

# A FLUX-BASED HDG METHOD

ISSEI OIKAWA

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper, we present a flux-based formulation of the hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin (HDG) method for steady-state diffusion problems and propose a new method derived by letting a stabilization parameter tend to infinity. Assuming an inf-sup condition, we prove its well-posedness and error estimates of optimal order. We show that the inf-sup condition is satisfied by some triangular elements. Numerical results are also provided to support our theoretical results.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin (HDG) method for the steady-state diffusion problem with Dirichlet boundary condition

$$\begin{aligned}
 (1a) \quad & \mathbf{q} + \nabla u = 0 && \text{in } \Omega, \\
 (1b) \quad & \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} = f && \text{in } \Omega, \\
 (1c) \quad & u = 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega,
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  ( $d = 2, 3$ ) is a bounded convex polygonal or polyhedral domain and  $f$  is a given function. In the original HDG method [3], a numerical trace  $\hat{u}_h$  is introduced as an unknown variable to approximate the trace of  $u$  on element boundaries, which corresponds to a Dirichlet boundary condition, and a numerical flux  $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$  is properly defined. The other variables  $u_h$  and  $\mathbf{q}_h$  approximating  $u$  and  $\mathbf{q}$ , respectively, can be eliminated in element-by-element fashion and we obtain a globally-coupled system of equations only in terms of  $\hat{u}_h$ , which is called static condensation.

In [2], a flux-based formulation is presented, in which the trace of  $\mathbf{q}$  on element boundaries instead of  $\hat{u}_h$  is hybridized, in other words,  $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$  is an unknown variable and  $\hat{u}_h$  is defined in terms of  $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$  and the other variables. The flux-based method is a rewrite of the original HDG method and provides the same solution, however, the local problem has a Neumann boundary condition, so that the static condensation is different from that of the original method. We note that the local solvability of the flux-based method is not obvious, which will be verified in Section 2.4.

In this paper, we propose a new flux-based method derived by passing the stabilization parameter to infinity. In our method,  $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$  is unknown and the numerical trace is defined by  $\hat{u}_h = u_h$ . Since our method has saddle point structure, its well-posedness depends on whether the inf-sup condition we define in Section 2.3 is satisfied. The inf-sup condition is

---

*Key words and phrases.* Discontinuous Galerkin Method and Hybridization and Error Analysis.

fulfilled if we use triangular meshes and the polynomials of degree  $k$  and  $k+1$  for  $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$  and  $u_h$ , respectively, with a non-negative integer  $k$ . In addition, the proposed method using such approximation spaces achieves the optimal convergence rates in  $u_h$  and  $\mathbf{q}_h$ , like the HDG method with the so-called Lehrenfeld–Schöberl stabilization proposed in [5] and analyzed in [6, 7]. Although, in the Lehrenfeld–Schöberl stabilization, the  $L^2$ -orthogonal projection onto the approximation space of  $\hat{u}_h$  is inserted in front of  $u_h$ , such a projection is not used in our method because it is naturally incorporated through the transmission condition in a flux-based formulation.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce notation and present the flux-based formulation, and a new method is derived from it. We verify the local solvability of the methods. In Section 3, we establish a priori estimate and error estimates of optimal order for our method, assuming that an inf-sup condition holds. In Section 4, we prove that the inf-sup condition is satisfied if the polynomial degrees for  $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$  and  $u_h$  are  $k$  and  $k+1$ , respectively, and triangular meshes are used. In Section 5, numerical results are presented to validate our theoretical results.

## 2. A FLUX-BASED HDG FORMULATION

**2.1. Notation.** To begin with, we introduce notation to present the HDG method via flux hybridization. Let  $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$  be a family of meshes satisfying the quasi-uniform condition, where  $h$  stands for the mesh size. Let  $\mathcal{E}_h$  denote the set of all edges or faces of elements in  $\mathcal{T}_h$ . Let  $L^2(\mathcal{E}_h)$  denote the  $L^2$ -space on  $\bigcup_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} e$  and  $P_m(\mathcal{T}_h)$  and  $P_m(\mathcal{E}_h)$  denote the spaces of element-wise and edge-wise polynomials of degree  $m$ , respectively.

We use the usual symbols of Sobolev spaces [1], such as  $H^m(D)$ ,  $H^m(D)^d$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_{m,D} := \|\cdot\|_{H^m(D)}$ , and  $|\cdot|_{m,D} := |\cdot|_{H^m(D)}$  for a domain  $D$  and an integer  $m$ . We may omit the subscripts when  $D = \Omega$  or  $m = 0$ , such as  $\|\cdot\|_m = \|\cdot\|_{m,\Omega}$ ,  $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_{0,\Omega}$ , and  $|\cdot|_m = |\cdot|_{m,\Omega}$ . The piecewise Sobolev space of order  $m$  is denoted by  $H^m(\mathcal{T}_h)$ . The inner products are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v})_K &= \int_K \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{v} dx, & (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v})_K, \\ (u, w)_K &= \int_K u w dx, & (u, w)_{\mathcal{T}_h} &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (u, w)_K, \\ \langle u, w \rangle_{\partial K} &= \int_{\partial K} u w ds, & \langle u, w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \langle u, w \rangle_{\partial K}, \\ \langle \mu, \lambda \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_h} &= \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e \mu \lambda ds, & (u, w) &= \int_{\Omega} u w dx. \end{aligned}$$

We define the induced norms from these inner products by

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h}^{1/2}, \quad \|w\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} = (w, w)_{\mathcal{T}_h}^{1/2}, \quad \|w\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = \langle w, w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}^{1/2}.$$

Throughout the paper, we use the symbol  $C$  to denote a generic constant independent of the mesh size  $h$  and  $\mathbf{n}$  to stand for the unit (outer) normal vector to an edge  $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$  or  $\partial K$  for  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ .

**2.2. Finite element spaces.** Let  $k$  be a non-negative integer. We define the local approximation spaces on  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$  as

$$\mathbf{V}(K) = P_k(K)^d, \quad W(K) = P_{k+1}(K),$$

where  $P_m(K)$  stands for the space of polynomials of degree  $m$ . We introduce an approximation space for  $\mathbf{q}|_e \cdot \mathbf{n}$  on  $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$ ,

$$\mathbf{N}(e) = P_k(e),$$

and assume that  $(I - \mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n})\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}$  for  $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}(e)$ . The global finite element spaces are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}_h &:= \{\mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega)^d : \mathbf{v}|_K \in \mathbf{V}(K) \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}, \\ W_h &:= \{w \in L^2(\Omega) : w|_K \in W(K) \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}, \\ \mathbf{N}_h &:= \{\mathbf{r} \in L^2(\mathcal{E}_h)^d : \mathbf{r}|_e \in \mathbf{N}(e) \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathbf{P}_V$ ,  $P_W$ , and  $\mathbf{P}_N$  denote the  $L^2$ -projections onto  $\mathbf{V}_h$ ,  $W_h$ , and  $\mathbf{N}_h$ , respectively. The following approximation properties hold for  $1 \leq s \leq k+1$ : If  $u \in H^{k+2}(\Omega)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} (2a) \quad & \|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_V \mathbf{q}\| \leq Ch^s |\mathbf{q}|_s, \\ (2b) \quad & \|\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} - (\mathbf{P}_V \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \leq Ch^{s-1/2} |\mathbf{q}|_s, \\ (2c) \quad & \|u - P_W u\| \leq Ch^s |u|_s, \\ (2d) \quad & \|u - P_W u\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \leq Ch^{s+1/2} |u|_{s+1}, \\ (2e) \quad & \|(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_N \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \leq Ch^{s+1/2} |\mathbf{q}|_{s+1}. \end{aligned}$$

**2.3. A flux-based HDG method.** The solution of the original HDG method,  $(\mathbf{q}_h, u_h, \hat{u}_h) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times W_h \times M_h$ , is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (3a) \quad & (\mathbf{q}_h, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (u_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \hat{u}_h, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 & \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h, \\ (3b) \quad & -(\mathbf{q}_h, \nabla w)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \hat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = (f, w) & \forall w \in W_h, \\ (3c) \quad & \langle \hat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mu \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 & \forall \mu \in M_h, \\ (3d) \quad & \hat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n} := \mathbf{q}_h \cdot \mathbf{n} + \tau(u_h - \hat{u}_h) \text{ on } \partial K & \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h, \end{aligned}$$

where  $M_h$  is an approximation space for the trace  $u|_{\mathcal{E}_h}$  and  $\tau$  is a stabilization parameter. Another formulation via flux hybridization is also stated in [2], which reads as follows:

Find  $(\mathbf{q}_h, u_h, \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times W_h \times \mathbf{N}_h$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4a) \quad & (\mathbf{q}_h, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (u_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \widehat{u}_h, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 & \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h, \\
(4b) \quad & -(\mathbf{q}_h, \nabla w)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = (f, w) & \forall w \in W_h, \\
(4c) \quad & \langle \widehat{u}_h, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 & \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h, \\
(4d) \quad & \widehat{u}_h := u_h + \tau^{-1}(\mathbf{q}_h - \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h) \cdot \mathbf{n} \text{ on } \partial K & \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h.
\end{aligned}$$

This method is a rewrite of the original HDG method and its solution coincides with that of the original method. We can verify that by expressing the hybrid variables in terms of  $u_h$  and  $\mathbf{q}_h$ . Let  $K^+$  and  $K^-$  be adjacent elements sharing an internal edge  $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$  and let  $\mathbf{n}^+$  and  $\mathbf{n}^-$  denote the outer unit normal vectors to  $\partial K^+$  and  $\partial K^-$ , respectively. For a function  $w$ , let  $w^+$  and  $w^-$  stand for the trace of  $(w|_{K^+})|_e$  and  $(w|_{K^-})|_e$ , respectively. In both methods,  $\widehat{u}_h$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h$  are single valued on element boundaries from the transmission conditions (3c) and (4c). From (3d) or (4d), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}^+ &= \mathbf{q}_h^+ \cdot \mathbf{n}^+ + \tau(u_h^+ - \widehat{u}_h), \\
\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}^- &= \mathbf{q}_h^- \cdot \mathbf{n}^- + \tau(u_h^- - \widehat{u}_h).
\end{aligned}$$

Solving these equations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{u}_h &= \frac{1}{2}(u_h^+ + u_h^-) + \frac{1}{2\tau}(\mathbf{q}_h^+ \cdot \mathbf{n}^+ + \mathbf{q}_h^- \cdot \mathbf{n}^-), \\
\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}^\pm &= \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{q}_h^+ + \mathbf{q}_h^-) \cdot \mathbf{n}^\pm + \frac{\tau}{2}(u_h^+ \mathbf{n}^+ + u_h^- \mathbf{n}^-) \cdot \mathbf{n}^\pm.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we see that the equations (3a)-(3b) and (4a)-(4b) give the same solution  $u_h$  and  $\mathbf{q}_h$ . However, note that the procedures of the static condensation are different and the local solvability of the flux-based method is not obvious, which we will prove later.

We consider the limiting case of  $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$  in (4). In this case, (4d) is naturally interpreted as  $\widehat{u}_h = u_h$ , which leads to the following scheme: Find  $(\mathbf{q}_h, u_h, \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times W_h \times \mathbf{N}_h$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5a) \quad & (\mathbf{q}_h, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (u_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle u_h, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 & \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h, \\
(5b) \quad & -(\mathbf{q}_h, \nabla w)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = (f, w) & \forall w \in W_h, \\
(5c) \quad & \langle u_h, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 & \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h.
\end{aligned}$$

We remark that the above method is not always well-posed. Assume that  $f \equiv 0$ . By taking  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{q}_h$ ,  $w = u_h$ , and  $\mathbf{r} = \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h$  in (5), we have  $\mathbf{q}_h = \mathbf{0}$ . From (5a) with  $\mathbf{q}_h = \mathbf{0}$  and (5c), it follows that  $u_h = 0$ . However,  $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h$  still remains unknown, which depends on if the following equation implies  $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ :

$$(6) \quad \langle \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 \quad \forall w \in W_h.$$

Indeed, when  $\mathbf{N}_h$  and  $W_h$  are piecewise constant spaces, it is easy to see that there exists  $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \in \mathbf{N}_h$  satisfying (6) and  $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n} \neq 0$ . For this reason, we need the following inf-sup

condition for the well-posedness: There exists a constant  $C$  independent of  $h$  such that, for all  $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h$ ,

$$(7) \quad \|h^{1/2} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \leq C \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sup_{w \in W(K)} \frac{\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial K}}{\|\nabla w\|_{L^2(K)} + \|h^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_N w\|_{L^2(\partial K)}},$$

where  $\mathbf{P}_N w := \mathbf{P}_N(w|_{\partial K} \mathbf{n}) \cdot \mathbf{n}$ . In order to derive a priori estimates, we also use the transposed version of the inf-sup condition: There exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$(8) \quad \|h^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_N w\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \leq C \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}(\partial K)} \frac{\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial K}}{\|h^{1/2} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{L^2(\partial K)}} \quad \forall w \in W_h.$$

**2.4. Local solvability.** We here verify the local solvability of the flux-based methods (4) and (5).

We first consider the local problem of (4). Let  $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_{\partial K}$  denote the restriction of  $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h$  to  $\partial K$  and let  $[[w]]$  denote the jump of a function  $w$ . We define  $\|\mu\|_{\mathcal{E}_h} = \langle \mu, \mu \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_h}^{1/2}$  and  $\|\mathbf{r}\|_{\mathcal{E}_h} = \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_h}^{1/2}$ . We introduce the mean-zero subspace of  $W(K)$ ,

$$W_0(K) := \{w \in W(K) : (w, 1)_K = 0\}.$$

The local problem reads: Find  $(\mathbf{q}_K, u_{K0}) \in \mathbf{V}(K) \times W_0(K)$  such that

(9a)

$$(\mathbf{q}_K, \mathbf{v})_K + \langle \tau^{-1} \mathbf{q}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial K} + (\nabla u_{K0}, \mathbf{v})_K = \langle \tau^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_{\partial K} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial K} \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}(K),$$

(9b)

$$-(\mathbf{q}_K, \nabla w_0)_K = (f, w_0)_K - \langle \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_{\partial K} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w_0 \rangle_{\partial K} \quad \forall w_0 \in W_0(K).$$

To verify the well-posedness of the local problem, we let  $f \equiv 0$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_{\partial K} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ . Taking  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{q}_K$  in (9a) and  $w_0 = u_{K0}$  in (9b), we have  $\mathbf{q}_K = \mathbf{0}$ . Since we can  $\mathbf{v} = \nabla u_{K0}$ , we get  $\nabla u_{K0} = 0$ , which implies  $u_{K0} = 0$ . Therefore,  $\mathbf{q}_K$  and  $u_{K0}$  are uniquely determined if  $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_{\partial K}$  is given.

However, the piecewise constant part of  $u_h$ , denoted by  $\bar{u}_h$ , remains unknown. Eliminating  $\mathbf{q}_K$  and  $u_{K0}$  in element-by-element fashion by static condensation, we obtain the global equations for  $(\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h, \bar{u}_h) \in \mathbf{N}_h \times P_0(\mathcal{T}_h)$

$$(10a) \quad \langle \bar{u}_h - \tau^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = -\langle u_{h0} - \tau^{-1} \mathbf{q}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} =: F_1(\mathbf{r}) \quad \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h,$$

$$(10b) \quad \langle \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \bar{w} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = (f, \bar{w}) \quad \forall \bar{w} \in P_0(\mathcal{T}_h),$$

where  $u_{h0} := u_h - \bar{u}_h$  and we note that  $u_{h0}$  has been determined by (9). We will show that the global problem is well posed. To this end, we first prove the following inf-sup condition.

**Theorem 2.1.** There exists a positive constant  $C$  such that

$$C \|[[\bar{w}]]\|_{\mathcal{E}_h} \leq \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h} \frac{\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \bar{w} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}}{\|\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}} \quad \forall \bar{w} \in P_0(\mathcal{E}_h).$$

*Proof.* For  $\bar{w} \in P_0(\mathcal{T}_h)$  with  $\bar{w} \neq 0$ , we define  $\mathbf{r} = [[\bar{w}]]$ . Then, it follows that

$$\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \bar{w} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = \langle \mathbf{r}, [[\bar{w}]] \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_h} = \|[[\bar{w}]]\|_{\mathcal{E}_h}^2 = \|\mathbf{r}\|_{\mathcal{E}_h} \|[[\bar{w}]]\|_{\mathcal{E}_h}.$$

Since  $\|\mathbf{r}\|_{\mathcal{E}_h} \leq \|\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \leq \sqrt{2}\|\mathbf{r}\|_{\mathcal{E}_h}$  for  $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h$ , we have

$$\|[\bar{w}]\|_{\mathcal{E}_h} \leq \frac{\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \bar{w} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}}{\|\mathbf{r}\|_{\mathcal{E}_h}} \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \frac{\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \bar{w} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}}{\|\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}},$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

We now prove an a priori estimate for the global problem (10) using the inf-sup condition in Theorem 2.1, which ensures that the problem admits a unique solution.

**Theorem 2.2.** There exists a positive constant  $C$  independent of  $h$  such that

$$\|\tau^{-1/2}\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|[\bar{u}_h]\|_{\mathcal{E}_h} \leq C (\|u_{h0}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\mathbf{q}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|f\|).$$

*Proof.* Taking  $\mathbf{r} = \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h$  in (10a) and  $\bar{w} = \bar{u}_h$  in (10b), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \bar{u}_h, \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - \|\tau^{-1/2}\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2 &= F_1(\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h), \\ \langle \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \bar{u}_h \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} &= (f, \bar{u}_h). \end{aligned}$$

It then follows that

$$\|\tau^{-1/2}\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2 = (f, \bar{u}_h) - F_1(\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h) \leq \|f\| \|\bar{u}_h\| + \|F_1\| \|\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h},$$

where

$$\|F_1\| := \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h} \frac{F(\mathbf{r})}{\|\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}}.$$

Using Young's inequality, we deduce

$$(11) \quad \|\tau^{-1/2}\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2 \leq C (\|F_1\|^2 + \epsilon^{-2}\|f\|^2) + \epsilon^2 \|\bar{u}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ . By Theorem 2.1, (10a) and (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\bar{u}_h]\|_{\mathcal{E}_h} &\leq C \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h} \frac{\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \bar{u}_h \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}}{\|\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}} \\ &\leq C \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h} \frac{F_1(\mathbf{r}) + \langle \tau^{-1}\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}}{\|\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}} \\ &\leq C (\|F_1\| + \|\tau^{-1}\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}) \\ &\leq C (\|F_1\| + \epsilon^{-1}\|f\| + \epsilon \|\bar{u}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}). \end{aligned}$$

Since both  $\|[\cdot]\|_{\mathcal{E}_h}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}$  are norms on  $P_0(\mathcal{T}_h)$ , they are equivalent to each other and  $\|\bar{u}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}$  is bounded by  $C\|[\bar{u}_h]\|_{\mathcal{E}_h}$ . Choosing  $\epsilon$  sufficiently small, we get

$$\|[\bar{u}_h]\|_{\mathcal{E}_h} \leq C (\|F_1\| + \|f\|).$$

From this and (11), it follows that

$$\|\tau^{-1/2}\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \leq C (\|F_1\| + \|f\|).$$

Since we can bound as  $\|F_1\| \leq C(\|u_{h0}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\mathbf{q}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h})$ , the proof is complete.  $\square$

Next, we show that the local problem of the proposed method is well-posed. Let us define  $\mathbf{R}_0(\partial K) = \{w|_{\partial K} \mathbf{n} : w \in P_0(K)\}$ , whose dimension is one. The local problem of (5) is as follows: Find  $(\mathbf{q}_K, u_{K0}, \bar{u}_K) \in \mathbf{V}(K) \times W_0(K) \times P_0(K)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} (12a) \quad & (\mathbf{q}_K, \mathbf{v})_K + (\nabla u_{K0}, \mathbf{v})_K = 0 & \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}(K), \\ (12b) \quad & -(\mathbf{q}_K, \nabla w_0)_K = (f, w_0)_K - \langle \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_{\partial K} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w_0 \rangle_{\partial K} & \forall w_0 \in W_0(K), \\ (12c) \quad & \langle \bar{u}_K + u_{K0}, \mathbf{r}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial K} = 0 & \forall \mathbf{r}_0 \in \mathbf{R}_0(\partial K). \end{aligned}$$

The well-posedness is verified by setting all terms on the right-hand side to zero and a straightforward computation.

### 3. ERROR ANALYSIS

**3.1. A priori estimate.** We consider the proposed method in general form

$$\begin{aligned} (13a) \quad & (\mathbf{q}_h, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (u_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle u_h, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = F_1(\mathbf{v}) & \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h, \\ (13b) \quad & -(\mathbf{q}_h, \nabla w)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = F_2(w) & \forall w \in W_h, \\ (13c) \quad & \langle u_h, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = F_3(\mathbf{r}) & \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h, \end{aligned}$$

where  $F_1 : \mathbf{V}_h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $F_2 : W_h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $F_3 : \mathbf{N}_h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are linear functionals and their norms are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_1\| &= \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h} \frac{F_1(\mathbf{v})}{\|\mathbf{v}\|}, \\ \|F_2\| &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sup_{w \in W(K)} \frac{F_2(w)}{\|\nabla w\|_{L^2(K)} + \|h^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_N w\|_{L^2(\partial K)}}, \\ \|F_3\| &= \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h} \frac{F_3(\mathbf{r})}{\|h^{1/2} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}}. \end{aligned}$$

We first establish a priori estimate for the problem.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let  $(\mathbf{q}_h, u_h, \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times W_h \times \mathbf{N}_h$  be a solution of (13). Then there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$\|\mathbf{q}_h\| + \|h^{1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} + \|\nabla u_h\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \|h^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_N u_h\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \leq C (\|F_1\| + \|F_2\| + \|F_3\|).$$

*Proof.* From the inf-sup condition (7) and (13b), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|h^{1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} &\leq C \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sup_{w \in W(K)} \frac{\langle \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial K}}{\|\nabla w\|_{L^2(K)} + \|h^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_N w\|_{L^2(\partial K)}} \\ (14) \quad &= C \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sup_{w \in W(K)} \frac{F_2(w) + (\mathbf{q}_h, \nabla w)_K}{\|\nabla w\|_{L^2(K)} + \|h^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_N w\|_{L^2(\partial K)}} \\ &\leq C (\|F_2\| + \|\mathbf{q}_h\|). \end{aligned}$$

Integrating by parts in (13a), we have

$$(15) \quad (\mathbf{q}_h, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\nabla u_h, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} = F_1(\mathbf{v}).$$

Substituting  $\mathbf{v} = \nabla u_h$  in the above equation, we get

$$(16) \quad \|\nabla u_h\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} \leq C (\|\mathbf{q}_h\| + \|F_1\|).$$

Taking  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{q}_h$  in (15),  $\mathbf{r} = \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h$  in (13c), and  $w = u_h$  in (13b), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{q}_h\|^2 &= F_1(\mathbf{q}_h) + F_2(u_h) - F_3(\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h) \\ &\leq \|F_1\| \|\mathbf{q}_h\| + C \|F_2\| \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left( \|\nabla u_h\|_{L^2(K)} + \|h^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_N u_h\|_{\partial K} \right) + \|F_3\| \|h^{1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}. \end{aligned}$$

By (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|h^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_N u_h\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} &\leq C \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h} \frac{\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{P}_N u_h \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}}{\|h^{1/2} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|} \\ &= C \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h} \frac{\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, u_h \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}}{\|h^{1/2} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|} \\ &\leq C \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h} \frac{F_3(\mathbf{r})}{\|h^{1/2} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|} \\ &\leq C \|F_3\|. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (16), we get

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left( \|\nabla u_h\|_{L^2(K)} + \|h^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_N u_h\|_{\partial K} \right) \leq C (\|\mathbf{q}_h\| + \|F_3\|).$$

Thus we estimate as

$$\|\mathbf{q}_h\|^2 \leq \|F_1\| \|\mathbf{q}_h\| + C \|F_2\| (\|\mathbf{q}_h\| + \|F_1\|) + C \|F_3\| (\|F_2\| + \|\mathbf{q}_h\|).$$

Using Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{q}_h\|^2 \leq C (\|F_1\|^2 + \|F_2\|^2 + \|F_3\|^2).$$

From this and (14), it follows that

$$\|h^{1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \leq C (\|F_2\| + \|\mathbf{q}_h\|) \leq C (\|F_1\| + \|F_2\| + \|F_3\|),$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

If  $f \equiv 0$ , it follows from Theorem 3.1 that  $\mathbf{q}_h = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $u_h$  is constant on each element,  $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ , and  $\mathbf{P}_N u_h = 0$  on element boundaries. Thus, we have verified the existence and uniqueness of our method.

**3.2. Optimal convergence of  $\mathbf{q}_h$ .** The projections of errors are defined as

$$\mathbf{e}_q = \mathbf{P}_V \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_h, \quad e_u = P_W u - u_h, \quad \mathbf{e}_{\widehat{\mathbf{q}}} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{P}_N \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} - \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}.$$

**Theorem 3.2.** If  $u \in H^{k+2}(\Omega)$ , then we have

$$\|\mathbf{e}_q\| + \|h^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_{\widehat{\mathbf{q}}} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \leq C h^{k+1} |u|_{k+2}.$$

*Proof.* The problem (1) is rewritten into

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (u, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle u, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} &= 0 & \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h, \\ -(\mathbf{q}, \nabla w)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} &= (f, w) & \forall w \in W_h, \\ \langle u, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} &= 0 & \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h. \end{aligned}$$

By the property of the  $L^2$ -projections, the above equations become

$$\begin{aligned} (17a) \quad (\mathbf{P}_V \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (P_W u, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle P_W u, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} &= G_1(\mathbf{v}) & \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h, \\ (17b) \quad -(\mathbf{P}_V \mathbf{q}, \nabla w)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \mathbf{P}_N \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} &= (f, w) + G_2(w) & \forall w \in W_h, \\ (17c) \quad \langle P_W u, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} &= G_3(\mathbf{r}) & \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h, \end{aligned}$$

where we have integrated by parts in the first equation and

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(\mathbf{v}) &:= -\langle u - P_W u, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}, \\ G_2(w) &:= -\langle \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{P}_N \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}, \\ G_3(\mathbf{r}) &:= -\langle u - P_W u, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}. \end{aligned}$$

The norms of  $G_1$  and  $G_3$  are bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_1\| &= \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h} \frac{G_1(\mathbf{v})}{\|\mathbf{v}\|} \leq \|u - P_W u\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \cdot Ch^{-1/2} \leq Ch^{k+1}|u|_{k+2}, \\ \|G_3\| &= \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h} \frac{G_3(\mathbf{r})}{\|h^{1/2} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}} \leq \|u - P_W u\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \cdot h^{-1/2} \leq Ch^{k+1}|u|_{k+2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using [6, Lemma 3], we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |G_2(w)| &\leq |\langle (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_N \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}| \\ &= \|(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_N \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \cdot Ch^{1/2} \|\nabla w\|_{\mathcal{T}_h}. \end{aligned}$$

The norm of  $G_2$  is bounded as

$$\|G_2\| = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sup_{w \in W(K)} \frac{G_2(w)}{\|\nabla w\|_{L^2(K)} + \|h^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_N w\|_{L^2(\partial K)}} \leq Ch^{k+1} |\mathbf{q}|_{k+1}.$$

Subtracting (5) from (17), we obtain the error equations

$$\begin{aligned} (18a) \quad (\mathbf{e}_q, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_u, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle e_u, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} &= G_1(\mathbf{v}) & \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h, \\ (18b) \quad -(\mathbf{e}_q, \nabla w)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \mathbf{e}_{\hat{q}} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} &= G_2(w) & \forall w \in W_h, \\ (18c) \quad \langle e_u, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} &= G_3(\mathbf{r}) & \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Theorem 3.1 to the error equations leads to

$$\|\mathbf{e}_q\| + \|h^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_{\hat{q}} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \leq C (\|G_1\| + \|G_2\| + \|G_3\|) \leq Ch^{k+1} |u|_{k+2}.$$

□

From Theorem 3.1, it also follows that

$$(19) \quad \|\nabla e_u\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \|h^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_N e_u\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \leq Ch^{k+1} |u|_{k+2}.$$

3.3.  **$L^2$ -error estimate of  $u_h$ .** We consider the following adjoint problem: Find  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \xi) \in \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega) \times (H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega))$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\theta} + \nabla \xi &= \mathbf{0} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta} &= e_u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \xi &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

It is well known that the elliptic regularity holds:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 + \|\xi\|_2 \leq C\|e_u\|.$$

We provide an  $L^2$ -error estimate of  $u_h$  by the Aubin–Nitsche technique.

**Theorem 3.3.** If  $k \geq 1$  and  $u \in H^{k+2}(\Omega)$ , then there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$\|e_u\| \leq Ch^{k+2}|u|_{k+2}.$$

*Proof.* Since (17) holds for the adjoint problem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (21a) \quad (\mathbf{P}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (P_W \xi, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle P_W \xi, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} &= G'_1(\mathbf{v}) & \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h, \\ (21b) \quad -(\mathbf{P}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}, \nabla w)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \mathbf{P}_N \boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} &= (e_u, w) + G'_2(w) & \forall w \in W_h, \\ (21c) \quad \langle P_W \xi, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} &= G'_3(\mathbf{r}) & \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G'_1(\mathbf{v}) &:= -\langle \xi - P_W \xi, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}, \\ G'_2(w) &:= -\langle (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{P}_N \boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}, \\ G'_3(\mathbf{r}) &:= -\langle \xi - P_W \xi, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $\mathbf{v} = -\mathbf{e}_q$  in (21a),  $w = e_u$  in (21b), and  $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{e}_{\hat{q}}$  in (21c), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (22) \quad & -(\mathbf{P}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{e}_q)_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\nabla P_W \xi, \mathbf{e}_q)_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\mathbf{P}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}, \nabla e_u)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \mathbf{P}_N \boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{n}, e_u \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle P_W \xi, \mathbf{e}_{\hat{q}} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\ &= \|e_u\|^2 - G'_1(\mathbf{e}_q) + G'_2(e_u) + G'_3(\mathbf{e}_{\hat{q}}). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $\mathbf{v} = -\mathbf{P}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}$  in (18a),  $w = P_W \xi$  in (18b), and  $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{P}_N \boldsymbol{\theta}$  in (18c), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (23) \quad & -(\mathbf{e}_q, \mathbf{P}_V \boldsymbol{\theta})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\nabla e_u, \mathbf{P}_V \boldsymbol{\theta})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\mathbf{e}_q, \nabla P_W \xi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \mathbf{e}_{\hat{q}} \cdot \mathbf{n}, P_W \xi \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle e_u, \mathbf{P}_N \boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\ &= -G_1(\mathbf{P}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}) + G_2(P_W \xi) + G_3(\mathbf{P}_N \boldsymbol{\theta}). \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting (23) from (22) yields

$$\|e_u\|^2 = -G_1(\mathbf{P}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}) + G_2(P_W \xi) + G_3(\mathbf{P}_N \boldsymbol{\theta}) - G'_1(\mathbf{e}_q) + G'_2(e_u) + G'_3(\mathbf{e}_{\hat{q}}).$$

We will bound the terms on the right-hand side. The first and third terms are bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} | -G_1(\mathbf{P}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}) + G_3(\mathbf{P}_N \boldsymbol{\theta}) | &= | \langle u - P_W u, (\mathbf{P}_V \boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{P}_N \boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} | \\ &\leq \|u - P_W u\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} (\|(\mathbf{P}_V \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{P}_N \boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}) \\ &\leq Ch^{k+3/2}|u|_{k+2} \cdot Ch^{1/2}|\boldsymbol{\theta}|_1 \\ &= Ch^{k+2}|u|_{k+2}|\boldsymbol{\theta}|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $P_1$  denote the  $L^2$ -projection from  $L^2(\Omega)$  onto  $P_1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ . Note that  $\langle (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_N \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}, P_1 \xi \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0$  since we assume  $k \geq 1$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
(24) \quad |G_2(P_W \xi)| &= |\langle (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_N \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}, P_W \xi - P_1 \xi \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}| \\
&\leq \|(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_N \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} (\|P_W \xi - \xi\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} + \|\xi - P_1 \xi\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}) \\
&\leq Ch^{k+1/2} |\mathbf{q}|_{k+1} \cdot Ch^{3/2} |\xi|_2 \\
&= Ch^{k+2} |\mathbf{q}|_{k+1} |\xi|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

The rest terms are bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
|G'_1(\mathbf{e}_q)| &\leq Ch |\xi|_2 \|\mathbf{e}_q\|, \\
|G'_2(e_u)| &\leq Ch |\boldsymbol{\theta}|_1 \|\nabla e_u\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} \quad (\text{by [6, Lemma 3]}) \\
&\leq Ch |\boldsymbol{\theta}|_1 \left( \|\mathbf{e}_q\| + h^{k+1} |u|_{k+2} \right), \quad (\text{by (19)}) \\
|G'_3(\mathbf{e}_{\hat{q}})| &\leq Ch |\xi|_2 \|h^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_{\hat{q}} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we deduce

$$\|e_u\| \leq C \left( h \|\mathbf{e}_q\| + h \|h^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_{\hat{q}} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} + h^{k+2} |u|_{k+2} \right) \leq Ch^{k+2} |u|_{k+2}.$$

□

**Remark 3.4.** Theorem 3.3 also holds for  $k = 0$ . When  $k = 0$ , we can use the Crouzeix–Raviart interpolation  $I_{CR}$  instead of  $P_W$ . Then, the right-hand sides of (18) and (21) are changed as  $G_1(\mathbf{v}) = -(\nabla(u - I_{CR}u), \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ ,  $G_3(\mathbf{r}) = 0$ ,  $G'_1(\mathbf{v}) = -(\nabla(\xi - I_{CR}\xi), \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ ,  $G'_3(\mathbf{r}) = 0$ . It is clear that they are bounded by the Schwarz inequality and the interpolation error estimate, and we do not need to use the  $L^2$ -projection in (24) since  $G_2(I_{CR}\xi) = \langle (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_N \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}, I_{CR}\xi \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0$ .

#### 4. PROOF OF THE INF-SUP CONDITION FOR TRIANGULAR ELEMENTS

We show that the inf-sup conditions (7) and (8) are satisfied for the triangular  $P_k$ -element in the two-dimensional case.

Let  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  be the reference triangles whose vertices are  $\{(0,0), (0,1), (1,1)\}$  and  $\{(1,0), (0,0), (0,1)\}$ , respectively. Let  $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$  and  $\{e_3, e_4, e_5\}$  denote be the edges of  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , respectively, see Figure 1. For  $1 \leq i \leq 5$ , we define  $F_i$  by the linear transforms from  $e_i$  to  $[-1, 1]$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
F_1((0,0)) &= -1, & F_1((1,0)) &= 1, \\
F_2((1,0)) &= -1, & F_2((1,1)) &= 1, \\
F_3((1,1)) &= -1, & F_3((0,0)) &= 1, \\
F_4((0,0)) &= -1, & F_4((0,1)) &= 1, \\
F_5((0,1)) &= -1, & F_5((1,1)) &= 1.
\end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 1. The reference triangles  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  and the orientation of the edges  $e_1, \dots, e_5$

Let  $\chi^{(i)}$  denote the characteristic function of  $e_i$  and let  $\varphi_p$  denote the Legendre polynomial of degree  $p$  on  $[-1, 1]$ . We define the normalized Legendre polynomial on  $e_i$  by

$$\varphi_p^{(i)} = \frac{(\varphi_p \circ F_i)\chi^{(i)}}{\left(\int_{e_i} (\varphi_p \circ F_i)^2 ds\right)^{1/2}}$$

for  $0 \leq p \leq k$ . It is clear that  $\{\varphi_0^{(i)}, \varphi_1^{(i)}, \dots, \varphi_k^{(i)}\}$  is a basis of  $\mathbf{N}(e_i) = P_k(e_i)$  and satisfies the orthogonality

$$\langle \varphi_p^{(i)}, \varphi_q^{(j)} \rangle_{\partial T_1 \cup \partial T_2} = \delta_{ij} \delta_{pq} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i, j, p, q \leq 5.$$

Note that  $\varphi_p^{(i)} = (-1)^p$  at the starting point of  $e_i$  and  $\varphi_p^{(i)} = 1$  at the end point of  $e_i$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** Let  $\mathbf{r} \in \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 5} \mathbf{N}(e_i)$ . It holds that  $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$  on  $e_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq 5$ ) if and only if

$$(25) \quad \langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial T_1 \cup \partial T_2} = 0 \quad \forall w \in W(T_1) \oplus W(T_2).$$

*Proof.* We prove that only when  $k$  is even, i.e.,  $k = 2k'$ , since the proof when  $k$  is odd is similar. We show that  $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$  follows from (25). We can write  $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}$  as

$$\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \sum_{i=1}^5 \sum_{p=0}^{2k'} a_p^{(i)} \varphi_p^{(i)}, \quad a_p^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

First, we show that  $a_{2q}^{(i)} = 0$  for  $1 \leq q \leq k'$  and  $1 \leq i \leq 5$ . Let us define

$$w_1 = \varphi_{2q}^{(1)} - \varphi_{2k'+1}^{(2)} + \varphi_{2k'+1}^{(3)}$$

for  $1 \leq q \leq k'$ , see also Figure 2. Since  $w_1$  is continuous at the vertices, there exists  $Ew_1 \in W(T_1) \oplus W(T_2)$  such that  $Ew_1 = w_1$  on element boundaries. For simplicity,

we use the same symbol  $w_1$  to denote  $Ew_1$ . Choosing  $w = w_1$  in (25) and noting that  $\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \varphi_{2k'+1}^{(i)} \rangle_{\partial T_1 \cup \partial T_2} = 0$  for any  $i$ , we have

$$\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w_1 \rangle_{\partial T_1 \cup \partial T_2} = \sum_{p=0}^{2k'} \langle a_p^{(1)} \varphi_p^{(1)}, \varphi_{2q}^{(1)} \rangle_{e_1} = a_{2q}^{(1)} = 0.$$

Taking  $w = \varphi_{2k'+1}^{(1)} + \varphi_{2q}^{(2)} - \varphi_{2k'+1}^{(3)}$  and  $w = -\varphi_{2k'+1}^{(1)} + \varphi_{2k'+1}^{(2)} + \varphi_{2q}^{(3)}$ , we get  $a_{2q}^{(2)} = a_{2q}^{(3)} = 0$  for  $1 \leq q \leq k'$ . Similarly, it follows that  $a_{2q}^{(4)} = a_{2q}^{(5)} = 0$  for  $1 \leq q \leq k'$ .




FIGURE 2. Diagrams of the test functions  $w_1$ ,  $w_2$ , and  $w_3$ , where the subscripts are discarded and the number at each vertex indicates the value of the function at the vertex

Next, we show that  $a_1^{(i)} = a_3^{(i)} = \dots = a_{2k'-1}^{(i)}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 5$ . In (25), choosing

$$w = w_2 := \varphi_{2q-1}^{(1)} - \varphi_{2q-1}^{(2)} + \varphi_{2k'}^{(3)},$$

in view of  $a_{2k'}^{(i)} = 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 5$ , we have

$$\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w_2 \rangle_{\partial T_1 \cup \partial T_2} = a_{2q-1}^{(1)} - a_{2q-1}^{(2)} = 0 \quad (1 \leq q \leq k').$$

Choosing  $w = \varphi_{2k'}^{(1)} + \varphi_{2q-1}^{(2)} - \varphi_{2q-1}^{(3)}$  in (25) yields  $a_{2q-1}^{(2)} = a_{2q-1}^{(3)}$  for  $1 \leq q \leq k'$ . Similarly, we deduce that  $a_{2q-1}^{(3)} = a_{2q-1}^{(4)} = a_{2q-1}^{(5)}$  for  $1 \leq q \leq k'$ . Hence, we define  $a_{2q-1} := a_{2q-1}^{(1)} = \dots = a_{2q-1}^{(5)}$  for  $1 \leq q \leq k'$  to omit the subscripts.

Finally, we prove that  $a_{2q-1} = 0$  for  $1 \leq q \leq k'$ . We take the following  $w_3$  as a test function:

$$w_3 := \varphi_{2q-1}^{(1)} + \varphi_{2k'}^{(2)} - \varphi_{2k'+1}^{(3)} - \varphi_{2k'}^{(3)} + \varphi_{2q-1}^{(5)}.$$

Since  $w_3$  is single valued on  $e_3$ , we see that

$$\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w_3|_{e_3} \rangle_{\partial T_1 \cup \partial T_2} = \langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, -\varphi_{2k'+1}^{(3)} \rangle_{\partial T_1 \cup \partial T_2} = 0.$$

Noting that  $a_{2k'}^{(i)} = 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 5$ , we get

$$\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \varphi_{2k'}^{(2)} \rangle_{\partial T_1 \cup \partial T_2} = \langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, -\varphi_{2k'}^{(4)} \rangle_{\partial T_1 \cup \partial T_2} = 0$$

and

$$\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w_3 \rangle_{\partial T_1 \cup \partial T_2} = \langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \varphi_{2q-1}^{(1)} + \varphi_{2q-1}^{(5)} \rangle_{\partial T_1 \cup \partial T_2} = 2a_{2q-1} = 0.$$

Thus, we conclude that all coefficients equal zero.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** Let  $K_1$  and  $K_2 \in \mathcal{T}_h$  be two adjacent triangles. There exists a constant  $C$  independent  $h$  such that, for  $\mathbf{r} \in \bigoplus_{e \in \partial K_1 \cup \partial K_2} \mathbf{N}(e)$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \|h^{1/2} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{L^2(\partial K_i)} \leq C \sum_{i=1,2} \sup_{w \in W(K_i)} \frac{\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial K_i}}{\|\nabla w\|_{L^2(K_i)} + \|h^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_N \nabla w\|_{L^2(\partial K_i)}}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  be the reference triangles and let  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_5$  be the edges of  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ . By Lemma 4.1, we see that

$$\|\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|'_{\partial T_1 \cup \partial T_2} := \sum_{i=1,2} \sup_{w \in W(T_i)} \frac{\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial T_i}}{\|\nabla w\|_{L^2(T_i)} + \|\mathbf{P}_N w\|_{\partial T_i}}$$

is a norm on  $\bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 5} \mathbf{N}(e_i)$ . Since any two norms on a finite-dimensional space are equivalent, there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$\|\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial T_1 \cup \partial T_2} \leq C \|\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|'_{\partial T_1 \cup \partial T_2} \quad \forall \mathbf{r} \in \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 5} \mathbf{N}(e_i).$$

By considering the Piola transforms from  $T_i$  to  $K_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) and the scaling argument, we obtain the assertion.  $\square$

The inf-sup condition (7) immediately follows from Lemma 4.2. Similarly, we can prove the transposed inf-sup condition (8) from the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.3.** Let  $K$  be an element of  $\mathcal{T}_h$  and  $w \in W(K)$ . Then,  $\mathbf{P}_N w = 0$  on  $\partial K$  if and only if

$$\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial K} = 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}(\partial K).$$

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{P}_N w \in \mathbf{N}(\partial K)$ , we can choose  $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{P}_N w$ . We then have

$$\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial K} = \langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{P}_N w \rangle_{\partial K} = \|\mathbf{P}_N w\|_{\partial K}^2 = 0,$$

which implies  $\mathbf{P}_N w|_{\partial K} = 0$ .  $\square$

The proof of the transposed inf-sup condition is the same as in Lemma 4.1, so we omit it here.

**Remark 4.4.** We have proved that the inf-sup condition (7) holds for the triangular elements where  $\mathbf{N}_h$  and  $W_h$  are polynomials of degree  $k$  and  $k + 1$ , respectively. However, it is still open whether there exists a pair of  $\mathbf{N}_h$  and  $W_h$  satisfying the inf-sup condition (7) in the three- or higher-dimensional cases.

## 5. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we examine the convergence property of the proposed method (5) by numerical experiments. As a test problem, we consider the Poisson equation with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u &= 2\pi^2 \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y) && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Omega = (0, 1)^2$  and the exact solution is given by  $u(x, y) = \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y)$ . We use the unstructured triangulations whose mesh sizes are approximately  $0.4 \times 2^{-i}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq 4$ ) and compute the solution of (5), varying the polynomial degree  $k$  from 0 to 3. All numerical computations are carried out by FreeFEM [4]. The  $L^2$ -errors of  $\mathbf{q}_h$  and  $u_h$  are displayed in Table 5. We observe that the orders of convergence in  $\mathbf{q}_h$  and  $u_h$  are  $k + 1$  and  $k + 2$ , respectively, which are of optimal order and fully agrees with Theorems 3.2 and 3.3.

TABLE 1. Convergence history for the method (5)

$k$	$h$	$\ \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_h\ $	Order	$\ u - u_h\ $	Order
0	0.1901	3.472E-01	—	1.027E-02	—
	0.1025	1.660E-01	1.20	2.404E-03	2.35
	0.0509	8.355E-02	0.98	6.150E-04	1.94
	0.0262	4.120E-02	1.07	1.461E-04	2.17
1	0.1901	1.827E-02	—	2.868E-04	—
	0.1025	5.218E-03	2.03	4.389E-05	3.04
	0.0509	1.221E-03	2.07	4.926E-06	3.12
	0.0262	2.967E-04	2.14	5.872E-07	3.21
2	0.1901	1.172E-03	—	1.537E-05	—
	0.1025	1.212E-04	3.68	7.598E-07	4.87
	0.0509	1.465E-05	3.01	4.524E-08	4.02
	0.0262	1.797E-06	3.17	2.732E-09	4.24
3	0.1901	3.283E-05	—	2.773E-07	—
	0.1025	2.662E-06	4.07	1.185E-08	5.11
	0.0509	1.408E-07	4.19	3.021E-10	5.23
	0.0262	8.376E-09	4.27	1.326E-11	4.73

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for providing valuable comments and suggestions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. A. ADAMS AND J. J. F. FOURNIER, *Sobolev spaces*, vol. 140 of Pure and Applied Mathematics (Amsterdam), Academic Press, Amsterdam, second ed., 2003.
- [2] B. COCKBURN, *Static condensation, hybridization, and the devising of the HDG methods*, in Building bridges: connections and challenges in modern approaches to numerical partial differential equations, vol. 114 of Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng., Springer, [Cham], 2016, pp. 129–177.
- [3] B. COCKBURN, J. GOPALAKRISHNAN, AND R. LAZAROV, *Unified hybridization of discontinuous Galerkin, mixed, and continuous Galerkin methods for second order elliptic problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 47 (2009), pp. 1319–1365.
- [4] F. HECHT, *New development in freefem++*, J. Numer. Math., 20 (2012), pp. 251–265.
- [5] C. LEHRENFELD, *Hybrid discontinuous Galerkin methods for solving incompressible flow problems*, Master’s Thesis, RWTH Aachen University, (2010).
- [6] I. OIKAWA, *A hybridized discontinuous Galerkin method with reduced stabilization*, J. Sci. Comput., 65 (2015), pp. 327–340.
- [7] ———, *An HDG method with orthogonal projections in facet integrals*, J. Sci. Comput., 76 (2018), pp. 1044–1054.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INSTITUTE OF PURE AND APPLIED SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF TSUKUBA,  
1-1-1 TENNODAI, TSUKUBA, IBARAKI 305-8571, JAPAN  
*Email address:* ioikawa00@gmail.com