

# THE CONDITION FOR CONSTRUCTING A FINITE ELEMENT FROM A SUPERSPLINE

JUN HU, TING LIN, QINGYU WU, AND BEIHUI YUAN

**ABSTRACT.** This paper addresses the sufficient and necessary conditions for constructing  $C^r$  conforming finite element spaces from a superspline spaces on general simplicial triangulations. We introduce the concept of extendability for the pre-element spaces, which encompasses both the superspline space and the finite element space. By examining the extendability condition for both types of spaces, we provide an answer to the conditions regarding the construction. A corollary of our results is that constructing  $C^r$  conforming elements in  $d$  dimensions should in general require an extra  $C^{2^s r}$  continuity on  $s$ -codimensional simplices, and the polynomial degree is at least  $(2^d r + 1)$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The finite element method and the spline method are two closely related methods using piecewise polynomials to approximate the target function. However, their main distinction of these two methods is their own construction philosophies: The *finite element* follows a *bottom-up* approach, while the *spline* employs a *top-down* approach. In fact, in the finite element method, we first propose the local shape function space and the corresponding degrees of freedom. Then, we glue all the local spaces together by matching the degrees of freedom from adjacent simplices to obtain the global finite element space. On contrast, in the spline method, we start with a global piecewise polynomial space, namely the spline space, on which some inter-element continuity conditions are imposed. Both methods have been widely used. In particular, the finite element method has been popularly used in solving partial differential equations, while the spline method has been largely used in data fitting and 3D modeling.

For piecewise polynomial spaces with  $C^0$  continuity, the finite element space is practically equivalent to the spline space, which is spanned by the Lagrange basis. However, for general cases, these two methods result in different spaces. Both approaches will be briefly introduced below.

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 65N30, 65D07.

*Key words and phrases.* Finite element method, spline, continuity vector, pre-element mapping, extendability.

The first author was supported by NSFC project No.12288101. The second author was supported by NSFC project No.123B2014.

The  $C^r$  spline space is the intersection of the piecewise polynomial space and the  $C^r$  continuous function space. This top-down definition results in the lack of direct controls on the local smoothness of  $C^r$  spline functions. For example, the splines might have higher smoothness locally, known as (intrinsic) supersmoothness in the literature, see [19]. When  $r \geq 1$ , the dimension of the  $C^r$  spline space relies heavily on the global geometry of the triangulation. A typical case is the Morgan-Scott triangulation [13, Figure 9.2], which exemplifies the dependence. Therefore, sometimes the spline space does not have a local basis [3]. As a result, the dimension counting for spline spaces with  $r \geq 1$ , even for triangulations of planar regions, is highly non-trivial [15]. Nonetheless, bivariate spline spaces have been intensively studied, for which there is a well-known lower bound for the dimension of spline spaces derived by Schumaker in [16]. It has also been proved, for example in [1], [2] and [10], that under some mild condition and assumption on degrees, Schumaker's formula gives the actual dimension of spline spaces, see also [14] and [4] for local bases. For trivariate splines, less is known, see [5], [9], and references therein.

In contrast, the study of the  $C^r$  finite element spaces concentrates on the local degrees of freedom to achieve the continuity conditions. In two dimensions, [8] generalizes the  $C^1$  Argyris element [7] to the general  $C^r$  elements, where the partial derivatives up to order  $2r$  are employed in the degrees of freedom. In three dimensions, the existing constructions of  $C^r$  finite element spaces require: (1) the partial derivatives up to order  $4r$  at each vertex, and (2) the partial derivatives up to order  $2r$  on each edge. See [23, 22] for the elements of  $r = 1$ , [24] for the elements of  $r = 2$ , and [18, 13, 21] for the elements of arbitrary  $r$ . In arbitrary  $d$  dimensions, it is commonly conjectured that the  $C^r$  finite element can be constructed if the  $\mathcal{P}_{2^{d_r}+1}$  polynomial space is chosen as the local shape function space, and the derivatives up to  $2^{d-1-s}r$  order on  $s$ -dimensional subsimplex are used. Recently, three of the authors [12] gave the first construction of the conforming  $C^r$  finite element in  $d$  dimensions with respect to the simplicial triangulation, based on the above conditions.

This paper shed light on the distinction and connection between finite element and spline spaces. Our results indicate that the continuity requirement of the finite element construction is tight. To this end, we recall the definition of superspline spaces, see the following definitions.

**Finite Element spaces and Superspline spaces.** Throughout this paper, following [11], we assume that a *finite element* consists of a Ciarlet's triple  $(K, P, \Sigma)$  where

- $K$  is a  $d$ -simplex, embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ;
- $P$  is a finite-dimensional space of polynomial functions;
- $\Sigma$  is a basis for the dual space  $P^\vee$  (the space of linear mappings from  $P$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ ), together with a natural partition  $\Sigma = \coprod_{F \subseteq K} \Sigma_F$  with

respect to the subsimplices  $F$  of  $K$ . The element in  $\Sigma$  is called the degree of freedom.

Given a triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$  of the underlying region  $\Omega$ , we can define a *finite element space*  $\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{T})$ , a subspace of  $L^2(\Omega)$ , by specifying a finite element  $(K_j, P, \Sigma(K_j))$  for each  $d$ -simplex  $K_j \in \mathcal{T}$ , satisfying the condition that for each subsimplex  $F \subseteq K_j \cap K_{j'}$ ,  $\Sigma_F(K_j) = \Sigma_F(K_{j'})$ , shortened as  $\Sigma_F$ . Hence, we have a *global degree of freedom*  $\Sigma(\mathcal{T}) := \coprod_{F \in \mathcal{T}} \Sigma_F$ , according to the above condition. Then the global finite element space is defined as

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(\mathcal{T}) := \{ & u \in L^2(\Omega) : \text{for each } d\text{-simplex } K \in \mathcal{T}, u|_K \in P(K); \\ & \text{for each proper subsimplex } F \in \mathcal{T} \\ & \text{and each degree of freedom } l \in \Sigma_F, \\ & l(u|_K) \text{ is single-valued for any } K \in \text{star}(F; \mathcal{T}) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the  $d$ -simplex set  $\text{star}(F; \mathcal{T})$  is defined as

$$\text{star}(F; \mathcal{T}) := \{K \in \mathcal{T} : K \text{ is a } d\text{-simplex, } F \text{ is a subsimplex of } K\}.$$

The superspline is a natural generalization of the Argyris element. Let  $\mathcal{T}_s$  be the collection of  $s$ -dimensional subsimplices of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

**Definition 1.1.** For a given *continuity vector*  $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_d)$  and a given *polynomial degree*  $k$ , define the superspline space  $\mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$  over the triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$  as

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T}) := \{ & u \in L^2(\Omega) : \text{for each } d\text{-simplex } K \in \mathcal{T}, u|_K \in \mathcal{P}_k(K); \\ & \text{for each proper subsimplex } F \in \mathcal{T}_{d-s} \text{ and each } 0 \leq n \leq r_s, \\ & \nabla^n u|_F \text{ is single-valued for any } K \in \text{star}(F; \mathcal{T}) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T}) := \{ & u \in L^2(\Omega) : \text{for each } d\text{-simplex } K \in \mathcal{T}, u|_K \in \mathcal{P}(K); \\ & \text{for each proper subsimplex } F \in \mathcal{T}_{d-s} \text{ and each } 0 \leq n \leq r_s, \\ & \nabla^n u|_F \text{ is single-valued for any } K \in \text{star}(F; \mathcal{T}) \}. \end{aligned}$$

be the union of all  $\mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$  for  $k \geq 0$ . Here,  $\mathcal{P}_k(K)$  denotes the polynomial function space defined on  $K$  with degrees less than or equal to  $k$ , and  $\mathcal{P}(K)$  denotes the polynomial function space defined on  $K$ . Hereafter, we always assume that  $r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \dots \leq r_d$ , and  $r_0 = 0$  for convenience.

Similar to spline spaces, the dimension counting and the basis construction of superspline spaces have been explored, see [6] and [20].

There are strong relationships between finite element spaces and superspline spaces (see, e.g., [17]). The construction of the Argyris element then indicates that the superspline space  $\mathbf{S}_k^{(1,2)}(\mathcal{T})$  can be regarded as a global finite element space, or equivalently speaking, the superspline space  $\mathbf{S}_k^{(1,2)}(\mathcal{T})$  admits a finite element construction. The classical construction of  $C^r$  finite

elements falls into this category. The global space of [8] is  $\mathbf{S}_{4r+1}^{(r,2r)}(\mathcal{T})$  in two dimensions; the global space of [23] is  $\mathbf{S}_k^{(1,2,4)}(\mathcal{T})$  for  $k \geq 9$  in three dimensions. We shall prove later that the global finite element space of the finite elements [12] due to Hu, Lin, and Wu is  $\mathbf{S}_k^r(\mathcal{T}) = \mathbf{S}_k^{(r_1, \dots, r_d)}(\mathcal{T})$  if

$$(A1) \quad k \geq 2r_d + 1, \quad r_d \geq 2r_{d-1} \geq \dots \geq 2^{d-1}r_1.$$

This is precisely why we incorporate superspline spaces into our study.

The problem of constructing  $C^r$  finite element spaces from superspline spaces is then formulated as the following question.

**Question 1.** When does a superspline space admit a finite element construction?

It should be noted that having a local basis is not a sufficient condition for admitting a finite element construction in the sense of Ciarlet's triple. Morgan and Scott [14] provided a nodal basis of  $\mathbf{S}_k^{(1,1)}(\mathcal{T})$  in two dimensions for  $k \geq 5$ . We shall discuss this case in Example 2.3.

**Contributions and main techniques.** This paper solves Question 1, by characterizing the sufficient and in some sense necessary condition for a superspline space to be a global finite element space. The key idea is to introduce the concept of extendability. To this end, we first introduce the pre-element space mappings. The finite element spaces and the superspline spaces are special cases of the pre-element space mappings.

**Definition 1.2.** A *pre-element space mapping*  $\mathbf{P}(\cdot)$  in  $d$  dimensions is a vector space-valued mapping defined for all the triangulations  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) Given a triangulation  $\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{T}(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T})$  is a subspace of  $L^2(\Omega)$ .
- (2) If  $\mathcal{T}'$  is a subtriangulation (namely, a pure  $d$  subcomplex) of  $\mathcal{T}$ , then the restriction of  $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T})$  on  $\mathcal{T}'$  is a subspace of  $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T}')$ .

By the above definition, the mapping  $\mathbf{E}(\cdot)$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_k^r(\cdot)$  and  $\mathbf{S}^r(\cdot)$  are pre-element space mappings.

**Definition 1.3.** We say a pre-element space mapping  $\mathbf{P}(\cdot)$  admits a construction of a finite element, if there exists a Ciarlet's triple such that  $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathbf{E}(\mathcal{T})$  for all  $\mathcal{T}$ .

We now define the extendability for the pre-element space mapping.

**Definition 1.4.** We say a pre-element space mapping  $\mathbf{P}(\cdot)$  is *extendable*, if for any subtriangulation  $\mathcal{T}'$  of  $\mathcal{T}$ , the restriction operator  $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T}')$  is onto.

**Remark 1.** Note again that  $\mathbf{E}(\cdot)$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_k^r(\cdot)$  and  $\mathbf{S}^r(\cdot)$  are mappings, whose inputs are triangulations and outputs are vector spaces. Hereafter, we use  $\mathbf{E}$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$  and  $\mathbf{S}^r$  to denote such mappings on  $\mathcal{T}$  for simplicity.

From the bottom-up construction of the global finite element space, we can prove that all the global finite element mapping  $\mathbf{E}$  are extendable, see Theorem 2.1. As a corollary, if a superspline space admits a finite element construction, then it must be extendable. We then propose the following question.

**Question 2.** When is a superspline space extendable?

The answers of both Question 1 and Question 2 happen to be if and only if Assumption (A1) holds, which will be formally stated as Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 2.2, respectively.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$  be a superspline space mapping. Then,  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$  admits a construction of a finite element if and only if the continuity vector  $\mathbf{r}$  and the polynomial degree  $k$  satisfy Assumption (A1).*

The proof of Theorem 1.1 are divided into three parts, which are all proved by explicit constructions:

- (1) Under Assumption (A1), the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$  is exactly the finite element space mapping  $\mathbf{E}_k^r$  in [12], see Proposition 3.5.
- (2) If the mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$  admits a construction of a finite element, and it must be extendable, see Theorem 2.1.
- (3) The mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$  is extendable only if Assumption (A1) holds, see Theorem 2.2.

**Notation.** Throughout this paper, we keep the following notation.

Let  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}(\Omega)$  be a triangulation of a domain  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ . The triangulation  $\mathcal{T}'$  is a pure  $d$  subcomplex of  $\mathcal{T}$ , called a subtriangulation of  $\mathcal{T}$ , denoted as  $\mathcal{T}' \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}_s$  be the collection of  $s$ -dimensional subsimplices of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

We shall use  $K$  to represent a  $d$ -simplex and  $F, E$  to represent subsimplices of  $K$ . The vertices of  $K$  are denoted as  $V_0, V_1, \dots, V_d$ . We assume that  $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$  are barycentric coordinates corresponding to  $V_0, V_1, \dots, V_d$ . Here  $\lambda_i$  is a linear function, which can be naturally extended to  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $\lambda_i(V_{i'}) = \delta_{ii'}$  for  $i, i' = 0, 1, \dots, d$ , where  $\delta$  is Kronecker's delta.

For a  $(d-s)$ -dimensional subsimplex  $F$  of  $K$ , formed by vertices  $V_s, \dots, V_d$ , we assume that  $\lambda_{F,s}, \dots, \lambda_{F,d}$  are barycentric coordinates corresponding to  $V_s, \dots, V_d$ . Here  $\lambda_{F,i}$  is a linear function defined on  $F$ , such that  $\lambda_{F,i} = \lambda_i|_F$  for  $i = s, \dots, d$ . In particular, when  $F$  is a vertex  $V_d$ , we assume that  $\lambda_{F,d} = 1$ .

## 2. EXTENDABILITY: AN EXAMPLE

This section focuses on the extendability. We first show that the finite element space mappings are always extendable, by leveraging the bottom-up construction.

**Theorem 2.1.** *The finite element space mapping  $\mathbf{E}$  defined in (1.1) is extendable.*

*Proof.* The proof is based on a direct construction. For any subtriangulation  $\mathcal{T}' \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ , it suffices to prove that the restriction operator  $\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}(\mathcal{T}')$  is onto. For any  $u \in \mathbf{E}(\mathcal{T}')$ , consider  $v \in \mathbf{E}(\mathcal{T})$  such that

- $l(v) = l(u)$  for each degree of freedom  $l \in \Sigma_F$  defined on each subsimplex  $F \in \mathcal{T}' \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ . Note that the right-hand side  $l(u)$  is well-defined since  $l(u|_K)$  is single-valued for any  $K \in \text{star}(F; \mathcal{T}')$ .
- $l(v) = 0$  for each degree of freedom  $l \in \Sigma_F$  defined on each subsimplex  $F \in \mathcal{T}$  but  $F \notin \mathcal{T}'$ .

By the above choice, it holds that  $u|_K = v|_K$  holds for all  $d$ -simplex  $K \in \mathcal{T}'$ , by the definition of the finite element space, namely,  $l(v|_K) = l(u|_K)$  holds for each  $l \in \Sigma_F$ ,  $F \subseteq K \in \mathcal{T}'$ .  $\square$

The following theorem answers Question 2.

**Theorem 2.2.** *The superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$  is extendable if and only if Assumption (A1) holds.*

Note that the above argument can be translated into the study of the superspline space  $\mathbf{S}^r$ , and we can further deduce when the superspline space  $\mathbf{S}^r$  is extendable.

**Theorem 2.3.** *The superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}^r$  is extendable if and only if*

$$(A2) \quad r_d \geq 2r_{d-1} \geq \dots \geq 2^{d-1}r_1.$$

*holds.*

Before the proof, we first show some one-dimensional examples to briefly explain our idea. Here, we take triangulations  $\mathcal{T} = \{[1, 2], [0, 1], [-1, 0]\}$  and  $\mathcal{T}' = \{[1, 2], [-1, 0]\} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ .

**Example 2.1.** We shall prove that the mapping  $\mathbf{S}_0^{(0)}$  is not extendable. For each  $\mathcal{T}$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_0^{(0)}(\mathcal{T})$  is the space of piecewise constant function space on  $\mathcal{T}$ . Take  $u \in \mathbf{S}_0^{(0)}(\mathcal{T}')$  such that  $u|_{[1,2]} = 1$  and  $u|_{[-1,0]} = 0$ . Clearly, such  $u$  cannot be extended to a function in  $\mathbf{S}_0^{(0)}(\mathcal{T})$ , since functions in  $\mathbf{S}_0^{(0)}(\mathcal{T})$  are constant in each connected component.

However, for the mapping  $\mathbf{S}_1^{(0)}$ , any function in  $\mathbf{S}_1^{(0)}(\mathcal{T}')$  can be extended to  $\mathbf{S}_1^{(0)}(\mathcal{T})$  by considering  $v \in \mathcal{P}_1([0, 1])$  such that  $v(1) = u(1)$  and  $v(0) = u(0)$ .

In fact, one can show that the mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^{(0)}$  is extendable for  $k \geq 1$ , with the help of one-dimensional Lagrange interpolation.

**Example 2.2.** Consider the mapping  $\mathbf{S}_2^{(1)}$ . For each  $\mathcal{T}$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_2^{(1)}(\mathcal{T})$  is the space of  $C^1$ -continuous piecewise quadratic functions on  $\mathcal{T}$ , which is known as a quadratic spline space. We can also prove that the mapping  $\mathbf{S}_2^{(1)}$  is not extendable. Take  $u \in \mathbf{S}_2^{(1)}(\mathcal{T}')$  such that  $u|_{[1,2]} = 0$  and  $u|_{[-1,0]} = x$ . If

$u$  can be extended into a function in  $\mathbf{S}_2^{(1)}(\mathcal{T})$ , then in  $[0, 1]$  it holds that  $u(1) = u'(1) = u(0) = 0$  while  $u'(0) = 1$ , which leads to a contradiction.

Similarly, one can show that the mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^{(1)}$  is extendable for  $k \geq 3$ , with the help of one-dimensional Hermite interpolation.

In two dimensions, we show that the mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^{(1,1)}$  is not extendable. Here, consider the following three triangles defined as

$$\begin{aligned} K_{++} &:= \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 \geq 0, x_2 \geq 0, x_1 + x_2 \leq 1\}, \\ K_{--} &:= \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 \leq 0, x_2 \leq 0, -x_1 - x_2 \leq 1\}, \\ K_{+-} &:= \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 \geq 0, x_2 \leq 0, x_1 - x_2 \leq 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathcal{T} = \{K_{++}, K_{--}, K_{+-}\}$  and  $\mathcal{T}' = \{K_{++}, K_{--}\}$  be a subcomplex of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Furthermore, denote the edges  $F_1 = [0, 1] \times \{0\}$ ,  $F_2 = \{0\} \times [-1, 0]$ , and the vertex  $V_0 = (0, 0)$ , which are shown in Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. A mesh containing a singular vertex

**Example 2.3.** Consider the mapping  $\mathbf{S}_5^{(1,1)}$  in two dimensions, the space of  $C^1$ -continuous piecewise  $\mathcal{P}_5$  polynomial functions. We shall prove that the mapping  $\mathbf{S}_5^{(1,1)}$  is not extendable. Take  $u \in L^2(\mathcal{T}')$  such that  $u|_{K_{++}} = 0$  and  $u|_{K_{--}} = x_1x_2$ . Since  $\partial_{x_1}(x_1x_2)|_{V_0} = \partial_{x_2}(x_1x_2)|_{V_0} = 0$ , it implies that  $u \in \mathbf{S}_5^{(1,1)}(\mathcal{T}')$ . If  $u$  can be extended into a function in  $\mathbf{S}_5^{(1,1)}(\mathcal{T})$ , then in triangle  $K_{+-}$  it holds that  $\partial_{x_2}u|_{F_1} = 0$  while  $\partial_{x_1}u|_{F_2} = x_2|_{F_2}$ . By expansion and comparing the coefficient of the  $x_1x_2$  term, it follows that such  $u$  cannot exist.

On the other hand, one can show that the mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^{(1,r_2)}$  is extendable for  $r_2 \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 2r_2 + 1$ , with the help of Argyris element and its extension.

Such a geometric structure around  $V_0$  in Example 2.3 is usually considered, while such vertex  $V_0$  is usually called a *singular* vertex. By giving different treatments on the degrees of freedom at singular and nonsingular vertices respectively, a basis of a non-extendable superspline space

can be constructed in two dimensions. In [14], a basis is constructed for  $\mathcal{S}_k^{(1,1)}(\mathcal{T})$ ,  $k \geq 5$ . For all vertices  $V$ , the degrees of freedom include the second order tangential derivatives  $\partial_{EE}^2$  along each edge  $E$ , sharing  $V$  as an endpoint. However, for singular vertices, we need an additional degree of freedom.

Note that even though a local basis of the spline function space  $\mathcal{S}_5^{(1,1)}(\mathcal{T})$  can be given from the degrees of freedom, these triangulation-dependent degrees of freedom are not considered in this paper. This implies that the existence of a local basis is not sufficient for extendability.

### 3. SUFFICIENCY AND THE COINCIDENCE OF TWO SPACES

This section proves the “if” part of Theorem 1.1, i.e., under Assumption (A1), the mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$  admits a construction of finite element. In fact, through the construction in [12], it holds that  $\mathbf{S}_k^r(\mathcal{T}) = \mathbf{E}_k^r(\mathcal{T})$  for all  $\mathcal{T}$ , where  $\mathbf{E}_k^r(\mathcal{T})$  is the finite element space constructed in [12]. By Theorem 2.1, the finite element space mapping  $\mathbf{E}_k^r$  is extendable, which consequently implies that the mappings  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$  and  $\mathbf{S}^r$  are also extendable.

Throughout this section, we suppose that the continuity vector  $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_d)$  and the polynomial degree  $k$  satisfy Assumption (A1).

**3.1. Degrees of freedom of  $C^r$  finite elements.** We recall the degrees of freedom of the finite element space from [12], and introduce the bubble function spaces as follows first.

**Definition 3.1** (Bubble function spaces). For any  $s$  such that  $0 \leq s \leq d$  and any  $(d-s)$ -dimensional subsimplex  $F \in \mathcal{T}_{d-s}$ , we define the corresponding bubble function space. For each integer  $n$  such that  $0 \leq n \leq r_s$ , the bubble function space  $\mathcal{B}_{F,n,k}$  on  $F$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{B}_{F,n,k} := \text{span} \left\{ \prod_{i=s}^d \lambda_{F,i}^{\sigma_i} : (\sigma_s, \dots, \sigma_d) \text{ satisfies (3.1) and (3.2)} \right\}.$$

Here  $\lambda_{F,s}, \dots, \lambda_{F,d}$  are barycentric coordinates of  $F$ , and the multi-index  $(\sigma_s, \dots, \sigma_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d-s+1}$  satisfies

$$(3.1) \quad \sum_{i=s}^d \sigma_i = k - n,$$

and

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sigma_{i_1} + \dots + \sigma_{i_l} > r_{l+s} - n, \\ &\forall \{i_1, \dots, i_l\} \subsetneq \{s, \dots, d\}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq d - s. \end{aligned}$$

For the special case  $s = d$ , i.e.,  $F$  is a vertex  $V$ , set

$$\mathcal{B}_{V,n,k} := \mathbb{R}.$$

Based on the bubble function space  $\mathcal{B}_{F,n,k}$ , we can define the degrees of freedom on  $F$ .



**Definition 3.2** (Degrees of Freedom). For any  $s$  such that  $0 \leq s \leq d$  and any  $(d-s)$ -dimensional subsimplex  $F \in \mathcal{T}_{d-s}$ , we define the corresponding functional space. For each integer  $n$  such that  $0 \leq n \leq r_s$  and each multi-index  $\theta \in \{(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_s) \in \mathbb{N}_0^s : \sum_{i=1}^s \theta_i = n\}$ , the functional space for  $u$  is defined by weighted moments as

$$\frac{1}{|F|} \int_F (D_F^\theta u) \cdot v, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{B}_{F,n,k}.$$

Here  $D_F^\theta$  represents an  $n$ -th order normal derivative of  $u$  on  $F$ , defined by

$$D_F^\theta u := \frac{\partial^n}{\prod_{i=1}^s \partial \mathbf{n}_{F,i}^{\theta_i}} u,$$

where  $\mathbf{n}_{F,1}, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{F,s}$  are  $s$  pairwise orthogonal unit normal vector(s) of  $F$ .

Two special cases are listed below.

- For  $s = 0$ , namely,  $F$  is the  $d$ -simplex  $K$ , all the involved partial derivatives become the value of  $u$  itself. Therefore, the weighted moments are

$$\frac{1}{|K|} \int_K u \cdot v, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{B}_{K,0,k}.$$

- For  $s = d$ , namely,  $F$  is a vertex  $V$ , the weighted moments are defined as

$$(D_V^\theta u)|_V \cdot v, \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}.$$

To align with the definition of the finite element triple, we can define  $\Sigma_F$ , the set of degrees of freedom on  $F$ , as the collection of any basis of the functional space described above, for all integers  $n$  such that  $0 \leq n \leq r_s$  and all multi-indices  $\theta \in \{(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_s) \in \mathbb{N}_0^s : \sum_{i=1}^s \theta_i = n\}$ .

It should be emphasized that the set of degrees of freedom  $\Sigma_F$  defined here depends on the continuity vector  $\mathbf{r}$  and the polynomial degree  $k$ . The dependence will be omitted if the context is clear. The following proposition is the main result of [12, Theorem 3.3].

**Proposition 3.1.** *For a  $d$ -simplex  $K$ , let the local shape function space be  $\mathcal{P}_k(K)$ . The set of local degrees of freedom  $\Sigma(K)$  is the collection of  $\Sigma_F$  defined in Definition 3.2 for all subsimplices  $F$  of  $K$ , including  $K$  itself. Note that  $\Sigma(K)$  depends on the continuity vector  $\mathbf{r}$  and the polynomial degree  $k$ .*

*Under Assumption (A1),  $\Sigma(K)$  is unisolvent with respect to  $\mathcal{P}_k(K)$ , i.e.,  $\Sigma(K)$  is a dual basis of  $\mathcal{P}_k(K)$ .*

The following lemma is useful in the next subsection, showing some relationship between the bubble function spaces with different continuity vectors.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{B}_{E,n'+n,k}$  is the bubble function space corresponding to the continuity vector  $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_d)$  and the polynomial degree  $k$ , and  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{E,n',k-n}$  is the bubble function space corresponding to the continuity*

vector  $\mathbf{q} = (r_{s+1} - n, \dots, r_d - n)$  and the polynomial degree  $(k - n)$ . It holds that

$$\mathcal{B}_{E, n''+n, k} = \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{E, n'', k-n},$$

*Proof.* The bubble function space  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{E, n'', k-n}$  associated to  $E$  with the continuity vector  $\mathbf{q} = (r_{s+1} - n, \dots, r_d - n)$  and the polynomial degree  $(k - n)$  is defined as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{E, n'', k-n} = \text{span} \left\{ \prod_{i=t}^d \lambda_{E, i}^{\sigma_i} : (\sigma_t, \dots, \sigma_d) \text{ satisfies (3.3) and (3.4)} \right\}.$$

Here  $\lambda_{E, t}, \dots, \lambda_{E, d}$  are barycentric coordinates of  $E$ , and the multi-indices  $(\sigma_t, \dots, \sigma_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d-t+1}$  satisfy

$$(3.3) \quad \sum_{i=t}^d \sigma_i = (k - n) - n'' = k - (n'' + n),$$

and

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \sigma_{i_1} + \dots + \sigma_{i_m} &> q_{l+t-s} - n'' = r_{m+t} - (n'' + n), \\ \forall \{i_1, \dots, i_m\} &\subsetneq \{t, \dots, d\}, \quad 1 \leq m \leq d - t. \end{aligned}$$

The bubble function space  $\mathcal{B}_{E, n''+n, k}$  associated to  $K_+$  and  $K_-$  with the continuity vector  $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_d)$  and the polynomial degree  $k$  is defined in Definition 3.2, namely,

$$\mathcal{B}_{E, n''+n, k} = \text{span} \left\{ \prod_{i=t}^d \lambda_{E, i}^{\sigma_i} : (\sigma_t, \dots, \sigma_d) \text{ satisfies (3.5) and (3.6)} \right\}.$$

Here  $\lambda_{E, t}, \dots, \lambda_{E, d}$  are barycentric coordinates of  $E$ , and the multi-indices  $(\sigma_t, \dots, \sigma_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d-t+1}$  satisfy

$$(3.5) \quad \sum_{i=t}^d \sigma_i = k - (n'' + n),$$

and

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \sigma_{i_1} + \dots + \sigma_{i_l} &> r_{l+t} - (n'' + n), \\ \forall \{i_1, \dots, i_l\} &\subsetneq \{t, \dots, d\}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq d - t. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing (3.3) and (3.5), (3.4) and (3.6), one can get the conclusion.  $\square$

**3.2. Equivalence of the  $C^r$  finite element space and superspline space.** By the definition of the finite element space, we have the following finite element space over a triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$ , with respect to the continuity

vector  $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_d)$  and the polynomial degree  $k$ , defined as

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_k^r(\mathcal{T}) := \{ & u \in L^2(\Omega) : \text{for each } d\text{-simplex } K \in \mathcal{T}, u|_K \in \mathcal{P}_k(K); \\ & \text{for each proper subsimplex } F \in \mathcal{T} \\ & \text{and each degree of freedom } l \in \Sigma_F \\ & \text{defined in Definition 3.2 corresponding to } \mathbf{r} \text{ and } k, \\ & l(u|_K) \text{ is single-valued for any } K \in \text{star}(F; \mathcal{T}) \}. \end{aligned}$$

This finite element space  $\mathbf{E}_k^r(\mathcal{T})$  is  $C^{r_1}$  continuous, which has been proved in [12]. In this subsection, we prove a further result that  $\mathbf{E}_k^r(\mathcal{T}) = \mathbf{S}_k^r(\mathcal{T})$ . The result is based on the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.3.** *For each  $s$  such that  $1 \leq s \leq d$ , let  $F$  be a  $(d-s)$ -dimensional subsimplex, shared by two adjacent  $d$ -dimensional simplices  $K_+$  and  $K_-$ . Suppose that  $u_+ \in \mathcal{P}_k(K_+)$  and  $u_- \in \mathcal{P}_k(K_-)$  satisfy that they are single-valued in the degrees of freedom defined on  $F$  and its subsimplices. Then for any integer  $n$  such that  $0 \leq n \leq r_s$ , it holds that*

$$\nabla^n u_+|_F = \nabla^n u_-|_F.$$

*Proof.* We first consider the normal derivatives. We show that for any integers  $n$  such that  $0 \leq n \leq r_s$  and any multi-index  $\theta \in \{(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_s) \in \mathbb{N}_0^s : \sum_{i=1}^s \theta_i = n\}$ , it holds that  $D_F^\theta u_+|_F = D_F^\theta u_-|_F$ . Here  $D_F^\theta u$  is the  $n$ -th order normal derivative of  $u$  on  $F$  defined in Definition 3.2, namely,

$$D_F^\theta u := \frac{\partial^n}{\prod_{i=1}^s \mathbf{n}_{F,i}^{\theta_i}} u,$$

where  $\mathbf{n}_{F,1}, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{F,s}$  are  $s$  pairwise orthogonal normal vectors of  $F$ .

For any  $t$  such that  $s \leq t \leq d$ , let  $E$  be a  $(d-t)$ -dimensional subsimplex of  $F$ . Since  $u_+$  and  $u_-$  are single-valued on the common degrees of freedom, for any integer  $n'$  such that  $0 \leq n' \leq r_t$  and any multi-index  $\theta' \in \{(\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_t) \in \mathbb{N}_0^t : \sum_{i=1}^t \theta'_i = n'\}$ , it holds that

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{1}{|E|} \int_E (D_E^{\theta'} u_+) \cdot v = \frac{1}{|E|} \int_E (D_E^{\theta'} u_-) \cdot v, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{B}_{E,n',k}.$$

Here

$$D_E^{\theta'} u := \frac{\partial^{n'}}{\prod_{i=1}^t \mathbf{n}_{E,i}^{\theta'_i}} u,$$

where  $\mathbf{n}_{E,1}, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{E,t}$  are  $t$  pairwise orthogonal unit normal vectors of  $E$ .

Since  $E$  is a subsimplex of  $F$  and  $\mathbf{n}_{F,1}, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{F,s}$  are orthogonal unit normal vectors of  $F$ , these vectors are also the normal vectors of  $E$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{n}_{F,1}, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{F,s}$  can be linearly represented by  $\mathbf{n}_{E,1}, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{E,t}$ .

Therefore, given  $n$  and  $\theta$ , for any integer  $n''$  such that  $0 \leq n'' \leq r_t - n$  and any multi-index  $\theta'' \in \{(\theta''_1, \dots, \theta''_t) \in \mathbb{N}_0^t : \sum_{i=1}^t \theta''_i = n''\}$ , it follows from (3.8) that

$$(3.9) \quad \frac{1}{|E|} \int_E [D_E^{\theta''} (D_F^\theta u_+)] \cdot v = \frac{1}{|E|} \int_E [D_E^{\theta''} (D_F^\theta u_-)] \cdot v, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{B}_{E,n''+n,k}.$$

The condition (3.9) indicates that  $D_F^\theta u_+|_F$  and  $D_F^\theta u_-|_F$  conform to another set of degrees of freedom in Definition 3.2. Here, ‘‘another’’ means that the degrees of freedom are associated with another pair  $(\mathbf{q}, k - n)$ , rather than  $(\mathbf{r}, k)$ . Here,  $\mathbf{q} = (r_{s+1} - n, \dots, r_d - n)$ . We shall prove that (3.9) indicates

$$D_F^\theta u_+|_F = D_F^\theta u_-|_F,$$

see Lemma 3.4.

Till now, we have considered the case of the normal derivatives. Now we complete the proof by considering the partial derivatives involving tangential ones. We first choose unit tangential vectors  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{F,s+1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{F,d}$  of  $F$ , such that  $\{\mathbf{n}_{F,1}, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{F,s}\} \cup \{\boldsymbol{\tau}_{F,s+1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{F,d}\}$  is an orthogonal base of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . For any multi-index  $\bar{\theta} \in \{(\bar{\theta}_{s+1}, \dots, \bar{\theta}_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d-s}\}$ , define the tangential partial derivative

$$D_{//}^{\bar{\theta}} := \prod_{i=s+1}^d \frac{\partial^{\bar{\theta}_i}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\tau}_{F,i}^{\bar{\theta}_i}}.$$

Since for any integers  $n$  such that  $0 \leq n \leq r_s$  and any multi-index  $\theta \in \{(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_s) \in \mathbb{N}_0^s : \sum_{i=1}^s \theta_i = n\}$ , it holds that  $D_F^\theta u_+|_F = D_F^\theta u_-|_F$ , which leads to

$$D_{//}^{\bar{\theta}} D_F^\theta u_+|_F = D_{//}^{\bar{\theta}} (D_F^\theta u_+|_F) = \bar{D}_{//}^{\bar{\theta}} (D_F^\theta u_-|_F) = D_{//}^{\bar{\theta}} D_F^\theta u_-|_F.$$

Finally, since each component of  $\nabla^n u$  can be linearly represented by  $\bar{D}_{//}^{\bar{\theta}} D_F^\theta$  as mentioned above, therefore we conclude that  $\nabla^n u_+|_F = \nabla^n u_-|_F$  for any integer  $n$  such that  $0 \leq n \leq r_s$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

To complete the proof, we show the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4.** *The equations (3.9) indicates that  $D_F^\theta u_+|_F = D_F^\theta u_-|_F$ .*

*Proof.* To be more specific, we choose the continuity vector  $\mathbf{q} = (r_{s+1} - n, \dots, r_d - n)$  and the polynomial degree  $(k - n)$ . It is straightforward to see that the continuity vector  $\mathbf{q}$  and the polynomial degree  $(k - n)$  satisfy Assumption (A2). To distinguish the two sets of bubble function spaces, we use  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  for these bubble function spaces corresponding to  $\mathbf{q}$  and  $(k - n)$ , and retain  $\mathcal{B}$  for those bubble function spaces corresponding to  $\mathbf{r}$  and  $k$ .

For each  $(d - t)$ -dimensional subsimplex  $E$  of  $F$ , each integer  $n''$  such that  $0 \leq n'' \leq r_t - n$  and each multi-index  $\theta'' \in \{(\theta''_1, \dots, \theta''_t) \in \mathbb{N}_0^t : \sum_{i=1}^t \theta''_i = n''\}$ , the degrees of freedom of  $w \in \mathcal{P}_{k-n}(E)$  are

$$(3.10) \quad \frac{1}{|E|} \int_E (D_E^{\theta''} w) \cdot v, \quad \forall v \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{E,n'',k-n}.$$

It follows from Lemma 3.2 that

$$(3.11) \quad \mathcal{B}_{E,n''+n,k} = \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{E,n'',k-n},$$

and the proof will be postponed later, see Lemma 3.2.

As a consequence, a combination of the equation (3.9) and the degrees of freedom (3.10) leads to

$$D_F^\theta u_+|_F = D_F^\theta u_-|_F.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Now we show the main result of this subsection, which shows that under Assumption (A1), the superspline space admits a construction of finite element.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Suppose the continuity vector  $\mathbf{r}$  and the polynomial degree  $k$  satisfy Assumption (A1). For any triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$ , it holds that  $\mathbf{E}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$ .*

*Proof.* This proof will be divided into two parts.

The first part is to prove  $\mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq \mathbf{E}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$ . Given  $u \in \mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$ , consider each  $(d-s)$ -dimensional subsimplex  $F \in \mathcal{T}$ . By the continuity assumption of  $\mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$ , the partial derivatives  $D_F^\theta(u|_K)$  have the same value for all  $K \in \text{star}(F; \mathcal{T})$ , whenever  $\theta \in \{(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_s) \in \mathbb{N}_0^s : \sum_{i=1}^s \theta_i := n \leq r_s\}$ . In addition, the bubble function space  $\mathcal{B}_{F,n,k}$  does not depend on the choice of  $K \in \text{star}(F; \mathcal{T})$ . Thus, the degree of freedom  $l$  defined on  $F$  of  $u|_K$

$$l(u|_K) := \frac{1}{|F|} \int_F [D_F^\theta(u|_K)] \cdot v, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{B}_{F,n,k}$$

shares the same value for all  $K \in \text{star}(F; \mathcal{T})$ . In other words,  $u$  is single-valued with respect to  $l$ . In addition, for each  $d$ -dimensional simplex  $K \in \mathcal{T}$ , it holds that  $u|_K \in \mathcal{P}_k(K)$ . Therefore, by the definition of  $\mathbf{E}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$  in (3.7), it implies that  $u \in \mathbf{E}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$ , namely  $\mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq \mathbf{E}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$ .

The second part is to prove  $\mathbf{E}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq \mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$ . For each  $u \in \mathbf{E}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$ , consider each  $(d-s)$ -dimensional subsimplex  $F \in \mathcal{T}$ . For any  $K_+, K_- \in \text{star}(F; \mathcal{T})$  and any integer  $n$  such that  $0 \leq n \leq r_s$ , by the Proposition 3.3, it holds that

$$(3.12) \quad \nabla^n u_+|_F = \nabla^n u_-|_F.$$

This means  $\nabla^n u$  is single-valued on  $F$ . Moreover, for any  $d$ -simplex  $K \in \mathcal{T}$ , it holds that  $u|_K \in \mathcal{P}_k(K)$ . Hence, it implies that  $u \in \mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$ , and consequently  $\mathbf{E}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq \mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$ .

As a result, it holds that  $\mathbf{E}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$ .  $\square$

Recall Theorem 2.1, which implies that the mapping  $\mathbf{E}_k^{\mathbf{r}}$  is extendable. Thus, we have the following corollaries.

**Corollary 3.6.** *Under Assumption (A1), the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}$  is extendable.*

**Corollary 3.7.** *Under Assumption (A2), the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{r}}$  is extendable.*

*Proof.* For each function in  $u \in \mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T}')$ , there exists a  $k \geq 2r_d + 1$  such that  $u \in \mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T}')$ . We can extend  $u$  as a function in  $\mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq \mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{T})$  by the extendability of  $\mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}$ , since the continuity vector  $\mathbf{r}$  and the polynomial degree  $k$  satisfy Assumption (A1). Therefore,  $\mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{r}}$  is extendable as well.  $\square$

#### 4. NECESSITY

The previous section shows that the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}$  ( $\mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{r}}$ , resp.) is extendable if Assumption (A1) (Assumption (A2), resp.) holds, respectively. This section shows the “only if” part, i.e., the mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}$  is extendable only if Assumption (A1) holds, and the mapping  $\mathbf{S}^{\mathbf{r}}$  is extendable only if Assumption (A2) holds. Specifically, if Assumption (A1) and Assumption (A2) are violated, we shall directly construct counterexamples on certain specific triangulations.

Some one-dimensional and two-dimensional examples have been already shown in Section 2. For general dimensions, we first prove the condition  $k \geq 2r_d + 1$  is a must, by considering a subtriangulation  $\mathcal{T}'$  with multiple connected components. Then we prove the necessity of the condition  $r_d \geq 2r_{d-1}$  in a specific triangulation. Finally, we verify the remaining part of the condition  $r_d \geq 2r_{d-1} \geq \dots \geq 2^{d-1}r_1$  in the same triangulation with the help of the mathematical induction argument.

We first show the necessary condition of the polynomial degree.

**Proposition 4.1.** *If the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^{\mathbf{r}}$  is extendable, it holds that  $k \geq 2r_d + 1$ .*

The proof is based on the following lemma, which characterizes the  $C^r$  continuity in the barycenter coordinate expression. Given a  $d$ -simplex  $K$  with vertices  $V_0, V_1, \dots, V_d$ , respectively, consider the barycentric coordinate representation of a function  $u \in \mathcal{P}_k(K)$ :

$$(4.1) \quad u = \sum_{|\alpha|=k} c_{\alpha} \prod_{i=0}^d \lambda_i^{\alpha_i}.$$

Here the summation goes through all the multi-indices  $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d+1}$  with the sum  $|\alpha| := \sum_{i=0}^d \alpha_i = k$ , and  $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$  are barycentric coordinates corresponding to vertices  $V_0, V_1, \dots, V_d$ . Note that the barycenter coordinate representation is unique.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Fixing an index  $i$ , suppose that  $\nabla^n u|_{V_i} = 0$  holds for any integer  $n$  such that  $0 \leq n \leq r_d$ , then  $c_{\alpha} = 0$  holds for all  $\alpha$  in the summation (4.1) such that  $\alpha_i \geq k - r_d$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is done by reformulating the expression via Bernstein-Bézier coordinates. Without loss of generality, let  $i = 0$ , and denote  $\mathbf{t}_i$  the vector connecting  $V_0$  to  $V_i$ . For a multi-index  $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d+1}$ , let the multi-index  $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  be the part of  $\alpha$  with the sum  $|\bar{\alpha}| := \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i$ . In addition, denote the following normalized barycenter

coordinate polynomial  $\Lambda^{\bar{\alpha}} := \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{\lambda_i^{\alpha_i}}{\alpha_i!}$ ,  $\Lambda_0^{\alpha_0} := \frac{\lambda_0^{\alpha_0}}{\alpha_0!}$ , and partial derivative  $\overline{D}^{\bar{\alpha}} := \frac{\partial^{|\bar{\alpha}|}}{\prod_{i=1}^d \partial t_i^{\alpha_i}}$ . It then holds that  $\partial \lambda_i / \partial t_j = \delta_{ij}$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ , and  $\partial \lambda_0 / \partial t_j = (-1)$ .

Note that for each multi-index  $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d)$ , it holds that

$$\overline{D}^{\gamma} \Lambda^{\bar{\alpha}} = \Lambda^{\bar{\alpha}-\gamma}, \quad \overline{D}^{\gamma} \Lambda_0^{\alpha_0} = (-1)^{|\gamma|} \Lambda_0^{\alpha_0-|\gamma|}$$

which leads to

$$\overline{D}^{\gamma} (\Lambda^{\bar{\alpha}} \Lambda_0^{\alpha_0}) = \sum_{\gamma' \leq \gamma} (-1)^{|\gamma|-|\gamma'|} \binom{\gamma}{\gamma'} \Lambda^{\bar{\alpha}-\gamma'} \Lambda_0^{\alpha_0-|\gamma|+|\gamma'|}.$$

Here  $\gamma' \leq \gamma$  if and only if  $\gamma'_i \leq \gamma_i$  holds for each  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . For  $\bar{\alpha} \leq \gamma$ , it holds that

$$\overline{D}^{\gamma} (\Lambda^{\bar{\alpha}} \Lambda_0^{\alpha_0})|_{V_0} = \Lambda_0^{\alpha_0}|_{V_0} = \frac{1}{\alpha_0!}.$$

Otherwise, it holds that  $\overline{D}^{\gamma} (\Lambda^{\bar{\alpha}} \Lambda_0^{\alpha_0})|_{V_0} = 0$ .

It follows from (4.1) and the assumption that for all  $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d)$  such that  $|\gamma| := \sum_{i=1}^d \gamma_i \leq r_d$

$$0 = \overline{D}^{\gamma} u|_{V_0} = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} c_{\alpha} \alpha! \overline{D}^{\gamma} (\Lambda^{\bar{\alpha}} \Lambda_0^{\alpha_0})|_{V_0} = \sum_{\bar{\alpha} \leq \gamma} \frac{c_{\alpha} \alpha!}{\alpha_0!} = \bar{\alpha}! \sum_{\bar{\alpha} \leq \gamma} c_{\alpha}.$$


Here the factorials are defined as  $\alpha! := \prod_{i=0}^d \alpha_i!$  and  $\bar{\alpha}! := \prod_{i=1}^d \alpha_i!$ .

After performing mathematical induction on  $r_d$ , we can conclude that if  $\sum_{\bar{\alpha} \leq \gamma} c_{\alpha} = 0$  holds for all  $|\gamma| \leq r_d$ , then  $c_{\alpha} = 0$  holds for all  $|\bar{\alpha}| \leq r_d$ , which is equivalent to  $\alpha_0 \geq k - r_d$ .  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 4.1.

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* Suppose that  $k \leq 2r_d$ . We shall construct a function  $u \in \mathcal{S}_k^r(\mathcal{T}')$  with  $\mathcal{T}' = K_0 \cup K_1$  for two  $d$ -simplices  $K_0$  and  $K_1$ , which cannot be extended to  $\mathcal{S}_k^r(\mathcal{T})$  with  $\mathcal{T} = K_0 \cup K_1 \cup K$ . Here  $K$  is a  $d$ -simplex other than  $K_0$  and  $K_1$ , with the vertices  $V_0, V_1, \dots, V_d$ . Consider  $d$ -simplices  $K_0$ ,  $K_1$  and  $K$ , such that

$$K_0 \cap K_1 = \emptyset, \quad K_0 \cap K = V_0, \quad K_1 \cap K = V_1.$$



Since  $k \leq 2r_d$ , there exist two integers  $k_0$  and  $k_1$  such that  $k_0 \leq r_d$ ,  $k_1 \leq r_d$ , and  $k = k_0 + k_1$ . Define  $u \in L^2(\mathcal{T}')$  by

$$u|_{K_0} := u_0 = 0, \quad u|_{K_1} := u_1 = \lambda_0^{k_0} \lambda_1^{k_1}.$$

Here  $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$  are barycentric coordinates of  $K$  corresponding to vertices  $V_0, V_1, \dots, V_d$ , respectively, which are extended to linear functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Since  $K_0 \cap K_1 = \emptyset$ , it holds that the function  $u \in \mathbf{S}_k^r(\mathcal{T}')$ .

Suppose that  $u$  can be extended to a function in  $\mathbf{S}_k^r(\mathcal{T})$ , still denoted by  $u$  for convenience. Consider the value on the simplex  $K$ , expressed uniquely as

$$u|_K := u = \sum_{|\alpha|=k} c_\alpha \lambda^\alpha = \sum_{|\alpha|=k} c_\alpha \left( \prod_{i=0}^d \lambda_i^{\alpha_i} \right),$$

where  $c_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  are coefficients, and  $\alpha \in \{(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d+1} : |\alpha| := \sum_{i=0}^d \alpha_i = k\}$  goes through all non-negative multi-indices summing to  $k$ .

Consider the multi-index  $\alpha = \beta(p, q) := (p, q, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d+1}$ , where the last  $(d-1)$  indices are zero. Consider the vertex  $V_0$ , which is the common vertex of both  $K_0$  and  $K$ . By the continuity assumption, for any integer  $n$  such that  $0 \leq n \leq r_d$ , it holds that

$$(4.2) \quad \nabla^n u|_{V_0} = \nabla^n u_0|_{V_0} = 0.$$

Hence, by Lemma 4.2,  $c_\alpha = 0$  holds for each  $\alpha_0 \geq k - r_d$ , especially for  $\alpha = \beta(k_0, k_1)$ , since  $k_0 = k - k_1 \geq k - r_d$ .

On the other hand, consider the vertex  $V_1$ , which is the common vertex of both  $K_1$  and  $K$ . By the continuity assumption, for any integer  $n$  such that  $0 \leq n \leq r_d$ , it holds that

$$(4.3) \quad \nabla^n (u - \lambda_0^{k_0} \lambda_1^{k_1})|_{V_1} = \nabla^n (u_1 - \lambda_0^{k_0} \lambda_1^{k_1})|_{V_1} = 0.$$

Next, we shall obtain the contradiction from (4.2) and (4.3). Indeed, the polynomial  $(u - \lambda_0^{k_0} \lambda_1^{k_1})$  can be uniquely expressed as

$$u - \lambda_0^{k_0} \lambda_1^{k_1} = \sum_{|\alpha|=k} c'_\alpha \lambda^\alpha,$$

with  $c'_\alpha = c_\alpha - 1$  for  $\alpha = \beta(k_0, k_1)$  and  $c'_\alpha = c_\alpha$  otherwise. Hence, by Lemma 4.2,  $c'_\alpha = 0$  holds for each  $\alpha_1 \geq k - r_d$ , especially for  $\alpha = \beta(k_0, k_1)$ , since  $k_1 = k - k_0 \geq k - r_d$ . It implies that  $c_{\beta(k_0, k_1)} = 1$ , which contradicts to  $c_{\beta(k_0, k_1)} = 0$ . As a consequence,  $k \geq 2r_d + 1$ .  $\square$

In the remaining part of this section, we fix  $\mathcal{T}$  to be the triangulation  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{qua}}$  of the  $L^1$  unit ball  $B_d = \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : \sum_{i=1}^d |x_i| \leq 1\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , while the triangulation  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{qua}}(B_d) = \{K_0, K_1, \dots, K_{2^d-1}\}$ . The simplices  $K_j$ ,  $j = 0, 1, \dots, 2^d - 1$  are defined as follows. For  $j = 0, 1, \dots, 2^d - 1$ , we have the binary representation  $j = \sum_{i=1}^d \epsilon_i \cdot 2^{i-1}$ ,  $\epsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}$ . The simplex  $K_j$  is then defined as  $K_j = \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in B_d : (-1)^{\epsilon_i} x_i \geq 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, d\}$ .



For example,  $K_0$  collects all the points in  $B_d$  with non-negative coordinates, while  $K_{2^{d-1}}$  collects all the points in  $B_d$  with non-positive coordinates.

Now let  $V_0$  be the vertex with the coordinate  $(0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , the vertex  $V_i^+$  denotes the point with coordinate  $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $x_{i'} = \delta_{ii'}$ , and the vertex  $V_i^-$  denotes the point with coordinate  $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $x_{i'} = -\delta_{ii'}$ , where  $\delta$  is Kronecker's delta.

Therefore, the simplex  $K_j$  has  $(d+1)$  vertices  $V_0, V_i^+$  for those  $\epsilon_i = 0$ , and  $V_i^-$  for those  $\epsilon_i = 1$ , for  $j = \sum_{i=1}^d \epsilon_i \cdot 2^{i-1}, \epsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}$ .

We first show the following result.

**Proposition 4.3.** *If the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}^r$  is extendable, then it holds that*

$$(4.4) \quad r_d \geq 2r_{d-1}.$$

In addition,  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$  is extendable only if (4.4) holds.


*Proof.* We use a contradiction argument, and suppose  $r_d \leq 2r_{d-1} - 1$  and the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}^r$  is extendable. Our goal is to prove that there exists a function  $u$ , defined in  $\mathbf{S}^r(K_{++} \cup K_{--})$  for two  $d$ -simplices  $K_{++} = K_0$  and  $K_{--} = K_{2^{d-1}}$ , but cannot be extended to  $\mathbf{S}^r(\mathcal{T}_{\text{qua}})$ . Recall again that we always assume that  $0 \leq r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \dots \leq r_{d-1} \leq r_d$  and  $r_0 = 0$ . Let  $\bar{r}_{d-1} = r_d - r_{d-1} + 1$ , and  $u \in L^2(K_{++} \cup K_{--})$  be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} u|_{K_{++}} &:= u_{++} = 0, \\ u|_{K_{--}} &:= u_{--} = x_{d-1}^{r_{d-1}} x_d^{\bar{r}_{d-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We first assert  $u \in \mathbf{S}^r(K_{++} \cup K_{--})$ . Note that the only intersection of  $K_{++}$  and  $K_{--}$  is  $V_0$ , it suffices to check that

$$\nabla^n u_{--}|_{V_0} = 0 = \nabla^n u_{++}|_{V_0}$$

for all integers  $n$  such that  $0 \leq n \leq r_d$ , which is straightforward since  $\bar{r}_{d-1} + r_{d-1} = r_d + 1 > r_d$ .



Suppose that  $u$  can be extended to a function in  $\mathbf{S}^r(\mathcal{T}_{\text{qua}})$ , still denoted by  $u$  for convenience. We focus on the value of  $u$  in  $K_{+-} = K_{2^{d-1}}$ , namely,

$u_{+-} := u|_{K_{+-}}$ , and express it as

$$u_{+-} = \sum_{\sigma} c_{\sigma} x^{\sigma} = \sum_{\sigma} c_{\sigma} \left( \prod_{i=1}^d x_i^{\sigma_i} \right),$$

where  $c_{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}$  are coefficients determined later, and  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  goes through all (non-negative) multi-indices. Consider the multi-index  $\sigma = \omega_d(p, q) = (0, \dots, 0, p, q)$ , where the first  $(d-2)$  indices are zero.

Let  $F_1 := \{(0, \dots, 0, x, 0) : 0 \leq x \leq 1\}$  be the edge on the positive  $x_{d-1}$  axis, which is a common edge of  $K_{++}$  and  $K_{+-}$ . By the assumption, we have  $\bar{r}_{d-1} = r_d - r_{d-1} + 1 \leq r_{d-1}$ . It follows from the definition of  $\mathbf{S}^r(\mathcal{T}_{\text{qua}})$  that

$$\frac{\partial^{\bar{r}_{d-1}}}{\partial x_d^{\bar{r}_{d-1}}} u_{+-} \Big|_{F_1} = \frac{\partial^{\bar{r}_{d-1}}}{\partial x_d^{\bar{r}_{d-1}}} u_{++} \Big|_{F_1} = 0.$$

A direct calculation yields that

$$\frac{\partial^{\bar{r}_{d-1}}}{\partial x_d^{\bar{r}_{d-1}}} u_{+-} \Big|_{F_1} = \bar{r}_{d-1}! \sum_p c_{\omega_d(p, \bar{r}_{d-1})} x_{d-1}^p \Big|_{F_1}.$$

Therefore, for  $\bar{\sigma} = \omega_d(r_{d-1}, \bar{r}_{d-1})$ , it implies that  $c_{\bar{\sigma}} = 0$ .

Similarly, consider the edge on the negative  $x_d$  axis  $F_2 := \{(0, \dots, 0, 0, x) : -1 \leq x \leq 0\}$ , which is a common edge of  $K_{+-}$  and  $K_{--}$ . Again, it holds that

$$\frac{\partial^{r_{d-1}}}{\partial x_{d-1}^{r_{d-1}}} u_{+-} \Big|_{F_2} = \frac{\partial^{r_{d-1}}}{\partial x_{d-1}^{r_{d-1}}} u_{--} \Big|_{F_2} = r_{d-1}! x_d^{\bar{r}_{d-1}} \Big|_{F_2}.$$

Another direct calculation leads to

$$\frac{\partial^{r_{d-1}}}{\partial x_{d-1}^{r_{d-1}}} u_{+-} \Big|_{F_2} = r_{d-1}! \sum_q c_{\omega_d(r_{d-1}, q)} x_d^q \Big|_{F_2}.$$

Hence, for  $\bar{\sigma} = \omega_d(r_{d-1}, \bar{r}_{d-1})$ , it follows that  $c_{\bar{\sigma}} = 1$ , which contradicts to  $c_{\bar{\sigma}} = 0$ . As a consequence,  $r_d \geq 2r_{d-1}$ .

For the extendability of the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$ , a similar contradiction argument is used. Suppose  $r_d \leq 2r_{d-1} - 1$  and the mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$  is extendable. From Proposition 4.1, it holds that  $k \geq 2r_d + 1$ . Note that  $r_{d-1} + \bar{r}_{d-1} = r_d + 1 \leq 2r_d + 1$ , which implies the constructed  $u \in \mathbf{S}_k^r(K_{++} \cup K_{--})$ . Note that  $u$  cannot be extended to  $\mathbf{S}^r(\mathcal{T}_{\text{qua}})$  and  $\mathbf{S}_k^r(\mathcal{T}_{\text{qua}}) \subseteq \mathbf{S}^r(\mathcal{T}_{\text{qua}})$ , which leads to a contradiction. Therefore, it can be asserted that the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$  is extendable only if  $r_d \geq 2r_{d-1}$  holds.  $\square$

We now prove the general result.

**Proposition 4.4.** *If the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}^r$  is extendable, then it holds that*

$$(4.5) \quad r_d \geq 2r_{d-1} \geq \dots \geq 2^{d-1}r_1.$$

*In addition,  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$  is extendable only if (4.5) holds.*

*Proof.* This proof is based on a mathematical induction. The first inequality of (4.5) for  $r_d$  and  $r_{d-1}$  is already proved in Proposition 4.3. Suppose for  $t = d, d-1, \dots, s+1$ ,  $s \geq 2$ , it holds that  $r_t \geq 2r_{t-1}$ , but  $r_s < 2r_{s-1}$  and the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}^r$  is extendable.

Let the two  $d$ -simplices  $K_{++} = K_0$ ,  $K_{--} = K_{2^s-1}$ , and let  $\bar{r}_{s-1} := r_s - r_{s-1} + 1$ . Define  $u \in L^2(K_{++} \cup K_{--})$  by

$$\begin{aligned} u|_{K_{++}} &:= u_{++} = 0, \\ u|_{K_{--}} &:= u_{--} = \left( x_{s-1}^{r_{s-1}} x_s^{\bar{r}_{s-1}} \prod_{i=s+1}^d x_i^{r_i - r_{i-1}} \right) \left( 1 - \sum_{i=s+1}^d x_i \right)^{r_d - r_s}. \end{aligned}$$

We first show that  $u \in \mathbf{S}^r(K_{++} \cup K_{--})$ . Note that all the common subsimplices of the two simplices  $K_{++}$  and  $K_{--}$  lie in

$$F_{12} := \left\{ \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{s \text{ zeros}}, x_{s+1}, \dots, x_d \in B_d : x_{s+1}, \dots, x_d \geq 0 \right\}.$$

This  $F_{12}$  is the convex hull of  $V_{s+1}^+, \dots, V_d^+$  and  $V_0$ . It follows from  $r_s \leq 2r_{s-1} - 1$  that  $\bar{r}_{s-1} \leq r_{s-1}$ .

For a  $(d-t)$ -dimensional subsimplex  $E$  of  $F_{12}$ , we separate the discussion by whether  $E$  contains  $V_0$ .

- The vertices of  $E$  are  $V_{i_{t+1}}^+, \dots, V_{i_d}^+$  and  $V_0$ . Note here  $x_{s-1}$ ,  $x_s$  and  $x_{i'}$  for  $V_{i'}^+ \notin E$  vanish on  $E$ . Due to  $r_d - r_{d-1} \geq r_{d-1} - r_{d-2} \geq \dots \geq r_{s+1} - r_s$ , it can be deduced that  $u_{--}$  has a factor

$$x_{s-1}^{r_{s-1}} x_s^{\bar{r}_{s-1}} \prod_{i' > s, V_{i'}^+ \notin E} x_{i'}^{r_{i'} - r_{i'-1}}$$

with a total degree not less than  $r_{s-1} + \bar{r}_{s-1} + \sum_{l=s+1}^t (r_l - r_{l-1}) = r_t + 1$ . Therefore, for any integer  $n$  such that  $0 \leq n \leq r_t$ , it holds that

$$\nabla^n u_{--}|_E = 0 = \nabla^n u_{++}|_E.$$


- The vertices of  $E$  are  $V_{i_t}^+, \dots, V_{i_d}^+$ . Note here  $x_{s-1}$ ,  $x_s$  and  $(1 - \sum_{i=s+1}^d x_i)$  vanish on  $E$ , and it follows from  $r_{s-1} + \bar{r}_{s-1} + (r_d - r_s) = r_d + 1 > r_t$  that for any integer  $n$  such that  $0 \leq n \leq r_t$ , it holds that

$$\nabla^n u_{--}|_E = 0 = \nabla^n u_{++}|_E.$$

As a consequence, we have  $u \in \mathbf{S}^r(K_{++} \cup K_{--})$ .

Suppose that  $u$  can be extended to a function in  $\mathbf{S}^r(\mathcal{T}_{\text{qua}})$ , still denoted by  $u$  for convenience. We focus on the value of  $u$  in  $K_{+-} = K_{2^s-1}$ , namely,  $u_{+-} := u|_{K_{+-}}$ , and express it as

$$(4.6) \quad u_{+-} = \sum_{\sigma} c_{\sigma} x^{\sigma} = \sum_{\sigma} c_{\sigma} \left( \prod_{i=1}^d x_i^{\sigma_i} \right),$$



where  $c_\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$  are coefficients determined later, and  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  goes through all (non-negative) multi-indices. Consider the multi-index

$$\omega_s(p, q) = (\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(s-2) \text{ zeros}}, p, q, r_{s+1} - r_s, \dots, r_d - r_{d-1}),$$

and

$$\tau_s(p, q, \rho) = (\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(s-2) \text{ zeros}}, p, q, \rho_{s+1}, \dots, \rho_d).$$

Note that  $p$  and  $q$  are the  $(s-1)$ -th and  $s$ -th index in  $\omega_s(p, q)$ .

Consider the common subsimplex of  $K_{++}$  and  $K_{+-}$ , denoted as (4.7)

$$F_1 := \{(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(s-2) \text{ zeros}}, x_{s-1}, 0, x_{s+1}, \dots, x_d) \in B_d : x_{s-1}, x_{s+1}, \dots, x_d \geq 0\}.$$

Note that  $F_1$  is the convex hull of  $V_{s-1}^+, V_{s+1}^+, \dots, V_d^+$  and  $V_0$ . Hence, by the continuity assumption, it implies that

$$\frac{\partial^{\bar{r}_{s-1}}}{\partial x_s^{\bar{r}_{s-1}}} u_{+-} \Big|_{F_1} = \frac{\partial^{\bar{r}_{s-1}}}{\partial x_s^{\bar{r}_{s-1}}} u_{++} \Big|_{F_1} = 0.$$

It follows a direct calculation that

$$\frac{\partial^{\bar{r}_{s-1}}}{\partial x_s^{\bar{r}_{s-1}}} u_{+-} \Big|_{F_1} = \bar{r}_{s-1}! \sum_{(p, \rho) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d-s+1}} c_{\tau_s(p, \bar{r}_{s-1}, \rho)} \left( x_{s-1}^p \prod_{i=s+1}^d x_i^{\rho_i} \right) \Big|_{F_1}.$$

Therefore, for all  $\sigma = \tau_s(p, \bar{r}_{s-1}, \rho)$ , the coefficients  $c_\sigma = 0$ . Especially,  $c_{\omega_s(r_{s-1}, \bar{r}_{s-1})} = 0$ .

On the other hand, consider the common subsimplex of  $K_{--}$  and  $K_{+-}$ , namely,

$$(4.8) \quad F_2 := \{(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(s-2) \text{ zeros}}, 0, -x_s, x_{s+1}, \dots, x_d) \in B_d : x_s, x_{s+1}, \dots, x_d \geq 0\}.$$

Hence, by the continuity assumption, it implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial^{r_{s-1}}}{\partial x_{s-1}^{r_{s-1}}} u_{+-} \right|_{F_2} &= \left. \frac{\partial^{r_{s-1}}}{\partial x_{s-1}^{r_{s-1}}} u_{--} \right|_{F_2} \\ &= r_{s-1}! \left( x_s^{\bar{r}_{s-1}} \prod_{i=s+1}^d x_i^{r_i - r_{i-1}} \right) \left( 1 - \sum_{i=s+1}^d x_i \right)^{r_d - r_s} \Big|_{F_2} \\ &= r_{s-1}! \left( x_s^{\bar{r}_{s-1}} \prod_{i=s+1}^d x_i^{r_i - r_{i-1}} \right) \Big|_{F_2} + \text{high order terms.} \end{aligned}$$

By a direct calculation, it holds that

$$\left. \frac{\partial^{r_{s-1}}}{\partial x_{s-1}^{r_{s-1}}} u_{+-} \right|_{F_2} = r_{s-1}! \sum_{(q,\rho) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d-s+1}} c_{\tau_s(r_{s-1}, q, \rho)} \left( x_s^q \prod_{i=s+1}^d x_i^{\rho_i} \right) \Big|_{F_2}.$$

Hence, for  $\omega_s(r_{s-1}, \bar{r}_{s-1})$ , it follows that the coefficient  $c_{\sigma(r_{s-1}, \bar{r}_{s-1})} = 1$ , which contradicts to  $c_{\sigma(r_{s-1}, \bar{r}_{s-1})} = 0$ . Therefore, the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}^r$  is not extendable if  $r_s < 2r_{s-1}$ .

Finally, we conclude the result by an induction argument on  $s$ .

Again, for the extendability of the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$ , a similar contradiction argument is used. Suppose for each  $t = d, d-1, \dots, s+1$ ,  $s \geq 2$ , it holds that  $r_t \geq 2r_{t-1}$ , but  $r_s < 2r_{s-1}$  and the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}^r$  is extendable. From Proposition 4.1, it holds that  $k \geq 2r_d + 1$ . Note that  $r_{s-1} + \bar{r}_{s-1} + \sum_{i=s+1}^d (r_i - r_{i-1}) + (r_d - r_s) = 2r_d - r_s + 1 \leq 2r_d + 1$ , which implies the constructed  $u \in \mathbf{S}_k^r(K_{++} \cup K_{--})$ . Note that  $u$  cannot be extended to  $\mathbf{S}^r(\mathcal{T}_{\text{qua}})$  and  $\mathbf{S}_k^r(\mathcal{T}_{\text{qua}}) \subseteq \mathbf{S}^r(\mathcal{T}_{\text{qua}})$ , which leads to a contradiction. Therefore, it can be asserted that the superspline space mapping  $\mathbf{S}_k^r$  is extendable only if (4.5) holds.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Peter Alfeld and Larry L Schumaker. The dimension of bivariate spline spaces of smoothness  $r$  for degree  $d \geq 4r + 1$ . *Constructive Approximation*, 3:189–197, 1987.
- [2] Peter Alfeld and Larry L Schumaker. On the dimension of bivariate spline spaces of smoothness  $r$  and degree  $d = 3r + 1$ . *Numerische Mathematik*, 57(1):651–661, 1990.
- [3] Peter Alfeld and Larry L Schumaker. Nonexistence of star-supported spline bases. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 31(2):455–465, 2000.
- [4] Peter Alfeld, Larry L Schumaker, and Maritza Sirvent. On dimension and existence of local bases for multivariate spline spaces. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 70(2):243–264, 1992.
- [5] Peter Alfeld, Larry L Schumaker, and Walter Whiteley. The generic dimension of the space of  $C^1$  splines of degree  $d \geq 8$  on tetrahedral decompositions. *SIAM journal on numerical analysis*, 30(3):889–920, 1993.
- [6] Peter Alfeld and Maritza Sirvent. The structure of multivariate superspline spaces of high degree. *Mathematics of Computation*, 57(195):299–308, 1991.
- [7] John H Argyris, Isaac Fried, and Dieter W Scharpf. The TUBA family of plate elements for the matrix displacement method. *The Aeronautical Journal*, 72(692):701–709, 1968.

- [8] James H Bramble and Miloš Zlámal. Triangular elements in the finite element method. *Mathematics of Computation*, 24(112): 809–820, 1970.
- [9] Michael DiPasquale and Nelly Villamizar. A lower bound for splines on tetrahedral vertex stars. *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry*, 5(2):250–277, 2021.
- [10] Hong Dong. Spaces of bivariate spline functions over triangulation. *Approximation Theory and its Applications*, 7:56–75, 1991.
- [11] Alexandre Ern and Jean-Luc Guermond. *Finite elements I: Approximation and interpolation*, volume 72. Springer Nature, 2021.
- [12] Jun Hu, Ting Lin, and Qingyu Wu. A construction of  $C^r$  conforming finite element spaces in any dimension. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, pages 1–37, 2023.
- [13] Ming-Jun Lai and Larry L Schumaker. *Spline functions on triangulations*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [14] John Morgan and Ridgway Scott. A nodal basis for  $C^1$  piecewise polynomials of degree  $n \geq 5$ . *Mathematics of Computation*, 29(131):736–740, 1975.
- [15] Hal Schenck. Algebraic methods in approximation theory. *Computer Aided Geometric Design*, 45:14–31, 2016.
- [16] Larry L Schumaker. On the dimension of spaces of piecewise polynomials in two variables. In *Multivariate Approximation Theory: Proceedings of the Conference held at the Mathematical Research Institute at Oberwolfach Black Forest, February 4–10, 1979*, pages 396–412. Springer, 1979.
- [17] Larry L Schumaker. On super splines and finite elements. *SIAM journal on numerical analysis*, 26(4):997–1005, 1989.
- [18] Xiquan Shi. *Higher-dimensional spline*. PhD thesis, Jilin University, 1988.
- [19] Tatyana Sorokina. Intrinsic supersmoothness of multivariate splines. *Numerische Mathematik*, 116:421–434, 2010.
- [20] Deepesh Toshniwal and Nelly Villamizar. Algebraic methods to study the dimension of supersmooth spline spaces. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 142:102412, 2023.
- [21] Ren-Hong Wang. *Multivariate spline functions and their applications*, volume 529. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [22] Alexander Ženíšek. Interpolation polynomials on the triangle. *Numerische Mathematik*, 15(4): 283–296, 1970.
- [23] Shangyou Zhang. A family of 3D continuously differentiable finite elements on tetrahedral grids. *Applied Numerical Mathematics*, 59(1):219–233, 2009.
- [24] Shangyou Zhang. A family of differentiable finite elements on simplicial grids in four space dimensions. *Mathematica Numerica Sinica*, 38(3):309, 2016.

LMAM AND SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100871, P.R. CHINA.

*Email address:* hujun@math.pku.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100871, P.R. CHINA.

*Email address:* lintingsms@pku.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100871, P.R. CHINA.

*Email address:* wu\_qingyu@pku.edu.cn

BEIJING INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND APPLICATIONS, BEIJING 101408, P.R. CHINA.

*Email address:* beihuiyuan@bimsa.cn