

# Additive Schwarz preconditioners for a state constrained elliptic distributed optimal control problem discretized by a partition of unity method

Susanne C. Brenner, Christopher B. Davis, and Li-yeng Sung

## 1 Introduction

In this work, we are interested in solving a model elliptic optimal control problem of the following form: Find  $(y, u) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times L_2(\Omega)$  that minimize the functional

$$J(y, u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} (y - f)^2 dx + \frac{\beta}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^2 dx$$

subject to

$$-\Delta y = u \text{ in } \Omega, \quad y = 0 \text{ in } \partial\Omega, \quad (1)$$

and  $y \leq \psi$  in  $\Omega$ , where  $\Omega$  is a convex polygon in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and  $f \in L_2(\Omega)$ . We also assume  $\psi \in C^2(\Omega) \cap H^3(\Omega)$  and  $\psi > 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ .

Due to the elliptic regularity (cf. [7]) for (1), we can reformulate the model problem as follows: Find  $y \in K$  such that

$$y = \operatorname{argmin}_{v \in K} \left[ \frac{1}{2} a(v, v) - (f, v) \right], \quad (2)$$

where  $K = \{v \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) : v \leq \psi \text{ in } \Omega\}$ ,

$$a(w, v) = \beta \int_{\Omega} \Delta w \Delta v dx + \int_{\Omega} w v dx \quad \text{and} \quad (f, v) = \int_{\Omega} f v dx.$$

Once  $y$  is calculated, then  $u$  can be determined by  $u = -\Delta y$ .

The minimization problem (2) was discretized in [4] by a partition of unity method (PUM). The goal of this paper is to use the ideas in [5] for an obstacle problem of clamped Kirchhoff plates to develop preconditioners for the discrete problems in [4]. We refer to these references for technical details and only present the important results here.

## 2 The Discrete Problem

We will use a variant of the PUM (cf. [11, 8, 1, 12]) to construct a conforming approximation space  $V_h \subset H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ . Below we present an overview of the construction of  $V_h$ .

We take  $V_h$  to be  $\sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i V_i$ , where  $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^n$  is a set of  $C^1$  piecewise polynomial flat-top partition of unity functions over  $\Omega$  and  $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are the local approximation spaces. We denote the patch  $\Omega_i$  as the support of  $\phi_i$  and the flat-top part of  $\Omega_i$  is  $\Omega_i^{\text{flat}} = \{x \in \Omega : \phi_i(x) = 1\}$  (for an example see Figure 2.1 in [5]). Each  $V_i$  consists of biquadratic polynomials satisfying the Dirichlet boundary condition of (1). Basis functions for  $V_i$  are tensor product Lagrange polynomials and the interpolation nodes are distributed uniformly over  $\Omega_i^{\text{flat}}$ . This allows us to select basis functions for  $V_h$  that satisfy the Kronecker delta property.

Let  $\mathcal{N}_h$  be the set of all interior interpolation nodes used in the construction of  $V_h$ . The discrete problem is to find  $y_h \in K_h$  such that

$$y_h = \underset{v \in K_h}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left[ \frac{1}{2} a(v, v) - (f, v) \right], \quad (3)$$

where  $K_h = \{v \in V_h : v(p) \leq \psi(p) \forall p \in \mathcal{N}_h\}$ .

By introducing a Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda_h : \mathcal{N}_h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the minimization problem (3) can be rewritten in the following form: Find  $y_h \in K_h$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} a(y_h, v) - (f, v) &= - \sum_{p \in \mathcal{N}_h} \lambda_h(p) v(p) & \forall v \in V_h, \\ \lambda_h(p) &= \max(0, \lambda_h(p) + c(y_h(p) - \psi(p))) & \forall p \in \mathcal{N}_h, \end{aligned}$$

where  $c$  is a (large) positive number. This system can then be solved by a primal-dual active set (PDAS) algorithm (cf. [2, 3, 9, 10]). Given the  $k$ -th approximation  $(y_k, \lambda_k)$ , the  $(k+1)$ -st iteration of the PDAS algorithm is to find  $(y_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1})$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} a(y_{k+1}, v) - (f, v) &= - \sum_{p \in \mathcal{N}_h} \lambda_{k+1}(p) v(p) & \forall v \in V_h, \\ y_{k+1}(p) &= \psi(p) & \forall p \in \mathfrak{A}_k, \\ \lambda_{k+1}(p) &= 0 & \forall p \in \mathcal{N}_h \setminus \mathfrak{A}_k, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathfrak{A}_k = \{p \in \mathcal{N}_h : \lambda_k(p) + c(y_k(p) - \psi(p)) > 0\}$  is the set of active nodes determined from the approximations  $(y_k, \lambda_k)$ . Below we present preconditioners for the linear systems encountered in (4).

### 3 The Preconditioners

The additive Schwarz preconditioners (cf. [6]) will be applied to a system associated with a subset  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_h$  of  $\mathcal{N}_h$ . Let  $\tilde{T}_h : V_h \rightarrow V_h$  be defined by

$$(\tilde{T}_h v)(p) = \begin{cases} v(p) & \text{if } p \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_h \\ 0 & \text{if } p \notin \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_h \end{cases}.$$

The approximation space for the subproblem is  $\tilde{V}_h = \tilde{T}_h V_h$ . The associated stiffness matrix is a symmetric positive definite operator  $\tilde{A}_h : \tilde{V}_h \rightarrow \tilde{V}'_h$  defined by

$$\langle \tilde{A}_h v, w \rangle = a(v, w) \quad \forall v, w \in \tilde{V}_h,$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is the canonical bilinear form on  $\tilde{V}'_h \times \tilde{V}_h$ .

**A One-Level Method** Here we introduce a collection of shape regular subdomains  $\{D_j\}_{j=1}^J$  with  $\text{diam } D_j \approx H$  that overlap with each other by at most  $\delta$ . Associated with each subdomain is a function space  $V_j \subset \tilde{V}_h$  whose members vanish at the nodes outside  $D_j$ . Let  $A_j : V_j \rightarrow V'_j$  be defined by

$$\langle A_j v, w \rangle = a(v, w) \quad \forall v, w \in V_j.$$

The one-level additive Schwarz preconditioner  $B_{OL} : V'_h \rightarrow V_h$  is defined by

$$B_{OL} = \sum_{j=1}^J I_j A_j^{-1} I_j^t,$$

where  $I_j : V_j \rightarrow \tilde{V}_h$  is the natural injection.

Following the arguments in [5], we can obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *There exists a positive constant  $C_{OL}$  independent of  $H$ ,  $h$ ,  $J$ ,  $\delta$  and  $\tilde{N}_h$  such that*

$$\kappa(B_{OL} \tilde{A}_h) \leq C_{OL} \delta^{-3} H^{-1}.$$

**A Two-Level Method** Let  $V_H \subset H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$  be a coarse approximation space based on the construction in Section 2 where  $H > h$ . We assume the patches of  $V_H$  are of comparable size to the subdomains  $\{D_j\}_{j=1}^J$ . Let  $\Pi_h : H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow V_h$  be the nodal interpolation operator. We define  $V_0 \subset \tilde{V}_h$  by  $V_0 = T_h \Pi_h V_H$ , and  $A_0 : V_0 \rightarrow V'_0$  by

$$\langle A_0 v, w \rangle = a(v, w) \quad \forall v, w \in V_0.$$

The two-level additive Schwarz preconditioner  $B_{TL} : V'_h \rightarrow V_h$  is given by

$$B_{TL} = \sum_{j=0}^J I_j A_j^{-1} I_j^t,$$

where  $I_0 : V_0 \rightarrow \tilde{V}_h$  is the natural injection. Following the arguments in [5], we can obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.** *There exists a positive constant  $C_{TL}$  independent of  $H$ ,  $h$ ,  $J$ ,  $\delta$  and  $\tilde{N}_h$  such that*

$$\kappa(B_{TL}A_h) \leq C_{TL} \min((H/h)^4, \delta^{-3}H^{-1}).$$

*Remark 1.* The two-level method is scalable as long as  $H/h$  remains bounded.

## 4 A Numerical Example

We consider Example 4.2 in [4], where  $\Omega = (-0.5, 0.5)^2$ ,  $\beta = 0.1$ ,  $\psi = 0.01$ , and  $f = 10(\sin(2\pi(x_1 + 0.5)) + (x_2 + 0.5))$ . We discretize (3) by the PUM with uniform rectangular patches so that  $h \approx 2^{-\ell}$ , where  $\ell$  is the refinement level. As  $\ell$  increases from 1 to 8, the number of degrees of freedom increases from 16 to 586756. The discrete variational inequalities are solved by the PDAS algorithm presented in Section 2, with  $c = 10^8$ .

For the purpose of comparison, we first solve the auxiliary systems in each iteration of the PDAS algorithm by the conjugate gradient (CG) method without a preconditioner. The average condition number during the PDAS iteration and the time to solve the variational inequality are presented in Table 1. The PDAS iterations fail to stop (DNC) within 48 hours beyond level 6.

**Table 1** Average condition number ( $\kappa$ ) and time to solve ( $t_{\text{solve}}$ ) in seconds by the CG algorithm

$\ell$	$\kappa$	$t_{\text{solve}}$
1	$3.1305 \times 10^{+2}$	$2.6111 \times 10^{-2}$
2	$9.1118 \times 10^{+3}$	$1.0793 \times 10^{-1}$
3	$2.0215 \times 10^{+5}$	$9.7842 \times 10^{-1}$
4	$3.3705 \times 10^{+6}$	$3.3911 \times 10^{+1}$
5	$6.4346 \times 10^{+7}$	$6.2173 \times 10^{+2}$
6	$1.0537 \times 10^{+9}$	$8.8975 \times 10^{+3}$
7	DNC	DNC
8	DNC	DNC

We then solve the auxiliary systems by the preconditioned conjugate gradient (PCG) method, using the additive Schwarz preconditioners associated with  $J$  subdomains. The mesh size  $H$  for the coarse space  $V_H$  is  $\approx 1/\sqrt{J}$ . We say the PCG method has converged if  $\|Br\|_2 \leq 10^{-15}\|b\|_2$ , where  $B$  is the preconditioner,  $r$  is the residual, and  $b$  is the load vector. The initial guess for the PDAS algorithm is taken to be the solution at the previous level, or 0 if  $2^{2\ell} = J$ . To obtain a good initial guess for the two-level method, the one-level method is used when  $2^{2\ell} = J$ . The subdomain problems and the coarse problem are solved by a direct method based on the Cholesky factorization on independent processors.

**Small Overlap** Here we apply the preconditioners in such a way that  $\delta \approx h$ . The averaged condition numbers of the linear systems over the PDAS iterations are presented in Tables 2 and 3. We can see that these condition numbers are significantly smaller than those for the unpreconditioned case and the condition numbers for the two-level method are smaller than those for the one-level method. For each  $\ell$ , as  $J$  increases the condition numbers for the two-level method are decreasing, which demonstrates the scalability of the two-level method (cf. Remark 1).

**Table 2** One-level small overlap: average condition number

$\ell$	$J = 4$	$J = 16$	$J = 64$	$J = 256$
1	$1.0000 \times 10^{+0}$	-	-	-
2	$4.9489 \times 10^{+0}$	$7.4007 \times 10^{+0}$	-	-
3	$1.5165 \times 10^{+1}$	$4.4136 \times 10^{+1}$	$6.6141 \times 10^{+1}$	-
4	$7.8249 \times 10^{+1}$	$1.9021 \times 10^{+2}$	$5.3590 \times 10^{+2}$	$8.1948 \times 10^{+2}$
5	$6.4747 \times 10^{+2}$	$1.6428 \times 10^{+3}$	$3.1727 \times 10^{+3}$	$9.5009 \times 10^{+3}$
6	$5.0797 \times 10^{+3}$	$1.3163 \times 10^{+4}$	$2.5880 \times 10^{+4}$	$5.0481 \times 10^{+4}$
7	$4.0710 \times 10^{+4}$	$1.0630 \times 10^{+5}$	$2.1060 \times 10^{+5}$	$4.1597 \times 10^{+5}$
8	$3.2674 \times 10^{+5}$	$8.5575 \times 10^{+5}$	$1.7014 \times 10^{+6}$	$3.3814 \times 10^{+6}$

**Table 3** Two-level small overlap: average condition number

$\ell$	$J = 4$	$J = 16$	$J = 64$	$J = 256$
1	$1.0000 \times 10^{+0}$	-	-	-
2	$5.4624 \times 10^{+0}$	$7.4007 \times 10^{+0}$	-	-
3	$1.2293 \times 10^{+1}$	$1.1437 \times 10^{+1}$	$6.6141 \times 10^{+1}$	-
4	$2.8578 \times 10^{+1}$	$2.7932 \times 10^{+1}$	$1.2645 \times 10^{+1}$	$8.1948 \times 10^{+2}$
5	$6.2993 \times 10^{+1}$	$9.1991 \times 10^{+1}$	$4.6130 \times 10^{+1}$	$1.9891 \times 10^{+1}$
6	$3.6714 \times 10^{+2}$	$3.4816 \times 10^{+2}$	$1.3100 \times 10^{+2}$	$5.7716 \times 10^{+1}$
7	$2.7431 \times 10^{+3}$	$2.1182 \times 10^{+3}$	$1.0314 \times 10^{+3}$	$2.8685 \times 10^{+2}$
8	$2.1656 \times 10^{+4}$	$1.4827 \times 10^{+4}$	$9.1992 \times 10^{+3}$	$1.8754 \times 10^{+3}$

The times to solve the problem for each method are presented in Tables 4 and 5. By comparing them with the results in Table 1, we can see that both methods are superior. For comparison purposes, the faster time between the two methods is highlighted in red for each  $\ell$  and  $J$ . As  $h$  decreases and  $J$  increases, the two-level method performs better than the one-level method. This agrees with what one would expect from Theorems 1 and 2.

**Generous Overlap** Here we apply the preconditioners in such a way that  $\delta \approx H$ . When  $J = 4$  and  $J = 16$  both methods fail to converge at  $\ell = 8$  within 48 hours due to the large size of the local problems. The averaged condition numbers of the linear systems over the PDAS iterations are presented in Tables 6 and 7. They agree with Theorems 1 and 2. We can also see that these condition numbers are smaller than those in the case of small overlap.

**Table 4** One-level small overlap: time to solve in seconds. Times highlighted in red are faster than the ones for the corresponding two-level method.

$\ell$	$J = 4$	$J = 16$	$J = 64$	$J = 256$
1	$1.7824 \times 10^{+0}$	-	-	-
2	$3.0485 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.5566 \times 10^{+1}$	-	-
3	$3.8408 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.0783 \times 10^{+1}$	$6.0871 \times 10^{+1}$	-
4	$2.6069 \times 10^{+0}$	$4.1818 \times 10^{+1}$	$9.1811 \times 10^{+1}$	$3.5518 \times 10^{+2}$
5	$2.5704 \times 10^{+1}$	$1.1104 \times 10^{+2}$	$1.5399 \times 10^{+2}$	$3.5482 \times 10^{+2}$
6	$2.8261 \times 10^{+2}$	$2.6935 \times 10^{+2}$	$4.0033 \times 10^{+2}$	$4.6376 \times 10^{+2}$
7	$5.2566 \times 10^{+3}$	$1.9115 \times 10^{+3}$	$1.4825 \times 10^{+3}$	$1.5815 \times 10^{+3}$
8	$1.0946 \times 10^{+5}$	$2.9034 \times 10^{+4}$	$1.1631 \times 10^{+4}$	$6.8551 \times 10^{+3}$

**Table 5** Two-level small overlap: time to solve in seconds. Times highlighted in red are faster than the ones for the corresponding one-level method.

$\ell$	$J = 4$	$J = 16$	$J = 64$	$J = 256$
1	$1.7824 \times 10^{+0}$	-	-	-
2	$1.0694 \times 10^{+0}$	$1.5566 \times 10^{+1}$	-	-
3	$1.0889 \times 10^{+0}$	$1.4261 \times 10^{+1}$	$6.0871 \times 10^{+1}$	-
4	$5.5186 \times 10^{+0}$	$5.8349 \times 10^{+1}$	$7.0962 \times 10^{+1}$	$3.5518 \times 10^{+2}$
5	$3.0950 \times 10^{+1}$	$1.1499 \times 10^{+2}$	$1.4285 \times 10^{+2}$	$1.4650 \times 10^{+2}$
6	$2.8179 \times 10^{+2}$	$2.0602 \times 10^{+2}$	$1.6374 \times 10^{+2}$	$1.5015 \times 10^{+2}$
7	$4.4391 \times 10^{+3}$	$1.1894 \times 10^{+3}$	$4.6832 \times 10^{+2}$	$2.9826 \times 10^{+2}$
8	$9.0540 \times 10^{+4}$	$2.0476 \times 10^{+4}$	$3.1224 \times 10^{+3}$	$8.8092 \times 10^{+2}$

**Table 6** One-level generous overlap: average condition number

$\ell$	$J = 4$	$J = 16$	$J = 64$	$J = 256$
1	$1.0000 \times 10^{+0}$	-	-	-
2	$1.0000 \times 10^{+0}$	$7.4007 \times 10^{+0}$	-	-
3	$1.0000 \times 10^{+0}$	$7.8491 \times 10^{+0}$	$6.6141 \times 10^{+1}$	-
4	$1.0000 \times 10^{+0}$	$7.5665 \times 10^{+0}$	$8.4735 \times 10^{+1}$	$8.1948 \times 10^{+2}$
5	$1.0000 \times 10^{+0}$	$8.2910 \times 10^{+0}$	$9.6722 \times 10^{+1}$	$1.4803 \times 10^{+3}$
6	$1.0000 \times 10^{+0}$	$8.3675 \times 10^{+0}$	$9.8624 \times 10^{+1}$	$1.4780 \times 10^{+3}$
7	$1.0000 \times 10^{+0}$	$8.4332 \times 10^{+0}$	$1.0019 \times 10^{+2}$	$1.4998 \times 10^{+3}$
8	DNC	DNC	$1.0108 \times 10^{+2}$	$1.5161 \times 10^{+3}$

**Table 7** Two-level generous overlap: average condition number

$\ell$	$J = 4$	$J = 16$	$J = 64$	$J = 256$
1	$1.0000 \times 10^{+0}$	-	-	-
2	$1.2500 \times 10^{+0}$	$7.4007 \times 10^{+0}$	-	-
3	$1.2500 \times 10^{+0}$	$6.2713 \times 10^{+0}$	$6.6141 \times 10^{+1}$	-
4	$1.2500 \times 10^{+0}$	$6.4760 \times 10^{+0}$	$1.3273 \times 10^{+1}$	$8.1948 \times 10^{+2}$
5	$1.2500 \times 10^{+0}$	$7.1544 \times 10^{+0}$	$1.7516 \times 10^{+1}$	$1.7316 \times 10^{+1}$
6	$1.2500 \times 10^{+0}$	$7.4536 \times 10^{+0}$	$2.0683 \times 10^{+1}$	$2.0360 \times 10^{+1}$
7	$1.2500 \times 10^{+0}$	$7.6360 \times 10^{+0}$	$2.2223 \times 10^{+1}$	$2.5925 \times 10^{+1}$
8	DNC	DNC	$2.4425 \times 10^{+1}$	$2.8208 \times 10^{+1}$

The times to solve the problem for each method are presented in Tables 8 and 9. Again both methods are superior to the unpreconditioned method and the scalability of the two-level method is observed.

We now compare the generous overlap methods with the small overlap methods. In Tables 8 and 9, the times in red are the ones where the method with generous overlap outperforms the method with small overlap. It is evident from Table 9 that the performance of the two-level method with generous overlap suffers from a high communication cost for small  $h$  and large  $J$ .

**Table 8** One-level generous overlap: time to solve in seconds. Times highlighted in red are faster than the corresponding method with small overlap.

$\ell$	$J = 4$	$J = 16$	$J = 64$	$J = 256$
1	$1.3327 \times 10^{-1}$	-	-	-
2	$1.9001 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.6626 \times 10^{+1}$	-	-
3	$2.8851 \times 10^{-1}$	$7.1764 \times 10^{+0}$	$6.1481 \times 10^{+1}$	-
4	$5.8644 \times 10^{+0}$	$2.5455 \times 10^{+1}$	$4.5772 \times 10^{+1}$	$3.5521 \times 10^{+2}$
5	$1.0258 \times 10^{+2}$	$7.3422 \times 10^{+1}$	$6.8872 \times 10^{+1}$	$1.5702 \times 10^{+2}$
6	$1.3211 \times 10^{+3}$	$5.2160 \times 10^{+2}$	$1.0986 \times 10^{+2}$	$1.5081 \times 10^{+2}$
7	$2.4185 \times 10^{+4}$	$8.1268 \times 10^{+3}$	$7.7438 \times 10^{+2}$	$3.0096 \times 10^{+2}$
8	DNC	DNC	$1.1663 \times 10^{+4}$	$1.6401 \times 10^{+3}$

**Table 9** Two-level generous overlap: time to solve in seconds. Times highlighted in red are faster than the corresponding method with small overlap.

$\ell$	$J = 4$	$J = 16$	$J = 64$	$J = 256$
1	$1.3327 \times 10^{-1}$	-	-	-
2	$4.7170 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.6626 \times 10^{+1}$	-	-
3	$6.4757 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.0396 \times 10^{+1}$	$6.1481 \times 10^{+1}$	-
4	$6.7362 \times 10^{+0}$	$3.4515 \times 10^{+1}$	$6.3328 \times 10^{+1}$	$3.5521 \times 10^{+2}$
5	$1.0614 \times 10^{+2}$	$8.1754 \times 10^{+1}$	$8.7046 \times 10^{+1}$	$1.4895 \times 10^{+2}$
6	$1.3276 \times 10^{+3}$	$5.4679 \times 10^{+2}$	$1.1548 \times 10^{+2}$	$1.1275 \times 10^{+2}$
7	$2.3118 \times 10^{+4}$	$8.4160 \times 10^{+3}$	$7.5119 \times 10^{+2}$	$1.9706 \times 10^{+2}$
8	DNC	DNC	$1.1962 \times 10^{+4}$	$1.1392 \times 10^{+3}$

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper we present additive Schwarz preconditioners for the linear systems that arise from the PDAS algorithm applied to an elliptic distributed optimal control problem with pointwise state constraints discretized by a PUM. Based on the condition number estimates and the numerical results, the two-level method with small overlap appears to be the best choice for small  $h$  and large  $J$ .

## Acknowledgements

The work of the first and third authors was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-16-20273. Portions of this research were conducted with high performance computing resources provided by Louisiana State University (<http://www.hpc.lsu.edu>).

## References

1. I. Babuška, U. Banerjee, and J.E. Osborn. Survey of meshless and generalized finite element methods: a unified approach. *Acta Numer.*, 12:1-125, 2003.
2. M. Bergounioux, K. Ito, and K. Kunisch. Primal-dual strategy for constrained optimal control problems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 37:1176-1194 (electronic), 1999.
3. M. Bergounioux and K. Kunisch. Primal-dual strategy for state-constrained optimal control problems. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 22:193-224, 2002.
4. S.C. Brenner, C.B. Davis, and L.-Y. Sung. A partition of unity method for a class of fourth order elliptic variational inequalities. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 276 (2014), 612 – 626.
5. S.C. Brenner, C.B. Davis, and L.-Y. Sung. Additive Schwarz preconditioners for the obstacle problem of clamped Kirchhoff plates, arXiv:1809.06311 [math.NA]
6. M. Dryja and O.B. Widlund. An additive variant of the Schwarz alternating method in the case of many subregions. Technical Report 339, Department of Computer Science, Courant Institute, 1987.
7. P. Grisvard, *Elliptic Problems in Non Smooth Domains*. Pitman, Boston, 1985.
8. M. Griebel and M.A. Schweitzer. A particle-partition of unity method. II. Efficient cover construction and reliable integration. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 23:1655-1682, 2002.
9. M. Hintermüller, K. Ito, and K. Kunisch. The primal-dual active set strategy as a semismooth Newton method. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 13:865-888, 2003.
10. K. Ito and K. Kunisch. *Lagrange Multiplier Approach to Variational Problems and Applications*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 2008.
11. J.M. Melenk and I. Babuška. The partition of unity finite element method: basic theory and applications. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 139:289-314, 1996.
12. H.-S. Oh, J.G. Kim, and W.-T. Hong. The piecewise polynomial partition of unity functions for the generalized finite element methods. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 197:3702-3711, 2008.