

A Mini Immersed Finite Element Method for Two-Phase Stokes Problems on Cartesian Meshes

Haifeng Ji* Dong Liang† Qian Zhang‡

Abstract

This paper presents a mini immersed finite element (IFE) method for solving two- and three-dimensional two-phase Stokes problems on Cartesian meshes. The IFE space is constructed from the conventional mini element with shape functions modified on interface elements according to interface jump conditions, while keeping the degrees of freedom unchanged. Both discontinuous viscosity coefficients and surface forces are considered in the construction. The interface is approximated via discrete level set functions and explicit formulas of IFE basis functions and correction functions are derived, which make the IFE method easy to implement. The optimal approximation capabilities of the IFE space and the inf-sup stability and the optimal a priori error estimate of the IFE method are derived rigorously with constants independent of the mesh size and how the interface cuts the mesh. It is also proved that the condition number has the usual bound independent of the interface. Numerical experiments are provided to confirm the theoretical results.

Keywords. Stokes equations, interface, immersed finite element, unfitted mesh, mini element

AMS subject classifications. 65N15, 65N30, 65N12, 76D07

1 Introduction

In this paper we are interested in designing and analyzing an immersed finite element (IFE) method for solving two-phase Stokes problems (also known as the Stokes interface problem in the literature). Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N = 2, 3$, be the computational domain and Γ be a C^2 -smooth closed hypersurface immersed in Ω . The interface Γ divides Ω into two phases Ω^+ and Ω^- . Without loss of generality, we assume that Ω^- is the inclusion, i.e., $\Gamma = \partial\Omega^-$. The Stokes interface problem reads as follows: Given a body force $\mathbf{f} \in L^2(\Omega)^N$, a surface force $\mathbf{g} \in L^2(\Gamma)^N$ and a piecewise constant viscosity $\mu|_{\Omega^\pm} = \mu^\pm > 0$, find a velocity \mathbf{u} and a pressure p such that

$$-\nabla \cdot (2\mu\boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{u})) + \nabla p = \mathbf{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega^+ \cup \Omega^-, \quad (1.1a)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (1.1b)$$

$$[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mu, \mathbf{u}, p)\mathbf{n}]_\Gamma = \mathbf{g} \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \quad (1.1c)$$

$$[\mathbf{u}]_\Gamma = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \quad (1.1d)$$

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (1.1e)$$

*School of Science, Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Nanjing, Jiangsu 210023, China (hfji1988@foxmail.com, hfji@njupt.edu.cn)

†Department of Mathematics and Statistics, York University, Toronto, ON M3J 1P3, Canada (dliang@yorku.ca)

‡School of Artificial Intelligence and Information Technology, Nanjing University of Chinese Medicine, Nanjing, Jiangsu 210023, China (380793@njucm.edu.cn)

where $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla\mathbf{u} + (\nabla\mathbf{u})^T)$ is the strain tensor, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mu, \mathbf{u}, p) = 2\mu\boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{u}) - p\mathbb{I}$ is the total stress tensor, \mathbb{I} is the identity matrix, \mathbf{n} is the unit normal to Γ pointing from Ω^- to Ω^+ , and $[\mathbf{v}]_\Gamma$ stands for the jump of \mathbf{v} across Γ , i.e., $[\mathbf{v}]_\Gamma := \mathbf{v}^+|_\Gamma - \mathbf{v}^-|_\Gamma$ with $\mathbf{v}^\pm := \mathbf{v}|_{\Omega^\pm}$. If the trace $(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u})|_\Gamma$ is well defined, (1.1b) provides an additional relationship

$$[\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}]_\Gamma = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma. \quad (1.2)$$

An important motivation for investigating the Stokes interface problem comes from two-phase incompressible flows (see [29, 35, 16] and the references therein). For such problems involving interfaces, numerical methods based on fixed background meshes independent of interfaces (called unfitted meshes) have attracted a lot of attention because of the relative ease of handling complex or moving interfaces, especially in three dimensions. Since the interface is not aligned with the mesh, it can cut some elements (called interface elements) in an arbitrary fashion. To obtain a stable and accurate finite element (FE) method, some efforts should be made on these interface elements. Roughly speaking, there are two ways to develop unfitted mesh FE methods with optimal convergences. One is to enrich the conventional FE space by extra degrees of freedom on interface elements to capture the discontinuities (see, e.g., [21, 9, 29, 18, 8]). The other approach is to modify the traditional FE space according to interface conditions to capture the behavior of the exact solution, while keeping the degrees of freedom unchanged. The immersed finite element (IFE) method, which was originally introduced in [32] for one-dimensional interface problems, uses the latter approach and has become an efficient method for solving interface problems. One advantage of the IFE method compared with other unfitted mesh FE methods is that the IFE space is isomorphic to the traditional FE space on the same unfitted mesh regardless of the position of the interface, and thus the structure of the resulting linear systems remains unchanged when solving moving interface problems. For second-order elliptic interface problems, IFE methods have been extensively studied (see, e.g., [33, 22, 34, 20, 17, 27, 24]). However, for Stokes interface problems, the development and analysis of IFE methods are more challenging due to the coupling between velocity and pressure in the interface conditions, and the divergence-free equation. The first IFE method for Stokes interface problems was developed in [2], in which the coupling of velocity and pressure was taken into account in the construction of IFE spaces. Since then, many IFEs have been developed, such as the immersed $CR-P_0$ element [28], the immersed rotated Q_1-Q_0 element [28] and the Taylor–Hood IFE [10]. Very recently, in [26], Ji et al. provide a theoretical analysis of an IFE method based on the immersed $CR-P_0$ element. However, to the best of our knowledge, the existing IFEs for Stokes interface problems are restricted to 2D and there is no theoretical analysis for IFEs with surface forces (i.e., $\mathbf{g} \neq \mathbf{0}$). One major obstacle is that the velocity and the pressure are also coupled in IFE spaces and this becomes more complicated in 3D.

For Stokes problems, the so-called mini element developed by Arnold, Brezzi, and Fortin [3] is very popular because it is stable, economic and easy to implement. In this paper we propose and analyze an IFE variant of the mini element in 2D and 3D for solving Stokes interface problems on Cartesian meshes. Compared with the conventional mini element method, the new IFE method only needs some modifications near the interface, and thus the additional computational cost is low. On each interface element, we first introduce some discrete interface conditions on approximate interfaces according to the exact interface conditions, and then modify the shape functions of the mini element so that those discrete interface conditions are satisfied. It should be stressed that in this paper we use discrete level set functions to discretize the interface. Differing from the traditional IFE methods using points of intersection of the interface and the edges of elements to discretize the interface, our discretization of the interface by level set functions overcomes the coplanarity issue encountered in constructing 3D IFE spaces, that is, the interface cuts four edges of a tetrahedron and the points of intersection are not coplanar.

Another contribution of this work is the IFE discretization of the surface force (i.e., $\mathbf{g} \neq \mathbf{0}$), which is significant and cannot be neglected in many practical applications, for example, simulating a (rising) liquid drop contained in a surrounding fluid [16]. In the IFE framework, some correction function which is nonzero only on interface elements is pre-calculated based on non-homogeneous jump conditions, and then is moved to the right-hand side of the formulation of IFE methods. The attractive feature is that the stiffness matrix is same as that of IFE methods for problems with homogeneous jump conditions and only the right-hand side needs to be modified. Generally speaking, there are two approaches to construct the correction function in the literature. One is based on extending the non-homogeneous jump functions smoothly to the neighborhood of the interface (see, e.g., [15, 25, 40]). The other approach is to use the non-homogeneous jump functions directly and solve a linear system with the same coefficient matrix as that for IFE basis functions to get the correction function (see, e.g., [23, 19, 1]). In this paper we follow the second approach. On each interface element T , it is natural to use the quantity $\int_{\Gamma \cap T} \mathbf{g}$ to construct the correction function. However, we find that $\int_{\Gamma \cap T} \mathbf{g}$ may blow up as $|\Gamma \cap T| \rightarrow 0$ even if $\mathbf{g} \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ (see [40, Example 3.1]). In fact, this case can happen because the interface Γ cuts the element T in an arbitrary fashion. In order to remedy, we construct a larger box R_T containing T and use the quantity $\int_{\Gamma \cap R_T} \mathbf{g}$ to develop correction functions.

As said before, the analysis of the proposed IFE space and IFE method is extremely difficult due to the coupling between velocities and pressures, and the existence of surface forces. Fortunately, we can derive explicit expressions for the IFE basis functions and the correction functions, which are not only convenient in implementation but also useful in the analysis. Thanks to these explicit expressions, we are able to prove the optimal approximation capabilities of the IFE space and correction functions. These explicit expressions also enable us to derive some useful inequalities for the coupled IFE functions, such as the trace inequality and the inverse inequality. With this preparation, we present a complete analysis of the proposed IFE method including the inf-sup stability, the optimal a priori error estimate and the condition number estimate, taking into consideration of the dependency of the interface location relative to the mesh.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we formulate our IFE method. In section 3 we prove the optimal approximation capabilities of IFE spaces. In section 4 we present the theoretical analysis of our IFE method. Finally, some numerical results are provided in section 5.

2 Finite element discretization

2.1 Unfitted meshes

Since we focus on the interface, we simply assume that the computational domain Ω is rectangular/cubic so that there is a family of Cartesian triangular/tetrahedral meshes, denoted by $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}$, on Ω . The meshes are not fitted to the interface. For example, in three dimensions ($N = 3$), the Cartesian tetrahedral meshes are obtained by first partitioning Ω into cuboids and then subdividing each cuboid into six tetrahedra in the same manner (see Remark 3 in [30]). For an element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ (a triangle for $N = 2$ and a tetrahedron for $N = 3$), h_T denotes its diameter, and for a mesh \mathcal{T}_h , the index h refers to the mesh size, i.e., $h = \max_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_T$. We assume that $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}$ is shape regular, i.e., for all \mathcal{T}_h and for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, there exists a constant C such that $h_T \leq C\rho_T$, where ρ_T is the diameter of the largest ball inscribed in T .

In this paper, face means edge/face in two/three dimensions. We denote the sets of nodes and faces of \mathcal{T}_h by \mathcal{N}_h and \mathcal{F}_h , respectively. For each $F \in \mathcal{F}_h$, we use h_F to denote its diameter.

The sets of interface elements and interface faces are defined by $\mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma = \{T \in \mathcal{T}_h : T \cap \Gamma \neq \emptyset\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma = \{F \in \mathcal{F}_h : F \cap \Gamma \neq \emptyset\}$, where we adopt the convention that elements and faces are open sets. The sets of non-interface elements and non-interface faces are then $\mathcal{T}_h^{non} = \mathcal{T}_h \setminus \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$ and $\mathcal{F}_h^{non} = \mathcal{F}_h \setminus \mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma$, respectively.

Let us introduce the signed distance function: $d(\mathbf{x})|_{\Omega^\pm} = \pm \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \Gamma)$, and the δ -neighborhood of Γ : $U(\Gamma, \delta) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \Gamma) < \delta\}$, where $\text{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the standard distance function between two sets. It is well known that for $\Gamma \in C^2$, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $d(\mathbf{x})$ belongs to $C^2(U(\Gamma, \delta_0))$ and the closest point mapping $\mathbf{p} : U(\Gamma, \delta_0) \rightarrow \Gamma$ maps every \mathbf{x} to precisely one point at Γ (see [13]). Now the unit normal vector $\mathbf{n} = \nabla d$ is well defined in $U(\Gamma, \delta_0)$, and it holds $\mathbf{n} \in C^1(U(\Gamma, \delta_0))^N$. We assume $h < \delta_0$ so that the interface is resolved by the mesh in the sense that $\overline{T} \subset U(\Gamma, \delta_0)$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$. In the neighborhood of Γ , we recall the following fundamental result which will be useful in the analysis (see, e.g., [6, 31, 12]).

Lemma 2.1. *For all $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$, there is a constant C depending only on Γ such that*

$$\|v\|_{L^2(U(\Gamma, \delta))}^2 \leq C(\delta \|v\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \delta^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(U(\Gamma, \delta))}^2) \quad \forall v \in H^1(U(\Gamma, \delta_0)).$$

Furthermore, if $v|_\Gamma \neq 0$, there holds $\|v\|_{L^2(U(\Gamma, \delta))} \leq C\delta^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{H^1(U(\Gamma, \delta_0))}$.

Finally, we emphasize that throughout the paper, C or C with a subscript are used to denote generic positive constants that are independent of mesh size and the interface location relative to the mesh.

2.2 Discretization of the interface

Let I_h be the standard piecewise linear nodal interpolation operator associated with \mathcal{T}_h . The approximate interface Γ_h is chosen as the zero level set of the Lagrange interpolant of $d(\mathbf{x})$, i.e., $\Gamma_h = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N : I_h d(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}$. Correspondingly, Γ_h divides Ω into two subdomains Ω_h^+ and Ω_h^- with $\partial\Omega_h^- = \Gamma_h$. For all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$, we let $\Gamma_{h,T} = \Gamma_h \cap T$, $\Gamma_T = \Gamma \cap T$, and assume $\Gamma_{h,T} \neq \emptyset$ to simplify the presentation and avoid technical details. Note that if there exists an element T with $\Gamma_{h,T} = \emptyset$, then the element can be treated as a non-interface element and the optimal convergence rate does not deteriorate since the geometric error is in the order of $O(h^2)$ (see, e.g., [31]).

Clearly, Γ_h is continuous and piecewise linear (see the left plot in Fig 1 for an illustration for the 2D case). We note that in traditional 2D IFEs the interface is discretized by connecting the points of intersection of the exact interface and the mesh. However, this approach cannot be extended to 3D because there exists the case that the points of intersection are not coplanar (see the right plot in Fig 1 for an example). We also note that based on our discretization of the interface, the IFE method developed in this paper is particularly well suited for the well-known level set method [36, 38] for solving more complicated moving interface problems.

Let $\Gamma_{h,T}^{ext}$ be the $N - 1$ -dimensional hyperplane containing $\Gamma_{h,T}$ and \mathbf{n}_h be a piecewise constant vector defined on all interface elements with $\mathbf{n}_h|_T$ being the unit vector perpendicular to $\Gamma_{h,T}^{ext}$ pointing from Ω_h^- to Ω_h^+ . We have (see [7, 24])

$$\|d\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_{h,T})} + \|\text{dist}(\cdot, \Gamma_{h,T}^{ext})\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} + h_T \|\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{n}_h\|_{L^\infty(T)} \leq Ch_T^2 \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma. \quad (2.1)$$

Define a mapping $\mathbf{p}_h : \Gamma_h \rightarrow \Gamma$ by $\mathbf{p}_h(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} + \varrho_h \mathbf{n}_h$ with the smallest ϱ_h chosen such that $\mathbf{x} + \varrho_h \mathbf{n}_h \in \Gamma$. The existence of this mapping is shown in [6, p. 637]. Moreover, there holds (see (2.18) in [6])

$$\|\text{id} - \mathbf{p}_h\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_{h,T})} + h_T \|\mathbf{n}_h - \mathbf{n} \circ \mathbf{p}\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_{h,T})} \leq Ch_T^2. \quad (2.2)$$




Figure 1: Left: an example of Γ_h in 2D; Middle: an interface element in 2D; Right: an interface element in 3D.

2.3 The IFE space without surface forces

Let $P_k(D)$ be the set of all polynomials of degree less than or equal to k on a domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. Define $D^\pm = D \cap \Omega^\pm$ and $P_k(\cup D^\pm) = \{v : v|_{D^\pm} \in P_k(D^\pm)\}$. Similarly, we define $\mathbf{P}_k(D) = P_k(D)^N$ and $\mathbf{P}_k(\cup D^\pm) = P_k(\cup D^\pm)^N$. On each element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, the conventional mini element space is $(\mathbf{V}_h(T), Q_h(T)) = (\mathbf{P}_1(T), P_1(T)) \oplus (\text{span}\{b_T\}^N, \{0\})$, where b_T is the standard bubble function associated with T (see [3]).

On each interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$, we need to modify $(\mathbf{P}_1(T), P_1(T))$ since it cannot capture the behavior of the exact solution well due to the interface jump conditions. Let $\mathcal{I}_N = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ and $\mathbf{t}_{i,h}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}_{N-1}$, be unit tangent vectors to Γ_h such that $\mathbf{t}_{i,h}$ and \mathbf{n}_h form standard basis vectors in \mathbb{R}^N . Define $T_h^\pm = T \cap \Omega_h^\pm$ and $\mu_h|_{\Omega_h^\pm} = \mu^\pm$. According to (1.1d), (1.2) and (1.1c) with $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{0}$, we introduce the following discrete interface jump conditions for all $(\mathbf{v}, q) \in (\mathbf{P}_1(\cup T_h^\pm), P_1(\cup T_h^\pm))$:

$$[\sigma(\mu_h, \mathbf{v}, q)\mathbf{n}_h]_{\Gamma_{h,T}}(\mathbf{x}_T^*) = \mathbf{0}, \quad (\mathbf{x}_T^* \text{ is a point on } \Gamma_{h,T}), \quad (2.3a)$$

$$[\mathbf{v}]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} = \mathbf{0} \text{ (or, equivalently, } [\mathbf{v}]_{\Gamma_{h,T}}(\mathbf{x}_T^P) = \mathbf{0}, [(\nabla \mathbf{v})\mathbf{t}_{i,h}]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} = \mathbf{0} \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_{N-1}), \quad (2.3b)$$

$$[\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} = 0, \quad (2.3c)$$

$$\nabla q \in P_0(T)^N \text{ (or, equivalently, } [\nabla q]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} = \mathbf{0}). \quad (2.3d)$$

The modified space is then defined by $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_1 \widetilde{P}_1(T) = \{(\mathbf{v}, q) \in (\mathbf{P}_1(\cup T_h^\pm), P_1(\cup T_h^\pm)) : (\mathbf{v}, q) \text{ satisfies (2.3)}\}$. Let $\mathbf{a}_{i,T}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}_{N+1}$ be vertices of T and write $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N)^T$. The degrees of freedom of the space $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_1 \widetilde{P}_1(T)$, denoted by $\text{DoF}_{i,T}$, $i = 1, \dots, (N+1)^2$, are chosen as

$$\text{DoF}_{i+(j-1)(N+1),T}(\mathbf{v}, q) = v_j(\mathbf{a}_{i,T}), \text{DoF}_{(N+1)N+i,T}(\mathbf{v}, q) = q(\mathbf{a}_{i,T}), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_{N+1}, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{I}_N.$$

Remark 2.2. Condition (2.3d) is added not only for the unisolvence of basis functions but also for the inf-sup stability (see the proof of Lemma 4.4). Condition (2.3d) also implies that $[q]_{\Gamma_{h,T}}$ is a constant on $\Gamma_{h,T}$, and so is $[\sigma(\mu_h, \mathbf{v}, q)\mathbf{n}_h]_{\Gamma_{h,T}}$. Thus, (2.3a) is equivalent to $[\sigma(\mu_h, \mathbf{v}, q)\mathbf{n}_h]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} = \mathbf{0}$.

Remark 2.3. Since \mathbf{v} and q are piecewise linear, we know (\mathbf{v}, q) has $2(N+1)^2$ parameters. On the other hand, there are $(N+1)^2$ degrees of freedom and $(N+1)^2$ constraints according to (2.3). More precisely, (2.3a) provides N constraints; (2.3b) provides N^2 constraints; (2.3c) provides one constraint; and (2.3d) provides N constraint. Intuitively, we can expect that (\mathbf{v}, q) can be uniquely determined by $\text{DoF}_{i,T}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, (N+1)^2$, i.e., the nodal values $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{a}_{i,T})$ and $q(\mathbf{a}_{i,T})$. In subsection 2.6, we will prove that this property holds on Cartesian meshes.

Remark 2.4. The point $\mathbf{x}_T^* \in \Gamma_{h,T}$ is arbitrary but fixed. The point $\mathbf{x}_T^P \in \Gamma_{h,T}^{\text{ext}}$ is only for theoretical analysis. We set $\mathbf{x}_T^P = \mathbf{p}_{\Gamma_{h,T}^{\text{ext}}}(\mathbf{x}_T^S)$ with \mathbf{x}_T^S being a point on the surface Γ_T , where $\mathbf{p}_{\Gamma_{h,T}^{\text{ext}}}$ is the orthogonal projection onto the plane $\Gamma_{h,T}^{\text{ext}}$ (see the middle plot in Figure 1 for the 2D case). From

(2.1) we have

$$|\mathbf{x}_T^P - \mathbf{x}_T^S| \leq Ch_T^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_T^P| \leq |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_T^S| + |\mathbf{x}_T^S - \mathbf{x}_T^P| \leq Ch_T \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in T, \quad (2.4)$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm.

Now the local and global mini IFE space are given by $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\widetilde{Q}_h(T) = \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_1\widetilde{P}_1(T) \oplus (\text{span}\{b_T\}^N, \{0\})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\widetilde{Q}_h(\Omega) = \{(\mathbf{v}, q) : (\mathbf{v}, q)|_T \in (\mathbf{V}_h(T), Q_h(T)) \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h^{\text{non}}, (\mathbf{v}, q)|_T \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\widetilde{Q}_h(T) \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma, \\ \mathbf{v} \text{ and } q \text{ are continuous at every } \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{N}_h \}. \end{aligned}$$

2.4 Correction functions for the surface force

If $\mathbf{g} \neq \mathbf{0}$, we need a correction function (\mathbf{u}_h^J, p_h^J) to deal with the non-homogeneous jump condition (1.1c). On non-interface elements, we set $(\mathbf{u}_h^J, p_h^J) = (\mathbf{0}, 0)$, and on each interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$, we construct $(\mathbf{u}_h^J, p_h^J) \in (\mathbf{P}_1(\cup T_h^\pm), P_1(\cup T_h^\pm))$ satisfying $\mathbf{u}_h^J(\mathbf{a}_{i,T}) = \mathbf{0}, p_h^J(\mathbf{a}_{i,T}) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}_{N+1}$ and the jump conditions in (2.3) with (2.3a) changed to

$$[\sigma(\mu_h, \mathbf{u}_h^J, p_h^J)\mathbf{n}_h]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} = \text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}(\mathbf{g}), \quad \text{where} \quad \text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}(\mathbf{g}) := |\Gamma_{R_T}|^{-1} \int_{\Gamma_{R_T}} \mathbf{g}. \quad (2.5)$$

Here $\Gamma_{R_T} := \Gamma \cap R_T$ and $R_T \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a larger domain containing T such that its diameter $h_{R_T} \leq Ch_T$ and $|\Gamma_{R_T}| \geq Ch_T^{N-1}$. We note that, in this occasion, $|\cdot|$ means the measure of domains or manifolds.




Figure 2: 2D illustration for the construction of R_T and Γ_{R_T} .

Here we give an example of R_T . For ease of implementation, we choose $R_T = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_T^* + \xi_N \mathbf{n}_h + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \xi_i \mathbf{t}_{i,h}, |\xi_i| \leq h_T \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_N\}$. A 2D illustration of R_T and Γ_{R_T} is shown in Figure 2. By (2.2), it is no hard to see that there exists a constant C_Γ such that $\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \Gamma_{h,T}^{\text{ext}}) \leq C_\Gamma h_T^2$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma_{R_T}$. Then we further assume $h < \min\{1/(2C_\Gamma), \delta_0/(\sqrt{N})\}$ so that $\overline{R_T} \subset U(\Gamma, \delta_0)$ and $\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \Gamma_{h,T}^{\text{ext}}) \leq h_T/2$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma_{R_T}$. Now Γ_{R_T} can be parameterized as $\mathbf{x}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{N-1}) = \mathbf{x}_T^* + \xi_N(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{N-1})\mathbf{n}_h + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \xi_i \mathbf{t}_{i,h}$, $-h_T \leq \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{N-1} \leq h_T$, where $\xi_N(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{N-1})$ is chosen such that $\mathbf{x}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{N-1}) \in \Gamma$. The parametric representation of Γ_{R_T} is useful in computing $\text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}(\mathbf{g})$ practically. Obviously, the requirements $|\Gamma_{R_T}| \geq Ch_T^{N-1}$ and $h_{R_T} \leq Ch_T$ are fulfilled. Applying these and the following well-known trace inequality for parts of Γ (see, e.g., [18, Lemma 1]):

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{R_T})}^2 \leq C(h_T^{-1}\|v\|_{L^2(R_T)}^2 + h_T|v|_{H^1(R_T)}^2) \quad \forall v \in H^1(R_T), \quad (2.6)$$

we obtain the following useful inequality:

$$|\text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}(v)|^2 \leq |\Gamma_{R_T}|^{-1}\|v\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{R_T})}^2 \leq Ch_T^{-N}(\|v\|_{L^2(R_T)}^2 + h_T^2|v|_{H^1(R_T)}^2) \quad \forall v \in H^1(R_T). \quad (2.7)$$

2.5 The IFE method

With the usual spaces $\mathbf{V} = H_0^1(\Omega)^N$ and $Q = L_0^2(\Omega) := \{q \in L^2(\Omega) : \int_\Omega q = 0\}$, the weak formulation of (1.1) reads: Find $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in (\mathbf{V}, Q)$ such that

$$a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + b(\mathbf{v}, p) - b(\mathbf{u}, q) = l(\mathbf{v}) \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}, q) \in (\mathbf{V}, Q), \quad (2.8)$$

where $a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) := \int_\Omega 2\mu\epsilon(\mathbf{u}) : \epsilon(\mathbf{v})$, $b(\mathbf{v}, q) := -\int_\Omega q\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}$ and $l(\mathbf{v}) := \int_\Omega \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{v} - \int_\Gamma \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{v}$.

Define a subspace of $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_h(\Omega)$ by $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_{h,0}(\Omega) = \{(\mathbf{v}, q) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_h(\Omega) : \mathbf{v}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}, q \in L_0^2(\Omega)\}$. Similar to the IFE methods for elliptic interface problems, the velocity in the IFE space is discontinuous across interface faces, i.e., the IFE space is non-conforming. To get a consistent method, we should add some integral terms on interface faces, like the discontinuous Galerkin method. Given a face $F \in \mathcal{F}_h$ shared by two elements T_1 and T_2 , let \mathbf{n}_F be the unit normal vector of F pointing from T_1 to T_2 . The jump and the average of a function v across the face F are denoted by $[v]_F := v|_{T_1} - v|_{T_2}$ and $\{v\}_F := \frac{1}{2}(v|_{T_1} + v|_{T_2})$, respectively.

Let \mathbf{f}_E^\pm be extensions of $\mathbf{f}^\pm := \mathbf{f}|_{\Omega^\pm}$. We approximate the source term \mathbf{f} by $\mathbf{f}^{BK}|_{\Omega_h^\pm} = \mathbf{f}_E^\pm|_{\Omega_h^\pm}$. Define the mismatch region by $\Omega^\Delta = (\Omega_h^+ \setminus \Omega^+) \cup (\Omega_h^- \setminus \Omega^-)$. Clearly, $\mathbf{f}|_{\Omega \setminus \Omega^\Delta} = \mathbf{f}^{BK}|_{\Omega \setminus \Omega^\Delta}$. To achieve the optimal convergence, we assume $\|\mathbf{f}^{BK}\|_{L^2(\Omega^\Delta)} \leq C\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, which holds if $\|\mathbf{f}_E^\pm\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\mathbf{f}^\pm\|_{L^2(\Omega^\pm)}$. The force \mathbf{g} defined on Γ is transferred to Γ_h as $\mathbf{g}_h = \mathbf{g} \circ \mathbf{p}_h$. Alternatively, we can use $\mathbf{g}_h = \mathbf{g} \circ \mathbf{p}$. However, as shown in [6], the computation of $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x})$ for a given $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma_h$ is substantially more costly than that of $\mathbf{p}_h(\mathbf{x})$.

Define the following forms with $\gamma = 1$ or -1 and $\eta \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h; \mathbf{v}_h, q_h) &:= a_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) + b_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p_h) - b_h(\mathbf{u}_h, q_h), \\ a_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) &:= \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_T 2\mu_h \epsilon(\mathbf{u}_h) : \epsilon(\mathbf{v}_h) + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma} \frac{1+\eta}{h_F} \int_F [\mathbf{u}_h]_F \cdot [\mathbf{v}_h]_F \\ &\quad - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma} \int_F (\{2\mu_h \epsilon(\mathbf{u}_h) \mathbf{n}_F\}_F \cdot [\mathbf{v}_h]_F + \gamma \{2\mu_h \epsilon(\mathbf{v}_h) \mathbf{n}_F\}_F \cdot [\mathbf{u}_h]_F), \\ b_h(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) &:= - \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_T q_h \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma} \int_F \{q_h\}_F [\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_F]_F, \\ l_h(\mathbf{v}_h) &:= \int_\Omega \mathbf{f}^{BK} \cdot \mathbf{v}_h - \int_{\Gamma_h} \mathbf{g}_h \cdot \mathbf{v}_h. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

The discretization of (2.8) reads: Find $(\mathbf{U}_h, P_h) := (\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) + (\mathbf{u}_h^J, p_h^J - c_h^J)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) &\in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_{h,0}(\Omega), \quad c_h^J = \int_\Omega p_h^J, \\ \mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h; \mathbf{v}_h, q_h) &= l_h(\mathbf{v}_h) - \mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^J, p_h^J - c_h^J; \mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_{h,0}(\Omega). \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

For practical implementations, we next derive explicit forms of basis and correction functions.

2.6 Explicit formulas for IFE basis functions

The space $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}_1\mathcal{P}_1}(T)$ is not empty since $(\mathbf{0}, 0) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{P}_1\mathcal{P}_1}(T)$. For each $(\mathbf{v}, q) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{P}_1\mathcal{P}_1}(T)$, if

$$[\sigma(1, \mathbf{v}, q) \mathbf{n}_h]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} c_i \mathbf{t}_{i,h} + c_N \mathbf{n}_h,$$

we have

$$(\mathbf{v}, q) = (\mathbf{v}^{J_0}, q^{J_0}) + \sum_{i=1}^N c_i (\mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i}), \quad (2.11)$$

where $(\mathbf{v}^{J_0}, q^{J_0})$ is defined by

$$(\mathbf{v}^{J_0}, q^{J_0}) \in (\mathbf{P}_1(T), P_1(T)), \text{DoF}_{i,T}(\mathbf{v}^{J_0}, q^{J_0}) = \text{DoF}_{i,T}(\mathbf{v}, q) \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, (N+1)^2\}, \quad (2.12)$$

and $(\mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i})$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i}) &\in (\mathbf{P}_1(UT_h^\pm), P_1(UT_h^\pm)), \text{DoF}_{j,T}(\mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i}) = 0 \quad \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, (N+1)^2\}, \\ [\sigma(1, \mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i}) \mathbf{n}_h]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{t}_{i,h} & \text{if } i \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}, \\ \mathbf{n}_h & \text{if } i = N, \end{cases} \\ [\mathbf{v}^{J_i}]_{\Gamma_{h,T}}(\mathbf{x}_T^P) &= \mathbf{0}, [(\nabla \mathbf{v}^{J_i}) \mathbf{t}_{j,h}]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} = \mathbf{0} \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}, \\ [\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^{J_i}]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} &= 0, [\nabla q^{J_i}]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Now the problem is to find c_i so that the jump condition $[\sigma(\mu_h, \mathbf{v}, q) \mathbf{n}_h]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} = \mathbf{0}$ is satisfied. Substituting (2.11) into this jump condition, we obtain a N -by- N system of linear equations:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N [\sigma(\mu_h, \mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i}) \mathbf{n}_h]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} c_i = -[\sigma(\mu_h, \mathbf{v}^{J_0}, q^{J_0}) \mathbf{n}_h]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} = -\sigma([\mu_h]_{\Gamma_{h,T}}, \mathbf{v}^{J_0}, 0) \mathbf{n}_h, \quad (2.14)$$

where we note that $[\sigma(\mu_h, \mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i}) \mathbf{n}_h]_{\Gamma_{h,T}}$ is a N -dimensional column vector. To solve the above system of linear equations, we need an explicit expression of $(\mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i})$. Let $I_{h,T}$ be the standard linear nodal interpolation operator on the element T , then we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $(\mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i})$ be defined in (2.12) and (2.13). There holds*

$$(\mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i}) = \begin{cases} (I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}, I_{h,T} q) & \text{if } i = 0, \\ ((w_T - I_{h,T} w_T) \mathbf{t}_{i,h}, 0) & \text{if } i \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}, \\ (\mathbf{0}, z_T - I_{h,T} z_T) & \text{if } i = N, \end{cases} \quad (2.15)$$

where

$$z_T(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_h^+, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_h^-, \end{cases} \quad w_T(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \Gamma_{h,T}^{ext}) & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_h^+, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_h^-. \end{cases} \quad (2.16)$$

Proof. The result is trivial for $i = 0$. For $i \in \mathcal{I}_N$, we define a new function having the same interface jump conditions as $(\mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i})$ by

$$(\mathbf{v}_i, q_i) = \begin{cases} (\mathbf{v}_i^+, q_i^+) \in (P_1(T_h^+)^N, P_1(T_h^+)) & \text{in } T_h^+, \\ (\mathbf{0}, 0) & \text{in } T_h^-, \end{cases} \quad (2.17)$$

where the linear functions \mathbf{v}_i^+ and q_i^+ are chosen such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(1, \mathbf{v}_i^+, q_i^+) \mathbf{n}_h &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{t}_{i,h} & \text{if } i \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}, \\ \mathbf{n}_h & \text{if } i = N, \end{cases} \\ \mathbf{v}_i^+(\mathbf{x}_T^P) &= \mathbf{0}, (\nabla \mathbf{v}_i^+) \mathbf{t}_{j,h} = \mathbf{0} \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_i^+ = 0, \quad \nabla q_i^+ = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

Then, by definition, the function $(\mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i})$ can be constructed as

$$(\mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i}) = (\mathbf{v}_i, q_i) - (I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_i, I_{h,T} q_i), \quad (2.19)$$

where we used the facts that $(I_{h,T}\mathbf{v}_i, I_{h,T}q_i)$ has no jumps across $\Gamma_{h,T}$ and $(\mathbf{v}_i, q_i) - (I_{h,T}\mathbf{v}_i, I_{h,T}q_i)$ vanishes on all vertices of T . Considering (2.18) in the $\mathbf{t}_{i,h}-\mathbf{n}_h$ coordinate system and using an argument similar to the one in the proof of Lemma 4.5 in [26], it is no hard to see

$$(\mathbf{v}_i^+(\mathbf{x}), q_i^+) = \begin{cases} (\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \Gamma_{h,T}^{ext})\mathbf{t}_{i,h}, 0) & \text{if } i \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}, \\ (\mathbf{0}, -1) & \text{if } i = N. \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

The result (2.15) follows from (2.17), (2.19) and (2.20). \square

Substituting (2.15) into (2.14) and using the $\mathbf{t}_{i,h}-\mathbf{n}_h$ coordinate system, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + (\mu^-/\mu^+ - 1)\nabla I_{h,T}w_T \cdot \mathbf{n}_h)c_i &= \mathbf{t}_{i,h}^T \sigma(\mu^-/\mu^+ - 1, I_{h,T}\mathbf{v}, 0)\mathbf{n}_h, \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1, \\ c_N &= \mathbf{n}_h^T \sigma(\mu^- - \mu^+, I_{h,T}\mathbf{v}, 0)\mathbf{n}_h, \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

where we have used the identity $[\mu_h \partial_{\mathbf{n}_h}(w_T - I_{h,T}w_T)]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} = \mu^+ + (\mu^- - \mu^+)\nabla I_{h,T}w_T \cdot \mathbf{n}_h$ in the derivation. On the Cartesian meshes used in this paper, the relation $0 \leq \nabla I_{h,T}w_T \cdot \mathbf{n}_h \leq 1$ holds for both $N = 2$ and $N = 3$ (see Lemmas 1 and 16 in [27] and Remark 3 in [30]). Then we have

$$1 + (\mu^-/\mu^+ - 1)\nabla I_{h,T}w_T \cdot \mathbf{n}_h \geq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mu^-/\mu^+ \geq 1, \\ \mu^-/\mu^+ & \text{if } 0 < \mu^-/\mu^+ < 1, \end{cases} \quad (2.22)$$

which implies that (2.21) is unisolvent. Combining (2.22), (2.11) and (2.15) yields the following lemma.

Lemma 2.6. *For any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$ with vertices $\mathbf{a}_{i,T}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}_{N+1}$, the function $(\mathbf{v}, q) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_1\widetilde{P}_1(T)$ is uniquely determined by nodal values $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{a}_{i,T})$ and $q(\mathbf{a}_{i,T})$. Furthermore, we have*

$$(\mathbf{v}, q) = (I_{h,T}\mathbf{v}, I_{h,T}q) + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (c_i(w_T - I_{h,T}w_T)\mathbf{t}_{i,h}, 0) + (\mathbf{0}, c_N(z_T - I_{h,T}z_T)), \quad (2.23)$$

where c_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$ are determined from (2.21).

Remark 2.7. *From the above lemma, one can see $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_1\widetilde{P}_1(T) = (\mathbf{P}_1(T), P_1(T))$ if $\mu^+ = \mu^-$. Thus, the IFE reduces to the conventional mini element when there is no interface. We also find that \mathbf{v} depends only on $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{a}_i)$ while q depends not only on $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{a}_i)$ and but also on $q(\mathbf{a}_i)$. Note that $(\mathbf{0}, c) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_1\widetilde{P}_1(T)$ for any constant c . We can choose a proper constant c to make the pressure have average zero.*

Define the basis functions of $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_1\widetilde{P}_1(T)$ by $\text{DoF}_{j,T}(\phi_{i,T}^\Gamma, \varphi_{i,T}^\Gamma) = \delta_{ij}$ (the Kronecker symbol) for all $i, j = 1, \dots, (N+1)^2$. The standard basis functions of $(\mathbf{P}_1(T), P_1(T))$, denoted by $(\phi_{i,T}, \varphi_{i,T})$, are defined analogously. By Lemma 2.6 we can write the IFE basis functions explicitly as follows:

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned} \phi_{i,T}^\Gamma &= \begin{cases} \phi_{i,T} + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \frac{\mathbf{t}_{j,h}^T \sigma(\mu^-/\mu^+ - 1, \phi_{i,T}, 0)\mathbf{n}_h}{1 + (\mu^-/\mu^+ - 1)\nabla I_{h,T}w_T \cdot \mathbf{n}_h} (w_T - I_{h,T}w_T)\mathbf{t}_{j,h}, & i = 1, \dots, N(N+1), \\ \mathbf{0}, & i = N(N+1) + 1, \dots, (N+1)^2, \end{cases} \\ \varphi_{i,T}^\Gamma &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{n}_h^T \sigma(\mu^- - \mu^+, \phi_{i,T}, 0)\mathbf{n}_h (z_T - I_{h,T}z_T), & i = 1, \dots, N(N+1), \\ \varphi_{i,T}, & i = N(N+1) + 1, \dots, (N+1)^2. \end{cases} \end{aligned}}$$

Using the above explicit formulas, the definition of z_T and w_T in (2.16) and the estimates of standard basis functions, it is easy to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 2.8. *There exists a positive constant C such that for $m = 0, 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |(\phi_{i,T}^\Gamma)^\pm|_{W_\infty^m(T)} &\leq Ch_T^{-m}, \quad \|(\varphi_{i,T}^\Gamma)^\pm\|_{L^\infty(T)} \leq Ch_T^{-1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N(N+1), \\ |(\phi_{i,T}^\Gamma)^\pm|_{W_\infty^m(T)} &= 0, \quad \|(\varphi_{i,T}^\Gamma)^\pm\|_{L^\infty(T)} = 1, \quad i = N(N+1) + 1, \dots, (N+1)^2. \end{aligned}$$

2.7 Explicit formulas for correction functions

Similarly to (2.11), we can write $(\mathbf{u}_h^J, p_h^J)|_T = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i^J(\mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i})$, where the c_i^J 's are constants to be determined. Substituting this equation into (2.5) yields $\sum_{i=1}^N [\sigma(\mu_h, \mathbf{v}^{J_i}, q^{J_i}) \mathbf{n}_h]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} c_i^J = \text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}(\mathbf{g})$. Analogous to (2.21), we have

$$\mu^+(1 + (\mu^-/\mu^+ - 1)\nabla I_{h,T} w_T \cdot \mathbf{n}_h) c_i^J = \mathbf{t}_{i,h}^T \text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}(\mathbf{g}), \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1, \quad c_N^J = \mathbf{n}_h^T \text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}(\mathbf{g}).$$

Combining this with Lemma 2.5 yields the following explicit formulas:

$$\boxed{\mathbf{u}_h^J|_T = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{\mathbf{t}_{i,h}^T \text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}(\mathbf{g})(w_T - I_{h,T} w_T) \mathbf{t}_{i,h}}{\mu^+(1 + (\mu^-/\mu^+ - 1)\nabla I_{h,T} w_T \cdot \mathbf{n}_h)}, \quad p_h^J|_T = (z_T - I_{h,T} z_T) \mathbf{n}_h^T \text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}(\mathbf{g}).} \quad (2.24)$$

3 Approximation capabilities of IFE spaces

We first introduce some norms, extensions and interpolation operators. For all non-negative integers m , define broken Sobolev spaces $H^m(\cup D^\pm) = \{v \in L^2(D) : v|_{D^\pm} \in H^m(D^\pm)\}$ equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^m(\cup D^\pm)}$ and the semi-norm $|\cdot|_{H^m(\cup D^\pm)}$ satisfying $\|\cdot\|_{H^m(\cup D^\pm)}^2 = \|\cdot\|_{H^m(D^+)}^2 + \|\cdot\|_{H^m(D^-)}^2$ and $|\cdot|_{H^m(\cup D^\pm)}^2 = |\cdot|_{H^m(D^+)}^2 + |\cdot|_{H^m(D^-)}^2$. For the convergence analysis, we assume the solution to (2.8) belongs to the space

$$\widetilde{H^2 H^1}(\mathbf{g}) := \{(\mathbf{v}, q) \in (H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm))^N, H^1(\cup \Omega^\pm)\} : [\sigma(\mu, \mathbf{v}, q) \mathbf{n}]_\Gamma = \mathbf{g}, [\mathbf{v}]_\Gamma = \mathbf{0}, [\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}]_\Gamma = 0\}. \quad (3.1)$$

For any $v \in H^m(\cup \Omega^\pm)$, we let $v^\pm = v|_{\Omega^\pm}$. There exist extensions of v^\pm , denoted by v_E^\pm , such that (see [14])

$$\|v_E^\pm\|_{H^m(\Omega)} \leq C \|v^\pm\|_{H^m(\Omega^\pm)}. \quad (3.2)$$

For any $v \in P_k(\cup T_h^\pm)$, with a small ambiguity of notation, we also use v^\pm to represent the polynomial extensions of $v|_{T_h^\pm}$, i.e., $v^\pm \in P_k(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $v^\pm|_{T_h^\pm} = v|_{T_h^\pm}$.

Given two functions v^+ and v^- , we will frequently use the notation $[[v^\pm]](\mathbf{x}) := v^+(\mathbf{x}) - v^-(\mathbf{x})$ in the analysis. Therefore, for any $v \in H^m(\cup \Omega^\pm)$, we have $[[v_E^\pm]](\mathbf{x}) = v_E^+(\mathbf{x}) - v_E^-(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, which can be viewed as an extension of the jump $[v]_\Gamma$.

The extensions of tangential gradients along surfaces are defined as follows. Recalling \mathbf{n} is well-defined in $U(\Gamma, \delta_0)$, we define $(\nabla_\Gamma v)(\mathbf{x}) := \nabla v - (\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla v) \mathbf{n} \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in U(\Gamma, \delta_0)$. Similarly, for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$, we define $(\nabla_{\Gamma_{h,T}^{ext}} v)(\mathbf{x}) := \nabla v - (\mathbf{n}_h(\mathbf{x}_T^*) \cdot \nabla v) \mathbf{n}_h(\mathbf{x}_T^*) \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in R_T$. By (2.1) and the fact $\mathbf{n} \in C^1(\overline{R_T})^N$, we have

$$|\mathbf{n}_h(\mathbf{x}_T^*) - \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})| \leq |\mathbf{n}_h(\mathbf{x}_T^*) - \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}_T^S)| + |\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}_T^S) - \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})| \leq Ch_T \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \overline{R_T}. \quad (3.3)$$

Therefore, by (3.3) and (2.6) there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{\Gamma_{h,T}^{ext}} v - \nabla_\Gamma v\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{R_T})} &= \|(\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla v)(\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{n}_h(\mathbf{x}_T^*)) + ((\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{n}_h(\mathbf{x}_T^*)) \cdot \nabla v) \mathbf{n}_h(\mathbf{x}_T^*)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{R_T})} \\ &\leq C \|\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{n}_h(\mathbf{x}_T^*)\|_{L^\infty(R_T)} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{R_T})} \leq Ch_T^{1/2} |v|_{H^1(R_T)} + Ch_T^{3/2} |v|_{H^2(R_T)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

The tangential gradient acting on $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_N)^T$ is defined by $\nabla_\Gamma \mathbf{v} = (\nabla_\Gamma v_1, \dots, \nabla_\Gamma v_N)^T$.

Let \tilde{I}_h be the Scott-Zhang interpolation mapping from $H^1(\Omega)$ to the standard P_1 -conforming finite element space associated with \mathcal{T}_h (see [37]). The operator acting on vector-valued functions are also denoted by \tilde{I}_h for simplicity. The restriction on an element T is defined by $\tilde{I}_{h,T} v = (\tilde{I}_h v)|_T$.

For all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, let $\omega_T = \text{interior}(\bigcup\{\overline{T'} : \overline{T'} \cap \overline{T} \neq \emptyset, T' \in \mathcal{T}_h\})$. We recall the standard interpolation error estimates (see [37, 5]):

$$\begin{aligned} |v - \tilde{I}_{h,T}v|_{H^m(T)} &\leq Ch_T^{l-m}|v|_{H^l(\omega_T)}, \quad 0 \leq m \leq l \leq 2, \\ |v - I_{h,T}v|_{H^m(T)} &\leq Ch_T^{2-m}|v|_{H^2(T)}, \quad m = 0, 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

For every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ with $T \subset \Omega^s$, $s = +$ or $-$, we let $\Pi_{h,T}(\mathbf{v}, q) = (I_{h,T}\mathbf{v}, \tilde{I}_{h,T}q_E^s)$ and $\tilde{\Pi}_{h,T}(\mathbf{v}, q) = (\tilde{I}_{h,T}\mathbf{v}_E^s, \tilde{I}_{h,T}q_E^s)$. And, on each interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$, we define $\Pi_{h,T}^\Gamma$ and $\tilde{\Pi}_{h,T}^\Gamma$, respectively, by

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{v}_I, q_I) &:= \Pi_{h,T}^\Gamma(\mathbf{v}, q) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_1\widetilde{P}_1(T), \\ \mathbf{v}_I(\mathbf{a}_{i,T}) &= \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{a}_{i,T}), \quad q_I(\mathbf{a}_{i,T}) = (\tilde{I}_{h,T}q_E^s)(\mathbf{a}_{i,T}), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_{N+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_I, q_I) &:= \tilde{\Pi}_{h,T}^\Gamma(\mathbf{v}, q) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_1\widetilde{P}_1(T), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_I(\mathbf{a}_{i,T}) &= (\tilde{I}_{h,T}\mathbf{v}_E^s)(\mathbf{a}_{i,T}), \quad q_I(\mathbf{a}_{i,T}) = (\tilde{I}_{h,T}q_E^s)(\mathbf{a}_{i,T}), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_{N+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where $s = +$ if $\mathbf{a}_{i,T} \in \Omega^+$ and $s = -$ if $\mathbf{a}_{i,T} \in \overline{\Omega^-}$. The global IFE interpolation operator Π_h^Γ is then defined by $(\Pi_h^\Gamma(\mathbf{v}, q))|_T = \Pi_{h,T}^\Gamma(\mathbf{v}, q)$ if $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$ and $(\Pi_h^\Gamma(\mathbf{v}, q))|_T = \Pi_{h,T}(\mathbf{v}, q)$ if $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^{non}$. We use $\Pi_{\mathbf{v}}^\Gamma\mathbf{v}$ and $\Pi_{\mathbf{v},q}^\Gamma q$, respectively, to represent the velocity and pressure component of $\Pi_h^\Gamma(\mathbf{v}, q)$, i.e., $\Pi_h^\Gamma(\mathbf{v}, q) = (\Pi_{\mathbf{v}}^\Gamma\mathbf{v}, \Pi_{\mathbf{v},q}^\Gamma q)$. Recalling Remark 2.7, we know $\Pi_{\mathbf{v}}^\Gamma\mathbf{v}$ depends only on the velocity \mathbf{v} while $\Pi_{\mathbf{v},q}^\Gamma q$ depends both on the velocity \mathbf{v} and the pressure q .

Similarly, we define $\tilde{\Pi}_h^\Gamma$ by $(\tilde{\Pi}_h^\Gamma(\mathbf{v}, q))|_T = \tilde{\Pi}_{h,T}^\Gamma(\mathbf{v}, q)$ if $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$ and $(\tilde{\Pi}_h^\Gamma(\mathbf{v}, q))|_T = \tilde{\Pi}_{h,T}(\mathbf{v}, q)$ if $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^{non}$, and use $\tilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}}^\Gamma\mathbf{v}$ and $\tilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v},q}^\Gamma q$ to represent the velocity and pressure component of $\tilde{\Pi}_h^\Gamma(\mathbf{v}, q)$, respectively.

For all (\mathbf{v}, q) belonging to the *broken* space $(H^2(\cup\Omega^\pm)^N, H^1(\cup\Omega^\pm))$, we also need operators E_h^{BK} and Π_h^{BK} defined by $(E_h^{BK}(\mathbf{v}, q))|_{\Omega_h^\pm} = (\mathbf{v}_E^\pm, q_E^\pm)$ and $(\Pi_h^{BK}(\mathbf{v}, q))|_{\Omega_h^\pm} = \Pi_h(\mathbf{v}_E^\pm, q_E^\pm)$, respectively.

To handle the surface force, we define $\Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}$ by

$$\Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{v}, q) := (\Pi_{\mathbf{v}}^{\Gamma,J}\mathbf{v}, \Pi_{\mathbf{v},q}^{\Gamma,J}q) = \Pi_h^\Gamma(\mathbf{v}, q) + (\mathbf{u}_h^J, p_h^J). \quad (3.8)$$

One can see that for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$,

$$(\Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{v}, q))|_T \in (\mathbf{P}_1(\cup T_h^\pm), P_1(\cup T_h^\pm)) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{DoF}_{i,T}(\Pi_h^{BK}(\mathbf{v}, q)) = \text{DoF}_{i,T}(\Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{v}, q)). \quad (3.9)$$

3.1 Interpolation error decomposition

To prove the optimal approximation capabilities of the IFE space, it suffices to consider interface elements. For each $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$, the triangle inequality gives

$$\|(\mathbf{u}, p) - \Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_T \leq \|(\mathbf{u}, p) - E_h^{BK}(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_T + \|E_h^{BK}(\mathbf{u}, p) - \Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_T, \quad (3.10)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_T$ is a specific norm on T . The first term relates to the error caused by the mismatch of Γ and Γ_h , which will be analyzed later. For the second term, we have

$$\|E_h^{BK}(\mathbf{u}, p) - \Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_T^2 \leq \sum_{s=\pm} \|(\mathbf{u}_E, p_E)^s - (\Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p))^s\|_T^2. \quad (3.11)$$

Our goal is to estimate $(\mathbf{u}_E^\pm, p_E^\pm) - (\Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p))^\pm$ on each interface element T . Obviously, we have

$$(\mathbf{u}_E^\pm, p_E^\pm) - (\Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p))^\pm = \underbrace{(\mathbf{u}_E^\pm, p_E^\pm) - \Pi_h(\mathbf{u}_E^\pm, p_E^\pm)}_{(I)_1} + \underbrace{\Pi_h(\mathbf{u}_E^\pm, p_E^\pm) - (\Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p))^\pm}_{(I)_2}. \quad (3.12)$$

The estimate of Term $(I)_1$ is trivial and the main task is to estimate $(I)_2$. By definition, one can see that the functions in $(I)_2$ are polynomial extensions of $(\Pi_h^{BK}(\mathbf{u}, p) - \Pi_h^{\Gamma, J}(\mathbf{u}, p))|_{T_h^\pm}$, i.e.,

$$(I)_2 = \Pi_h(\mathbf{u}_E^\pm, p_E^\pm) - (\Pi_h^{\Gamma, J}(\mathbf{u}, p))^\pm = (\Pi_h^{BK}(\mathbf{u}, p) - \Pi_h^{\Gamma, J}(\mathbf{u}, p))^\pm. \quad (3.13)$$

Our idea is to decompose $(\Pi_h^{BK}(\mathbf{u}, p) - \Pi_h^{\Gamma, J}(\mathbf{u}, p))|_T$ by $\text{DoF}_{i,T}$, $i = 1, \dots, (N+1)^2$ and others related to interface jump conditions. For simplicity of notation, we let $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{i,h} := \mathbf{t}_{i,h}$, $i = 1, \dots, N-1$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{N,h} := \mathbf{n}_h$. Define functionals $\mathfrak{S}_{i,T}$, $i = 1, \dots, (N+1)^2$ for any $(\mathbf{v}, q) \in (\mathbf{P}_1(\cup T_h^\pm), P_1(\cup T_h^\pm))$ by

$$\mathfrak{S}_{i,T}(\mathbf{v}, q) = \llbracket \mathbf{v}^\pm \rrbracket(\mathbf{x}_T^P) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i,h}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (3.14a)$$

$$\mathfrak{S}_{N+(i-1)N+j,T}(\mathbf{v}, q) = \llbracket \nabla \mathbf{v}^\pm \rrbracket \boldsymbol{\nu}_{j,h}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1, \quad j = 1, \dots, N, \quad (3.14b)$$

$$\mathfrak{S}_{N^2+i,T}(\mathbf{v}, q) = \llbracket \sigma(\mu^\pm, \mathbf{v}^\pm, q^\pm) \mathbf{n}_h \rrbracket(\mathbf{x}_T^*) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i,h}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (3.14c)$$

$$\mathfrak{S}_{N^2+N+1,T}(\mathbf{v}, q) = \llbracket \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}^\pm \rrbracket, \quad (3.14d)$$

$$\mathfrak{S}_{N^2+N+1+i,T}(\mathbf{v}, q) = \llbracket \nabla q^\pm \rrbracket \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i,h}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (3.14e)$$

If $\text{DoF}_{i,T}(\mathbf{v}, q) = \mathfrak{S}_{i,T}(\mathbf{v}, q) = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, (N+1)^2$, there holds $(\mathbf{v}, q) = (\mathbf{0}, 0)$ by Lemma 2.6. This implies that the function in the space $(\mathbf{P}_1(\cup T_h^\pm), P_1(\cup T_h^\pm))$ is uniquely determined by $\text{DoF}_{i,T}$ and $\mathfrak{S}_{i,T}$. Defining the auxiliary functions $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i,T}, \vartheta_{i,T}) \in (\mathbf{P}_1(\cup T_h^\pm), P_1(\cup T_h^\pm))$ by

$$\text{DoF}_{i,T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i,T}, \vartheta_{i,T}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{S}_{j,T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i,T}, \vartheta_{i,T}) = \delta_{ij} \quad \text{for all } i, j = 1, \dots, (N+1)^2,$$

and recalling (3.9), we have the following interpolation error decomposition:

$$(\Pi_h^{BK}(\mathbf{u}, p) - \Pi_h^{\Gamma, J}(\mathbf{u}, p))|_T = \sum_i \alpha_{i,T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i,T}, \vartheta_{i,T}), \quad \alpha_{i,T} := \mathfrak{S}_{i,T}(\Pi_h^{BK}(\mathbf{u}, p) - \Pi_h^{\Gamma, J}(\mathbf{u}, p)). \quad (3.15)$$

Next, we estimate the constants $\alpha_{i,T}$ and the auxiliary functions $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i,T}, \vartheta_{i,T})$.

Lemma 3.1. *The auxiliary functions $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i,T}, \vartheta_{i,T})$ exist uniquely and satisfy for $m = 0, 1$, that*

$$\begin{aligned} |\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i,T}^\pm|_{W_\infty^m(T)} & \begin{cases} \leq Ch_T^{-m}, & i = 1, \dots, N, \\ \leq Ch_T^{1-m}, & i = N+1, \dots, N^2+N+1, \\ = 0, & i = N^2+N+2, \dots, (N+1)^2, \end{cases} \\ \|\vartheta_{i,T}^\pm\|_{L^\infty(T)} & \begin{cases} \leq Ch_T^{-1}, & i = 1, \dots, N, \\ \leq C, & i = N+1, \dots, N^2+N+1, \\ \leq Ch_T, & i = N^2+N+2, \dots, (N+1)^2. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is in the same spirit as Lemma 2.5. Define $(\mathbf{v}_i, q_i) \in (\mathbf{P}_1(\cup T_h^\pm), P_1(\cup T_h^\pm))$ having the same interface jump conditions as $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i,T}, \vartheta_{i,T})$ by setting

$$(\mathbf{v}_i^-, q_i^-) = (\mathbf{0}, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{S}_{j,T}(\mathbf{v}_i, q_i) = \delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, (N+1)^2. \quad (3.16)$$

Then the auxiliary function can be constructed as

$$(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i,T}, \vartheta_{i,T}) = (\mathbf{v}_i, q_i) - (I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_i, I_{h,T} q_i) = (\mathbf{v}_i, q_i) - \sum_j \text{DoF}_{j,T}(\mathbf{v}_i, q_i)(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{j,T}^\Gamma, \varphi_{j,T}^\Gamma). \quad (3.17)$$

Similarly to (2.20), using the $\mathbf{t}_{i,h}$ - \mathbf{n}_h coordinate system one can deduce from (3.16) and (3.14) that the functions (\mathbf{v}_i^+, q_i^+) exist uniquely and satisfy for all $l, m = 1, \dots, N$, that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{v}_i^+(\mathbf{x}_T^P)| &= 1, \quad |\partial_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_{m,h}}(\mathbf{v}_i^+ \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{l,h})| = 0, \quad q_i^+ = 0, & i = 1, \dots, N, \\ |\mathbf{v}_i^+(\mathbf{x}_T^P)| &= 0, \quad |\partial_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_{m,h}}(\mathbf{v}_i^+ \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{l,h})| = 0, 1, \text{ or } (\mu^+)^{-1}, \quad |q_i^+| = 0, 1, \text{ or } 2\mu^+, & i = N+1, \dots, N^2+N+1, \\ \mathbf{v}_i^+ &= \mathbf{0}, \quad q_i^+(\mathbf{x}_T^*) = 0, \quad |\partial_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_{m,h}} q_i^+| = 0 \text{ or } 1, & i = N^2+N+2, \dots, (N+1)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows from the above identities, (3.17), (2.4) and Lemma 2.8. \square

Lemma 3.2. Let $\alpha_{i,T}$ be defined in (3.15) and assume $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{H}^2 H^1}(\mathbf{g})$, then there holds

$$\alpha_{i,T}^2 \leq Ch_T^{4-N} \sum_{s=\pm} \sum_{m=1,2} |\mathbf{u}_E^s|_{H^m(T)}^2, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (3.18a)$$

$$\alpha_{i,T}^2 \leq Ch_T^{2-N} \sum_{s=\pm} \sum_{m=1,2} |\mathbf{u}_E^s|_{H^m(R_T)}^2, \quad i = N+1, \dots, N^2, \quad (3.18b)$$

$$\alpha_{i,T}^2 \leq Ch_T^{2-N} \sum_{s=\pm} \sum_{m=1,2} (|\mathbf{u}_E^s|_{H^m(R_T)}^2 + |p_E^s|_{H^{m-1}(\omega_T \cup R_T)}^2), \quad i = N^2+1, \dots, N^2+N, \quad (3.18c)$$

$$\alpha_{i,T}^2 \leq Ch_T^{2-N} \sum_{s=\pm} |\mathbf{u}_E^s|_{H^2(R_T)}^2, \quad i = N^2+N+1, \quad (3.18d)$$

$$\alpha_{i,T}^2 \leq Ch_T^{-N} \sum_{s=\pm} |p_E^s|_{H^1(\omega_T)}^2, \quad i = N^2+N+2, \dots, (N+1)^2. \quad (3.18e)$$

Proof. It follows from (2.3) and (3.14) that $\mathfrak{S}_{i,T}(\Pi_h^\Gamma(\mathbf{u}, p)) = 0$. With this identity and (3.8), the constants $\alpha_{i,T}$ in (3.15) becomes $\alpha_{i,T} = \mathfrak{S}_{i,T}(\Pi_h^{BK}(\mathbf{u}, p)) - \mathfrak{S}_{i,T}(\mathbf{u}_h^J, p_h^J)$. Recalling the definition of (\mathbf{u}_h^J, p_h^J) in subsection 2.4, we further have

$$\alpha_{i,T} = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{S}_{i,T}(\Pi_h^{BK}(\mathbf{u}, p)) - \text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}([\sigma(\mu^\pm, \mathbf{u}_E^\pm, p_E^\pm)\mathbf{n}]) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i,h}, & i = N^2+1, \dots, N^2+N, \\ \mathfrak{S}_{i,T}(\Pi_h^{BK}(\mathbf{u}, p)), & \text{Others.} \end{cases} \quad (3.19)$$

For $i = 1, \dots, N$, by (3.14a), (2.4), (3.5) and the fact $[\mathbf{u}_E^\pm](\mathbf{x}_T^S) = \mathbf{0}$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha_{i,T}| &\leq |[I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm](\mathbf{x}_T^P)| \leq |[I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm](\mathbf{x}_T^S)| + |[\nabla I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm]|\ |\mathbf{x}_T^S - \mathbf{x}_T^P| \\ &\leq |[I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm](\mathbf{x}_T^S)| + Ch_T^2 |[\nabla I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm]| \\ &\leq |[I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm - \mathbf{u}_E^\pm](\mathbf{x}_T^S)| + Ch_T^{2-N/2} |([I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm] - [\mathbf{u}_E^\pm])|_{H^1(T)} \\ &\leq Ch_T^{2-N/2} \sum_{s=\pm} |\mathbf{u}_E^s|_{H^2(T)} + Ch_T^{2-N/2} \sum_{s=\pm} |\mathbf{u}_E^s|_{H^1(T)}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired result (3.18a).

In what follows, we use polynomial extensions of $I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm$ and $\tilde{I}_{h,T}p_E^\pm$, also denoted by $I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm$ and $\tilde{I}_{h,T}p_E^\pm$, to carry out the analysis. In other words, $I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm$ and $\tilde{I}_{h,T}p_E^\pm$ are polynomials defined on \mathbb{R}^N and have the same expressions as $I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm$ and $\tilde{I}_{h,T}p_E^\pm$ on T . We can prove the following estimates (see Appendix A.1):

$$|v - \tilde{I}_{h,T}v|_{H^m(R_T)} \leq Ch_T^{l-m} |v|_{H^l(\omega_T \cup R_T)}, \quad 0 \leq m \leq l \leq 2, \quad (3.20)$$

$$|v - I_{h,T}v|_{H^m(R_T)} \leq Ch_T^{2-m} |v|_{H^2(R_T)}, \quad m = 0, 1. \quad (3.21)$$

For $i = N+1, \dots, N^2$, by (3.19) and (3.14b), we have

$$|\alpha_{i,T}| \leq \max_{k=1, \dots, N-1} \|[\nabla(I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm)\boldsymbol{\nu}_k]\| \leq \|[\nabla_{\Gamma_{h,T}^{ext}}(I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm)]\| \leq Ch_T^{-\frac{N-1}{2}} \|[\nabla_{\Gamma_{h,T}^{ext}}(I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm)]\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{R_T})}.$$

Using the triangle inequality, the fact $[\nabla_{\Gamma} \mathbf{u}_E^\pm]_{\Gamma} = \mathbf{0}$ and the estimate (3.4), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\nabla_{\Gamma_{h,T}^{ext}}(I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm)]\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{R_T})} &\leq \|[\nabla_{\Gamma_{h,T}^{ext}}(I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm - \mathbf{u}_E^\pm)]\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{R_T})} + \|[(\nabla_{\Gamma_{h,T}^{ext}} - \nabla_{\Gamma})\mathbf{u}_E^\pm]\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{R_T})} \\ &\leq \|[\nabla(I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm - \mathbf{u}_E^\pm)]\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{R_T})} + C \sum_{s=\pm} \sum_{l=1,2} h_T^{l-1/2} |\mathbf{u}_E^s|_{H^l(R_T)}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (2.6) and (3.21) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\nabla(I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm - \mathbf{u}_E^\pm)]\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{R_T})} &\leq C(h_T^{-1/2} \|[\nabla(I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm - \mathbf{u}_E^\pm)]\|_{L^2(R_T)} + h_T^{1/2} \|[\nabla \mathbf{u}_E^\pm]\|_{H^1(R_T)}) \\ &\leq Ch_T^{1/2} \sum_{s=\pm} |\mathbf{u}_E^s|_{H^2(R_T)}. \end{aligned}$$

Collecting the above three estimates yields the desired result (3.18b).

Next, we consider $i = N^2+1, \dots, N^2+N$. For simplicity of notation, we let $\sigma_I^\pm := \sigma(\mu^\pm, I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm, \tilde{I}_{h,T}p_E^\pm)$, $\sigma^\pm := \sigma(\mu^\pm, \mathbf{u}_E^\pm, p_E^\pm)$ and $\mathbf{n}_{h,T} := \mathbf{n}_h(\mathbf{x}_T^*)$. By (3.19) and (3.14c), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha_{i,T}| &\leq |[\sigma_I^\pm \mathbf{n}_h](\mathbf{x}_T^*) - \text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}([\sigma^\pm \mathbf{n}])| \\ &\leq |[\sigma_I^\pm \mathbf{n}_h](\mathbf{x}_T^*) - \text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}([\sigma_I^\pm \mathbf{n}_{h,T}])| + |\text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}([\sigma_I^\pm \mathbf{n}_{h,T} - \sigma^\pm \mathbf{n}])|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Since $I_{h,T}\mathbf{u}_E^\pm$ and $\tilde{I}_{h,T}p_E^\pm$ are linear, the first term on the right-hand side can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} |[\sigma_I^\pm \mathbf{n}_h](\mathbf{x}_T^*) - \text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}([\sigma_I^\pm \mathbf{n}_{h,T}])| &= |\text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}([\nabla(\tilde{I}_{h,T}p_E^\pm) \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_T^*)])| \\ &\leq Ch_T |\nabla \tilde{I}_{h,T}p_E^\pm| \leq Ch_T^{1-N/2} \sum_{s=\pm} |\tilde{I}_{h,T}p_E^s|_{H^1(T)} \leq Ch_T^{1-N/2} \sum_{s=\pm} |p_E^s|_{H^1(\omega_T)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

For the second term on the right-hand side of (3.22), we use (2.7) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}([\sigma_I^\pm \mathbf{n}_{h,T} - \sigma^\pm \mathbf{n}])| &\leq Ch_T^{-N/2} \sum_{l=0,1} h_T^l |[\sigma_I^\pm \mathbf{n}_{h,T} - \sigma^\pm \mathbf{n}]|_{H^l(R_T)} \\ &\leq Ch_T^{-N/2} \sum_{l=0,1} h_T^l |[(\sigma_I^\pm - \sigma^\pm) \mathbf{n}_{h,T} + \sigma^\pm (\mathbf{n}_{h,T} - \mathbf{n})]|_{H^l(R_T)} \\ &\leq Ch_T^{-N/2} \sum_{s=\pm} \sum_{l=0,1} h_T^l (|\sigma_I^s - \sigma^s|_{H^l(R_T)} + \|\mathbf{n}_h(\mathbf{x}_T^*) - \mathbf{n}\|_{L^\infty(R_T)} |\sigma^s|_{H^l(R_T)}). \end{aligned}$$

By (3.3), (3.20) and (3.21), we have

$$|\text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}([\sigma_I^\pm \mathbf{n}_{h,T} - \sigma^\pm \mathbf{n}])| \leq Ch_T^{1-N/2} \sum_{s=\pm} \sum_{m=1,2} (|\mathbf{u}_E^s|_{H^m(R_T)} + |p_E^s|_{H^{m-1}(\omega_T \cup R_T)}). \quad (3.24)$$

Substituting (3.23) and (3.24) into (3.22) yields the desired result (3.18c). The proof of (3.18d) and (3.18e) is analogous. The details are omitted for brevity. \square

3.2 Interpolation error estimates

With the help of (3.15) and Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, we can prove the following interpolation error estimates on interface elements.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in \widetilde{H^2 H^1}(\mathbf{g})$, then there holds for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$ that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}_E^\pm - (\Pi_{\mathbf{u}}^{\Gamma, J} \mathbf{u})^\pm\|_{H^m(T)}^2 &\leq Ch_T^{4-2m} \mathcal{L}_T(\mathbf{u}, p), \quad m = 0, 1, \\ \|p_E^\pm - (\Pi_{\mathbf{u}, p}^{\Gamma, J} p)^\pm\|_{L^2(T)}^2 &\leq Ch_T^2 \mathcal{L}_T(\mathbf{u}, p), \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_T(\mathbf{u}, p) := \sum_{s=\pm} (\|\mathbf{u}_E^s\|_{H^2(R_T)}^2 + \|p_E^s\|_{H^1(\omega_T \cup R_T)}^2)$.

Proof. We use (3.15) and Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 to get

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_h \mathbf{u}_E^\pm - (\Pi_{\mathbf{u}}^{\Gamma, J} \mathbf{u})^\pm\|_{H^m(T)}^2 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N C \alpha_{i,T}^2 h_T^{N-2m} + \sum_{i=N+1}^{N^2+N+1} C \alpha_{i,T}^2 h_T^{N+2-2m} \leq Ch_T^{4-2m} \mathcal{L}_T(\mathbf{u}, p), \\ \|\tilde{I}_h p_E^\pm - (\Pi_{\mathbf{u}, p}^{\Gamma, J} p)^\pm\|_{L^2(T)}^2 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N C \alpha_{i,T}^2 h_T^{N-2} + \sum_{i=N+1}^{N^2+N+1} C \alpha_{i,T}^2 h_T^N + \sum_{i=N^2+N+2}^{(N+1)^2} C \alpha_{i,T}^2 h_T^{N+2} \\ &\leq Ch_T^2 \mathcal{L}_T(\mathbf{u}, p). \end{aligned}$$

The result (3.25) follows from (3.12), the triangle inequality, the above inequalities and (3.5). \square

Taking into account the mismatch of Γ and Γ_h , we prove in the following theorem that the IFE space has optimal approximation capabilities.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{H}^2 H^1}(\mathbf{g})$, then there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} |\mathbf{u} - \Pi_{\mathbf{u}}^{\Gamma, J} \mathbf{u}|_{H^m(T)}^2 &\leq Ch^{4-2m} (\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm)}^2 + \|p\|_{H^1(\cup \Omega^\pm)}^2), \quad m = 0, 1, \\ \|p - \Pi_{\mathbf{u}, p}^{\Gamma, J} p\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq Ch^2 (\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm)}^2 + \|p\|_{H^1(\cup \Omega^\pm)}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

Proof. In view of (3.10), (3.11) and Lemma 3.3, it suffices to consider the first term on the right-hand of (3.10). Recalling $\Omega^\Delta = (\Omega_h^+ \setminus \Omega^+) \cup (\Omega_h^- \setminus \Omega^-)$, it is clear that

$$|\mathbf{u} - E_h^{BK} \mathbf{u}|_{H^m(\Omega)} = \|[\![\mathbf{u}_E^\pm]\!] \|_{H^m(\Omega^\Delta)}, \quad \|p - E_h^{BK} p\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \|[\![p^\pm]\!] \|_{L^2(\Omega^\Delta)},$$

By (2.1), we have $\text{dist}(\Gamma, \Gamma_h) \leq Ch^2$, which implies $\Omega^\Delta \subset U(\Gamma, Ch^2)$. Therefore, using Lemma 2.1 with $\delta = Ch^2$ and the fact $[\![\mathbf{u}_E^\pm]\!]_\Gamma = \mathbf{0}$ and the extension stability (3.2) we get

$$|\mathbf{u} - E_h^{BK} \mathbf{u}|_{H^m(\Omega)} \leq Ch^{2-m} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm)}, \quad \|p - E_h^{BK} p\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ch \|p\|_{H^1(\cup \Omega^\pm)}. \quad (3.27)$$

The desired result (3.26) follows from (3.27), (3.10), (3.11), Lemma 3.3, the standard estimates (3.5) on non-interface elements, finite overlapping of the sets R_T and ω_T , and the extension stability (3.2). \square

We also have the optimal interpolation error estimates under the H^1 -regularity.

Lemma 3.5. *For each $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$, there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$|\mathbf{v} - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}}^\Gamma \mathbf{v}|_{H^m(T)} \leq Ch_T^{1-m} |\mathbf{v}|_{H^1(\omega_T)}, \quad m = 0, 1, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega)^N. \quad (3.28)$$

Proof. By (3.7), we have $I_h(\widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}}^\Gamma \mathbf{v}) = \widetilde{I}_h \mathbf{v}$. Then, using Lemma 2.6, we have

$$(\widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}}^\Gamma \mathbf{v})|_T = \widetilde{I}_{h,T} \mathbf{v} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} c_i (w_T - I_{h,T} w_T) \mathbf{t}_{i,h} \quad \text{with} \quad c_i = \frac{\mathbf{t}_{i,h}^T \sigma(\mu^- / \mu^+ - 1, \widetilde{I}_{h,T} \mathbf{v}, 0) \mathbf{n}_h}{1 + (\mu^- / \mu^+ - 1) \nabla I_{h,T} w_T \cdot \mathbf{n}_h}.$$

From (2.22) and (2.16), it is easy to see $|c_i| \leq C |\nabla \widetilde{I}_{h,T} \mathbf{v}|$ and $|w_T - I_{h,T} w_T|_{W_\infty^m(T)} \leq Ch_T^{1-m}$. Then we have

$$|\widetilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}}^\Gamma \mathbf{v} - \widetilde{I}_{h,T} \mathbf{v}|_{H^m(T)} \leq Ch_T^{1-m} |\widetilde{I}_{h,T} \mathbf{v}|_{H^1(T)} \leq Ch_T^{1-m} |\mathbf{v}|_{H^1(\omega_T)},$$

where we used (3.5) in the last inequality. The lemma now follows from the triangle inequality and (3.5). \square

4 Analysis of the IFE method

For all $(\mathbf{v}, q) \in (\mathbf{V}, Q) + \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_{h,0}(\Omega)$, we define some norms by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{1,h}^2 &:= \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} |\mathbf{v}|_{H^1(T)}^2, \quad \|q\|_{*,pre}^2 := \|q\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma} h_F \|\{q\}_F\|_{L^2(F)}^2, \\ \|\mathbf{v}\|_{*,h}^2 &:= \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\sqrt{2\mu_h} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(T)}^2 + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma} (h_F \|\{2\mu_h \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{n}_F\}_F\|_{L^2(F)}^2 + \frac{2+\eta}{h_F} \|[\![\mathbf{v}]\!]_F\|_{L^2(F)}^2), \\ \|(\mathbf{v}, q)\|^2 &:= \|\mathbf{v}\|_{1,h}^2 + \|q\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad \|(\mathbf{v}, q)\|_*^2 := \|\mathbf{v}\|_{*,h}^2 + \|q\|_{*,pre}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the Korn inequality for piecewise H^1 vector functions (see [4]), we immediately have

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{1,h} \leq C \|\mathbf{v}\|_{*,h} \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}, q) \in (\mathbf{V}, Q) + \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_{h,0}(\Omega). \quad (4.1)$$

4.1 Norm-equivalence for IFE functions

We first collect some useful inequalities for the coupled IFE functions. For all $(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_h(\Omega)$, we have the decomposition $\mathbf{v}_h = \mathbf{v}_L + \mathbf{v}_b$ with $(\mathbf{v}_L, q_h)|_T \in \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_1\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}_1(T)$ and $\mathbf{v}_b|_T \in \text{span}\{b_T\}^N$. Define $I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h = I_h \mathbf{v}_L + \mathbf{v}_b$ and let \mathcal{T}_h^F be the set of all elements in \mathcal{T}_h sharing the face F . We have the following lemma whose proof is given in Appendix A.2.

Lemma 4.1. *For any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma$, the following inequalities hold for all $(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_h(\Omega)$:*

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(\partial T)} \leq Ch_T^{-1/2} |\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}, \quad (4.2)$$

$$|\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)} \leq Ch_T^{-1} |\mathbf{v}_h|_{L^2(T)}, \quad (4.3)$$

$$|I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)} \leq C |\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}, \quad (4.4)$$

$$h_T^{1/2} \|\mathbf{v}_h - I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{h,T})} + h_T^m |\mathbf{v}_h - I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h|_{H^m(T)} \leq Ch_T |\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}, \quad m = 0, 1, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\| [q_h^\pm] \|_{L^2(\Gamma_{h,T})} \leq Ch_T^{-1/2} |\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}, \quad (4.6)$$

$$\|q_h\|_{L^2(\partial T)} \leq Ch_T^{-1/2} (\|q_h\|_{L^2(T)} + |\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}), \quad (4.7)$$

$$h_F \| [q_h]_F \|_{L^2(F)}^2 + h_F^{-1} \| [\mathbf{v}_h]_F \|_{L^2(F)}^2 \leq C \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^F} |\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}^2. \quad (4.8)$$

Using (4.1), (4.2), (4.7) and (4.8) we obtain the following norm-equivalence property.

Lemma 4.2. *There exist constants C_0 and C_1 such that for all $(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_{h,0}(\Omega)$,*

$$C_1 \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{1,h} \leq \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{*,h} \leq C_0 \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{1,h} \quad \text{and} \quad C_1 \| \|(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)\| \| \leq \| \|(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)\| \|_* \leq C_0 \| \|(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)\| \| . \quad (4.9)$$

4.2 Boundedness and coercivity

It follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that there exist constants C_b and C_A such that for all $(\mathbf{v}, q), (\mathbf{w}, r) \in (\mathbf{V}, Q) + \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_h(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} a_h(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) &\leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_{*,h} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{*,h}, \quad b_h(\mathbf{v}, q) \leq C_b \|\mathbf{v}\|_{1,h} \|q\|_{*,pre}, \\ \mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{v}, q; \mathbf{w}, r) &\leq C_A \| \|(\mathbf{v}, q)\| \|_* \| \|(\mathbf{w}, r)\| \|_* , \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

With the help of (4.1) and (4.2), we can prove the following coercivity of the bilinear form $a_h(\cdot, \cdot)$. The proof is similar to the discontinuous Galerkin method (see, e.g., [11]) and so is omitted.

Lemma 4.3. *There exists a positive constant C_a such that*

$$a_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \geq C_a \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{1,h}^2 \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_{h,0}(\Omega) \quad (4.11)$$

is true for $\gamma = -1$ with an arbitrary $\eta \geq 0$ and is true for $\gamma = 1$ with a sufficiently large η .

4.3 Inf-sup stability

We first show the inf-sup stability of $b_h(\cdot, \cdot)$ in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *There exists a positive constant C_2 such that for all $(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_{h,0}(\Omega)$,*

$$C_2 \|q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \sup_{(\mathbf{v}'_h, q'_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_{h,0}(\Omega)} \frac{b_h(\mathbf{v}'_h, q_h)}{\|\mathbf{v}'_h\|_{1,h}} + \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{1,h}. \quad (4.12)$$

Proof. Since $q_h \in Q$, there is a function $\mathbf{v}' \in \mathbf{V}$ satisfying (see [11, Theorem 6.5])

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}' = q_h \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{v}'\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \quad (4.13)$$

Integration by parts gives

$$\|q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = \int_{\Omega} q_h \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}' = - \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_T \nabla q_h \cdot \mathbf{v}' + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma} \int_F [q_h]_F \mathbf{n}_F \cdot \mathbf{v}' - \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma} \int_{\Gamma_{h,T}} \llbracket q_h^\pm \rrbracket \mathbf{v}' \cdot \mathbf{n}_h. \quad (4.14)$$

Define an operator π_h by

$$(\pi_h \mathbf{w})|_T \in \text{span}\{b_T\}^N, \quad \int_T (\mathbf{w} - \pi_h \mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{0} \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h \quad \forall \mathbf{w} \in L^2(\Omega)^N. \quad (4.15)$$

Let $I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}' = \tilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}'}^\Gamma \mathbf{v}' + \pi_h(\mathbf{v}' - \tilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}'}^\Gamma \mathbf{v}')$. From (3.7) and the property of Scott-Zhang interpolation, we have $(I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}')|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{0}$. By (2.23), we know there exists at least one function q'_I such that $(I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}', q'_I) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_{h,0}(\Omega)$. Integration by parts again yields

$$\begin{aligned} -b_h(I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}', q_h) &= \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_T q_h \nabla \cdot I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}' - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma} \int_F \{q_h\}_F [I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}']_F \cdot \mathbf{n}_F \\ &= - \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_T \nabla q_h \cdot I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}' + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma} \int_F [q_h]_F \mathbf{n}_F \cdot \{I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}'\}_F - \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma} \int_{\Gamma_{h,T}} \llbracket q_h^\pm \rrbracket I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}' \cdot \mathbf{n}_h, \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

where we used $[I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}']_F = \mathbf{0}$, $[q_h]_F = 0 \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{F}_h^{non}$ and $[I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}']_{\Gamma_{h,T}} = \mathbf{0} \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$. Combining (4.14) and (4.16) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &= -b_h(I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}', q_h) - \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_T \nabla q_h \cdot (\mathbf{v}' - I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}') + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma} \int_F [q_h]_F \{\mathbf{v}' - I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}'\}_F \cdot \mathbf{n}_F \\ &\quad - \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma} \int_{\Gamma_{h,T}} \llbracket q_h^\pm \rrbracket (\mathbf{v}' - I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}') \cdot \mathbf{n}_h := (\text{II})_1 + (\text{II})_2 + (\text{II})_3 + (\text{II})_4. \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

By the definition of I_h^{new} , we have the relation

$$\mathbf{v}' - I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}' = (\mathbf{v}' - \tilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}'}^\Gamma \mathbf{v}') - \pi_h(\mathbf{v}' - \tilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}'}^\Gamma \mathbf{v}'). \quad (4.18)$$

We then use (4.15) to get $(\text{II})_2 = 0$ since $(\nabla q_h)|_T \in P_0(T)^N$ from (2.3d). To estimate other terms, we first use (4.18) to deduce that, for $m = 0, 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{v}' - I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}'|_{H^m(T)} &\leq |(\mathbf{v}' - \tilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}'}^\Gamma \mathbf{v}')|_{H^m(T)} + |\pi_h(\mathbf{v}' - \tilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}'}^\Gamma \mathbf{v}')|_{H^m(T)} \\ &\leq |(\mathbf{v}' - \tilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}'}^\Gamma \mathbf{v}')|_{H^m(T)} + Ch_T^{-m} \|\pi_h(\mathbf{v}' - \tilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}'}^\Gamma \mathbf{v}')\|_{L^2(T)} \\ &\leq |(\mathbf{v}' - \tilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}'}^\Gamma \mathbf{v}')|_{H^m(T)} + Ch_T^{-m} \|\mathbf{v}' - \tilde{\Pi}_{\mathbf{v}'}^\Gamma \mathbf{v}'\|_{L^2(T)} \leq Ch^{1-m} |\mathbf{v}'|_{H^1(\omega_T)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

where we used the inverse inequality in the second inequality, the property $\|\pi_h \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(T)} \leq C \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2(T)}$ for all $\mathbf{w} \in L^2(T)$ in the third inequality, and Lemma 3.5 in the last inequality. By the triangle inequality, (4.19) also implies the stability of I_h^{new} : $\|I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}'\|_{1,h} \leq \|\mathbf{v}' - I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}'\|_{1,h} + |\mathbf{v}'|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C |\mathbf{v}'|_{H^1(\Omega)}$. Therefore,

$$|(\text{II})_1| \leq C \frac{|b_h(I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}', q_h)|}{\|I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}'\|_{1,h}} |\mathbf{v}'|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\sup_{(\mathbf{v}'_h, q'_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_{h,0}(\Omega)} \frac{b_h(\mathbf{v}'_h, q_h)}{\|\mathbf{v}'_h\|_{1,h}} \right) |\mathbf{v}'|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \quad (4.20)$$

As for Term (II)₃, we use (4.8), the standard trace inequality and (4.19) to get

$$\begin{aligned} |(\text{II})_3|^2 &\leq \left(\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma} h_F \| [q_h]_F \|_{L^2(F)}^2 \right) \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma} h_F^{-1} \| \{ \mathbf{v}' - I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}' \}_F \|_{L^2(F)}^2 \\ &\leq C \| \mathbf{v}_h \|_{1,h}^2 \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma} (h_T^{-2} \| \mathbf{v}' - I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}' \|_{L^2(T)}^2 + | \mathbf{v}' - I_h^{new} \mathbf{v}' |_{H^1(T)}^2) \leq C \| \mathbf{v}_h \|_{1,h}^2 | \mathbf{v}' |_{H^1(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

For Term (II)₄, similarly to (4.21), we use (4.6) and the trace inequality (2.6) with Γ_{R_T} and R_T replaced by $\Gamma_{h,T}$ and T (see [18, Lemma 1]) to obtain $|(\text{II})_4| \leq C \| \mathbf{v}_h \|_{1,h} | \mathbf{v}' |_{H^1(\Omega)}$. Substituting the above estimates of (II)₁–(II)₄ into (4.17) and using (4.13) completes the proof. \square

We are ready to prove the following inf-sup stability of the \mathcal{A}_h form.

Theorem 4.5. *There exists a positive constant C_s such that*

$$C_s \|\!| (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \|\!| \leq \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_h, r_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\widetilde{Q}_{h,0}(\Omega)} \frac{\mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h; \mathbf{w}_h, r_h)}{\|\!| (\mathbf{w}_h, r_h) \|\!|} \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\widetilde{Q}_{h,0}(\Omega). \quad (4.22)$$

Proof. Since $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\widetilde{Q}_{h,0}(\Omega)$ is a finite-dimensional space, we assume that the supremum in (4.12) is achieved at $(\mathbf{v}_h^*, q_h^*) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\widetilde{Q}_{h,0}(\Omega)$ with $\| \mathbf{v}_h^* \|_{1,h} = \| q_h \|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Then (4.12) becomes

$$C_2 \| q_h \|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq b_h(\mathbf{v}_h^*, q_h) + \| \mathbf{v}_h \|_{1,h} \| q_h \|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \quad (4.23)$$

We note that q_h^* depends on \mathbf{v}_h^* and is not unique. Next, we describe how to choose q_h^* . We first construct a function q such that $(\mathbf{v}_h^*, q) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\widetilde{Q}_h(\Omega)$ and $I_h q = 0$, and then set $q_h^* = q - \int_\Omega q$ so that $q_h^* \in L_0^2(\Omega)$. It is clear that $q|_T = 0$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^{non}$. And, on each interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$, by (2.23) it holds $q|_T = c_N (z_T - I_{h,T} z_T)$ with $c_N = \mathbf{n}_h^T \sigma(\mu^- - \mu^+, I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h^*, 0) \mathbf{n}_h$. Using (2.16) and (4.4) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\Gamma} h_F \| q \|_{L^2(F)}^2 &\leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma} C h_T^N | \nabla I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h^* |^2 \leq C | I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h^* |_{H^1(T)}^2 \leq C \| \mathbf{v}_h^* \|_{1,h}^2, \\ \left| \int_\Omega q \right|^2 &\leq C \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma} \| q \|_{L^2(T)}^2 \leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma} C h_T^N | \nabla I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h^* |^2 \leq C \| \mathbf{v}_h^* \|_{1,h}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We then using the relation $q_h^* = q - \int_\Omega q$ to conclude that there exists a constant C_3 such that

$$\| q_h^* \|_{*,pre} \leq C_3 \| \mathbf{v}_h^* \|_{1,h}. \quad (4.24)$$

By (2.9), (4.10), (4.9), (4.24) and the fact $\| \mathbf{v}_h^* \|_{1,h} = \| q_h \|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, inequality (4.23) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 \| q_h \|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq \mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h; \mathbf{v}_h^*, q_h^*) - a_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{v}_h^*) + b_h(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h^*) + \| \mathbf{v}_h \|_{1,h} \| q_h \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h; \mathbf{v}_h^*, q_h^*) + (C_0^2 + C_3 C_b + 1) \| \mathbf{v}_h \|_{1,h} \| q_h \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h; \mathbf{v}_h^*, q_h^*) + \frac{(C_0^2 + C_3 C_b + 1)^2}{2C_2} \| \mathbf{v}_h \|_{1,h}^2 + \frac{C_2}{2} \| q_h \|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with $C_a \| \mathbf{v}_h \|_{1,h}^2 \leq \mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h; \mathbf{v}_h, q_h)$, we get

$$C_4 \|\!| (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \|\!|^2 \leq \mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h; \mathbf{v}_h + \theta \mathbf{v}_h^*, q_h + \theta q_h^*), \quad (4.25)$$

for a suitable $\theta > 0$ and a constant $C_4 > 0$ depending only on $\theta, C_0, C_2, C_3, C_a$ and C_b . The desired result (4.22) then follows from $(\mathbf{v}_h + \theta \mathbf{v}_h^*, q_h + \theta q_h^*) = (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) + \theta (\mathbf{v}_h^*, q_h^*) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\widetilde{Q}_{h,0}(\Omega)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\!| (\mathbf{v}_h + \theta \mathbf{v}_h^*, q_h + \theta q_h^*) \|\!| &\leq \|\!| (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \|\!| + \theta (\| \mathbf{v}_h^* \|_{1,h} + \| q_h^* \|_{L^2(\Omega)}) \\ &\leq \|\!| (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \|\!| + \theta (1 + C_3) \| \mathbf{v}_h^* \|_{1,h} \leq (1 + \theta + \theta C_3) \|\!| (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \|\!|, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (4.24) and the fact $\| \mathbf{v}_h^* \|_{1,h} = \| q_h \|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ in the derivation. \square

4.4 Consistency

Recalling that \mathbf{u}_E^\pm and p_E^\pm are extensions of \mathbf{u}^\pm and p^\pm , we can extend (1.1a) and (1.1b) from Ω^\pm to Ω as $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_E^\pm := -\nabla \cdot (2\mu^\pm \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{u}_E^\pm)) + \nabla p_E^\pm$ and $\tilde{h}_E^\pm := \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_E^\pm$. Obviously, $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_E^\pm = \mathbf{f}_E^\pm$ and $\tilde{h}_E^\pm = 0$ in Ω^\pm , while $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_E^\pm \neq \mathbf{f}_E^\pm$ and $\tilde{h}_E^\pm \neq 0$ in $\Omega_h^\pm \setminus \Omega^\pm$. For brevity, we let $(\mathbf{u}^{BK}, p^{BK}) := E_h^{BK}(\mathbf{u}, p)$ and define $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}^{BK}$ by $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}^{BK}|_{\Omega_h^\pm} = \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_E^\pm|_{\Omega_h^\pm}$ and \tilde{h}^{BK} by $\tilde{h}^{BK}|_{\Omega_h^\pm} = \tilde{h}_E^\pm|_{\Omega_h^\pm}$. Then it holds on the whole domain Ω that

$$-\nabla \cdot (2\mu_h \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{u}^{BK})) + \nabla p^{BK} = \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^{BK}, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^{BK} = \tilde{h}^{BK},$$

where the gradient and the divergence (also denoted by ∇ and $\nabla \cdot$ for simplicity) are understood in a piecewise sense since \mathbf{u}^{BK} and p^{BK} are broken across Γ_h . For all $(\mathbf{w}_h, r_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q}_{h,0}(\Omega)$, integrating by parts and using the facts $[\mathbf{u}^{BK}]_F = \mathbf{0}$ and $[p^{BK}]_F = 0$, we infer that

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^{BK}, p^{BK}; \mathbf{w}_h, r_h) = \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^{BK} \cdot \mathbf{w}_h + \int_{\Omega} \tilde{h}^{BK} r_h - \int_{\Gamma_h} [[\sigma^\pm \mathbf{n}_h]] \cdot \mathbf{w}_h,$$

where the notation $\sigma^\pm := \sigma(\mu^\pm, \mathbf{u}_E^\pm, p_E^\pm)$ is used for simplicity. Combining this with (2.10) and using the facts $\mathbf{f}^{BK}|_{\Omega \setminus \Omega^\Delta} = \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^{BK}|_{\Omega \setminus \Omega^\Delta}$ and $\tilde{h}^{BK}|_{\Omega \setminus \Omega^\Delta} = 0$ yields

$$\mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^{BK} - \mathbf{U}_h, p^{BK} - P_h; \mathbf{w}_h, r_h) = \underbrace{\int_{\Omega^\Delta} (\tilde{\mathbf{f}}^{BK} - \mathbf{f}^{BK}) \cdot \mathbf{w}_h}_{(\text{III})_1} + \underbrace{\int_{\Omega^\Delta} \tilde{h}^{BK} r_h}_{(\text{III})_2} - \underbrace{\int_{\Gamma_h} ([[\sigma^\pm \mathbf{n}_h]] - \mathbf{g}_h) \cdot \mathbf{w}_h}_{(\text{III})_3}. \quad (4.26)$$

We now estimate the right-hand side of (4.26) term by term.

Term (III)₁. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the triangle inequality we get

$$|(\text{III})_1| \leq (\|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}^{BK}\|_{L^2(\Omega^\Delta)} + \|\mathbf{f}^{BK}\|_{L^2(\Omega^\Delta)}) \|\mathbf{w}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega^\Delta)}.$$

Suppose $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{H}^2 H^1}(\mathbf{g})$, then by the definition of $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_E^s$ and the extension stability (3.2) we have

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}^{BK}\|_{L^2(\Omega^\Delta)} \leq \sum_{s=\pm} \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_E^s\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm)} + \|p\|_{H^1(\cup \Omega^\pm)}).$$

Adding and subtracting $I_h^B \mathbf{w}_h$ which belongs to $H_0^1(\Omega)^N$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{w}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega^\Delta)} &\leq \|I_h^B \mathbf{w}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega^\Delta)} + \|\mathbf{w}_h - I_h^B \mathbf{w}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega^\Delta)} \\ &\leq Ch \|I_h^B \mathbf{w}_h - \mathbf{w}_h + \mathbf{w}_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{w}_h - I_h^B \mathbf{w}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega^\Delta)} \leq Ch \|\mathbf{w}_h\|_{1,h}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we used Lemma 2.1, the fact $\Omega^\Delta \subset U(\Gamma, Ch^2)$ and Poincaré's inequality, and in the last inequality we used the triangle inequality and (4.5). Collecting the above inequalities and the assumption $\|\mathbf{f}^{BK}\|_{L^2(\Omega^\Delta)} \leq C\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ gives the bound

$$|(\text{III})_1| \leq Ch(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm)} + \|p\|_{H^1(\cup \Omega^\pm)}) \|\mathbf{w}_h\|_{1,h}.$$

Term (III)₂. Analogously, we have

$$|(\text{III})_2| \leq \sum_{s=\pm} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_E^\pm\|_{L^2(\Omega^\Delta)} \|r_h\|_{L^2(\Omega^\Delta)} \leq Ch \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm)} \|r_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Term (III)₃. We need the following lemma whose proof is postponed in Appendix A.3.

Lemma 4.6. *For all $v \in H^1(\Omega)$, there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)}^2 \leq C\|v\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + Ch^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad (4.27)$$

$$\|v - v \circ \mathbf{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)}^2 \leq Ch^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (4.28)$$

We observe from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the definition of \mathbf{g}_h that

$$|(\text{III})_3| \leq \| \llbracket \sigma^\pm \mathbf{n}_h \rrbracket - \llbracket \sigma^\pm \mathbf{n} \rrbracket \circ \mathbf{p}_h \|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} \| \mathbf{w}_h \|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)}.$$

Using (2.1), Lemma 4.6, the global trace inequality and (3.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \| \llbracket \sigma^\pm \mathbf{n}_h \rrbracket - \llbracket \sigma^\pm \mathbf{n} \rrbracket \circ \mathbf{p}_h \|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} &\leq \| \llbracket \sigma^\pm (\mathbf{n}_h - \mathbf{n}) \rrbracket \|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} + \| \llbracket \sigma^\pm \mathbf{n} \rrbracket - \llbracket \sigma^\pm \mathbf{n} \rrbracket \circ \mathbf{p}_h \|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} \\ &\leq Ch(\| \mathbf{u} \|_{H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm)} + \| p \|_{H^1(\cup \Omega^\pm)}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the triangle inequality gives $\| \mathbf{w}_h \|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} \leq \| I_h^B \mathbf{w}_h \|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} + \| \mathbf{w}_h - I_h^B \mathbf{w}_h \|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)}$. Since $I_h^B \mathbf{w}_h \in H_0^1(\Omega)^N$, it follows from Lemma 4.6, the global trace inequality, Poincaré's inequality and (4.5) that

$$\| I_h^B \mathbf{w}_h \|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} \leq C \| I_h^B \mathbf{w}_h \|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C |I_h^B \mathbf{w}_h|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \| \mathbf{w}_h \|_{1,h}.$$

By (4.5) again, we have $\| \mathbf{w}_h - I_h^B \mathbf{w}_h \|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} \leq Ch^{1/2} \| \mathbf{w}_h \|_{1,h}$. Thus, $\| \mathbf{w}_h \|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} \leq C \| \mathbf{w}_h \|_{1,h}$. Collecting the above inequalities yields $|(\text{III})_3| \leq Ch(\| \mathbf{u} \|_{H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm)} + \| p \|_{H^1(\cup \Omega^\pm)}) \| \mathbf{w}_h \|_{1,h}$. We now combine the bounds for Terms $(\text{III})_1$ – $(\text{III})_3$ in (4.26) to obtain

$$| \mathcal{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^{BK} - \mathbf{U}_h, p^{BK} - P_h; \mathbf{w}_h, r_h) | \leq Ch(\| \mathbf{u} \|_{H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm)} + \| p \|_{H^1(\cup \Omega^\pm)}) \| |(\mathbf{w}_h, r_h)| |. \quad (4.29)$$

4.5 A priori error estimates

We note that the pressure component of $\Pi_h^\Gamma(\mathbf{u}, p)$ and $\Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p)$ might not belong to $L_0^2(\Omega)$. To overcome this difficulty, we define $\Pi_{h,0}^\Gamma$ and $\Pi_{h,0}^{\Gamma,J}$ by

$$\Pi_{h,0}^\Gamma(\mathbf{u}, p) = \Pi_h^\Gamma(\mathbf{u}, p) - (\mathbf{0}, c_h) \text{ and } \Pi_{h,0}^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p) = \Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p) + (\mathbf{u}_h^J, p_h^J - c_h - c_h^J), \quad (4.30)$$

where $c_h = \int_\Omega \Pi_{\mathbf{u},p}^\Gamma p$ and $c_h^J = \int_\Omega p_h^J$. Recalling Remark 2.7, it is no hard to verify that $\Pi_{h,0}^\Gamma(\mathbf{u}, p) \in \widetilde{VQ}_{h,0}(\Omega)$, which will be useful in the proof of Theorem 4.8 (see (4.34)). Since $p \in L_0^2(\Omega)$, we have

$$|c_h| = \left| \int_\Omega \Pi_{\mathbf{u},p}^\Gamma p + p_h^J - p - p_h^J \right| \leq C \| \Pi_{\mathbf{u},p}^\Gamma p + p_h^J - p \|_{L^2(\Omega)} + |c_h^J|$$

The first term can be bounded by Theorem 3.4. Since $p_h^J = 0$ on all non-interface elements, we use (2.24) and (2.7) to bound the second term

$$\begin{aligned} (c_h^J)^2 &= \left(\int_{U(\Gamma,h)} p_h^J \right)^2 \leq \| p_h^J \|_{L^2(U(\Gamma,h))}^2 |U(\Gamma, h)| \leq Ch \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma} \| p_h^J \|_{L^2(T)}^2 \\ &\leq Ch \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma} h_T^N |\text{avg}_{\Gamma_{R_T}}(\mathbf{g})|^2 \leq Ch \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma} (\| \llbracket \sigma^\pm \mathbf{n} \rrbracket \|_{L^2(R_T)}^2 + h_T^2 \| \llbracket \sigma^\pm \mathbf{n} \rrbracket \|_{H^1(R_T)}^2) \\ &\leq Ch^2 (\| \mathbf{u} \|_{H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm)}^2 + \| p \|_{H^1(\cup \Omega^\pm)}^2), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the finite overlapping of R_T , the fact $\bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma} R_T \subset U(\Gamma, Ch)$, Lemma 2.1 with $\delta = Ch$, and the extension stability (3.2). Collecting the above results yields

$$\| |(\mathbf{0}, c_h)| |_* \leq C |c_h| \leq Ch(\| \mathbf{u} \|_{H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm)} + \| p \|_{H^1(\cup \Omega^\pm)}). \quad (4.31)$$

The following lemma presents an interpolation error estimate in terms of the $\| \cdot \|_*$ -norm.

Lemma 4.7. *Let (\mathbf{u}, p) be the solution of (2.8) and suppose $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in \widetilde{H^2 H^1}(\mathbf{g})$. Then there holds*

$$\| |(\mathbf{u}^{BK}, p^{BK}) - \Pi_{h,0}^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p)| |_* \leq Ch(\| \mathbf{u} \|_{H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm)} + \| p \|_{H^1(\cup \Omega^\pm)}).$$

Proof. It holds $\|(\mathbf{u}^{BK}, p^{BK}) - \Pi_{h,0}^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_* \leq \|(\mathbf{u}^{BK}, p^{BK}) - \Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_* + \|(\mathbf{0}, c_h)\|_*$. In view of (4.31), it suffices to prove

$$\|(\mathbf{u}^{BK}, p^{BK}) - \Pi_h^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_* \leq Ch(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\cup\Omega^\pm)} + \|p\|_{H^1(\cup\Omega^\pm)}). \quad (4.32)$$

First we have $\|\{2\mu_h \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{u}^{BK} - \Pi_{\mathbf{u}}^{\Gamma,J} \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{n}_F\}_F\|_{L^2(F)}^2 \leq \sum_{s=\pm} \|\{2\mu_h \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{u}_E^s - (\Pi_{\mathbf{u}}^{\Gamma,J} \mathbf{u})^s) \mathbf{n}_F\}_F\|_{L^2(F)}^2$. We then use the standard trace inequality and Lemma 3.3 to get

$$\begin{aligned} h_F \|\{2\mu_h \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(\mathbf{u}^{BK} - \Pi_{\mathbf{u}}^{\Gamma,J} \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{n}_F\}_F\|_{L^2(F)}^2 &\leq C \sum_{s=\pm} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^F} \left(|\mathbf{u}_E^s - (\Pi_{\mathbf{u}}^{\Gamma,J} \mathbf{u})^s|_{H^1(T)}^2 + h_T^2 |\mathbf{u}_E^s|_{H^2(T)}^2 \right) \\ &\leq Ch^2 \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^F} \sum_{s=\pm} \left(\|\mathbf{u}_E^s\|_{H^2(R_T)}^2 + \|p_E^s\|_{H^1(\omega_T \cup R_T)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Other terms in the $\|\cdot\|_*$ -norm can be estimated similarly and the details are omitted. The desired result (4.32) then follows from the finite overlapping of the sets $R_T \cup \omega_T$ and the extension stability (3.2). \square

With these preparations, we are now ready to derive the error estimate of the proposed IFE method.

Theorem 4.8. *Let (\mathbf{u}, p) and (\mathbf{U}_h, P_h) be the solutions of (2.8) and (2.10), respectively. Suppose $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{H}^2 H^1}(\mathbf{g})$, then the following error estimate holds true:*

$$\|(\mathbf{u}^{BK}, p^{BK}) - (\mathbf{U}_h, P_h)\|_* \leq Ch(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\cup\Omega^\pm)} + \|p\|_{H^1(\cup\Omega^\pm)}). \quad (4.33)$$

Proof. The triangle inequality gives

$$\|(\mathbf{u}^{BK}, p^{BK}) - (\mathbf{U}_h, P_h)\|_* \leq \|(\mathbf{u}^{BK}, p^{BK}) - \Pi_{h,0}^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_* + \|\Pi_{h,0}^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p) - (\mathbf{U}_h, P_h)\|_*.$$

By definition, it is true that

$$\Pi_{h,0}^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p) - (\mathbf{U}_h, P_h) = \Pi_{h,0}^{\Gamma}(\mathbf{u}, p) - (\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{VQ}}_{h,0}(\Omega). \quad (4.34)$$

Now we can use (4.9) and (4.22) to get

$$\|\Pi_{h,0}^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p) - (\mathbf{U}_h, P_h)\|_* \leq C_0 C_s^{-1} \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_h, r_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{VQ}}_{h,0}(\Omega)} \frac{\mathcal{A}_h(\Pi_{h,0}^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p) - (\mathbf{U}_h, P_h); \mathbf{w}_h, r_h)}{\|(\mathbf{w}_h, r_h)\|}.$$

Adding and subtracting $(\mathbf{u}^{BK}, p^{BK})$ and using (4.29), (4.10) and (4.9), we deduce that

$$\|\Pi_{h,0}^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p) - (\mathbf{U}_h, P_h)\|_* \leq Ch(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\cup\Omega^\pm)} + \|p\|_{H^1(\cup\Omega^\pm)}) + C \|(\mathbf{u}^{BK}, p^{BK}) - \Pi_{h,0}^{\Gamma,J}(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_*$$

The desired result (4.33) now follows from the above inequalities and Lemma 4.7. \square

Remark 4.9. *Using (3.27) and (4.33), we can establish the following error estimate:*

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{U}_h\|_{1,h} + \|p - P_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ch(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^2(\cup\Omega^\pm)} + \|p\|_{H^1(\cup\Omega^\pm)}).$$

4.6 Condition number analysis

In this subsection we show that the condition number of the stiffness matrix of our IFE method has the same bound as that of conventional mini element methods with the hidden constant independent

of the interface. We assume the family of triangulations is also quasi-uniform. Define $\|(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)\|_0^2 = \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$ for all $(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q_{0,h}(\Omega)}$. By (4.3), we have the inverse estimate

$$\|(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)\| \leq Ch^{-1} \|(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)\|_0 \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q_{0,h}(\Omega)}. \quad (4.35)$$

Using (4.8) and the Poincaré-Friedrichs inequalities for broken functions (see [5, Chapter 10.6]), we have the following Poincaré type inequality:

$$\|(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)\|_0 \leq C \|(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)\| \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q_{0,h}(\Omega)}. \quad (4.36)$$

By Lemma 2.6 and (A.4), we have on each $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$ that

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h - I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(T)}^2 + \|q_h - I_h q_h\|_{L^2(T)}^2 \leq Ch_T^2 |I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}^2 \leq \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(T)}^2. \quad (4.37)$$

Similarly to the second inequality in (A.3), it holds $|I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}^2 \leq |I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}^2$. Therefore, we have

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h - I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(T)}^2 + \|q_h - I_h q_h\|_{L^2(T)}^2 \leq Ch_T^2 |I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}^2 \leq C \|I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(T)}^2, \quad (4.38)$$

where we used the standard inverse inequality in the last inequality. Using (4.37) and (4.38) we obtain

$$c \|(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)\|_0 \leq \| (I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h, I_h q_h) \|_0 \leq C \|(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)\|_0, \quad (4.39)$$

where C and c are positive constants independent of h and the interface. Let X be the vector such that $(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) = \sum_i X(i) \Psi_i$ with $\{\Psi_i\}$ being the standard finite element basis in $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}Q_{0,h}(\Omega)}$. Since $(I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h, I_h q_h)$ belongs to the conventional mini finite element space, we have the following standard result:

$$ch^{-N} \| (I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h, I_h q_h) \|_0^2 \leq |X|^2 \leq Ch^{-N} \| (I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h, I_h q_h) \|_0^2,$$

where C and c are positive constants independent of h and the interface. Then, by (4.39) we get

$$ch^{-N} \|(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)\|_0^2 \leq |X|^2 \leq Ch^{-N} \|(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)\|_0^2. \quad (4.40)$$

Combining (4.40), the inverse estimate (4.35) and the Poincaré type inequality (4.36), we can use the approach in [21, p. 109] to derive the bound: $\kappa(A_h) \leq Ch^{-2}$, where A_h is the stiffness matrix associated with \mathcal{A}_h and $\kappa(A_h)$ is the the spectral condition number of A_h .

5 Numerical results

5.1 2D numerical examples

We first test two 2D numerical examples from [8]. Let $\Omega = (-1, 1)^2$, $\Omega^- = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |\mathbf{x}| < R\}$, $\Omega^+ = \Omega \setminus \Omega^-$ and $\Gamma = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |\mathbf{x}| = R\}$ with $R = 1/\sqrt{\pi}$. We test our IFE method with $\gamma = -1$ and $\eta = 0$ on uniform Cartesian meshes consisting of $2M \times M$ congruent triangles. The errors are denoted by $e_0(\mathbf{u}) := \|\mathbf{u}^{BK} - \mathbf{U}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, $e_1(\mathbf{u}) := \|\mathbf{u}^{BK} - \mathbf{U}_h\|_{1,h}$ and $e_0(p) = \|p^{BK} - P_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. **Example 1** ($\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{0}$). The exact solutions are chosen as, for all $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, x_2)^T \in \Omega$,

$$\mathbf{u}^\pm(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{r_0^2 - |\mathbf{x}|^2}{\mu^\pm} \begin{pmatrix} -x_2 \\ x_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad p(\mathbf{x}) = x_2^2 - x_1^2.$$

It is easy to verify $\mathbf{g} := [\sigma(\mu, \mathbf{u}, p)\mathbf{n}]_\Gamma = \mathbf{0}$. We consider three cases: $\mu^+ = 5, \mu^- = 1$; $\mu^+ = 1000, \mu^- = 1$; $\mu^+ = 1, \mu^- = 1000$. The numerical results presented in Figure 3 showing the optimal convergence of the proposed IFE method.




Figure 3: Plots of $\log_{10}(\text{error})$ versus $\log_{10}(h)$ for Example 1. The linear regression analysis is used to find an approximate order of convergence.

Example 2 ($\mathbf{g} \neq \mathbf{0}$). We consider the parameters $\mu^+ = 2, \mu^- = 0.5$ and the exact solutions given by

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\pi} \begin{pmatrix} \sin \pi x_1 \sin \pi x_2 \\ \cos \pi x_1 \cos \pi x_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad p^+(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{6\pi}, \quad p^-(\mathbf{x}) = x_1^2 + x_2^2.$$

In this example $\mathbf{g} := [\sigma(\mu, \mathbf{u}, p)\mathbf{n}]_{\Gamma} \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $[p]_{\Gamma} \neq 0$. We report the results in Table 1 which again show the optimal convergence.

Table 1: Errors and orders for Example 2.

M	$e_0(\mathbf{u})$	rate	$e_1(\mathbf{u})$	rate	$e_0(p)$	rate
16	2.164E-02		3.903E-01		7.983E-01	
32	5.280E-03	2.04	1.903E-01	1.04	2.213E-01	1.85
64	1.320E-03	2.00	9.442E-02	1.01	6.647E-02	1.74
128	3.258E-04	2.02	4.701E-02	1.01	2.106E-02	1.66
256	8.170E-05	2.00	2.347E-02	1.00	6.989E-03	1.59

5.2 A 3D numerical example

Example 3. This example is taken from [29]. We consider the domain $\Omega = (-1, 1)^3$, the parameters $\mu^+ = 2, \mu^- = 0.5, R = 2/3$, and the exact solution given by

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}) = \alpha(r)e^{-r^2} \begin{pmatrix} -x_2 \\ x_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha(r) = \begin{cases} 1/\mu^- & r < R, \\ \mu^+ + (1/\mu^- - 1/\mu^+)e^{r^2 - R^2} & r \geq R, \end{cases}$$

$$p^+(\mathbf{x}) = x_1^3 - c, \quad p^-(\mathbf{x}) = x_1^3 + 10 - c,$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)^T$ and $r = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2}$. We set $c = 5\pi R^3/3$ so that $\int_{\Omega} p = 0$.

In this example, both the mini IFE method ($\gamma = -1, \eta = 0$) and the conventional mini element method are tested on uniform Cartesian meshes obtained by first partitioning Ω into M^3 cubes and then subdividing each cube into six tetrahedra. Numerical results reported in Table 2 clearly show optimal convergence for our IFE method and suboptimal convergence for the conventional mini element method.

In Figure 4, we also show plots of the approximate pressures obtained by these two numerical methods on the mesh with $M = 32$. We observe that the IFE method reduces the non-physical oscillations near the interface substantially.

Table 2: Errors and orders obtained by two finite element methods for Example 3.

Conventional Mini Element Method						
M	$e_0(\mathbf{u})$	rate	$e_1(\mathbf{u})$	rate	$e_0(p)$	rate
4	1.309E-01		1.043E+00		5.768E+00	
8	6.405E-02	1.03	8.728E-01	0.26	3.837E+00	0.59
16	2.834E-02	1.18	7.275E-01	0.26	2.981E+00	0.36
32	1.260E-02	1.17	5.176E-01	0.49	2.012E+00	0.57
Mini IFE Method						
M	$e_0(\mathbf{u})$	rate	$e_1(\mathbf{u})$	rate	$e_0(p)$	rate
4	3.911E-01		4.083E+00		1.475E+01	
8	7.283E-02	2.42	8.829E-01	2.21	2.107E+00	2.81
16	1.628E-02	2.16	2.992E-01	1.56	4.003E-01	2.40
32	4.216E-03	1.95	1.256E-01	1.25	1.143E-01	1.81




Figure 4: Plots of approximate pressures obtained by the conventional mini element method (*left*) and the mini IFE method (*right*) for Example 3, on the mesh with $M = 32$.

A Technical results

A.1 Proof of (3.20) and (3.21)

We construct a new box R'_T centered at \mathbf{x}_T^c with diameter ρ_T , where \mathbf{x}_T^c and ρ_T are the center and diameter of the largest ball inscribed in T . We assume that each face of R'_T is parallel to a corresponding face of R_T . One can easily obtain $R'_T \subset T \subset R_T$ and $(R_T - \mathbf{x}_T^*) / (2\sqrt{N}h_T) = (R'_T - \mathbf{x}_T^c) / \rho_T$. Thus, it holds $R'_T = \lambda(R_T - \mathbf{x}_0) + \mathbf{x}_0$ with $\lambda = \rho_T / (2\sqrt{N}h_T)$ and $\mathbf{x}_0 = (\mathbf{x}_T^c - \lambda\mathbf{x}_T^*) / (1 - \lambda)$. This implies that R'_T is a homothetic image of R_T (see [39, Section 2.3] for the definition). From the mesh regularity, we know that the scaling factor λ has lower and upper bounds independent of the mesh size and the interface location. Therefore, using Lemma 2.2 in [39] we have the norm-equivalence property for polynomials:

$$\|w\|_{L^2(R_T)} \leq C\|w\|_{L^2(R'_T)} \quad \forall w \in P_k(R_T). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

For the box R_T , there exists a polynomial $v_h \in P_1(R_T)$ such that $|v - v_h|_{H^m(R_T)} \leq Ch_T^{l-m} |v|_{H^l(R_T)}$, $0 \leq m \leq l \leq 2$. (see [5]). Recalling that $\tilde{I}_{h,T}v$ is a polynomial defined on \mathbb{R}^N , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |v - \tilde{I}_{h,T}v|_{H^m(R_T)} &\leq |v - v_h|_{H^m(R_T)} + |v_h - \tilde{I}_{h,T}v|_{H^m(R_T)} \\ &\leq |v - v_h|_{H^m(R_T)} + C|v_h - \tilde{I}_{h,T}v|_{H^m(R'_T)} \\ &\leq |v - v_h|_{H^m(R_T)} + C|v_h - \tilde{I}_{h,T}v|_{H^m(T)} \\ &\leq C|v - v_h|_{H^m(R_T)} + C|v - \tilde{I}_{h,T}v|_{H^m(T)} \leq Ch_T^{l-m} |v|_{H^l(\omega_T \cup R_T)}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (3.20). The proof of (3.21) is analogous.

A.2 Proof of Lemma 4.1

We first prove the following useful result:

$$|\mathbf{v}_h^\pm|_{H^m(T)} \leq C|\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^m(T)}, \quad m = 0, 1. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

We have $\mathbf{v}_h^\pm = \mathbf{v}_b + \mathbf{v}_L^\pm$ with $(\mathbf{v}_L, q_h) \in \widetilde{P_1 P_1}(T)$ and $\mathbf{v}_b \in \text{span}\{b_T\}^N$. Since (\mathbf{v}_L, q_h) satisfies (2.3), in view of the $\mathbf{t}_{i,h}$ - \mathbf{n}_h coordinate system, it is no hard to see

$$\partial_{\nu_{i,h}}(\mathbf{v}_L^+ \cdot \nu_{j,h}) = \sum_k \sum_l c_{ijkl} \partial_{\nu_{k,h}}(\mathbf{v}_L^- \cdot \nu_{l,h}) \quad \text{with } |c_{ijkl}| \leq C,$$

where $\nu_{i,h} := \mathbf{t}_{i,h}$, $i = 1, \dots, N-1$ and $\nu_{N,h} := \mathbf{n}_h$. This implies $|\nabla \mathbf{v}_L^+| \leq C|\nabla \mathbf{v}_L^-|$ and similarly, $|\nabla \mathbf{v}_L^-| \leq C|\nabla \mathbf{v}_L^+|$. By (2.3b), we have $[\mathbf{v}_L^\pm]_{\Gamma_{h,T}} = \mathbf{0}$, and then $[\mathbf{v}_L^\pm]_{T_h^\pm} = \pm \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \Gamma_{h,T}^{ext}) [\nabla \mathbf{v}_L^\pm \mathbf{n}_h]$. Combining these results with the fact $\|\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \Gamma_{h,T}^{ext})\|_{L^\infty(T)} \leq Ch_T$ yields

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h^+\|_{L^2(T_h^-)}^2 \leq C\|\mathbf{v}_h^-\|_{L^2(T_h^-)}^2 + Ch_T^2 |T_h^-| |B|^{-1} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_L^{s_0}\|_{L^2(B)}^2,$$

where $s_0 = +$ or $-$ and B is a ball. The superscript s_0 and the ball B are chosen such that $B \subset T_h^{s_0}$ and $|B| \geq Ch_T^N$ (see [24, Lemma 5.8] for the construction of B). Since $\mathbf{v}_b|_{\partial T} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{v}_L^{s_0}$ is linear, we have $\int_T \nabla \mathbf{v}_L^{s_0} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_b = 0$, which implies

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{v}_L^{s_0}\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \leq \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_L^{s_0}\|_{L^2(T)}^2 \leq \|\nabla(\mathbf{v}_L^{s_0} + \mathbf{v}_b)\|_{L^2(T)}^2. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Similarly to the proof in Appendix A.1, we now need another ball B' with diameter $2h$ centered at the same point as B . Clearly, $T \subset B'$ and $B' = \lambda B$ with the scaling factor $2 \leq \lambda \leq C$. Keeping in mind that $\mathbf{v}_L^{s_0}$ and \mathbf{v}_b are viewed as polynomials defined in the whole space \mathbb{R}^N , we apply the norm-equivalence property for polynomials as (A.1) to obtain

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{v}_L^{s_0}\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \leq \|\nabla(\mathbf{v}_L^{s_0} + \mathbf{v}_b)\|_{L^2(B')}^2 \leq C\|\nabla(\mathbf{v}_L^{s_0} + \mathbf{v}_b)\|_{L^2(B)}^2 = C\|\nabla \mathbf{v}_h^{s_0}\|_{L^2(B)}^2.$$

Collecting above results and using the standard inverse inequality on B , we have

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h^+\|_{L^2(T_h)}^2 \leq \|\mathbf{v}_h^+\|_{L^2(T_h^+)}^2 + C\|\mathbf{v}_h^-\|_{L^2(T_h^-)}^2 + C\|\mathbf{v}_h^{s_0}\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \leq C\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(T)}^2,$$

which together with a similar result for \mathbf{v}_h^- completes the proof of (A.2) with $m = 0$. The proof of (A.2) with $m = 1$ is analogous and so is omitted for brevity.

With the help of (A.2), the desired inequalities (4.2) and (4.3) can be obtained by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(\partial T)} &\leq C \sum_{s=\pm} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_h^s\|_{L^2(\partial T)} \leq \sum_{s=\pm} Ch_T^{-1/2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_h^s\|_{L^2(T)} \leq Ch_T^{-1/2} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(T)}, \\ |\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)} &\leq C \sum_{s=\pm} |\mathbf{v}_h^s|_{H^1(T)} \leq \sum_{s=\pm} Ch_T^{-1} \|\mathbf{v}_h^s\|_{L^2(T)} \leq Ch_T^{-1} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(T)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the standard trace and inverse inequality on T since \mathbf{v}_h^\pm are polynomials. As for (4.4), we first use a similar argument to get

$$|I_{h,T}\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)} \leq Ch_T^{N/2-1} \sum_{s=\pm} \|\mathbf{v}_h^s\|_{L^\infty(T)} \leq Ch_T^{-1} \sum_{s=\pm} \|\mathbf{v}_h^s\|_{L^2(T)} \leq Ch_T^{-1} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(T)}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Then the desired inequality (4.4) can be obtained by

$$|I_{h,T}\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)} = |I_{h,T}(\mathbf{v}_h + \mathbf{c})|_{H^1(T)} \leq Ch_T^{-1} \|\mathbf{v}_h + \mathbf{c}\|_{L^2(T)} \leq C|\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)},$$

where the constant \mathbf{c} is chosen as $\mathbf{c} = |T|^{-1} \int_T \mathbf{v}_h$. By Lemma 2.6, it is easy to verify

$$|\mathbf{v}_h - I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h| \leq Ch_T |\nabla I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h|, \quad |\nabla(\mathbf{v}_h - I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h)| \leq C|I_{h,T} \nabla \mathbf{v}_h|, \quad \|\llbracket q_h^\pm \rrbracket\| \leq C|I_{h,T} \nabla \mathbf{v}_h|, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

which together with (4.4) yields (4.5) and (4.6). We also have $|q_h^\pm| \leq |q_h^\mp| + C|\nabla I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h|$. Thus,

$$\|q_h^\pm\|_{L^2(T_h^\mp)} \leq \|q_h^\mp\|_{L^2(T_h^\mp)} + C|I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)} \leq \|q_h\|_{L^2(T)} + C|\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}.$$

Now (4.7) is obtain by the above inequality and

$$\|q_h\|_{L^2(\partial T)} \leq C \sum_{s=\pm} \|q_h^s\|_{L^2(\partial T)} \leq Ch_T^{-1/2} \sum_{s=\pm} \|q_h^s\|_{L^2(T)}.$$

Finally, we consider (4.8). Observing that $I_h q_h$ and $I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h$ are continuous, we have

$$\|\llbracket q_h \rrbracket_F\|_{L^2(F)} = \|[q_h - I_h q_h]_F\|_{L^2(F)}, \quad \|\llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \rrbracket_F\|_{L^2(F)} = \|\llbracket \mathbf{v}_h - I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h \rrbracket_F\|_{L^2(F)}.$$

By the first inequality of (A.5) and (4.4) we get

$$h_F^{-1} \|\mathbf{v}_h - I_h^B \mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(F)}^2 \leq Ch_F^{-1} |F| h_T^2 |\nabla I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h|^2 \leq C|I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}^2 \leq C|\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}^2.$$

By Lemma 2.6, we have $|q_h - I_{h,T} q_h| \leq C|\nabla I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h|$, and then

$$h_F \|q_h - I_{h,T} q_h\|_{L^2(F)}^2 \leq Ch_F |F| |\nabla I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h|^2 \leq C|I_{h,T} \mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}^2 \leq C|\mathbf{v}_h|_{H^1(T)}^2.$$

The desired inequality (4.8) follows from the above results and the triangle inequality.

A.3 Proof of Lemma 4.6

See (A.4)-(A.6) in [6] for the proof of (4.27). In the following we prove (4.28) through a similar argument. For each $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma_{h,T}$, $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma$, using the representation

$$v(\mathbf{x}) = v(\mathbf{p}_h(\mathbf{x})) + \int_0^1 \nabla v(s\mathbf{x} + (1-s)\mathbf{p}_h(\mathbf{x})) \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}_h(\mathbf{x})) ds,$$

the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (2.2), we obtain

$$|v(\mathbf{x}) - v(\mathbf{p}_h(\mathbf{x}))|^2 \leq Ch_T^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(I_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_h(\mathbf{x})})}^2,$$

where $I_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p}_h(\mathbf{x})}$ is the line segment between \mathbf{x} and $\mathbf{p}_h(\mathbf{x})$. Integrating over $\Gamma_{h,T}$ yields

$$\|v - v \circ \mathbf{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Gamma_{h,T})}^2 \leq Ch_T^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(R_T)}^2.$$

The desired result (4.28) follows from the above inequality and the finite overlapping of R_T .

References

- [1] S. Adjerid, I. Babuška, R. Guo, and T. Lin. An enriched immersed finite element method for interface problems with nonhomogeneous jump conditions. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 404:115770, 2023.
- [2] S. Adjerid, N. Chaabane, and T. Lin. An immersed discontinuous finite element method for Stokes interface problems. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 293:170–190, 2015.
- [3] D. N. Arnold, F. Brezzi, and M. Fortin. A stable finite element for the Stokes equations. *Calcolo*, 21:337–344, 1984.
- [4] S. C. Brenner. Korn’s inequalities for piecewise H^1 vector fields. *Math. Comp.*, 73:1067–1087, 2004.
- [5] S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott. *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*. Texts in Applied Mathematics 15, Springer, Berlin, 2008.
- [6] E. Burman, P. Hansbo, and M. G. Larson. A cut finite element method with boundary value correction. *Math. Comp.*, 87(310):633–657, 2018.
- [7] E. Burman, P. Hansbo, M. G. Larson, and A. Massing. A cut discontinuous Galerkin method for the Laplace-Beltrami operator. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 37:138–169, 2017.
- [8] E. Cáceres, J. Guzmán, and M. Olshanskii. New stability estimates for an unfitted finite element method for two-phase Stokes problem. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 58:2165–2192, 2020.
- [9] L. Cattaneo, L. Formaggia, G. F. Iori, A. Scotti, and P. Zunino. Stabilized extended finite elements for the approximation of saddle point problems with unfitted interfaces. *Calcolo*, 52:123–152, 2015.
- [10] Y. Chen and X. Zhang. A $P_2 - P_1$ partially penalized immersed finite element method for Stokes interface problems. *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Model.*, 18:120–141, 2021.
- [11] D. A. Di Pietro and A. Ern. *Mathematical aspects of discontinuous Galerkin methods*, volume 69. Mathématiques & Applications (Berlin) [Mathematics & Applications], Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.
- [12] C. M. Elliott and T. Ranner. Finite element analysis for a coupled bulk-surface partial differential equation. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 33:377–402, 2013.
- [13] R. L. Foote. Regularity of the distance function. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 92:153–155, 1984.
- [14] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. Classics in Mathematics. Reprint of the 1998 edition*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [15] Y. Gong, B. Li, and Z. Li. Immersed-interface finite-element methods for elliptic interface problems with non-homogeneous jump conditions. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 46:472–495, 2008.
- [16] S. Gross and A. Reusken. *Numerical methods for two-phase incompressible flows*, volume 40. Springer Science and Business Media, Berlin, 2011.
- [17] R. Guo and T. Lin. An immersed finite element method for elliptic interface problems in three dimensions. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 414:109478, 2020.
- [18] J. Guzmán and M. Olshanskii. Inf-sup stability of geometrically unfitted Stokes finite elements. *Math. Comp.*, 87:2091–2112, 2018.

- [19] J. Guzmán, M. A. Sánchez, and M. Sarkis. Higher-order finite element methods for elliptic problems with interfaces. *ESAIM: Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 50:1561–1583, 2016.
- [20] J. Guzmán, M. A. Sánchez, and M. Sarkis. A finite element method for high-contrast interface problems with error estimates independent of contrast. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 73:330–365, 2017.
- [21] P. Hansbo, M. G. Larson, and S. Zahedi. A cut finite element method for a Stokes interface problem. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 85:90–114, 2014.
- [22] X. He, T. Lin, and Y. Lin. The convergence of the bilinear and linear immersed finite element solutions to interface problems. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 28:312–330, 2012.
- [23] X. He, T. Lin, and Y. Lin. Immersed finite element methods for elliptic interface problems with non-homogeneous jump conditions. *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Model.*, 8:284–301, 2012.
- [24] H. Ji. An immersed Crouzeix–Raviart finite element method in 2D and 3D based on discrete level set functions. *Numer. Math.*, 153:279–325, 2023.
- [25] H. Ji, J. Chen, and Z. Li. A high-order source removal finite element method for a class of elliptic interface problems. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 130:112–130, 2018.
- [26] H. Ji, F. Wang, J. Chen, and Z. Li. An immersed CR - P_0 element for Stokes interface problems and the optimal convergence analysis. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 399:115306, 2022.
- [27] H. Ji, F. Wang, J. Chen, and Z. Li. A new parameter free partially penalized immersed finite element and the optimal convergence analysis. *Numer. Math.*, 150:1035–1086, 2022.
- [28] D. Jones and X. Zhang. A class of nonconforming immersed finite element methods for Stokes interface problems. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 392:113493, 2021.
- [29] M. Kirchhart, S. Gross, and A. Reusken. Analysis of an XFEM discretization for Stokes interface problems. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 38:A1019–A1043, 2016.
- [30] M. Krížek. On the maximum angle condition for linear tetrahedral elements. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 29:513–520, 1992.
- [31] J. Li, J. Markus, B. Wohlmuth, and J. Zou. Optimal a priori estimates for higher order finite elements for elliptic interface problems. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 60:19–37, 2010.
- [32] Z. Li. The immersed interface method using a finite element formulation. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 27:253–267, 1998.
- [33] Z. Li, T. Lin, Y. Lin, and R. Rogers. An immersed finite element space and its approximation capability. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 20:338–367, 2004.
- [34] T. Lin, Y. Lin, and X. Zhang. Partially penalized immersed finite element methods for elliptic interface problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 53:1121–1144, 2015.
- [35] M. A. Olshanskii and A. Reusken. Analysis of a Stokes interface problem. *Numer. Math.*, 103:129–149, 2006.
- [36] S. Osher and R. P. Fedkiw. Level set methods: an overview and some recent results. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 169:463–502, 2001.
- [37] L. R. Scott and S. Zhang. Finite element interpolation of nonsmooth functions satisfying boundary conditions. *Math. Comp.*, 54:483–493, 1990.

- [38] A.-K. Tornberg and B. Engquist. A finite element based level-set method for multiphase flow applications. *Comput. Vis. Sci.*, 3:93–101, 2000.
- [39] Y. Xiao, J. Xu, and F. Wang. High-order extended finite element methods for solving interface problems. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 364:112964, 2016.
- [40] Q. Zhang, H. Ji, and D. Liang. Unfitted finite element methods based on correction functions for stokes flows with singular forces of low regularity. *Comput. & Fluids*, 256:105861, 2023.