

# AN ARBITRARY ORDER RECONSTRUCTED DISCONTINUOUS APPROXIMATION TO FOURTH-ORDER CURL PROBLEM

RUO LI, QICHENG LIU, AND SHUHAI ZHAO

ABSTRACT. We present an arbitrary order discontinuous Galerkin finite element method for solving the fourth-order curl problem using a reconstructed discontinuous approximation method. It is based on an arbitrarily high-order approximation space with one unknown per element in each dimension. The discrete problem is based on the symmetric IPDG method. We prove *a priori* error estimates under the energy norm and the  $L^2$  norm and show numerical results to verify the theoretical analysis.

**keywords:** fourth-order curl problem, patch reconstruction, discontinuous Galerkin method

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We are concerned in this paper with the fourth-order curl problem, which has applications in inverse electromagnetic scattering, and magnetohydrodynamics (MHD) when modeling magnetized plasmas. Discretizing the fourth-order curl operator is one of the keys to simulate these models. Additionally, the fourth-order curl operator plays an important role in approximating the Maxwell transmission eigenvalue problem. Therefore, it is important to design highly efficient and accurate numerical methods for fourth-order curl problems [2, 17].

Finite element methods (FEMs) are a widely used numerical scheme for solving partial differential equations. The design of FEMs for fourth-order curl problems is challenging. Nevertheless, in recent years, researchers have proposed and analysed various FEMs for these problems to address this difficulty. According to whether the finite element space is contained within the space of the exact solution, finite element methods can be classified into conforming methods and nonconforming methods. For conforming methods, one needs to construct  $H(\text{curl}^2)$ -conforming finite elements, we refer to [22, 6] for some recent works. Due to the high order of the fourth-order curl operator, it is still a difficult task to implement a high-order conforming space. Therefore, many researches focus on nonconforming methods. The discontinuous Galerkin (DG) methods use completely discontinuous piecewise polynomial to approximate the solution of partial differential equations. These methods enforce numerical solutions to be close to the exact solution by adding penalties. DG methods are commonly used in solving complex problems due to their simplicity and flexibility in approximation space. For fourth-order curl problems, we refer to [24, 5, 21, 20, 23] for some DG methods.

A significant drawback of DG methods is the large number of degrees of freedom in DG space, which results in high computational costs. This drawback is a matter of concern. In this paper, we propose an arbitrary order discontinuous Galerkin FEM for solving the fourth-order curl problem. The method is based on a reconstructed approximation space that has only one unknown per dimension in each element. The construction of the approximation space includes creating an element patch per element and solving a local least squares fitting problem to obtain a local high-order polynomial. Methods based on the reconstructed spaces are called reconstructed discontinuous approximation (RDA) methods, which have been successfully applied to a series of classical problems [13, 10, 16, 15, 8, 14]. The reconstructed space is a subspace of the standard DG space, which can approximate functions to high-order accuracy and inherits the flexibility on the mesh partition in the meanwhile. One advantage of this space is that it has very few degrees of freedom, which gives high approximation efficiency of finite element. Using this new space, we design the discrete scheme for the fourth-order curl problem under the symmetric interior penalty discontinuous Galerkin (IPDG) framework. We prove the convergence rates under the energy norm and the  $L^2$  norm, and numerical experiments are conducted to verify the theoretical analysis, showing our algorithm is simple to implement and can reach high-order accuracy.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the fourth-order curl problem without div-free condition and give the basic notations about the Sobolev spaces and the partition. We also recall two commonly used inequalities in this section. In Section 3, we establish the reconstruction operator and the corresponding approximation space. Some basic properties of the reconstruction are also proven. In Section 4, we define the discrete variational form for the fourth-order curl problem and analyse the error under the energy norm and the  $L^2$  norm, and prove that the convergence rate is optimal with respect to

the energy norm. In Section 5, we carried out some numerical examples to validate our theoretical results. Finally, a brief conclusion is given in Section 6.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d (d = 2, 3)$  be a bounded polygonal (polyhedral) domain with a Lipschitz boundary  $\partial\Omega$ . Given a bounded domain  $D \subset \Omega$ , we follow the standard definitions to the space  $L^2(D)$ ,  $L^2(D)^d$ , the spaces  $H^q(D)$ ,  $H^q(D)^d$  with the regular exponent  $q \geq 0$ . The corresponding norms and seminorms are defined as

$$\|\cdot\|_{H^q(D)} := \left( \|\cdot\|_{H^q(D)}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad |\cdot|_{H^q(D)} := \left( |\cdot|_{H^q(D)}^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

respectively.

Throughout this paper, for two vectors  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the cross product  $\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b} := \begin{cases} a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1, & d = 2, \\ (a_2 b_3 - a_3 b_2, a_3 b_1 - a_1 b_3, a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1)^T, & d = 3. \end{cases}$$

The cross product between a vector and a scalar will be used in two dimensions, and in this case for a vector  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and a scalar  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbf{a} \times b$  is defined as  $\mathbf{a} \times b := (a_2 b, -a_1 b)^T$ . Specifically, for a vector-valued function  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the curl of  $\mathbf{u}$  reads

$$\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u} := \nabla \times \mathbf{u} = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y}, & d = 2, \\ \left( \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z}, \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} \right)^T, & d = 3, \end{cases}$$

and for the scalar-valued function  $q(x, y)$ , we let  $\nabla \times q$  be the formal adjoint, which reads

$$\nabla \times q = \left( \frac{\partial q}{\partial y}, -\frac{\partial q}{\partial x} \right)^T.$$

For convenience, we mainly use the notations for the three-dimensional case.

In this paper, we consider the following fourth-order curl problem

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{curl}^4 \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f}, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{n} = g_1, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ (\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \times \mathbf{n} = g_2, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

For the problem domain  $\Omega$ , we define the space

$$H(\operatorname{curl}^s, \Omega) := \{ \mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega)^d \mid \operatorname{curl}^j \mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega), 1 \leq j \leq s \},$$

and

$$H_0(\operatorname{curl}^2, \Omega) := \{ \mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega)^d \mid \operatorname{curl}^j \mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega), \operatorname{curl}^{j-1} \mathbf{v} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, 1 \leq j \leq 2 \},$$

For the weak formulation we are going to find  $\mathbf{u} \in H(\operatorname{curl}^2, \Omega)$  such that

$$a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v})_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in H_0(\operatorname{curl}^2, \Omega),$$

where

$$a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) := (\operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}, \operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{v})_{L^2(\Omega)} + (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

We refer to [18, 23] for some regularity results of this problem.

Next, we define some notations about the mesh. Let  $\mathcal{T}_h$  be a regular and quasi-uniform partition  $\Omega$  into disjoint open triangles (tetrahedra). Let  $\mathcal{E}_h$  denote the set of all  $d-1$  dimensional faces of  $\mathcal{T}_h$ , and we decompose  $\mathcal{E}_h$  into  $\mathcal{E}_h = \mathcal{E}_h^i \cup \mathcal{E}_h^b$ , where  $\mathcal{E}_h^i$  and  $\mathcal{E}_h^b$  are the sets of interior faces and boundary faces, respectively. We let

$$h_K := \operatorname{diam}(K), \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h, \quad h_e := \operatorname{diam}(e), \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h,$$

and define  $h := \max_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K$ . The quasi-uniformity of the mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$  is in the sense that there exists a constant  $\nu > 0$  such that  $h \leq \nu \min_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \rho_K$ , where  $\rho_K$  is the diameter of the largest ball inscribed in  $K$ . One can get the inverse inequality and the trace inequality from the regularity of the mesh, which are commonly used in the analysis.

**Lemma 1.** *There exists a constant  $C$  independent of the mesh size  $h$ , such that*

$$(2) \quad \|v\|_{L^2(\partial K)}^2 \leq C \left( h_K^{-1} \|v\|_{L^2(K)}^2 + h_K \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(K)}^2 \right), \quad \forall v \in H^1(K).$$

**Lemma 2.** *There exists a constant  $C$  independent of the mesh size  $h$ , such that*

$$(3) \quad \|v\|_{H^q(K)} \leq Ch_K^{-q} \|v\|_{L^2(K)}, \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{P}_l(K),$$

where  $\mathbb{P}_l(K)$  is the space of polynomial on  $K$  with the degree no more than  $l$ .

We refer to [1] for more details of these inequalities.

Finally, we introduce the trace operators that will be used in our numerical schemes. For  $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$ , we denote by  $K^+$  and  $K^-$  the two neighbouring elements that share the boundary  $e$ , and  $\mathbf{n}^+$ ,  $\mathbf{n}^-$  the unit out normal vector on  $e$ , respectively. We define the jump operator  $[\cdot]$  and the average operator  $\{\cdot\}$  as

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} [\mathbf{q}] &:= \mathbf{q}|_{K^+} \times \mathbf{n}^+ + \mathbf{q}|_{K^-} \times \mathbf{n}^-, \quad \text{for vector-valued function,} \\ [\text{curl} \mathbf{q}] &:= \text{curl} \mathbf{q}|_{K^+} \times \mathbf{n}^+ + \text{curl} \mathbf{q}|_{K^-} \times \mathbf{n}^-, \quad \text{for vector-valued function,} \\ \{v\} &:= \frac{1}{2}(v|_{K^+} + v|_{K^-}), \quad \text{for scalar-valued function,} \\ \{\mathbf{q}\} &:= \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{q}|_{K^+} + \mathbf{q}|_{K^-}), \quad \text{for vector-valued function.} \end{aligned}$$

For  $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^b$ , we let  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$  such that  $e \in \partial K$  and  $\mathbf{n}$  is the unit out normal vector. We define

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} [\mathbf{q}] &:= \mathbf{q}|_K \times \mathbf{n}, \quad [\text{curl} \mathbf{q}] := \text{curl} \mathbf{q}|_K \times \mathbf{n} \text{ for vector-valued function,} \\ \{v\} &:= v|_K \quad \text{for scalar-valued function,} \quad \{\mathbf{q}\} := \mathbf{q}|_K \quad \text{for vector-valued function.} \end{aligned}$$

Throughout this paper,  $C$  and  $C$  with subscripts denote the generic constants that may differ between lines but are independent of the mesh size.

### 3. RECONSTRUCTED DISCONTINUOUS SPACE

In this section, we will introduce a linear reconstruction operator to obtain a discontinuous approximation space for the given mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$ . The reconstructed space can achieve a high-order accuracy while the number of degrees of freedom in each dimension remain the same as the number of elements in  $\mathcal{T}_h$ . The construction of the operator includes the following steps.

Step 1. For each  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , we construct an element patch  $S(K)$ , which consists of  $K$  itself and some surrounding elements. The size of the patch is controlled with a given threshold  $\#S$ . The construction of the element patch  $S(K)$  is conducted by a recursive algorithm. We begin by setting  $S_0(K) = \{K\}$ , and define  $S_t(K)$  recursively:

$$(6) \quad S_t(K) = \bigcup_{K' \in S_{t-1}(K)} \bigcup_{K'' \in \Delta(K')} K'', \quad t = 0, 1, \dots$$

where  $\Delta(K) := \{K' \in \mathcal{T}_h \mid \overline{K} \cap \overline{K'} \neq \emptyset\}$ . The recursion stops once  $t$  meets the condition that the cardinality  $\#S_t(K) \geq \#S$ , and we let the patch  $S(K) := S_t(K)$ . We apply the recursive algorithm (6) to all elements in  $\mathcal{T}_h$ .

Step 2. For each  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , we solve a local least squares fitting problem on the patch  $S(K)$ . We let  $\mathbf{x}_K$  be the barycenter of the element  $K$  and mark barycenters of all elements as collocation points. Let  $I(K)$  be the set of collocation points located inside the domain of  $S(K)$ ,

$$I(K) := \{\mathbf{x}_{K'} \mid K' \in S(K)\},$$

Let  $U_h^0$  be the piecewise constant space with respect to  $\mathcal{T}_h$ ,

$$U_h^0 := \{v_h \in L^2(\Omega) \mid v_h|_K \in \mathbb{P}_0(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}.$$

and we denote by  $\mathbf{U}_h^0 := (U_h^0)^d$  the vector-valued piecewise constant space. Given a function  $\mathbf{g}_h \in \mathbf{U}_h^0$  and an integer  $m \geq 1$ , for the element  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , we consider the following local constrained least squares problem:

$$(7) \quad \mathbf{p}_{S(K)} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}_m(S(K))^d} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} \|\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}_h(\mathbf{x})\|_{l^2}^2, \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{x}_K) = \mathbf{g}_h(\mathbf{x}_K),$$

where  $I(K) := \{\mathbf{x}_{\tilde{K}} \mid \tilde{K} \in S(K) \cap \mathcal{T}_h\}$  denotes the set of collocation points located in  $S(K)$ , and  $\|\cdot\|_{l^2}$  denotes the discrete  $l^2$  norm for vectors. We make the following geometrical assumption on the location of collocation points [11, 10]:

**Assumption 1.** *For any element patch  $S(K)$  and any polynomial  $p \in \mathbb{P}_m(S(K))$ ,  $p|_{I(K)} = 0$  implies  $p|_{S(K)} = 0$ .*

The Assumption 1 excludes the case that the points in  $I(K)$  are on an algebraic curve of degree  $m$  and requires cardinality  $\#I(K) \geq \dim(\mathbb{P}_m(\cdot))$ . Under this assumption, the fitting problem (7) admits a unique solution. By solving (7) and considering the restriction  $(\mathbf{p}_{S(K)})|_K$ , we actually gain a local polynomial defined on  $K$ . Since  $\mathbf{p}_{S(K)}$  is sought in the least squares sense, we note that  $\mathbf{p}_{S(K)}$  depends linearly on the given function  $\mathbf{g}_h$ . This property inspires us to define a linear operator from the piecewise constant space  $\mathbf{U}_h^0$  to a piecewise polynomial space with respect to  $\mathcal{T}_h$ .

We define a local reconstruction operator  $\mathcal{R}_K$  for elements in  $\mathcal{T}_h$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_K : \mathbf{U}_h^0 &\rightarrow (\mathbb{P}_m(K))^d, \\ \mathbf{g}_h &\rightarrow (\mathbf{p}_{S(K)})|_K, \end{aligned} \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

Further, the linear reconstruction operator  $\mathcal{R}$  for  $\mathcal{T}_h$  is defined in a piecewise manner as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R} : \mathbf{U}_h^0 &\rightarrow \mathbf{U}_h^m, \\ \mathbf{g}_h &\rightarrow \mathcal{R}\mathbf{g}_h, \end{aligned} \quad (\mathcal{R}\mathbf{g}_h)|_K := \mathcal{R}_K\mathbf{g}_h, \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h,$$

where  $\mathbf{U}_h^m$  is the image space of the operator  $\mathcal{R}$ . Clearly, by the operator  $\mathcal{R}$ , any piecewise constant function  $\mathbf{g}_h$  will be mapped into a piecewise polynomial function  $\mathcal{R}\mathbf{g}_h \in \mathbf{U}_h^m$ . Then, we present more details to the space  $\mathbf{U}_h^m$ , which are piecewise polynomial spaces for the partition  $\mathcal{T}_h$ . For any element  $K$ , we pick up a function  $\mathbf{w}_{K,j} \in \mathbf{U}_h^0$  such that

$$\mathbf{w}_{K,j}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_j, & \mathbf{x} \in K, \\ \mathbf{0}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad 1 \leq j \leq d,$$

where  $\mathbf{e}_j$  is the unit vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  whose  $j$ -th entry is 1. We let  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j} := \mathcal{R}\mathbf{w}_{K,j}$  ( $K \in \mathcal{T}_h, 1 \leq j \leq d$ ) and we state that the space  $\mathbf{U}_h^m$  is spanned by  $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j}\}$ .

**Lemma 3.** *the functions  $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j}\}$  ( $K \in \mathcal{T}_h, 1 \leq j \leq d$ ) are linearly independent and the space  $\mathbf{U}_h^m = \text{span}(\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j}\})$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , assume there exists a group of coefficients  $\{a_{K,j}\}$  such that

$$(8) \quad \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{j=1}^d a_{K,j} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j}(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

From the constraint to the problem (7), we have that

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j}(\mathbf{x}_{K'}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_j, & K' = K, \\ \mathbf{0}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We choose  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_K$  for all  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$  in (8), and it can be seen that  $a_{K,j} = 0$ . Thus, the functions  $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j}\}$  ( $K \in \mathcal{T}_h, 1 \leq j \leq d$ ) are linearly independent. Obviously, there holds  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j} \in \mathbf{U}_h^m$ , and we note that the dimension of  $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j}\}$  is  $d\#\mathcal{T}_h$ . By the linear property of  $\mathcal{R}$ , we have that the space  $\mathbf{U}_h^m$  is spanned by  $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j}\}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Lemma 3 claims that the basis functions of  $\mathbf{U}_h^m$  are indeed the group of functions  $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j}\}$ , and for any function  $\mathbf{g}_h \in \mathbf{U}_h^0$ , one can explicitly write  $\mathcal{R}\mathbf{g}_h$  as

$$(9) \quad \mathcal{R}\mathbf{g}_h = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{j=1}^d g_{h,j}(\mathbf{x}_K) \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j}.$$

From the problem (7), the basis function  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j}$  vanishes on the element  $K'$  that  $K \notin S(K')$ . This fact indicates  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j}$  has a finite support set that  $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j}) = \{K' \in \mathcal{T}_h \mid K \in S(K')\}$ , and  $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{K,j})$  is different from the patch  $S(K)$ .

We extend the operator  $\mathcal{R}$  to act on smooth functions. For any  $\mathbf{g} \in H^{m+1}(\Omega)^d$ , we define a piecewise constant function  $\mathbf{g}_h \in \mathbf{U}_h^0$  as

$$\mathbf{g}_h(\mathbf{x}_K) := \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K), \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h,$$

and we directly define  $\mathcal{R}\mathbf{g} := \mathcal{R}\mathbf{g}_h$ . In this way, any smooth function in  $H^{m+1}(\Omega)^d$  is mapped into a piecewise polynomial function with respect to  $\mathcal{T}_h$  by the operator  $\mathcal{R}$ . For any  $\mathbf{g} \in H^{m+1}(\Omega)^d$ ,  $\mathcal{R}\mathbf{g}$  can also be written as (9).

Next, we will focus on the approximation property of the operator  $\mathcal{R}$ . We first define a constant  $\Lambda_{m,K}$  for every element patch,

$$\Lambda_{m,K}^2 := \max_{p \in \mathbb{P}_m(S(K))} \frac{\|p\|_{L^2}}{h^d \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} p(\mathbf{x})^2}.$$

Assumption 1 as well as the norm equivalence in finite dimensional spaces actually ensures  $\Lambda_{m,K} < \infty$ .

**Lemma 4.** *For any element  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , there holds*

$$(10) \quad \|\mathcal{R}_K \mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(K)} \leq (1 + 2\Lambda_{m,K} \sqrt{\#I(K)}) h^{d/2} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} |\mathbf{g}|, \quad \forall \mathbf{g} \in H^{m+1}(\Omega)^d.$$

*Proof.* We define a polynomial space

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_m(S(K))^d := \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{P}_m(S(K))^d \mid \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}_K) = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)\}.$$

Clearly, any polynomial in  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_m(S(K))^d$  satisfies the constraint to (7). Since  $\mathbf{p} := \mathbf{p}_{S(K)}$  is the solution to (7), for any  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$  and any  $\mathbf{q} \in \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_m(S(K))^d$ , we have that  $\mathbf{p} + \varepsilon(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)) \in \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_m(S(K))^d$  and

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} \|\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}) + \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})\|_{l^2}^2 \geq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} \|\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})\|_{l^2}^2.$$

Because  $\varepsilon$  is arbitrary, the above inequality implies

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} (\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot (\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)) = 0.$$

for any  $\mathbf{q} \in \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_m(S(K))^d$ . By letting  $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{p}$  and applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} (\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K) + \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K) - \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot (\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} (-\|\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)\|_{l^2}^2 + (\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)) \cdot (\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K))) \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} \|\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)\|_{l^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)\|_{l^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

and we obtain

$$(11) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} \|\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)\|_{l^2}^2 \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)\|_{l^2}^2.$$

Combining the definition of the constant  $\Lambda_{m,K}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)\|_{L^2(K)} &\leq \Lambda_{m,K}^2 h^d \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} \|\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)\|_{l^2}^2 \leq \Lambda_{m,K}^2 h^d \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)\|_{l^2}^2 \\ &\leq 4d \Lambda_{m,K}^2 h^d \#I(K) \max_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} |\mathbf{g}|^2, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\|\mathbf{p}\|_{L^2(K)} \leq \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)\|_{L^2(K)} + h^{d/2} |\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_K)| \leq (1 + 2\Lambda_{m,K} \sqrt{\#I(K)}) h^{d/2} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} |\mathbf{g}|$$

and completes the proof.  $\square$

**Assumption 2.** *For every element patch  $S(K)$  ( $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ ), there exist constants  $R$  and  $r$  which are independent of  $K$  such that  $B_r \subset S(K) \subset B_R$ , and  $S(K)$  is star-shaped with respect to  $B_r$ , where  $B_\rho$  is a disk with the radius  $\rho$ .*

From the stability result (10), we can prove the approximation results.

**Lemma 5.** *For any  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , there exists a constant  $C$  such that*

$$(12) \quad \|\mathbf{g} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{g}\|_{H^q(K)} \leq C \Lambda_m h_K^{m+1-q} \|\mathbf{g}\|_{H^{m+1}(S(K))}, \quad 0 \leq q \leq m$$

for any  $\mathbf{g} \in H^{m+1}(\Omega)^d$ , where we set

$$(13) \quad \Lambda_m := \max_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left(1 + \Lambda_{m,K} \sqrt{\#I(K)}\right).$$

*Proof.* According to Assumption 2, there exists a polynomial  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{P}_m(S(K))^d$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{g} - \mathbf{p}\|_{H^q(S(K))} &\leq h_K^{m+1-q} \|\mathbf{g}\|_{H^{m+1}(S(K))} \\ \|\mathbf{g} - \mathbf{p}\|_{L^\infty(S(K))} &\leq h_K^{m+1-d/2} \|\mathbf{g}\|_{H^{m+1}(S(K))}\end{aligned}$$

Combining the stability result of the reconstruction operator, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{g} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(K)} &\leq \|\mathbf{g} - \mathbf{p}\|_{L^2(K)} + \|\mathbf{p} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(K)} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{g} - \mathbf{p}\|_{L^2(K)} + (1 + 2\Lambda_{m,K} \sqrt{\#I(K)}) h^{d/2} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} |\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})|\end{aligned}$$

By the arbitraryness of  $\mathbf{p}$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{g} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(K)} \leq Ch^{m+1} \Lambda_m \|\mathbf{g}\|_{H^{m+1}(S(K))}$$

the case  $q > 0$  follows from the inverse inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{g} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{g}\|_{H^q(K)} &\leq \|\mathbf{g} - \mathbf{p}\|_{H^q(K)} + \|\mathbf{p} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{g}\|_{H^q(K)} \\ &\leq Ch^{m+1-q} \|\mathbf{g}\|_{H^{m+1}(K)} + Ch^{-q} \|\mathbf{p} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(K)} \\ &\leq C\Lambda_m h^{m+1-q} \|\mathbf{g}\|_{H^{m+1}(S(K))}\end{aligned}$$

□

From (12), it can be seen that the operator  $\mathcal{R}$  has an approximation error of degree  $O(h^{m+1-q})$  under the case that  $\Lambda_m$  admits an upper bound independent of the mesh size  $h$ . However, it is not trivial to bound the constant  $\Lambda_m$ , see Remark 1. We can prove that under some mild conditions on the element patch, the constant admits a uniform upper bound.

**Remark 1.** *There is a constant  $\Lambda(m, S(K))$  defined in [10] as*

$$\Lambda(m, S(K)) := \max_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{P}_m(S(K))} \frac{\max_{\mathbf{x} \in S(K)} |p(\mathbf{x})|}{\max_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} |p(\mathbf{x})|}.$$

*It can be shown that  $\Lambda_{m,K} \leq \Lambda(m, S(K))$ . Hence when the constant  $\Lambda(m, S(K))$  is uniformly bounded, so is  $\Lambda_{m,K}$ . For the patch  $S(K)$ , consider the special case that the corresponding collocation points set  $I(K)$  has that  $\#I(K) = \dim(\mathbb{P}_m(\cdot))$ , then the constant  $\Lambda(m, S(K))$  is equal to the Lebesgue constant [19] and the solution to the least squares problem (7) is just the Lagrange interpolation polynomial, however, in this case the constant  $\Lambda(m, S(K))$  may depend on  $h$  and grow very fast, which will further damage the convergence. To ensure the stability of the reconstruction operator, we are acquired to choose a sufficiently large  $\#S$  so that the constant  $\Lambda(m, S(K))$  admits a uniform upper bound, thus. We refer to [10, Lemma 6] and [11, Lemma 3.4] for the details of this statement. The wide element patch will bring more computational cost for filling the stiffness matrix and increase the width of the banded structure. This is just the price we have to pay for the uniform bound of  $\Lambda(m, S(K))$ .*

#### 4. APPROXIMATION TO FOURTH-ORDER CURL PROBLEM

We define the approximation problem to solve the problem (1) based on the space  $\mathbf{U}_h^m$  constructed in the previous section: Seek  $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{U}_h^m$  ( $m \geq 2$ ) such that

$$(14) \quad B_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) = l_h(\mathbf{v}_h), \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{U}_h^m,$$

where we define the bilinear form  $B_h(\cdot, \cdot)$  on  $U_h := \mathbf{U}_h^m + H(\text{curl}^2, \Omega) \cap \{\mathbf{v} : \|\text{curl}^j \mathbf{v}\|_{1/2+\sigma, \Omega} < \infty, 0 \leq j \leq 3\}$ , as in [4].

$$\begin{aligned}B_h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) &:= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \text{curl}^2 \mathbf{u} \cdot \text{curl}^2 \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &+ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e ([\mathbf{u}] \cdot \{\text{curl}^3 \mathbf{v}\} + [\text{curl} \mathbf{u}] \cdot \{\text{curl}^2 \mathbf{v}\}) \, ds + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e ([\mathbf{v}] \cdot \{\text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}\} + [\text{curl} \mathbf{v}] \cdot \{\text{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}\}) \, ds \\ &+ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e (\mu_1 [\mathbf{u}] \cdot [\mathbf{v}] + \mu_2 [\text{curl} \mathbf{u}] \cdot [\text{curl} \mathbf{v}]) \, ds\end{aligned}$$

The parameter  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  are positive penalties which are set by

$$\mu_1|_e = \frac{\eta}{h_e^3}, \quad \mu_2|_e = \frac{\eta}{h_e}. \quad \text{for } e \in \mathcal{E}_h.$$

The linear form  $l_h(\cdot)$  is defined for  $\mathbf{v} \in U_h$ ,

$$l_h(\cdot) := \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{v} d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^b} \int_e (g_1 \cdot (\text{curl}^3 \mathbf{v}_h + \mu_1 \mathbf{v}_h \times \mathbf{n}) + g_2 \cdot (\text{curl}^2 \mathbf{v}_h + \mu_2 \text{curl} \mathbf{v}_h \times \mathbf{n})) ds.$$

We introduce two energy norms for the space  $U_h$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\text{DG}}^2 := \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K |\mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K |\text{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e h_K^{-3} |[\mathbf{u}]|^2 ds + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e h_K^{-1} |[\text{curl} \mathbf{u}]|^2 ds,$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 := \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\text{DG}}^2 + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e h_e^3 |\{\text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}\}|^2 ds + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e h_e |\{\text{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}\}|^2 ds.$$

We claim that the two energy norms are equivalent over the space  $\mathbf{U}_h^m$ .

**Lemma 6.** *For any  $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{U}_h^m$ , there exists a constant  $C$ , such that*

$$(15) \quad \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{\text{DG}} \leq \|\mathbf{u}_h\| \leq C \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{\text{DG}}.$$

*Proof.* We only need to prove  $\|\mathbf{u}_h\| \leq C \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{\text{DG}}$ . For  $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$ , we denote the two neighbor elements of  $e$  by  $K^+$  and  $K^-$ . We have

$$\|h_e^{3/2} \{\text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}_h\}\|_{L^2(e)} \leq C \left( \|h_e^{3/2} \text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(e \cap \partial K^+)} + \|h_e^{3/2} \text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(e \cap \partial K^-)} \right)$$

By the trace inequalities (2), and the inverse inequality (3), we obtain that

$$\|h_e^{3/2} \text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(e \cap \partial K^\pm)} \leq C \|\text{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(K^\pm)}$$

For  $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^b$ , let  $e \subset K$ . Similarly, we have

$$\|h_e^{3/2} \text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(e \cap \partial K)} \leq C \|\text{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(K)}$$

The term  $\|h_e^{1/2} \{\text{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}_h\}\|_{L^2(e)}$  can be bounded by the same way. Thus, by summing over all  $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$ , we conclude that

$$\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \|h_e^{1/2} \{\text{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}_h\}\|_{L^2(e)}^2 + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \|h_e^{3/2} \{\text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}_h\}\|_{L^2(e)}^2 \leq C \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\text{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(K)}^2,$$

which can immediately lead us to (15) and complete the proof.  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove the coercivity and the continuity of the bilinear form  $B_h(\cdot, \cdot)$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $B_h(\cdot, \cdot)$  be the bilinear form with sufficiently large penalty  $\eta$ . Then there exists a positive constant  $C$  such that*

$$(16) \quad B_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{u}_h) \geq C \|\mathbf{u}_h\|^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{U}_h^m.$$

*Proof.* From Lemma 6, we only need to establish the coercivity over the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{DG}}$ . For the face  $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$ , let  $e$  be shared by the neighbor elements  $K^-$  and  $K^+$ . We apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_e 2[\mathbf{u}_h] \cdot \{\text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}_h\} ds &\geq -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \|h_e^{-3/2} [\mathbf{u}_h]\|_{L^2(e)}^2 - \epsilon \|h_e^{3/2} \{\text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}_h\}\|_{L^2(e)}^2 \\ &\geq -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \|h_e^{-3/2} [\mathbf{u}_h]\|_{L^2(e)}^2 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|h_e^{3/2} \text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(e \cap \partial K^-)}^2 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \|h_e^{3/2} \text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(e \cap \partial K^+)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ . From the trace inequalities (2), and the inverse inequality (3), we deduce that

$$\|h_e^{3/2} \text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(e \cap \partial K^\pm)} \leq C \|\text{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(K^\pm)}$$

Thus, we have

$$(17) \quad - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \int_{e^0 \cup e^1} 2[\mathbf{u}_h] \cdot \{\text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}_h\} ds \geq - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|h_e^{-3/2} [\mathbf{u}_h]\|_{L^2(e^0 \cup e^1)}^2 - C\epsilon \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\text{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(K^0 \cup K^1)}^2.$$

For the face  $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^b$ , we can similarly derive that

$$(18) \quad - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^b} \int_{e^0 \cup e^1} 2[\mathbf{u}_h] \cdot \{\text{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}_h\} ds \geq - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^b} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|h_e^{-3/2} [\mathbf{u}_h]\|_{L^2(e)}^2 - C\epsilon \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\text{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(K)}^2.$$

By employing the same method to the term  $\int_{e^0 \cup e^1} 2[\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_h] \{\operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}_h\} ds$ , we can obtain that

$$(19) \quad - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e 2[\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_h] \{\operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}_h\} ds \geq -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \|h_e^{-1/2} [\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_h]\|_{L^2(e)}^2 - C\epsilon \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(K)}^2,$$

Combining the inequalities (17), (18), (19), we conclude that there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} B_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{u}_h) &\geq (1 - C\epsilon) \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(K)}^2 + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(K)}^2 \\ &\quad + (\eta - \frac{1}{\epsilon}) \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} (\|h_e^{-1/2} [\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_h]\|_{L^2(e)}^2 + \|h_e^{-3/2} [\mathbf{u}_h]\|_{L^2(e)}^2) \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ . We can let  $\epsilon = 1/(2C)$  and select a sufficiently large  $\eta$  to ensure  $B_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{u}_h) \geq C\|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{\text{DG}}^2$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** *There exists a positive constant  $C$  such that*

$$(20) \quad |B_h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})| \leq C\|\mathbf{u}\|\|\mathbf{v}\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in U_h.$$

*Proof.* By directly using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} B_h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) &\leq C \left( \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(K)}^2 + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} (\|h_e^{-3/2} [\mathbf{u}]\|_{L^2(e)}^2 + \|h_e^{-1/2} [\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}]\|_{L^2(e)}^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|h_e^{3/2} \{\operatorname{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}\}\|_{L^2(e)}^2 + \|h_e^{1/2} \{\operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}\}\|_{L^2(e)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad \left( \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(K)}^2 + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} (\|h_e^{-3/2} [\mathbf{v}]\|_{L^2(e)}^2 + \|h_e^{-1/2} [\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}]\|_{L^2(e)}^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|h_e^{3/2} \{\operatorname{curl}^3 \mathbf{v}\}\|_{L^2(e)}^2 + \|h_e^{1/2} \{\operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{v}\}\|_{L^2(e)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

Now we verify the Galerkin orthogonality.

**Lemma 7.** *Suppose  $\mathbf{u}$  is the exact solution to the problem (1), and  $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{U}_h^m$  is the numerical solution to the discrete problem (14), then*

$$(21) \quad B_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{U}_h^m.$$

*Proof.* We first have for the two jump terms

$$[\mathbf{u}]|_e = \mathbf{0}, \quad [\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}]|_e = \mathbf{0}, \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i, \quad i = 0, 1.$$

Taking the exact solution into  $B_h(\cdot, \cdot)$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} B_h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}_h) &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{u} \cdot \operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{v}_h dx + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}_h dx \\ &\quad + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e [\mathbf{v}_h] \cdot \{\operatorname{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}\} ds + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e [\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h] \{\operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}\} ds \\ &\quad + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^b} \int_e (g_1 \cdot (\operatorname{curl}^3 \mathbf{v}_h + \mu_1 \mathbf{v}_h \times \mathbf{n}) + g_2 \cdot (\operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{v}_h + \mu_2 \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h \times \mathbf{n})) ds \end{aligned}$$



We multiply the test function  $\mathbf{v}_h$  at both side of equation (1), and apply the integration by parts to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{v}_h d\mathbf{x} &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \operatorname{curl}^4 \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}_h d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}_h d\mathbf{x} \\
&= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{u} \cdot \operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{v}_h d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}_h d\mathbf{x} \\
&+ \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left( \int_{\partial K} \operatorname{curl}^3 \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \times \mathbf{n} ds + \int_{\partial K} \operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{u} \cdot (\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h \times \mathbf{n}) ds \right) \\
&= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{u} \cdot \operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{v}_h d\mathbf{x} + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}_h d\mathbf{x} \\
&+ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e [\mathbf{v}_h] \cdot \{\operatorname{curl}^3 \mathbf{u}\} ds + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_e [\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h] \{\operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{u}\} ds ds
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by simply calculating, we obtain that

$$B_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) = l_h(\mathbf{v}_h) = B_h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}_h),$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

Then we establish the interpolation error estimate of the reconstruction operator.

**Lemma 8.** For  $0 \leq h \leq h_0$  and  $m \geq 2$ , there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$(22) \quad \|\mathbf{v} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{v}\| \leq C \Lambda_m h^{m-1} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega)}, \quad \forall v \in H^s(\Omega), \quad s = \max(4, m+1).$$

*Proof.* From Lemma ??, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\operatorname{curl}^2 \mathbf{v} - \operatorname{curl}^2(\mathcal{R}\mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(K)}^2 &\leq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} C \Lambda_m^2 h_K^{2m-2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^{m+1}(S(K))}^2 \\
&\leq C \Lambda_m^2 h^{2m-2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega)}^2 \leq C \Lambda_m^2 h^{2m-2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega)}^2
\end{aligned}$$

,also

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\mathbf{v} - (\mathcal{R}\mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(K)}^2 &\leq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} C \Lambda_m^2 h_K^{2m+2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^{m+1}(S(K))}^2 \\
&\leq C \Lambda_m^2 h^{2m+2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega)}^2 \leq C \Lambda_m^2 h^{2m+2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

By the trace estimate (2) and the mesh regularity,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} h_e^{-1} \|\llbracket \operatorname{curl}(\mathbf{v} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{v}) \rrbracket\|_{L^2(e)}^2 &\leq C \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left( h_K^{-2} \|\operatorname{curl}(\mathbf{v} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(K)}^2 + \|\operatorname{curl}(\mathbf{v} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{v})\|_{H^1(K)}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C \Lambda_m^2 h^{2m-2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h} h_e^{-3} \|\llbracket \mathbf{v} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{v} \rrbracket\|_{L^2(e)}^2 &\leq C \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left( h_K^{-4} \|\mathbf{v} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(K)}^2 + h_K^{-2} \|\mathbf{v} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{v}\|_{H^1(K)}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C \Lambda_m^2 h^{2m-2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

Now we are ready to present the *a priori* error estimate under  $\|\cdot\|$  within the standard Lax-Milgram framework.

**Theorem 3.** Suppose the problem (1) has a solution  $\mathbf{u} \in H^s(\Omega)$ , where  $s = \max(4, m+1)$ ,  $m \geq 2$  and  $\Lambda_m$  has a uniform upper bound independent of  $h$ . Let the bilinear form  $B_h(\cdot, \cdot)$  be defined with a sufficiently large  $\eta$  and  $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{U}_h^m$  be the numerical solution to the problem (14). Then for  $h \leq h_0$  there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$(23) \quad \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\| \leq C \Lambda_m h^{m-1} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega)}.$$

*Proof.* From (16), (20) and (21), we have that for any  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{U}_h^m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{v}_h\|^2 &\leq CB_h(\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{v}_h) = CB_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{v}_h) \\ &\leq C\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}_h\|\|\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{v}_h\|. \end{aligned}$$

By the triangle inequality, there holds

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\| \leq \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}_h\| + \|\mathbf{v}_h - \mathbf{u}_h\| \leq C \inf_{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{U}_h^m} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}_h\|.$$

Let  $\mathbf{v}_h = \mathcal{R}\mathbf{u}$ , by the inequality (22), we arrive at

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\| \leq C\Lambda_m\|\mathbf{u} - \mathcal{R}\mathbf{u}\| \leq Ch^{m-1}\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega)},$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** *Under the same assumptions, there exists a constant  $C$  such that*

$$(24) \quad \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\Lambda_m h^{m-1} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^{m+1}(\Omega)}.$$

**Remark 2.** *We have proved that under the energy norm  $\|\cdot\|$  the numerical solution  $\mathbf{u}_h$  has the optimal convergence rate. It can be seen that  $\|\cdot\|$  is stronger than  $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$  from the definition of  $\|\cdot\|$ . Hence, from (24) we can conclude that the numerical solution  $\mathbf{u}_h$  at least have the  $O(h^{m-1})$  convergence rate in  $L^2$  norm, which is exactly the convergence rate indicated by our numerical tests.*

## 5. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we conduct a series numerical experiments to test the performance of our method. For the accuracy  $2 \leq m \leq 4$ , the threshold  $\#S$  we used in the examples are listed in Tab. 1. For all examples, the boundary  $g_1, g_2$  and the right hand side  $f$  in the equation (1) are chosen according to the exact solution.

**Example 1.** We first consider a fourth-order curl problem defined on the squared domain  $\Omega = (0, 1)^2$ . The exact solution is chosen by

$$\mathbf{u}(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} 3\pi \sin^2(\pi y) \cos(\pi y) \sin^3(\pi x) \\ -3\pi \sin^2(\pi x) \cos(\pi x) \sin^3(\pi y) \end{bmatrix},$$

We solve the problem on a sequence of meshes with the size  $h = 1/8, 1/16, 1/32, 1/64, 1/128$ . The convergence histories under the  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{DG}}$  (which is equivalent to  $\|\cdot\|$ ) and  $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$  are shown in Fig. 1. The error under the energy norm is decreasing at the speed  $O(h^{m-1})$  for fixed  $m$ . For  $L^2$  error, the speed is the same as the energy norm. These results coincide with the theoretical analysis in Theorem 1.

$m$	2	3	4	$m$	2	3
$\#S$	12	20	27	$\#S$	25	47

TABLE 1. The  $\#S$  used in 2D and 3D examples.

**Example 2.** We solve a three-dimensional problem in this case. The computation domain is an unit cube  $\Omega = (0, 1)^3$ . We select the exact solution as

$$\mathbf{u}(x, y, z) = \begin{bmatrix} \sin(\pi y) \sin(\pi z) \\ \sin(\pi z) \sin(\pi x) \\ \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y) \end{bmatrix},$$

We use the tetrahedra meshes generated by the Gmsh software [3]. We solve the problem on three different meshes with the reconstruction order  $m = 2, 3$ . The convergence order in both norms is shown in Fig. 2, also consistent with our theoretical predictions.

## 6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed an IPDG method for the fourth-order curl problem with the reconstructed discontinuous approximation. The approximation space is based on patch reconstruction from piecewise constant sapce and can approximate functions up to high order accuracy. We show numerical experiments in two and three dimensions to examine the order of convergence under the energy norm and the  $L^2$  norm.




FIGURE 1. The convergence histories under the  $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$  (left) and the  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{DG}}$  (right) in Example 1.




FIGURE 2. The convergence histories under the  $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$  (left) and the  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{DG}}$  (right) in Example 2.

#### APPENDIX A. CALCULATING THE RECONSTRUCTION CONSTANT

This appendix gives the method to compute the constant  $\Lambda_m$  for a given mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$ . For any element  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , let  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_l$  be a group of standard orthogonal basis functions in  $\mathbb{P}_m(K)$  under the  $L^2$  inner product  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{L^2(K)}$ . Then, any polynomial  $q \in \mathbb{P}_m(K)$  can be expanded by a group coefficients  $\mathbf{a} = \{a_j\}_{j=1}^l \in \mathbb{R}^l$  such that  $q = \sum_{j=1}^l a_j p_j$ . We can naturally extend  $q$  and all  $p_j$  to the domain  $S(K)$  by the polynomial extension. The main step to get  $\Lambda_m$  is to compute  $\Lambda_{m,K}$  for all elements, and  $\Lambda_{m,K}$  can be represented as

$$\Lambda_{m,K}^2 = \max_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^l} \frac{|\mathbf{a}|_l^2}{h_K^d \mathbf{a}^T B_K \mathbf{a}}, \quad B_K = \{b_{ij}\}_{l \times l}, \quad b_{ij} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in I(K)} p_i(\mathbf{x}) p_j(\mathbf{x}).$$

From the matrix representation,  $\Lambda_{m,K} = (h_K^d \sigma_{\min}(B_K))^{-1/2}$ , where  $\sigma_{\min}(B_K)$  is the smallest singular value to  $B_K$ . Hence, it is enough to observe the minimum value of  $\sigma_{\min}(B_K)$  for all elements, and  $\Lambda_m$  can be computed by (13).

As we remarked in Section 3, when the patch is wide enough,  $\Lambda_m$  will admit a uniform upper bound independent of the mesh size. Here, we will show  $\Lambda_m$  for different size of the patch. We consider the




FIGURE 3.  $\Lambda_m$  in 2d with  $h = 1/40$  (row 1) /  $\Lambda_m$  in 3d with  $h = 1/16$  (row 2).

triangular mesh with  $h = 1/40$  and the tetrahedral mesh with  $h = 1/16$  in two and three dimensions, which are used in Example 1 and Example 2. The values of  $\Lambda_m$  are collected in Fig. 3.

#### REFERENCES

1. S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott, *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, third ed., Texts in Applied Mathematics, vol. 15, Springer, New York, 2008.
2. Fioralba Cakoni and Housseem Haddar, *A variational approach for the solution of the electromagnetic interior transmission problem for anisotropic media*, *Inverse Problems and Imaging* **1** (2007), 443–456.
3. C. Geuzaine and J. F. Remacle, *Gmsh: A 3-D finite element mesh generator with built-in pre- and post-processing facilities*, *Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg.* **79** (2009), no. 11, 1309–1331.
4. Jiayu Han and Zhimin Zhang, *An hp-version interior penalty discontinuous galerkin method for the quad-curl eigenvalue problem*, *BIT Numerical Mathematics* **63** (2023), article number 56.
5. Qingguo Hong, Jun Hu, Shi Shu, and Jinchao Xu, *A discontinuous galerkin method for the fourth-order curl problem*, *Journal of Computational Mathematics* **30** (2012), 565–578.
6. Kaibo Hu, Qian Zhang, and Zhimin Zhang, *Simple curl-curl-conforming finite elements in two dimensions*, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **42** (2020), no. 6, A3859–A3877.
7. T. J. R. Hughes, G. Engel, L. Mazzei, and M. G. Larson, *A comparison of discontinuous and continuous Galerkin methods based on error estimates, conservation, robustness and efficiency*, *Discontinuous Galerkin methods* (Newport, RI, 1999), *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 11, Springer, Berlin, 2000, pp. 135–146.
8. R. Li, Q. Liu, and F. Yang, *A reconstructed discontinuous approximation on unfitted meshes to  $H(\text{curl})$  and  $H(\text{div})$  interface problems*, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.* **403** (2023), no. part A, Paper No. 115723, 27.
9. R. Li, P. Ming, Z. Sun, F. Yang, and Z. Yang, *A discontinuous Galerkin method by patch reconstruction for biharmonic problem*, *J. Comput. Math.* **37** (2019), no. 4, 563–580.
10. R. Li, P. Ming, Z. Sun, and Z. Yang, *An arbitrary-order discontinuous Galerkin method with one unknown per element*, *J. Sci. Comput.* **80** (2019), no. 1, 268–288.
11. R. Li, P. Ming, and F. Tang, *An efficient high order heterogeneous multiscale method for elliptic problems*, *Multiscale Model. Simul.* **10** (2012), no. 1, 259–283.
12. R. Li, Z. Sun, and F. Yang, *Solving eigenvalue problems in a discontinuous approximate space by patch reconstruction*, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **41** (2019), no. 5, A3381–A3400.
13. R. Li and F. Yang, *A discontinuous Galerkin method by patch reconstruction for elliptic interface problem on unfitted mesh*, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **42** (2020), no. 2, A1428–A1457.
14. ———, *A least squares method for linear elasticity using a patch reconstructed space*, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.* **363** (2020), no. 1, 112902.
15. ———, *A sequential least squares method for Poisson equation using a patch reconstructed space*, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **58** (2020), no. 1, 353–374.
16. ———, *A reconstructed discontinuous approximation to Monge-Ampère equation in least square formulation*, *Adv. Appl. Math. Mech.* **15** (2023), no. 5, 1109–1141. MR 4613677
17. Peter Monk and Jiguang Sun, *Finite element methods for maxwell’s transmission eigenvalues*, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **34** (2012), B247–B264.
18. Serge Nicaise, *Singularities of the quad curl problem*, *Journal of Differential Equations* **264** (2018), 5025–5069.
19. M. J. D. Powell, *Approximation theory and methods*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York, 1981.
20. Jiguang Sun, *A mixed fem for the quad-curl eigenvalue problem*, *Numerische Mathematik* **132** (2013), 185–200.
21. Jiguang Sun, Qian Zhang, and Zhimin Zhang, *A curl-conforming weak galerkin method for the quad-curl problem*, *BIT Numerical Mathematics* **59** (2019), 1093–1114.
22. Qian Zhang, Lixiu Wang, and Zhimin Zhang,  *$H(\text{curl}^2)$ -conforming finite elements in 2 dimensions and applications to the quad-curl problem*, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* **41** (2019), A1527–A1547.
23. Shuo Zhang, *Mixed schemes for quad-curl equations*, *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis* **52** (2018), 147–161.
24. Bin Zheng, Qiya Hu, and Jinchao Xu, *A nonconforming finite element method for fourth order curl equations in  $r^3$* , *Math. Comput.* **80** (2010), 1871–1886.

CAPT, LMAM AND SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100871, P.R. CHINA  
*Email address:* rli@math.pku.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100871, P.R. CHINA  
*Email address:* qcliu@pku.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100871, P.R. CHINA  
*Email address:* shuhai@pku.edu.cn