

UNIFIED ANALYSIS OF HDG METHODS USING SCALAR AND VECTOR HYBRID VARIABLES

ISSEI OIKAWA

ABSTRACT. In this paper, hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin (HDG) methods using scalar and vector hybrid variables for steady-state diffusion problems are considered. We propose a unified framework to analyze the methods, where both the hybrid variables are treated as double-valued functions. If either of them is single valued, the well-posedness is ensured under some assumptions on approximation spaces. Moreover, we prove that all methods are superconvergent, based on the so-called M -decomposition theory. Numerical results are presented to validate our theoretical results.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the following steady-state diffusion problem with Dirichlet boundary condition as a model problem:

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

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d = 2, 3$) is a bounded convex polygonal or polyhedral domain and f is a given function.

In this paper, we present hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin (HDG) methods using scalar and vector hybrid variables and propose a unified framework to analyze them. In the original HDG method [6], a scalar hybrid variable \hat{u}_h is introduced to approximate the trace of u on element boundaries, which corresponds to a Dirichlet boundary condition. The other variables approximating u and \mathbf{q} 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 Neumann-type HDG method is devised by employing a vector hybrid variable $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$ approximating the trace of \mathbf{q} instead of \hat{u}_h . In the method, $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$ is unknown and \hat{u}_h is replaced by a numerical flux defined in terms of the other variables. Roughly speaking, the Neumann-type method is derived by interchanging \hat{u}_h and $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$ in the original method. We can also define different HDG methods based on mixed boundary condition. Let us consider a triangle as an element and let e_1 , e_2 , and e_3 denote its edges. If we choose \hat{u}_h or $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$ as an unknown variable on all the edges, then the Dirichlet- or Neumann-type method

Key words and phrases. Discontinuous Galerkin Method and Hybridization and Superconvergence.

is obtained, respectively. If \hat{u}_h and $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$ are unknown variables on e_1 and $e_2 \cup e_3$, respectively, then we obtain a different method (see Figure 1). Up to now, we have mentioned three




FIGURE 1. Possible combinations of hybridization

types of HDG methods, which are summarized in Table 1. The main goal of the paper is to analyze all the methods in some unified framework, which is derived by permitting both of the hybrid variables to be double valued on internal edges and by imposing transmission conditions for them. The well-posedness is in fact established under some assumptions in the framework. We will also prove that all the methods as well as the original HDG method have superconvergence properties if the so-called M -decomposition [5, 3, 4] is assumed.

TABLE 1. List of all types of HDG methods

Method	\hat{u}_h	$\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$	Unknown
Dirichlet-type	single	double	\hat{u}_h
Neumann-type	double	single	$\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$
Mixed-type	single or double	\hat{u}_h or $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$	

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, some notation is introduced and the unified framework is presented. In Section 3, we show the existence and uniqueness of approximate solutions in the framework. In Section 4, we prove superconvergence properties of all the methods, assuming the M -decomposition. In Section 5, numerical results are presented to validate our theoretical results.

2. A UNIFIED FRAMEWORK

2.1. Notation. To begin with, we introduce some notation to define our unified framework. 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 $\bigcup_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} e$. We denote by $P_m(\mathcal{T}_h)$ and $P_m(\mathcal{E}_h)$ 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

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

Throughout the paper, we use the symbol C to denote a generic constant independent of the mesh size h .

2.2. Finite element spaces. Let $\mathbf{V}(K)$ and $W(K)$ be finite-dimensional spaces on $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ for approximating $u|_K$ and $\mathbf{q}|_K$, respectively. It is assumed that

$$\nabla W(K) \subset \mathbf{V}(K), \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{V}(K) \subset W(K),$$

namely, $\nabla w \in \mathbf{V}(K)$ for any $w \in W(K)$ and $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} \in W(K)$ for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}(K)$. We denote a finite element space for $\hat{u}_h|_e$ by $M(e)$ for $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$ and define an approximate space for $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h|_e$ by

$$\mathbf{N}(e) = \{\mathbf{r} \in L^2(e)^d : (I - \mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n})\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}\}.$$

The tangential component of $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$ is discarded since it is not used in the HDG method. We make the following assumptions:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(A1)} & \quad \mu \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}(e) & \quad \forall \mu \in M(e), \\ \text{(A2)} & \quad \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \in M(e) & \quad \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}(e), \\ \text{(A3)} & \quad \mathbf{v}|_e \cdot \mathbf{n} \in M(e) & \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}(K), \\ \text{(A4)} & \quad w|_e \in M(e) & \quad \forall w \in W(K), \end{aligned}$$

where K is any element in \mathcal{T}_h , e is any edge of K , and \mathbf{n} is a unit normal vector to e . If $M(e)^d \subset \mathbf{N}(e)$ and $\mathbf{N}(e) \subset M(e)^d$, then (A1) and (A2) are satisfied, respectively. If $M(e)$ is given, we can define $\mathbf{N}(e)$ by

$$\mathbf{N}(e) = (\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n})M(e)^d := \{(\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n})\boldsymbol{\mu} : \boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_d) \in M(e)^d\}.$$

Conversely, $M(e)$ can be constructed from any given $\mathbf{N}(e)$ as

$$M(e) = \mathbf{N}(e) \cdot \mathbf{n} := \{\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} : \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}(e)\}.$$

Assumptions (A3) and (A4) are needed to make $\mathbf{V}(K) \times W(K)$ admit the M -decomposition. Hereinafter, we write as $\text{tr } \mathbf{V} \subset M$ and $\text{tr } W \subset M$ to indicate (A3) and (A4), respectively. Note that (A1)–(A4) are in fact satisfied if all the spaces are polynomials of the same

degree. Finally, finite element spaces are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{V}_h &:= \{\mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega)^d : \mathbf{v}|_K \in \mathbf{V}(K) \ \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}, \\ W_h &:= \{w \in L^2(\Omega) : w|_K \in W(K) \ \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}, \\ M_h &:= \{\mu \in L^2(\mathcal{E}_h) : \mu|_e \in M(e) \ \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h, \mu|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}, \\ \mathbf{N}_h &:= \{\mathbf{r} \in L^2(\mathcal{E}_h)^d : \mathbf{r}|_e \in \mathbf{N}(e) \ \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h\}.\end{aligned}$$

Let \mathbf{P}_V , P_W , and P_M denote the L^2 -projections onto \mathbf{V}_h , W_h , and M_h , respectively. Let k be a non-negative integer. We assume the following approximation properties of the spaces: for $1 \leq s \leq k+1$,

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

where $\|w\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2 := \langle w, w \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}$.

2.3. HDG methods. We are now in a position to define the HDG formulations we mentioned in the Introduction. The scheme of the mixed-type method is not presented here since it is just a combination of the Dirichlet- and Neumann-type methods. In the following, let τ be a positive parameter.

The solution of the Dirichlet-type method $(\mathbf{q}_h, u_h, \hat{u}_h) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times W_h \times M_h$ is defined by

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

The Neumann-type method seeks a solution $(\mathbf{q}_h, u_h, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_h) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times W_h \times \mathbf{N}_h$ such that

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

Note that (4d) is formally equivalent to (3d).

2.4. Local solvability. In this subsection, we present the local problems of the HDG methods. We also give a priori estimates for the local problems in order to verify the local solvability.

The Dirichlet-type method. Let $\widehat{u}_{\partial K}$ denote the restriction of \widehat{u}_h to ∂K . The local problem is as follows: Find $(\mathbf{q}_K, u_K) \in \mathbf{V}(K) \times W(K)$ such that

$$(5a) \quad (\mathbf{q}_K, \mathbf{v})_K - (u_K, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_K = -\langle \widehat{u}_{\partial K}, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial K} \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}(K),$$

$$(5b) \quad (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_K, w)_K + \langle \tau u_K, w \rangle_{\partial K} = (f, w)_K + \langle \tau \widehat{u}_{\partial K}, w \rangle_{\partial K} \quad \forall w \in W(K).$$

The solvability of this problem is well known.

The Neumann-type method. We assume that $P_0(\mathcal{T}_h) \subset W_h$ and that $\mu \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}_h$ for all $\mu \in P_0(\mathcal{E}_h)$. Let $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_{\partial K}$ denote the restriction of $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h$ to ∂K and let $\llbracket w \rrbracket$ denote the jump of a function w . We define $\|\mu\|_{\mathcal{E}_h}^2 = \langle \mu, \mu \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_h}$ and $\|\mathbf{r}\|_{\mathcal{E}_h}^2 = \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_h}$. We introduce the mean-zero subspace of $W(K)$,

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

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

$$(6a)$$

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

$$(6b) \quad -(\mathbf{q}_K, \nabla w_0)_K = (f, w_0)_K - \langle \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_{\partial K} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w_0 \rangle_{\partial K} \quad \forall w_0 \in W_0(K).$$

Taking $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{q}_K$ in (6a) and $w = u_K$ in (6b), we have

$$\|\mathbf{q}_K\|_{L^2(K)}^2 + \|\tau^{-1/2} \mathbf{q}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{L^2(\partial K)}^2 \leq C \left(\|f\|_{L^2(K)}^2 + \|\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_{\partial K}\|_{L^2(\partial K)}^2 \right),$$

which, in view of (6a), implies that \mathbf{q}_K and u_{K0} are determined if $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_{\partial K}$ is given. Note, however, that the piecewise constant part of u_h , denoted by \bar{u}_h , remains to be unknown. Eliminating \mathbf{q}_K and u_{K0} in element-by-element fashion by static condensation, we obtain the global equations determining $(\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h, \bar{u}_h) \in \mathbf{N}_h \times P_0(\mathcal{T}_h)$:

$$(7a) \quad \langle \bar{u}_h - \tau^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = -\langle u_{h0} - \tau^{-1} \mathbf{q}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} =: F_1(\mathbf{r}) \quad \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h,$$

$$(7b) \quad \langle \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \bar{w} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = (f, \bar{w}) \quad \forall \bar{w} \in P_0(\mathcal{T}_h),$$

where $u_{h0} := u_h - \bar{u}_h$. Note that u_{h0} has been determined by (6). 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 real constant C such that, for all $\bar{w} \in P_0(\mathcal{E}_h)$,

$$C \|\llbracket \bar{w} \rrbracket\|_{\mathcal{E}_h} \leq \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h} \frac{\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \bar{w} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}}{\|\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}}.$$

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

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

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

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

which completes the proof. \square

We now prove an a priori estimate for the global problem (7) using the inf-sup condition, which ensures that the problem admits a unique solution.

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

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

Proof. Taking $\mathbf{r} = \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h$ in (7a) and $\bar{w} = \bar{u}_h$ in (7b), 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 follows from these that

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

where

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

Using Young's inequality, we deduce

$$(8) \quad \|\tau^{-1/2}\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \leq C (\|F_1\| + \|f\|) + \epsilon \|\bar{u}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. By the inf-sup condition, (7a) and (8) with ϵ sufficiently small, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\llbracket \bar{u}_h \rrbracket\|_{\mathcal{E}_h} &\leq C \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{N}_h} \frac{\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \bar{u}_h \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}}{\|\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}} \\ &\leq C \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{N}_h} \frac{F_1(\mathbf{r}) + \langle \tau^{-1}\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}}{\|\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}} \\ &\leq C (\|F_1\| + \|\tau^{-1}\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}) \\ &\leq C (\|F_1\| + \|f\|) + \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{u}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that both $\|\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket\|_{\mathcal{E}_h}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}$ are norms on $P_0(\mathcal{T}_h)$, we see that they are equivalent to each other. Hence, $\|\bar{u}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}$ is bounded by $C\|\llbracket \bar{u}_h \rrbracket\|_{\mathcal{E}_h}$ and we get

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

By (8), we obtain

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

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

The mixed-type method. Let ∂K_D and ∂K_N denote the facet of K assigned hybrid unknowns \widehat{u}_h and $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h$, respectively. We assume that both ∂K_D and ∂K_N are not empty for the mixed-type method. The local solution $(\mathbf{q}_K, u_K) \in \mathbf{V}(K) \times W(K)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (9a) \quad (\mathbf{q}_K, \mathbf{v})_K - (u_K, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_K + \langle u_K + \tau^{-1}\mathbf{q}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial K_N} &= F_2(\mathbf{v}) \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}(K), \\ (9b) \quad -(\mathbf{q}_K, \nabla w)_K + \langle \mathbf{q}_K \cdot \mathbf{n} + \tau u_K, w \rangle_{\partial K_D} &= F_3(w) \quad \forall w \in W(K), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_2(\mathbf{v}) &= -\langle \widehat{u}_{\partial K}, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial K_D} + \langle \tau^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_{\partial K} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial K_N}, \\ F_3(w) &= (f, w)_K + \langle \tau \widehat{u}_K, w \rangle_{\partial K_D} - \langle \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_{\partial K} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial K_N}. \end{aligned}$$

The solvability of this problem follows from the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3. For any $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathbf{q}_K\|_K^2 + \|\tau^{1/2} u_K\|_{L^2(\partial K_D)}^2 + \|\tau^{-1/2} \mathbf{q}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{L^2(\partial K_N)}^2 \\ &\leq C \left(\|f\|_{L^2(K)}^2 + \|\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_{\partial K}\|_{L^2(\partial K_N)}^2 + \|\widehat{u}_{\partial K}\|_{L^2(\partial K_D)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Choosing $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{q}_K$ in (9a) and $w = u_K$ in (9b) after integrating by parts, we have

$$\|\mathbf{q}_K\|_K^2 - \langle \mathbf{q}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}, u_K \rangle_{\partial K_N} + \|\tau^{1/2} u_K\|_{L^2(\partial K_D)}^2 + \|\tau^{-1/2} \mathbf{q}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{L^2(\partial K_N)}^2 = F_2(\mathbf{q}_K) + F_3(u_K).$$

The second term on the left-hand side is bounded from below as

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle \mathbf{q}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}, u_K \rangle_{\partial K_N} &= -\langle \tau^{-1/2} \mathbf{q}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}, \tau^{1/2} u_K \rangle_{\partial K_N} \\ &\geq -\frac{1}{2} \left(\|\tau^{1/2} u_K\|_{L^2(\partial K_D)}^2 + \|\tau^{-1/2} \mathbf{q}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{L^2(\partial K_N)}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\|\mathbf{q}_K\|_K^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\tau^{1/2} u_K\|_{L^2(\partial K_D)}^2 + \|\tau^{-1/2} \mathbf{q}_K \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{L^2(\partial K_N)}^2 \right) \leq F_2(\mathbf{q}_K) + F_3(u_K).$$

Since $F_2(\mathbf{q}_K)$ and $F_3(u_K)$ can be bounded by the L^2 norms of f , $\widehat{u}_{\partial K}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_{\partial K}$, we obtain the assertion. \square

2.5. Unified formulation. In the following, let \widehat{u}_h and $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h$ be double-valued functions on edges, namely, we consider the hybrid variables as $\widehat{u}_h : T(M_h) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h : \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{N}_h) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, where $T(M_h) := \prod_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} M(\partial K)$ and $\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{N}_h) := \prod_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \mathbf{N}(\partial K)$. It is assumed that either \widehat{u}_h or $\widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h$ is single valued. Imposing the transmission conditions for both of them and taking (3d) and (4d) into account lead to the following formulation:

$$\begin{aligned} (10a) \quad &(\mathbf{q}_h, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (u_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \widehat{u}_h, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 & \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h, \\ (10b) \quad &-(\mathbf{q}_h, \nabla w)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = (f, w) & \forall w \in W_h, \\ (10c) \quad &\langle \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mu \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 & \forall \mu \in M_h, \\ (10d) \quad &\langle \widehat{u}_h, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 & \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h, \\ (10e) \quad &(\mathbf{q}_h - \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h) \cdot \mathbf{n} + \tau(u_h - \widehat{u}_h) = 0 \text{ on } \partial K & \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h. \end{aligned}$$

The solutions of all the methods we presented in the previous subsection solve these equations. Therefore, we can analyze them with the above formulation. In what follow, let $(\mathbf{q}_h, u_h, \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h, \widehat{u}_h) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times W_h \times \mathbf{N}_h \times M_h$ denote a solution to (10).

3. WELL-POSEDNESS

This section is devoted to the establishment of the well-posedness of the unified formulation. We will use Assumptions (A1)–(A4) to prove the well-posedness.

Theorem 3.1. We have

$$\|\mathbf{q}_h\|^2 + \|\tau^{1/2}(u_h - \hat{u}_h)\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2 \leq C\|f\|^2.$$

Proof. Taking $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{q}_h$ in (10a) and $w = u_h$ in (10b), we have

$$\|\mathbf{q}_h\|^2 - \langle (u_h - \hat{u}_h), \mathbf{q}_h \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \hat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, u_h \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} = (f, u_h).$$

Since we assume that either \hat{u}_h or $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h$ is single valued, by using the transmission condition (10c) or (10d), we get $\langle \hat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \hat{u}_h \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} = 0$. Consequently, we obtain

$$(11) \quad \|\mathbf{q}_h\|^2 - \langle (\mathbf{q}_h - \hat{\mathbf{q}}_h) \cdot \mathbf{n}, u_h - \hat{u}_h \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} = (f, u_h).$$

By (10e), we deduce

$$\langle (\mathbf{q}_h - \hat{\mathbf{q}}_h) \cdot \mathbf{n}, u_h - \hat{u}_h \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} = -\|\tau^{1/2}(u_h - \hat{u}_h)\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2.$$

Combining this with (11), we have

$$\|\mathbf{q}_h\|^2 + \|\tau^{1/2}(u_h - \hat{u}_h)\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2 = (f, u_h).$$

It is known that

$$\|u_h\| \leq C \left(\|\mathbf{q}_h\|^2 + \|\tau^{1/2}(u_h - \hat{u}_h)\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

By this inequality and the Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{q}_h\|^2 + \|\tau^{1/2}(u_h - \hat{u}_h)\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2 \leq C\|f\|^2,$$

which completes the proof. \square

If $f \equiv 0$, it follows from Theorem 3.1 that \mathbf{q}_h is zero on each element and $u_h = \hat{u}_h$ on element boundaries. By (10e), we get $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h = \mathbf{0}$. Taking $\mathbf{v} = \nabla u_h$ in (10a) and integrating by parts give $\nabla u_h = 0$ on each element, which implies that u_h and \hat{u}_h are piecewise constant functions. In view of the transmission condition (10d), we see that the jump of \hat{u}_h equals zero on internal edges and \hat{u}_h equals zero on $\partial\Omega$. Thus, we have verified the existence and uniqueness of all the methods.

Remark 3.2. Let $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and e be an edge of K . Let us consider the case of $\text{tr } W(K) \notin M(\partial K)$, such as $W(K) = P_{k+1}(K)$ and $M(e) = P_k(e)$. The so-called Lehrenfeld–Schöberl (LS) stabilization is defined by

$$\hat{\mathbf{q}}_h^{LS} \cdot \mathbf{n} := \mathbf{q}_h \cdot \mathbf{n} + \tau(P_M u_h - \hat{u}_h),$$

which enables to achieve optimal-order convergence in all variables if τ is of order h^{-1} , see [8, 9]. The LS stabilization can be incorporated into our unified formulation by replacing (10e) by

$$(\mathbf{q}_h - \hat{\mathbf{q}}_h) \cdot \mathbf{n} + \tau(P_M u_h - \hat{u}_h) = 0.$$

Even if we do not assume (A4), the well-posedness can be proved and the following estimate instead of Theorem 3.1 hold:

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

4. SUPERCONVERGENCE BY THE M -DECOMPOSITION

In this section, we prove superconvergence properties in the unified formulation, assuming the M -decomposition. We begin by summarizing the results on the HDG-projection.

Theorem 4.1. If $\mathbf{V} \times W$ admits the M -decomposition, there exists the HDG-projection $(\Pi_{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{q}, \Pi_W u) \in \mathbf{V}(K) \times W(K)$ such that

$$(12a) \quad (\Pi_W u, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_K = (u, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_K \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}(K),$$

$$(12b) \quad (\Pi_{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{q}, \nabla w)_K = (\mathbf{q}, \nabla w)_K \quad \forall w \in W(K),$$

$$(12c) \quad \langle \Pi_{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} + \tau \Pi_W u, \mu \rangle_{\partial K} = \langle \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} + \tau P_M u, \mu \rangle_{\partial K} \quad \forall \mu \in M(\partial K).$$

Proof. This follows from [5, Definition 3.1] by choosing $w = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{v} = \nabla w$ therein. We also give a simplified proof in Appendix A for the readers' convenience. \square

By assuming approximation properties (2) in [5, Definition 3.1] or in Theorem A.3, the L^2 -errors of the HDG-projection are bounded as

$$(13) \quad \|u - \Pi_W u\| + \|\mathbf{q} - \Pi_{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{q}\| \leq Ch^{k+1}|u|_{k+1}.$$

4.1. **Optimal convergence of \mathbf{q}_h .** We denote the projections of errors as

$$\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{q}} = \Pi_{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_h, \quad e_u = \Pi_W u - u_h, \quad \mathbf{e}_{\widehat{\mathbf{q}}} \cdot \mathbf{n} = P_M(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n}) - \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \quad e_{\widehat{u}} = P_M u - \widehat{u}_h.$$

Theorem 4.2. We have

$$\|\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{q}}\|^2 + 2\|\tau^{1/2}(e_u - e_{\widehat{u}})\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2 \leq \|\mathbf{q} - \Pi_{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{q}\|^2.$$

Proof. The problem (1) is rewritten into

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

By Theorem 4.1 and Assumptions (A3) and (A4), these equations become

$$\begin{aligned} (14a) \quad (\Pi_{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\nabla \Pi_W u, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle \Pi_W u - P_M u, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} &= -(\mathbf{q} - \Pi_{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} & \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h, \\ (14b) \quad -(\Pi_{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{q}, \nabla w)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle P_M(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n}), w \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} &= (f, w) & \forall w \in W_h, \\ (14c) \quad \langle P_M(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n}), \mu \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} &= 0 & \forall \mu \in M_h, \\ (14d) \quad \langle P_M u, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} &= 0 & \forall \mu \in \mathbf{N}_h, \\ (14e) \quad \Pi_{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} - P_M(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n}) + \tau(\Pi_W u - P_M u) &= 0 \text{ on } \partial K & \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h, \end{aligned}$$

where we have integrated by parts in the first equation. Subtracting (10) from the above equations, we obtain the error equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
(15a) \quad & (\mathbf{e}_q, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\nabla e_u, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle e_u - e_{\widehat{u}}, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = -(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} & \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h, \\
(15b) \quad & -(\mathbf{e}_q, \nabla w)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \mathbf{e}_{\widehat{q}} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 & \forall w \in W_h, \\
(15c) \quad & \langle \mathbf{e}_{\widehat{q}} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mu \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 & \forall \mu \in M_h, \\
(15d) \quad & \langle e_{\widehat{u}}, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 & \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h, \\
(15e) \quad & (\mathbf{e}_q - \mathbf{e}_{\widehat{q}}) \cdot \mathbf{n} + \tau(e_u - e_{\widehat{u}}) = 0 \text{ on } \partial K & \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{e}_q$ in (15a) and $w = e_u$ in (15b) and summing up the resulting equations, we have

$$(16) \quad \|\mathbf{e}_q\|^2 - \langle e_u - e_{\widehat{u}}, \mathbf{e}_q \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \mathbf{e}_{\widehat{q}} \cdot \mathbf{n}, e_u \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = -(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{e}_q)_{\mathcal{T}_h}.$$

Noting that either $\mathbf{e}_{\widehat{q}}$ or $e_{\widehat{u}}$ is single valued, we have by (15c) or (15d),

$$\langle \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_q \cdot \mathbf{n}, e_{\widehat{u}} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0.$$

Adding this to (16), we have

$$\|\mathbf{e}_q\|^2 + \|\tau^{1/2}(e_u - e_{\widehat{u}})\|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}^2 = -(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{e}_q)_{\mathcal{T}_h}.$$

Applying Schwarz's and Young's inequalities to the right-hand side, we obtain the assertion. \square

Corollary 4.3. Assume the approximation properties (2). Then we have

$$\|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_h\| \leq 2\|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}\| \leq Ch^{k+1}|u|_{k+1}.$$

Proof. Apply the triangle inequality to Theorem 4.2. \square

4.2. Superconvergence of $\Pi_W u - u_h$. 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 estimate the L^2 -error of u_h by the Aubin-Nitsche technique.

Theorem 4.4. We have

$$\|\Pi_W u - u_h\| \leq Ch\|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}\|.$$

Proof. Since (14) holds also for the adjoint problem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(18a) \quad & (\mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\nabla \Pi_W \xi, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle \Pi_W \xi - P_M \xi, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = -(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_h, \\
(18b) \quad & -(\mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}, \nabla w)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle P_M(\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{n}), w \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = (e_u, w) \quad \forall w \in W_h, \\
(18c) \quad & \langle P_M(\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{n}), \mu \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 \quad \forall \mu \in M_h, \\
(18d) \quad & \langle P_M \xi, \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{N}_h, \\
(18e) \quad & \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{n} - P_M(\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{n}) + \tau(\Pi_W \xi - P_M \xi) = 0 \text{ on } \partial K \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h.
\end{aligned}$$

Since either (18c) or (15d) holds, we have

$$(19) \quad \langle P_M(\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{n}), e_{\hat{u}} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0.$$

Taking $\mathbf{v} = -\mathbf{e}_q$ in (18a) and $w = e_u$ in (18b), in view of (19), we have

$$(20) \quad -(\mathbf{P}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{e}_q)_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\nabla \Pi_W \xi, \mathbf{e}_q)_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}, \nabla e_u)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \Pi_W \xi - P_M \xi, \mathbf{e}_q \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \\ + \langle P_M(\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{n}), e_u - e_{\hat{u}} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = \|e_u\|^2.$$

Choosing $\mathbf{v} = -\mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}$ in (15a), $w = \Pi_W \xi$ in (15b), and $\mu = P_M \xi$ in (15e), we have

$$(21) \quad -(\mathbf{e}_q, \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\nabla e_u, \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\mathbf{e}_q, \nabla \Pi_W \xi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{n}, e_u - e_{\hat{u}} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \\ + \langle \mathbf{e}_{\hat{q}} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \Pi_W \xi - P_M \xi \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta})_{\mathcal{T}_h}.$$

Subtracting (21) from (20) yields

$$\|e_u\|^2 = (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{e}_q)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle (\mathbf{e}_q - \mathbf{e}_{\hat{q}}) \cdot \mathbf{n}, \Pi_W \xi - P_M \xi \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} \\ - \langle \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{n} - P_M(\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{n}), e_u - e_{\hat{u}} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}.$$

The second and third term on the right-hand side cancel each other out as follows:

$$\langle (\mathbf{e}_q - \mathbf{e}_{\hat{q}}) \cdot \mathbf{n}, \Pi_W \xi - P_M \xi \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = -\langle \tau(e_u - e_{\hat{u}}), \Pi_W \xi - P_M \xi \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h}, \\ -\langle \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{n} - P_M(\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{n}), e_u - e_{\hat{u}} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = \langle \tau(\Pi_W - P_M \xi), e_u - e_{\hat{u}} \rangle_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h},$$

where we have used (15e) and (18e) in the first and second lines, respectively. As a result, we have

$$\|e_u\|^2 = (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{e}_q)_{\mathcal{T}_h}.$$

Since $(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}, \nabla P_W \xi) = 0$ by Proposition A.2, the first term on the right-hand side is estimated as,

$$\begin{aligned}
|(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta})_{\mathcal{T}_h}| &= |(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta} + \nabla P_W \xi)_{\mathcal{T}_h}| \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}\| \|\mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta} + \nabla P_W \xi\| \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}\| (\|\mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\| + \|\nabla \xi - \nabla P_W \xi\|) \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}\| \cdot Ch(|\boldsymbol{\theta}|_1 + |\xi|_2) \\
&\leq Ch \|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}\| \|e_u\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (13) for $k = 0$ and the elliptic regularity. Again, by (13) for $k = 0$ and the elliptic regularity, we bound the other term as

$$|(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{e}_q)_{\tau_h}| \leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\theta}\| \|\mathbf{e}_q\| \leq Ch |\boldsymbol{\theta}|_1 \|\mathbf{e}_q\| \leq Ch \|e_u\| \|\mathbf{e}_q\|.$$

Therefore, by Theorem 4.2, we obtain

$$\|e_u\| \leq Ch (\|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}\| + \|\mathbf{e}_q\|) \leq Ch \|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{\Pi}_V \mathbf{q}\|.$$

The proof is complete. \square

5. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we examine the orders of convergence of the Dirichlet- and Neumann-type methods by numerical experiments. The test problem is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u &= 2\pi^2 \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y) && \text{in } \Omega := (0, 1)^2, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where the exact solution is given by $u(x, y) = \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y)$. All numerical computations are carried out by FreeFEM [7]. In all cases, we use unstructured triangulations, which are also generated by FreeFEM.

5.1. Case 1: $\text{tr } W \subset M$. We employ polynomials of the same degree k for all variables, which satisfies Assumptions (A1)–(A4) and admit the M -decomposition. The stabilization parameter is set as $\tau \equiv 1$. The numerical results are displayed in Table 2. We observe that the orders of convergence in \mathbf{q} are optimal for both the methods, which fully agrees with Theorem 4.3.

TABLE 2. Convergence history in Case 1

		Dirichlet-type				Neumann-type			
k	$1/h$	$\ \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_h\ $	Order	$\ u - u_h\ $	Order	$\ \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_h\ $	Order	$\ u - u_h\ $	Order
1	4	8.78E-02	–	4.67E-02	–	1.96E-02	–	1.02E-02	–
	8	1.96E-02	2.16	1.01E-02	2.21	5.58E-03	1.81	2.94E-03	1.80
	16	5.65E-03	1.80	2.99E-03	1.75	1.35E-03	2.05	7.28E-04	2.01
	32	1.35E-03	2.07	7.15E-04	2.07	3.28E-04	2.04	1.79E-04	2.02
2	4	7.56E-03	–	5.59E-03	–	6.39E-04	–	4.91E-04	–
	8	6.68E-04	3.50	4.63E-04	3.59	7.84E-05	3.03	6.17E-05	2.99
	16	8.23E-05	3.02	6.21E-05	2.90	9.81E-06	3.00	7.75E-06	2.99
	32	9.83E-06	3.07	7.76E-06	3.00	1.20E-06	3.03	9.56E-07	3.02
3	4	5.86E-04	–	2.79E-04	–	3.29E-05	–	1.59E-05	–
	8	2.64E-05	4.47	9.22E-06	4.92	2.55E-06	3.69	1.28E-06	3.63
	16	2.20E-06	3.58	6.64E-07	3.80	1.52E-07	4.06	7.71E-08	4.05
	32	1.18E-07	4.22	3.78E-08	4.13	9.06E-09	4.07	4.62E-09	4.06

5.2. Case 2: $\text{tr}W \not\subset M$. As mentioned in Remark 3.2, all the methods are optimally convergent in all variables if the polynomial degrees of \mathbf{V}_h , \mathbf{N}_h , and M_h are k , the degree of W_h is $k + 1$, and the stabilization parameter is set as $\tau = O(1/h)$. The LS stabilization of the Neumann-type method is defined by

$$\widehat{u}_h^{LS} := P_M u_h + \tau^{-1}(\mathbf{q}_h - \widehat{\mathbf{q}}_h) \cdot \mathbf{n}.$$

From the results, we see that the orders of convergence are optimal for both u and \mathbf{q} in all cases, which supports our claim in Remark 3.2.

TABLE 3. Convergence history in Case 2

		Dirichlet-type				Neumann-type			
k	$1/h$	$\ \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_h\ $		$\ u - u_h\ $		$\ \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_h\ $		$\ u - u_h\ $	
		Error	Order	Error	Order	Error	Order	Error	Order
1	4	7.77E-02	–	1.29E-02	–	1.73e-02	–	1.19e-03	–
	8	1.76E-02	2.14	1.19E-03	3.44	5.05e-03	1.78	1.88e-04	2.66
	16	5.15E-03	1.78	1.92E-04	2.63	1.22e-03	2.05	2.28e-05	3.04
	32	1.22E-03	2.08	2.26E-05	3.09	2.97e-04	2.04	2.77e-06	3.04
2	4	5.24E-03	–	1.81E-03	–	9.76e-04	–	6.95e-05	–
	8	4.79E-04	3.45	5.79E-05	4.97	1.15e-04	3.09	4.43e-06	3.97
	16	5.62E-05	3.09	4.13E-06	3.81	1.43e-05	3.00	2.76e-07	4.00
	32	6.98E-06	3.01	2.54E-07	4.02	1.78e-06	3.01	1.69e-08	4.03
3	4	5.86E-04	–	3.81E-05	–	2.78e-05	–	1.94e-06	–
	8	2.60E-05	4.49	6.44E-07	5.88	2.29e-06	3.60	9.20e-08	4.40
	16	2.23E-06	3.55	3.10E-08	4.38	1.36e-07	4.07	2.74e-09	5.07
	32	1.19E-07	4.22	8.37E-10	5.21	8.13e-09	4.07	8.13e-11	5.07

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

APPENDIX A. ANALYSIS OF THE HDG-PROJECTION

In this section, we show that the HDG-projection is well defined if the M -decomposition is admitted. To this end, we first introduce some notation.

Let $\mathbf{V}_s(K)$ denote the *solenoidal* space of $\mathbf{V}(K)$, namely,

$$\mathbf{V}_s(K) = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}(K) : \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0\}.$$

The space of *solenoidal bubbles* in $\mathbf{V}(K)$ is defined by

$$\mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(K) = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_s(K) : \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial K\}.$$

We denote the orthogonal complement of $\mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(K)$ by $\mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(K)^\perp$.

Proposition A.1. Let \mathbf{q}_h be the solution of (10a). Then $\mathbf{q}_h|_K \in \mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(K)^\perp$ for any $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$.

Proof. Decompose as $\mathbf{q}_h|_K = \mathbf{q}_K^\circ + \mathbf{q}_K^\perp$, where $\mathbf{q}_K^\circ \in \mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(K)$ and $\mathbf{q}_K^\perp \in \mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(K)^\perp$. Taking $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{q}_K^\circ$ in (10a), we have

$$\|\mathbf{q}_K^\circ\|_{L^2(K)}^2 - (u_h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}_K^\circ)_K + \langle \widehat{u}_h, \mathbf{q}_K^\circ \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial K} = 0.$$

Since the second and third terms on the left-hand side vanish, we have $\mathbf{q}_K^\circ = \mathbf{0}$. \square

Proposition A.2. $\mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(K)$ is orthogonal to $\nabla W(K)$.

Proof. For any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(K)$ and $w \in W(K)$, we have by Green's formula,

$$(\mathbf{v}, \nabla w)_K = -(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}, w)_K + \langle \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}, w \rangle_{\partial K} = 0,$$

which completes the proof. \square

According to [5], the M -index for $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ is defined by

$$I_M := \dim M(\partial K) - \dim\{\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial K} : \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_s(K)\} - \dim\{w|_{\partial K} : \nabla w = 0\}.$$

If $P_0(K) \subset W(K)$, then $\dim\{w|_{\partial K} : \nabla w = 0\} = 1$ and the M -index can be rewritten as

$$I_M = \dim M(\partial K) - (\dim \mathbf{V}_s(K) - \dim \mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(K) + 1).$$

By Proposition A.1, one of the trial function spaces in (12) is reduced from $\mathbf{V}(K)$ to $\mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(K)^\perp$. Some of the test function spaces in (12) are also reduced from $\mathbf{V}(K)$ and $W(K)$ to $\mathbf{V}_s(K)^\perp$ and $W(K)/P_0(K)$, respectively. Then (12) is rewritten as: find $(\Pi_{\mathbf{V}} \mathbf{q}, \Pi_W u) \in \mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(K)^\perp \times W(K)$ such that

$$(22a) \quad (\Pi_W u, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_K = (u, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_K \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_s(K)^\perp,$$

$$(22b) \quad (\Pi_{\mathbf{V}} \mathbf{q}, \nabla w)_K = (\mathbf{q}, \nabla w)_K \quad \forall w \in W(K)/P_0(K),$$

$$(22c) \quad \langle \Pi_{\mathbf{V}} \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} + \tau \Pi_W u, \mu \rangle_{\partial K} = \langle \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} + \tau P_M u, \mu \rangle_{\partial K} \quad \forall \mu \in M(\partial K).$$

Therefore, the corresponding matrix of (22) is square if and only if

$$(23) \quad \dim \mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(K)^\perp + \dim W(K) = \dim \mathbf{V}_s(K)^\perp + \dim(W(K)/P_0(K)) + \dim M(\partial K).$$

Since $\dim \mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(K)^\perp = \dim \mathbf{V}(K) - \dim \mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(K)$, $\dim \mathbf{V}_s(K)^\perp = \dim \mathbf{V}(K) - \dim \mathbf{V}_s(K)$, and $\dim W(K)/P_0 = \dim W(K) - 1$, we see that (23) is nothing but $I_M = 0$. So, it suffices to show the following a priori estimates in order to verify the existence and uniqueness of the HDG-projection. In the following, we assume that τ is a positive constant for simplicity.

Theorem A.3. Assume that τ is a positive constant. Then, for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, there exist constants C such that

$$\|\mathbf{q} - \Pi_{\mathbf{V}} \mathbf{q}\|_K \leq \|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{V}} \mathbf{q}\|_K + Ch^{1/2} (\|(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{V}} \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K} + \|\tau(u - P_W u)\|_{\partial K}),$$

$$\|u - \Pi_W u\|_K \leq \|u - P_W u\|_K + Ch^{1/2} (\|\tau^{-1}(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{V}} \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K} + \|u - P_W u\|_{\partial K}).$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}^\perp}$ be the L^2 -projection onto $\mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}^\perp$ and let us denote as

$$\delta_{\mathbf{q}} = \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}^\perp} \mathbf{q} - \Pi_{\mathbf{V}} \mathbf{q}, \quad \delta_u = P_W u - \Pi_W u.$$

We will show that there exist constants C independent of h such that

$$(24) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_q\|_K \leq Ch^{1/2} (\|(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_V \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K} + \|\tau(u - P_W u)\|_{\partial K}),$$

$$(25) \quad \|\delta_u\|_K \leq Ch^{1/2} (\|\tau^{-1}(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_V \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K} + \|u - P_W u\|_{\partial K}),$$

from which the assertion follows immediately.

Let T be a reference element. Note that $\|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}\|_T + \|\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial T}$ and $\|\nabla w\|_T + \|w\|_{\partial T}$ are norms on $\mathbf{V}_{\text{sbb}}(T)^\perp$ and $W(T)$, respectively. By the standard scaling argument, we obtain

$$(26) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_q\|_K \leq C \left(h \|\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_q\|_K + h^{1/2} \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_q \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K} \right),$$

$$(27) \quad \|\delta_u\|_K \leq C \left(h \|\nabla \delta_u\|_K + h^{1/2} \|\delta_u\|_{\partial K} \right).$$

Since $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} \in W(K)$ and $\nabla w \in \mathbf{V}(K)$, we have $(u, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_K = (P_W u, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_K$ and, in view of Proposition A.2, $(\mathbf{q}, \nabla w)_K = (\mathbf{P}_V \mathbf{q}, \nabla w)_K = (\mathbf{P}_{V_{\text{sbb}}^\perp} \mathbf{q}, \nabla w)_K$. Then we can rewrite (22) into

$$(28a) \quad (\delta_u, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_K = 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}(K),$$

$$(28b) \quad (\boldsymbol{\delta}_q, \nabla w)_K = 0 \quad \forall w \in W(K),$$

$$(28c) \quad \langle \boldsymbol{\delta}_q \cdot \mathbf{n} + \tau \delta_u, \mu \rangle_{\partial K} = F(\mu) \quad \forall \mu \in M(\partial K),$$

where $F(\mu) = -\langle (\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_V \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n} + \tau(u - P_W u), \mu \rangle_{\partial K}$. Choosing $\mathbf{v} = \boldsymbol{\delta}_q$, $w = \delta_u$, and $\mu = \delta_u$ in the above and integrating by parts in (28b) give us

$$(29a) \quad (\delta_u, \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_q)_K = 0,$$

$$(29b) \quad -(\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_q, \delta_u)_K + \langle \boldsymbol{\delta}_q \cdot \mathbf{n}, \delta_u \rangle_{\partial K} = 0,$$

$$(29c) \quad \langle \boldsymbol{\delta}_q \cdot \mathbf{n}, \delta_u \rangle_{\partial K} + \|\tau^{1/2} \delta_u\|_{\partial K}^2 = F(\delta_u).$$

Combining these equations, we have

$$\|\tau^{1/2} \delta_u\|_{\partial K}^2 = F(\delta_u) \leq (\|(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_V \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K} + \|\tau(u - P_W u)\|_{\partial K}) \|\delta_u\|_{\partial K},$$

from which it follows that

$$(30) \quad \|\delta_u\|_{\partial K} \leq \|\tau^{-1}(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_V \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K} + \|u - P_W u\|_{\partial K}.$$

By (29b) with $\mathbf{v} = \nabla \delta_u$ and integration by parts, we get

$$\|\nabla \delta_u\|_K^2 = \langle \delta_u, \nabla \delta_u \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial K} \leq \|\delta_u\|_{\partial K} \cdot Ch^{-1/2} \|\nabla \delta_u\|_K.$$

Then we have

$$\|\nabla \delta_u\|_K \leq Ch^{-1/2} \|\delta_u\|_{\partial K}.$$

Putting this together with (30) and using (27) yield (25). Substituting $\mu = \boldsymbol{\delta}_q \cdot \mathbf{n}$ in (28c), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_q \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K}^2 &= -\langle \tau \boldsymbol{\delta}_q \cdot \mathbf{n}, \delta_u \rangle_{\partial K} + F(\boldsymbol{\delta}_q \cdot \mathbf{n}) \\ &\leq (\|\tau \delta_u\|_{\partial K} + \|(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_V \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K} + \|\tau(u - P_W u)\|_{\partial K}) \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_q \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K}. \end{aligned}$$

From this and (30), it follows that

$$(31) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_q \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K} \leq 2(\|(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P}_V \mathbf{q}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K} + \|\tau(u - P_W u)\|_{\partial K}).$$

Taking $w = \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_q$ in (29a) and integrating by parts, we have

$$\|\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_q\|_K^2 = \langle \boldsymbol{\delta}_q \cdot \mathbf{n}, \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_q \rangle_{\partial K} \leq \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_q \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K} \cdot Ch^{-1/2} \|\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_q\|_K,$$

which implies

$$\|\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\delta}_q\|_K \leq Ch^{-1/2} \|\boldsymbol{\delta}_q \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K}.$$

Combining this and (31) with (26), we obtain (24). The proof is complete. \square

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 AND G. FU, *Superconvergence by M-decompositions. Part II: Construction of two-dimensional finite elements*, ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal., 51 (2017), pp. 165–186.
- [4] ———, *Superconvergence by M-decompositions. Part III: Construction of three-dimensional finite elements*, ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal., 51 (2017), pp. 365–398.
- [5] B. COCKBURN, G. FU, AND F. J. SAYAS, *Superconvergence by M-decompositions. Part I: General theory for HDG methods for diffusion*, Math. Comp., 86 (2017), pp. 1609–1641.
- [6] 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.
- [7] F. HECHT, *New development in freefem++*, J. Numer. Math., 20 (2012), pp. 251–265.
- [8] I. OIKAWA, *A hybridized discontinuous Galerkin method with reduced stabilization*, J. Sci. Comput., 65 (2015), pp. 327–340.
- [9] ———, *An HDG method with orthogonal projections in facet integrals*, J. Sci. Comput., 76 (2018), pp. 1044–1054.

FACULTY OF PURE AND APPLIED SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF TSUKUBA, 1-1-1 TENNODAI, TSUKUBA, IBARAKI 305-8571, JAPAN

E-mail address: ioikawa00@gmail.com