$ (dim $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi = 620$)
LSD (J=3)	1.4477e-10	1.1590e-06	1.1479e-05
LSD (J=2)	5.4182e-05	0.0022	0.0130
LSD (J=1)	0.0274	0.0346	0.2211

TABLE 6. Test 6.3: Relative energy error for LSD versions with different localizations (J=1,2,3). The total dimension of the eigenspace $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ is 2624

H	N_e	dim $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$	Relative energy error (dim $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi$)		
			$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.1$	$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.7$	$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 3.0$
1/8	8	2624	5.4182e-05 (1250)	0.0022 (734)	0.0130 (620)
1/8	4	1312	3.4172e-05 (975)	0.0063 (644)	0.0072 (445)
1/16	8	10720	1.1227e-05 (5170)	0.0016 (2948)	0.0111 (2604)
1/16	4	5360	3.0627e-05 (3991)	0.0011 (2663)	0.0122 (1869)

TABLE 7. Test 6.3: Test with $H = 1/16$ and $J = 2$. Relative energy error for LSD versions with localization $J = 2$.

Finally, Figure 5 shows how the relative energy error behaves with LOD (in blue) and LSD (in red) as the contrast ($=1/a_{\min}$) increases.

6.4. High-contrast channels. In this example we consider the macro element diameter $H = 1/8$, the second-level mesh diameter $h = H/17$, and the dimension of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^F$ on each face F as $N_e = 16$. For a given positive number a , the kernel \mathcal{A} is defined by

$$(70) \quad \mathcal{A}(x, y) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } \|(x - 0.5, y - 0.5)\|_2 < 1/40 \text{ and } y > 1/2, \\ a & \text{if } |y - 0.6| < 1/40, \\ a^{-1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The level curve defined by \mathcal{A} is depicted in Figure 6.

We consider a sequence of problems defined by increasing values of a . Note that the contrast $\kappa = a^2$. We test the performance of the LOD and LSD methods, presenting the




FIGURE 5. Test 6.3: Relative energy error with respect to contrast ($=1/a_{\min}$). The blue curve corresponds to LOD with $J = 1$ and the red curve is related to the LSD method with $J = 1$ and $\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.7$




FIGURE 6. The left figure displays the coarse mesh and the level curve of the coefficient (70). Basically, the geometry is defined by a channel that bifurcates, forming an “island.” The coefficient is equal to a^{-1} inside the channel and a on the “plateau” and in the island. On the right we present the “exact” solution for $a = 10^{7/2}$. The total contrast is 10^7 .

results in Table 8. We test the LOD method with $J = 4$, and it is clear that the performance deteriorates as the contrast increases. For the LSD method, we set $J = 2$ and present results for various values of α_{stab} . We remark that that the full system (14) has 5248 equations, while the LSD final systems range from 1151 ($\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.3$) to 632 equations ($\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 3.0$).

APPENDIX A. AUXILIARY RESULTS

Lemma 9. *Let λ_i^0 defined as in (18). Then $\{\lambda_i^0\}_{i=1}^N$ are linearly independent.*

		Relative energy error				
		LOD ($J = 4$)	LSD ($J = 2$)			
a	κ		$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.3$	$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.4$	$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 1.5$	$\alpha_{\text{stab}} = 3.0$
10^2	10^4	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.025
$10^{5/2}$	10^5	0.005	0.004	0.005	0.006	0.021
10^3	10^6	0.015	0.002	0.005	0.005	0.021
$10^{7/2}$	10^7	0.042	0.003	0.006	0.006	0.021

TABLE 8. Test 6.4: First and second columns give the value of a and the contrast κ ; third column lists relative energy error with LOD method with $J = 4$; Fourth-seventh columns shows relative energy error with LSD scheme with $J = 2$ and increasing values of α_{stab} .

Proof. Assume that there exist constants β_1, \dots, β_N such that $\sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i \lambda_i^0 = 0$. Consider τ_i, τ_j two adjacent triangles sharing a face F and let $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$ with support in τ_i such that $v|_{F'} = 0$ if $F' \neq F$ and $\int_F v = 1$. Then

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i (\lambda_i^0, v)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = \beta_i + \beta_j.$$

If $F \subset \partial\Omega \cap \partial\tau_i$ then using the same arguments we have $\beta_i = 0$. Then $\beta_i = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$ by using the connectivity of \mathcal{T}_H . \square

Lemma 10. *Let $\mu \in \Lambda_h$. Then the problem of finding μ^0 such that $(\mu^0, v^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H} = (\mu, v^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}$ for all $v^0 \in \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)$ is well-posed.*

Proof. Since we are dealing with finite dimensional spaces, it is enough to prove that the $N \times N$ matrix with components $(\lambda_i^0, v_j^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}$ is non-singular, where v_i^0 is the characteristic function of the element τ_i . Note that it follows from the definition of λ_i^0 that

$$|(\lambda_i^0, v_j^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}| = \begin{cases} |\partial\tau_i| & \text{if } i = j, \\ |\partial\tau_i \cap \partial\tau_j| & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and then the matrix is diagonally dominant. Consider now an element τ_i such that $\partial\tau_i \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$. Then,

$$|(\lambda_i^0, v_i^0)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}| = |\partial\tau_i| > \sum_{j \neq i} |\partial\tau_i \cap \partial\tau_j|.$$

We note that the matrix is irreducible since given any two distinct elements τ_i and τ_k , there exists a path of adjacent faces connecting τ_i to τ_k . Then the matrix is irreducibly diagonally dominant, and from [67, Theorem 1.11], it is non-singular. \square

Lemma 11. *Let $\mu \in \Lambda_h$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H$, assume that (2) holds, and denote by $T_{\mathcal{I}}$ the harmonic extension defined by (9) replacing \mathcal{A} by the identity operator. It follows then that*

$$\frac{1}{a_{\min}^\tau} |T_{\mathcal{I}}\mu|_{H^1(\tau)}^2 \geq |T\mu|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\tau)}^2 \geq \frac{1}{a_{\max}^\tau} |T_{\mathcal{I}}\mu|_{H^1(\tau)}^2.$$

Proof. First note that, for any non-vanishing λ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{v \in \tilde{H}^1(\tau)} \frac{1}{2} (\lambda \nabla v, \nabla v)_\tau - (\mu, v)_{\partial\tau} &= \inf_{v \in \tilde{H}^1(\tau)} \frac{1}{2} (\lambda \nabla \lambda^{-1}v, \nabla \lambda^{-1}v)_\tau - (\mu, \lambda^{-1}v)_{\partial\tau} \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda} \inf_{v \in \tilde{H}^1(\tau)} \frac{1}{2} (\nabla v, \nabla v)_\tau - (\mu, v)_{\partial\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2} (\mu, T\mu)_{\partial\tau} &= \inf_{v \in \tilde{H}^1(\tau)} \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{A} \nabla v, \nabla v)_\tau - (\mu, v)_{\partial\tau} \leq \inf_{v \in \tilde{H}^1(\tau)} a_{\max}^\tau \frac{1}{2} (\nabla v, \nabla v)_\tau - (\mu, v)_{\partial\tau} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2a_{\max}^\tau} (\mu, T_{\mathcal{I}}\mu)_{\partial\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$-\frac{1}{2} (\mu, T\mu)_{\partial\tau} \geq \inf_{v \in \tilde{H}^1(\tau)} a_{\min}^\tau \frac{1}{2} (\nabla v, \nabla v)_\tau - (\mu, v)_{\partial\tau} = -\frac{1}{2a_{\min}^\tau} (\mu, T_{\mathcal{I}}\mu)_{\partial\tau}.$$

□

APPENDIX B. NOTATIONS

Inner products, dualities and norms:

- $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathcal{T}_H}$, $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\partial\mathcal{T}_H}$, $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\partial\tau}$: inner and duality products; Section 3.1
- $\|\cdot\|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{div};\Omega)}$, $\|\cdot\|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)}$, $\|\cdot\|_{H_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1/2}(\mathcal{T}_H)}$: equation (4)

Functional spaces:

- $H^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$ and $\Lambda(\mathcal{T}_H)$: piecewise H^1 functions, and trace of $H(\text{div};\Omega)$ functions; equation (3)
- $\mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)$, $\tilde{H}^1(\mathcal{T}_H)$, $\tilde{H}^1(\tau)$: piecewise constants and zero average functions; equation (6)
- \mathcal{F}_J : eigenspace generating a finite dimension space for the right-hand side; equation (68)
- Λ_h : piecewise constants on the refined skeleton; equation (13)
- Λ^0 : constants flux traces on element boundaries; equation (19)
- $\tilde{\Lambda}_h = \mathbb{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_H)^\perp$: zero average flux traces on element boundaries; equation (19)
- $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^0$: constants on faces with zero average on element boundaries; equation (20)
- $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$: zero average flux traces on faces; equation (20)

- $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{f,\tau,j} \subset \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$: equation (55)
- $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^\tau$: local space; equation (28)
- $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^F, \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F^c}$: restriction of $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$ to F, F^c ; equation (28)
- $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F,\Delta}, \tilde{\Lambda}_h^{F,\Pi}, \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi, \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Delta$: spectral spaces; equations (33), (36)
- $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^{0,\Pi} := \tilde{\Lambda}_h^0 \oplus \tilde{\Lambda}_h^\Pi$: replaces $\tilde{\Lambda}_h^0$ in the high-contrast case; equation (37)

Operators

- $P : H^1(\mathcal{T}_H) \rightarrow \tilde{\Lambda}_h^f$: non-local operator; equation (22)
- $P^{K,j}, \tilde{P}^j, P^{F,j}, P^j$: equations (55), (56), (57), (58)
- $P^\Delta, P^{\Delta,K,j}, \tilde{P}^{\Delta,j}, P^{\Delta,F,j}, P^{\Delta,j}$: equations (38), (41), (42), (43), (44)
- $\Pi_J : L^2(\Omega)$ orthogonal projection on \mathcal{F}_J : Section 4
- $T, \tilde{T}, T_{FF}^\tau, T_{F^cF^c}^\tau, T_{F^cF}^\tau, T_{FF^c}^\tau, \hat{T}_{FF}^\tau$: local operators; Sections 2 and 3.1

Unknowns:

- λ : trace of the elementwise fluxes; equation (5)
- λ_h : traces of “surrogate” flux; equation (14)
- $\lambda^0, \tilde{\lambda}_h^0, \tilde{\lambda}_h^f$: decompose λ_h ; equation (21)
- $\lambda_h^j, \tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,j}, \tilde{\lambda}_h^{f,j}$: solutions using the P^j operator; equations (62) and (64)
- $\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi}, \tilde{\lambda}_h^\Delta$: components of the solution using the P^Δ operator; equations (38), (39)
- $\tilde{\lambda}_h^{0,\Pi,j}, \tilde{\lambda}_h^{\Delta,j}$: components of the solution using the $P^{\Delta,j}$ operator; equation (47)
- σ : flux; equation (12)
- σ_h : “surrogate” flux; equation (15)
- $\sigma_h^{\text{LSD},j}$: LSD flux; Remark 5
- u : solution of the original problem; equation (1)
- u^0, \tilde{u} : average and zero average components of u ; equations (7) and (8)
- u_h : solution of the “surrogate” discrete problem; equation (15)
- u_h^0 : average of u_h ; equation (14)
- $u_h^j, u_h^{0,j}$: solutions using the P^j operator; equation (62)
- $u_h^{\text{LSD},j}, u_h^{0,\text{LSD},j}$: solutions using the $P^{\Delta,j}$ operator; equation (47)
- v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots : eigenfunctions generating a finite dimension space for the right-hand side; equation (66)

Other notations:

- $a_{\min}, a_{\max}, a_-, a_+, a_{\min}^\tau, a_{\max}^\tau$: bounds for the eigenvalues of \mathcal{A} ; equation (2) and Lemma 1
- \mathcal{A} : symmetric coefficients tensor; equation (1)
- α_{stab} : controls the decay rate of the solutions to the non-local problems; equation (33)

- $c_P, C_{P,G}$: local and global weighted Poincaré inequality constants; Remark 4
- $\beta_{H/h} = 1 + \log(H/h)$: Lemma 1
- d : dimension; equation (1)
- \mathcal{F}_h : partition of the faces of elements in \mathcal{T}_H ; Section 3
- $F_\tau^c = \partial\tau \setminus F$: $\partial\tau$ except the face F ; above equation (28)
- g : right-hand side of the original problem; equation (1)
- γ : constant depending on shape regularity of \mathcal{T}_H ; Lemma 1
- H, h : coarse and fine mesh characteristic lengths
- \mathcal{H} : the method’s “target precision”; equation (17)
- $\kappa = \max_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_H} \kappa^\tau, \kappa^\tau = a_{\max}^\tau / a_{\min}^\tau$: Lemma 1
- \mathbf{n}^τ : unit size normal vector pointing outward τ ; Section 2
- $\Omega, \partial\Omega$: bi- or tri-dimensional domain and its boundary; Section 1
- $\tau, \partial\tau$: typical element in \mathcal{T}_H and its boundary
- \mathcal{T}_H : partition of Ω ; Section 2
- $\mathcal{T}_j(K)$: equation (27)

REFERENCES

- [1] W. N. Anderson Jr. and R. J. Duffin, *Series and parallel addition of matrices*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **26** (1969), 576–594, DOI 10.1016/0022-247X(69)90200-5. MR242573
- [2] Rodolfo Araya, Christopher Harder, Diego Paredes, and Frédéric Valentin, *Multiscale hybrid-mixed method*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **51** (2013), no. 6, 3505–3531, DOI 10.1137/120888223. MR3143841
- [3] Todd Arbogast, *Mixed multiscale methods for heterogeneous elliptic problems*, Numerical analysis of multiscale problems, Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng., vol. 83, Springer, Heidelberg, 2012, pp. 243–283, DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-22061-6_8. MR3050916
- [4] Todd Arbogast, Gergina Pencheva, Mary F. Wheeler, and Ivan Yotov, *A multiscale mortar mixed finite element method*, Multiscale Model. Simul. **6** (2007), no. 1, 319–346, DOI 10.1137/060662587. MR2306414
- [5] Ivo Babuska and Robert Lipton, *Optimal local approximation spaces for generalized finite element methods with application to multiscale problems*, Multiscale Model. Simul. **9** (2011), no. 1, 373–406, DOI 10.1137/100791051. MR2801210
- [6] Ivo Babuška, Gabriel Caloz, and John E. Osborn, *Special finite element methods for a class of second order elliptic problems with rough coefficients*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **31** (1994), no. 4, 945–981. MR1286212 (95g:65146)
- [7] I. Babuška and J. E. Osborn, *Finite element methods for the solution of problems with rough input data*, (Oberwolfach, 1983), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1121, Springer, Berlin, 1985, pp. 1–18. MR806382 (86m:65138)

- [8] L. Beirão da Veiga, L. F. Pavarino, S. Scacchi, O. B. Widlund, and S. Zampini, *Adaptive selection of primal constraints for isogeometric BDDC deluxe preconditioners*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **39** (2017), no. 1, A281–A302, DOI 10.1137/15M1054675. MR3612901
- [9] Susanne C. Brenner, *Poincaré-Friedrichs inequalities for piecewise H^1 functions*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **41** (2003), no. 1, 306–324, DOI 10.1137/S0036142902401311. MR1974504
- [10] ———, *Korn’s inequalities for piecewise H^1 vector fields*, Math. Comp. **73** (2004), no. 247, 1067–1087, DOI 10.1090/S0025-5718-03-01579-5. MR2047078
- [11] Haim Brezis, *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*, Universitext, Springer, New York, 2011. MR2759829 (2012a:35002)
- [12] Erik Burman, Johnny Guzmán, Manuel A. Sánchez, and Marcus Sarkis, *Robust flux error estimation of an unfitted Nitsche method for high-contrast interface problems*, IMA J. Numer. Anal. **38** (2018), no. 2, 646–668, DOI 10.1093/imanum/drx017. MR3800035
- [13] Juan G. Calvo and Olof B. Widlund, *An adaptive choice of primal constraints for BDDC domain decomposition algorithms*, Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal. **45** (2016), 524–544. MR3582898
- [14] C.-C. Chu, I. G. Graham, and T.-Y. Hou, *A new multiscale finite element method for high-contrast elliptic interface problems*, Math. Comp. **79** (2010), no. 272, 1915–1955, DOI 10.1090/S0025-5718-2010-02372-5. MR2684351
- [15] E. T. Chung, Y. Efendiev, and W. T. Leung, *Constraint Energy Minimizing Generalized Multiscale Finite Element Method*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering **339** (2018), 298–319, DOI 10.1016/j.cma.2018.04.010.
- [16] C. Dohrmann and C. Pechstein, *Modern decomposition solvers - BDDC, deluxe scaling, and an algebraic approach, slides to a talk at NuMa Seminar, JKU Linz, Linz, Austria, December 10, 2013*, <http://people.ricam.oeaw.ac.at/c.pechstein/pechstein-bddc2013.pdf>.
- [17] Victorita Dolean, Frédéric Nataf, Robert Scheichl, and Nicole Spillane, *Analysis of a two-level Schwarz method with coarse spaces based on local Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps*, Comput. Methods Appl. Math. **12** (2012), no. 4, 391–414, DOI 10.2478/cmam-2012-0027. MR3033238
- [18] Zdeněk Dostál, David Horák, and Radek Kučera, *Total FETI—an easier implementable variant of the FETI method for numerical solution of elliptic PDE*, Comm. Numer. Methods Engrg. **22** (2006), no. 12, 1155–1162, DOI 10.1002/cnm.881. MR2282408 (2007k:65177)
- [19] Maksymilian Dryja, Marcus V. Sarkis, and Olof B. Widlund, *Multilevel Schwarz methods for elliptic problems with discontinuous coefficients in three dimensions*, Numer. Math. **72** (1996), no. 3, 313–348, DOI 10.1007/s002110050172. MR1367653
- [20] Maksymilian Dryja and Marcus Sarkis, *Technical tools for boundary layers and applications to heterogeneous coefficients*, Domain decomposition methods in science and engineering XIX, Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng., vol. 78, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 205–212, DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-11304-8_22. MR2867661
- [21] Weinan E and Bjorn Engquist, *The heterogeneous multiscale methods*, Commun. Math. Sci. **1** (2003), no. 1, 87–132. MR1979846 (2004b:35019)
- [22] Weinan E and Pingbing Ming, *Analysis of multiscale methods*, J. Comput. Math. **22** (2004), no. 2, 210–219. MR2058933 (2005d:65188)

- [23] Y. Efendiev, J. Galvis, R. Lazarov, M. Moon, and M. Sarkis, *Generalized multiscale finite element method. Symmetric interior penalty coupling*, J. Comput. Phys. **255** (2013), 1–15, DOI 10.1016/j.jcp.2013.07.028. MR3109775
- [24] Yalchin Efendiev, Juan Galvis, and Xiao-Hui Wu, *Multiscale finite element methods for high-contrast problems using local spectral basis functions*, J. Comput. Phys. **230** (2011), no. 4, 937–955, DOI 10.1016/j.jcp.2010.09.026. MR2753343
- [25] Yalchin Efendiev, Juan Galvis, Raytcho Lazarov, and Joerg Willems, *Robust domain decomposition preconditioners for abstract symmetric positive definite bilinear forms*, ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal. **46** (2012), no. 5, 1175–1199, DOI 10.1051/m2an/2011073. MR2916377
- [26] Charbel Farhat and Francois-Xavier Roux, *A method of finite element tearing and interconnecting and its parallel solution algorithm*, Int. J. Numer. Meth. Engrg. **32** (1991), no. 6, 1205–1227, DOI 10.1002/nme.1620320604.
- [27] Charbel Farhat, Michael Lesoinne, and Kendall Pierson, *A scalable dual-primal domain decomposition method*, Numer. Linear Algebra Appl. **7** (2000), no. 7-8, 687–714, DOI 10.1002/1099-1506(200010/12)7:7/8<687::AID-NLA219>3.0.CO;2-S. Preconditioning techniques for large sparse matrix problems in industrial applications (Minneapolis, MN, 1999). MR1802366
- [28] Charbel Farhat, Jan Mandel, and François-Xavier Roux, *Optimal convergence properties of the FETI domain decomposition method*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. **115** (1994), no. 3-4, 365–385, DOI 10.1016/0045-7825(94)90068-X. MR1285024
- [29] Juan Galvis and Yalchin Efendiev, *Domain decomposition preconditioners for multiscale flows in high-contrast media*, Multiscale Model. Simul. **8** (2010), no. 4, 1461–1483, DOI 10.1137/090751190. MR2718268
- [30] I. G. Graham, P. O. Lechner, and R. Scheichl, *Domain decomposition for multiscale PDEs*, Numer. Math. **106** (2007), no. 4, 589–626, DOI 10.1007/s00211-007-0074-1. MR2317926
- [31] Johnny Guzmán, Manuel A. Sánchez, and Marcus Sarkis, *A finite element method for high-contrast interface problems with error estimates independent of contrast*, J. Sci. Comput. **73** (2017), no. 1, 330–365, DOI 10.1007/s10915-017-0415-x. MR3704855
- [32] Christopher Harder, Alexandre L. Madureira, and Frédéric Valentin, *A hybrid-mixed method for elasticity*, ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal. **50** (2016), no. 2, 311–336, DOI 10.1051/m2an/2015046. MR3482545
- [33] Christopher Harder, Diego Paredes, and Frédéric Valentin, *A family of multiscale hybrid-mixed finite element methods for the Darcy equation with rough coefficients*, J. Comput. Phys. **245** (2013), 107–130.
- [34] A. Heinlein, U. Hetmaniuk, A. Klawonn, and O. Rheinbach, *The approximate component mode synthesis special finite element method in two dimensions: parallel implementation and numerical results*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **289** (2015), 116–133, DOI 10.1016/j.cam.2015.02.053. MR3350765
- [35] Ulrich L. Hetmaniuk and Richard B. Lehoucq, *A special finite element method based on component mode synthesis*, M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal. **44** (2010), no. 3, 401–420, DOI 10.1051/m2an/2010007. MR2666649

- [36] Ulrich Hetmaniuk and Axel Klawonn, *Error estimates for a two-dimensional special finite element method based on component mode synthesis*, Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal. **41** (2014), 109–132. MR3225627
- [37] Thomas Y. Hou, Xiao-Hui Wu, and Zhiqiang Cai, *Convergence of a multiscale finite element method for elliptic problems with rapidly oscillating coefficients*, Math. Comp. **68** (1999), no. 227, 913–943. MR1642758 (99i:65126)
- [38] Thomas J. R. Hughes, Gonzalo R. Feijóo, Luca Mazzei, and Jean-Baptiste Quinicy, *The variational multiscale method—a paradigm for computational mechanics*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. **166** (1998), no. 1-2, 3–24, DOI 10.1016/S0045-7825(98)00079-6. MR1660141 (99m:65239)
- [39] T. J. R. Hughes and G. Sangalli, *Variational multiscale analysis: the fine-scale Green’s function, projection, optimization, localization, and stabilized methods*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **45** (2007), no. 2, 539–557, DOI 10.1137/050645646. MR2300286 (2008c:65332)
- [40] Hyea Hyun Kim and Eric T. Chung, *A BDDC algorithm with enriched coarse spaces for two-dimensional elliptic problems with oscillatory and high contrast coefficients*, Multiscale Model. Simul. **13** (2015), no. 2, 571–593, DOI 10.1137/140970598. MR3350292
- [41] A. Klawonn, P. Radtke, and O. Rheinbach, *FETI-DP methods with an adaptive coarse space*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **53** (2015), no. 1, 297–320, DOI 10.1137/130939675. MR3303686
- [42] Axel Klawonn, Martin Kühn, and Oliver Rheinbach, *Adaptive coarse spaces for FETI-DP in three dimensions*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **38** (2016), no. 5, A2880–A2911, DOI 10.1137/15M1049610. MR3546980
- [43] Axel Klawonn, Olof B. Widlund, and Maksymilian Dryja, *Dual-primal FETI methods for three-dimensional elliptic problems with heterogeneous coefficients*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **40** (2002), no. 1, 159–179, DOI 10.1137/S0036142901388081. MR1921914
- [44] Tomáš Kozubek, Vít Vondrák, Martin Menšík, David Horák, Zdeněk Dostál, Václav Hapla, Pavla Kabelíková, and Martin Čermák, *Total FETI domain decomposition method and its massively parallel implementation*, Advances in Engineering Software **60-61** (2013), 14–22, DOI 10.1016/j.advengsoft.2013.04.001.
- [45] Axel Målqvist, *Multiscale methods for elliptic problems*, Multiscale Model. Simul. **9** (2011), no. 3, 1064–1086, DOI 10.1137/090775592. MR2831590 (2012j:65419)
- [46] Axel Målqvist, Patrick Henning, and Fredrik Hellman, *Multiscale mixed finite elements*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S **9** (2016), no. 5, 1269–1298, DOI 10.3934/dcdss.2016051. MR3591945
- [47] Axel Målqvist and Daniel Peterseim, *Localization of elliptic multiscale problems*, Math. Comp. **83** (2014), no. 290, 2583–2603, DOI 10.1090/S0025-5718-2014-02868-8. MR3246801
- [48] Jan Mandel and Bedřich Sousedík, *Adaptive selection of face coarse degrees of freedom in the BDDC and the FETI-DP iterative substructuring methods*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. **196** (2007), no. 8, 1389–1399, DOI 10.1016/j.cma.2006.03.010. MR2277024
- [49] ———, *Adaptive coarse space selection in the BDDC and the FETI-DP iterative substructuring methods: optimal face degrees of freedom*, Domain decomposition methods in science and engineering XVI, Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng., vol. 55, Springer, Berlin, 2007, pp. 421–428, DOI 10.1007/978-3-540-34469-8_52. MR2334131

- [50] Alexandre Madureira and Marcus Sarkis, *Adaptive deluxe BDDC mixed and hybrid primal discretizations*, Domain decomposition methods in science and engineering XXIV, Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng., vol. 125, Springer, Cham, 2018, pp. 465–473. MR3989895
- [51] Duk-Soon Oh, Olof B. Widlund, Stefano Zampini, and Clark R. Dohrmann, *BDDC algorithms with deluxe scaling and adaptive selection of primal constraints for Raviart-Thomas vector fields*, Math. Comp. **87** (2018), no. 310, 659–692, DOI 10.1090/mcom/3254. MR3739213
- [52] Houman Owhadi, Lei Zhang, and Leonid Berlyand, *Polyharmonic homogenization, rough polyharmonic splines and sparse super-localization*, ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal. **48** (2014), no. 2, 517–552, DOI 10.1051/m2an/2013118. MR3177856
- [53] Diego Paredes, Frédéric Valentin, and Henrique M. Versieux, *On the robustness of multiscale hybrid-mixed methods*, Math. Comp. **86** (2017), no. 304, 525–548, DOI 10.1090/mcom/3108. MR3584539
- [54] Clemens Pechstein, *Finite and boundary element tearing and interconnecting solvers for multiscale problems*, Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering, vol. 90, Springer, Heidelberg, 2013. MR3013465
- [55] Clemens Pechstein and Clark R. Dohrmann, *A unified framework for adaptive BDDC*, Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal. **46** (2017), 273–336. MR3678572
- [56] Clemens Pechstein and Robert Scheichl, *Weighted Poincaré inequalities*, IMA J. Numer. Anal. **33** (2013), no. 2, 652–686, DOI 10.1093/imanum/drs017. MR3047947
- [57] ———, *Analysis of FETI methods for multiscale PDEs*, Numer. Math. **111** (2008), no. 2, 293–333, DOI 10.1007/s00211-008-0186-2. MR2456834
- [58] ———, *Analysis of FETI methods for multiscale PDEs. Part II: interface variation*, Numer. Math. **118** (2011), no. 3, 485–529, DOI 10.1007/s00211-011-0359-2. MR2810804
- [59] Daniel Peterseim and Robert Scheichl, *Robust numerical upscaling of elliptic multiscale problems at high contrast*, Comput. Methods Appl. Math. **16** (2016), no. 4, 579–603, DOI 10.1515/cmam-2016-0022. MR3552482
- [60] P.-A. Raviart and J. M. Thomas, *Primal hybrid finite element methods for 2nd order elliptic equations*, Math. Comp. **31** (1977), no. 138, 391–413. MR0431752 (55 #4747)
- [61] Giancarlo Sangalli, *Capturing small scales in elliptic problems using a residual-free bubbles finite element method*, Multiscale Model. Simul. **1** (2003), no. 3, 485–503 (electronic). MR2030161 (2004m:65202)
- [62] Marcus Sarkis and Henrique Versieux, *Convergence analysis for the numerical boundary corrector for elliptic equations with rapidly oscillating coefficients*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **46** (2008), no. 2, 545–576. MR2383203
- [63] Robert Scheichl, Panayot S. Vassilevski, and Ludmil T. Zikatanov, *Weak approximation properties of elliptic projections with functional constraints*, Multiscale Model. Simul. **9** (2011), no. 4, 1677–1699, DOI 10.1137/110821639. MR2861254
- [64] N. Spillane, V. Dolean, P. Hauret, F. Nataf, C. Pechstein, and R. Scheichl, *Abstract robust coarse spaces for systems of PDEs via generalized eigenproblems in the overlaps*, Numer. Math. **126** (2014), no. 4, 741–770, DOI 10.1007/s00211-013-0576-y. MR3175183
- [65] Nicole Spillane, Victorita Dolean, Patrice Hauret, Frédéric Nataf, and Daniel J. Rixen, *Solving generalized eigenvalue problems on the interfaces to build a robust two-level FETI method*, C. R. Math. Acad.

- Sci. Paris **351** (2013), no. 5-6, 197–201, DOI 10.1016/j.crma.2013.03.010 (English, with English and French summaries). MR3089678
- [66] Andrea Toselli and Olof Widlund, *Domain decomposition methods—algorithms and theory*, Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, vol. 34, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005. MR2104179 (2005g:65006)
- [67] Richard S. Varga, *Geršgorin and his circles*, Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, vol. 36, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. MR2093409
- [68] Henrique Versieux and Marcus Sarkis, *A three-scale finite element method for elliptic equations with rapidly oscillating periodic coefficients*, Domain decomposition methods in science and engineering XVI, Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng., vol. 55, Springer, Berlin, 2007, pp. 763–770. MR2334173
- [69] H. M. Versieux and M. Sarkis, *Numerical boundary corrector for elliptic equations with rapidly oscillating periodic coefficients*, Comm. Numer. Methods Engrg. **22** (2006), no. 6, 577–589. MR2235030 (2007d:65117)
- [70] Wei Wang, Johnny Guzmán, and Chi-Wang Shu, *The multiscale discontinuous Galerkin method for solving a class of second order elliptic problems with rough coefficients*, Int. J. Numer. Anal. Model. **8** (2011), no. 1, 28–47. MR2740478 (2012a:65346)
- [71] Barbara I. Wohlmuth, Andrea Toselli, and Olof B. Widlund, *An iterative substructuring method for Raviart-Thomas vector fields in three dimensions*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **37** (2000), no. 5, 1657–1676 (electronic), DOI 10.1137/S0036142998347310. MR1759911

LABORATÓRIO NACIONAL DE COMPUTAÇÃO CIENTÍFICA, PETRÓPOLIS - RJ, BRAZIL

FUNDAÇÃO GETÚLIO VARGAS, RIO DE JANEIRO - RJ, BRAZIL

Email address: alm@lncc.br, alexandre.madureira@fgv.br

MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES DEPARTMENT WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE, USA

Email address: msarkis@wpi.edu