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Abstract

We prove several optimal-order error estimates for a finite-element method applied to an inhomogeneous Robin boundary value problem for the Poisson equation defined in a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n = 2, 3$. The boundary condition is weakly imposed using Nitsche’s method [20]. We also investigate the symmetric interior penalty discontinuous Galerkin method and prove the same error estimates. Numerical examples are also reported to confirm our results.
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1 Introduction

This paper presents several optimal-order error estimates for a finite-element method (FEM) applied to an inhomogeneous Robin boundary value problem for the Poisson equation defined in a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n = 2, 3$. The boundary condition is weakly imposed using Nitsche’s method [20]. The case of a polyhedral domain has already been addressed in [15]; this paper is a generalization of [15] to a smooth domain. Moreover, we also evaluate the symmetric interior penalty (SIP) discontinuous Galerkin (DG) method. The motivation of this study is discussed in detail below.

The boundary condition is an indispensable component of the well-posed problem of partial differential equations (PDEs). In the field of scientific computation, a significant attention should be focused on imposing the boundary conditions, although this task is sometimes understood as simple and unambiguous. The Neumann boundary condition is naturally formulated in the variational equation and is handled directly in FEM. By contrast, the specification of the Dirichlet boundary condition (DBC) needs discussion. In a traditional FEM, including continuous $P^k$ FEM, DBC is simply imposed by specifying the nodal values at boundary nodal points. Meanwhile, the penalty method and Nitsche’s method for DBC provide reformulations of DBC as the Neumann condition or Robin boundary condition (RBC). Hence, their implementations are rather easy. As indicated by Bazilevs et al. [7, 8], the method of “weak imposition” of DBC using Nitsche’s method is useful for resolving the issue of spurious oscillations for non-stationary Navier–Stokes and convection–diffusion equations.
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From the viewpoint of physics, we also need to consider complex boundary conditions. Boundary conditions involving the Laplace–Beltrami operator $\Delta_\Gamma$, such as a dynamic boundary condition

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + au - b\Delta_\Gamma u = g$$

and a generalized RBC

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + au - b\Delta_\Gamma u = g,$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.1)

play important roles in application to the reduced fluid-structure interaction model and Cahn–Hilliard equation (see, e.g., [13], [21] and [11]). Nitsche’s method may be an effective approach to address these boundary conditions, and therefore, is worthy of a thorough investigation.

When numerically solving PDEs in a smooth domain, we often utilize polyhedral approximations of the domain. Generally, a facile approximation of the problem may result in a wrong numerical solution; the so-called Babuška’s paradox in [4, §5] is a remarkable example. Therefore, investigating not only the error caused by discretizations but also that caused by domain approximations is important. For the standard FEM, approximating domains is a common problem, and analysis of the energy norm is well-developed thus far (see, e.g., [22, §4.4] and [12, §4.4]). Recently, the optimal order $W_{1,\infty}$ and $L_\infty$ stability and error estimates were established (refer to [17] for detail).

Consequently, we evaluate Nitsche’s method for PDEs in a smooth bounded domain. In the first step, we consider a simple Robin boundary value problem for the Poisson equation as a model problem, based on [15]. Moreover, Nitsche’s method naturally appears in the imposition of DBC and RBC of the DG method. Hence, we also study the DG method because the FEM and DG methods can be analyzed simultaneously.

Our results are summarized as follows. We state the model Robin boundary value problem to be considered in Section 2. Then, we mention the standard FEM (2.9), SIPDG method (2.10), and several parameter-/mesh-dependent norms $\|\cdot\|_{N,h}, \|\cdot\|_{DG,h}$. These norms are defined as (2.12) and (2.14) and include the $H^1$ semi-norm. Assuming $u$ as the solution of the Robin boundary value problem, we let $u_N$ and $u_{DG}$ be the solutions of Nitsche’s and DG methods, respectively. Then, we prove the DG energy error estimates (refer to Theorem I)

$$\|\tilde{u} - u_N\|_{N,h}, \|\tilde{u} - u_{DG}\|_{DG,h} \leq Ch\left(\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{u}_0\|_{H^1(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^1(\tilde{\Omega})}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.2)

if $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ for $s = 2, 3$. Moreover, we obtain the $L^2$ error estimates (refer to Theorem II)

$$\|\tilde{u} - u_N\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)}, \|\tilde{u} - u_{DG}\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)} \leq Ch^2\left(\|u\|_{H^4(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{u}_0\|_{H^3(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^2(\tilde{\Omega})}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.3)

if $u \in H^4(\Omega)$. First, we present several preliminary results in Section 3. Then, we state the proofs of Theorems I and II in Sections 4 and 5, respectively. Finally, we show the results of numerical experiments to confirm the validity of our theoretical results in Section 6.

We also discuss previous related studies.

Barret and Elliott [5] studied the iso-parametric FEM for a similar problem and obtained similar results as ours. Specifically, we applied several techniques from [5]. However, regularity assumptions slightly vary from ours and the DG method was not addressed. Cockburn et al. [13] considered the DG method and approximation of domains only in a one-dimensional problem. Zhang [22] and Bassi and Rebay [6] also reported numerical results. Chen and Chen [10] studied the DG method in the “exactly fitted” triangulation. Kashiwabara et al. [16] investigated the standard FEM for (1.1) and proved the optimal-order convergence, where (1.1) is posed only on a “flat” part of the boundary. Kovács and
Lubich \[19\] also considered the standard FEM for (1.1) in a smooth domain, but the DG method was not addressed. For the DG method, some analyses for the dynamic boundary condition were proven by Antonietti et al. \[2\]. Nevertheless, applying the results of \[2\] to actual problems is difficult because these are shown only in a rectangular domain.

Notation. At the end of the Introduction, we list the notations used in this paper. We follow the standard notation of, for example, \[1\] for function spaces and their norms. Particularly, for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and a positive integer $j$, we use the standard Lebesgue space $L^p(\mathcal{O})$ and Sobolev space $W^{j,p}(\mathcal{O})$. Hereinafter, $\mathcal{O}$ denotes the bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

The semi-norm and norm of $W^{j,p}(\mathcal{O})$ are denoted, respectively, by

$$|v|_{W^{j,p}(\mathcal{O})} = \left( \sum_{|\alpha| = 1} \left| \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} v}{\partial x^\alpha} \right|^p \right)^{1/p}, \quad \|v\|_{W^{j,p}(\mathcal{O})} = \left( \sum_{i=0}^j \|v_i\|_{W^{j-i,p}(\mathcal{O})}^p \right)^{1/p}. $$

The inner product of $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ is denoted by $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathcal{O}}$. We also use the fractional-order Sobolev space $W^{s,p}(\mathcal{O})$ for $s > 0$. Generally, we write $H^s(\mathcal{O}) = W^{s,2}(\mathcal{O})$. For $\Gamma \subset \partial \mathcal{O}$, we define $W^{j,p}(\Gamma)$ and $H^s(\Gamma)$ by using a surface measure $d\gamma$ on $\Gamma$ in a common approach. The inner product of $L^2(\Gamma)$ is denoted by $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\Gamma}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{P}^r(\mathcal{O})$ denotes the set of all polynomials of degree $\leq r$.

# 2 Model problem and main results

## 2.1 Model problem

Supposing that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n = 2, 3$) is a bounded domain with a sufficiently smooth boundary $\Gamma = \partial \Omega$, we consider the Robin boundary value problem for the Poisson equation as follows:

$$\begin{cases}
-\Delta u = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} u = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} u_0 + g & \text{on } \Gamma,
\end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where $\partial/\partial \nu$ denotes the differentiation along the outward unit normal vector $\nu$ to $\Gamma$ and $\varepsilon$ is a positive constant. Moreover, $f$, $u_0$, and $g$ are the given functions.

Throughout this paper, we assume that

$$f \in L^2(\Omega), \quad u_0 \in H^{3/2}(\Gamma), \quad g \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma), \quad \text{and } \Gamma \text{ is a } C^2 \text{ boundary.} \quad (H1)$$

Under these assumptions, $\mathcal{E}u_0 \in H^2(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{E}g \in H^1(\Omega)$ exist, such that $\mathcal{E}u_0 = u_0$ on $\Gamma$, $\mathcal{E}g = g$ on $\Gamma$, $\|\mathcal{E}u_0\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C\|u_0\|_{H^{3/2}(\Gamma)}$, and $\|\mathcal{E}g\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C\|g\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}$.

From the general theory of elliptic PDEs, we recognize that for a non-negative integer $m$, a unique solution $u \in H^{m+2}(\Omega)$ of (2.1) exists if $f \in H^m(\Omega)$, $u_0 \in H^{m+3/2}(\Gamma)$, $g \in H^{m+1/2}(\Gamma)$, and $\Gamma$ is a $C^{m+2}$ boundary.

## 2.2 Numerical schemes

Let $\{T_h\}_h$ be a family of regular triangulations in the sense of \[9\] (4.4.15)], where the granularity parameter $h$ is defined as $h = \max_{K \in T_h} h_K$. Assuming $\Omega_h = \text{int}(\bigcup_{K \in T_h} K)$, the boundary of $\Omega_h$ is expressed as $\Gamma_h = \partial \Omega_h$. We introduce the set of all edges as

$$\mathcal{I}_h := \{E : E \text{ is an } (n-1)\text{-face of some } K \in T_h\}.$$

Then, the boundary mesh inherited from $T_h$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{E}_h = \{E \in \mathcal{I}_h : E \subset \Gamma_h\},$$
and $\Gamma_h$ is expressed as $\Gamma_h = \bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} E$. We assume that $\Gamma_h$ is an approximate surface/polygon of $\Gamma$ in the sense that

$$\text{every vertex of } E \in \mathcal{E}_h \text{ lies on } \Gamma.$$  \hfill (H2)

We define the following two finite-element spaces:

$$V_N := \{ \chi \in C(\Omega) : \chi|_K \in \mathcal{P}^1(K) \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h \};$$

$$V_{DG} := \{ \chi \in L^2(\Omega) : \chi|_K \in \mathcal{P}^1(K) \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h \}. \hfill (2.2)$$

Furthermore, we set

$$\mathcal{I}_h := \{ E \in \mathcal{T}_h : E \not\subset \Gamma_h \} = \mathcal{T}_h \setminus \mathcal{E}_h.$$  

The symbols $\{ \cdot \}$ and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ denote the average and jump of a function at an edge $E$, respectively; the precise definitions are described below. For each $E \in \mathcal{I}_h$, two distinct $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{T}_h$ exist, satisfying $E = \overline{K_1} \cap \overline{K_2}$. The unit vectors of $E$ outgoing from $K_1$ and $K_2$ are denoted by $n_1$ and $n_2$, respectively. Supposing that $v$ is a suitably smooth function defined in $K_1 \cup K_2 \cup \Gamma$, we define the restrictions of $v$ as $v_1 = v|_{K_1}$ and $v_2 = v|_{K_2}$. Then, we set

$$\llbracket v \rrbracket := v_1 n_1 + v_2 n_2,$$

Note that $\llbracket v \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket \nabla v \rrbracket$ are vector-valued functions, while $\{ v \}$ and $\{ \nabla v \}$ are scalar-valued functions. Finally, for $E \in \mathcal{E}_h$, we set $\{ \nabla v \} := \frac{\partial v}{\partial n_h}$.

We set

$$(w, v)_\omega = \int_{\omega} w v \, dx, \quad (\nabla w, \nabla v)_\omega = \int_{\omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla v \, dx, \quad \langle w, v \rangle_E = \int_E w v \, dS$$

for $\omega \subset \Omega$ and $E \in \mathcal{T}_h$.

Moreover, we define the bilinear forms as follows:

$$a^N_h(w, v) = (\nabla w, \nabla v)_\Omega + b_h(w, v) \hfill (2.4)$$

$$b_h(w, v) = \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} \left\{ -\frac{\gamma h_E}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \left( \frac{\partial w}{\partial n_h} \cdot v \right)_E + (w, \frac{\partial v}{\partial n_h})_E \right\};$$

$$a^{DG}_h(w, v) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\nabla w, \nabla v)_K + b_h(w, v) + J_h(w, v), \hfill (2.6)$$

$$J_h(w, v) = \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} \left\{ -\langle \llbracket \nabla w \rrbracket, [v] \rangle_E - \langle [w], \llbracket \nabla v \rrbracket \rangle_E + \frac{1}{\gamma h_E} \langle [w], [v] \rangle_E \right\}. \hfill (2.7)$$

Here, $\gamma$ is a penalty parameter and $h_E = \text{diam } E$. The bilinear form $a^N_h$ is taken from [15] and $a^{DG}_h$ appears in the SIPDG method (see [3]).

We also define the following linear form $l_h(v)$:

$$l_h(v) = (\tilde{f}, v)_\Omega + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} \left\{ \frac{1}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} (\tilde{u}_0, v)_E - \frac{\gamma h_E}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} (\tilde{u}_0, \frac{\partial v}{\partial n_h})_E \right\};$$

$$+ \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} (\tilde{g}, v)_E - \frac{\varepsilon \gamma h_E}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} (\tilde{g}, \frac{\partial v}{\partial n_h})_E \right\}. \hfill (2.8)$$
In this section, we will state our schemes. First, the standard FEM combined with Nitsche’s method for the inhomogeneous RBC is expressed as

\[(N) \quad \text{Find } u_N \in V_N \text{ s.t. } a_h^N(u_N, \chi) = l_h(\chi) \quad \forall \chi \in V_N. \tag{2.9}\]

The second one is the SIPDG method, which is expressed as

\[(DG) \quad \text{Find } u_{DG} \in V_{DG} \text{ s.t. } a_h^{DG}(u_{DG}, \chi) = l_h(\chi) \quad \forall \chi \in V_{DG}. \tag{2.10}\]

We call Nitsche’s method (N) and the DG method (DG) for brevity.

We use the following norms that depend on $\varepsilon$ and $h_E$:

$$\|v\|_N^2 := \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} \frac{1}{\varepsilon + h_E} \|v\|_{L^2(E)}^2,$$

$$\|v\|_{N,h}^2 := \|v\|_N^2 + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} h_E \left\| \frac{\partial v}{\partial n_h} \right\|_{L^2(E)}^2,$$

$$\|v\|_{DG}^2 := \|v\|_N^2 + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} \frac{1}{h_E} \|[v]\|_{L^2(E)}^2,$$

$$\|v\|_{DG,h}^2 := \|v\|_{DG}^2 + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} h_E \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(E)}^2.$$

Note that $\|\cdot\|_N$ and $\|\cdot\|_{N,h}$ are uniformly equivalent on $V_N$ in $h$. Similarly, $\|\cdot\|_{DG}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{DG,h}$ are equivalent on $V_{DG}$.

### 2.3 Main results

We fix a sufficiently smooth domain $\widehat{\Omega}$, which includes $\Omega$ and $\Omega_h$. Particularly, we assume that there is an $h_0 > 0$ such that

$$\text{dist}(\partial \widehat{\Omega}, \Omega) \geq h_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dist}(\partial \widehat{\Omega}, \Omega_h) \geq h_0, \tag{H3}$$

for $h \leq h_0$.

For any $m \geq 0$, there exists a linear operator $P: H^m(\Omega) \to H^m(\widehat{\Omega})$ such that

$$(Pv)|_\Omega = v \ \text{in} \ \Omega, \quad \|Pv\|_{H^m(\widehat{\Omega})} \leq C_m \|v\|_{H^m(\Omega)},$$

where $C_m$ denotes a positive constant depending only on $m$ and $\Omega$.

Here, we will discuss our main results. The following results are valid for a sufficiently smooth $h$. Specifically, we always assume that $h \leq h_0$, where $h_0$ is defined previously, although we do not mention it explicitly. Furthermore, (H1), (H2), and (H3) are assumed throughout. We set $\tilde{u}_0 = P(Eu_0)$ and $\tilde{g} = P(Eg)$.

**Theorem I.** Assuming that $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ is the solution of (2.1), we set $\tilde{u} = Pu$, where $s = 2$ if $\Omega$ is convex; otherwise, $s = 3$. Let $u_N \in V_N$ and $u_{DG} \in V_{DG}$ be the solutions of (2.9) and (2.10), respectively. Then, for a sufficiently small $\gamma$, the following error estimates hold:

$$\|\tilde{u} - u_N\|_{N,h} \leq C h(\|\tilde{u}\|_{H^s(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{u}_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}), \tag{2.15}$$

where $C$ denotes a positive constant that is independent of $\varepsilon$ and $h$.

**Theorem II.** Assuming that $u \in H^s(\Omega)$ is the solution of (2.1), we set $\tilde{u} = Pu$. Moreover, we assume that $\tilde{u}_0 \in H^3(\Omega)$ and $\tilde{g} \in H^3(\Omega)$. Let $u_N \in V_N$ and $u_{DG} \in V_{DG}$ be the solutions of (2.9) and (2.10), respectively. Then, for a sufficiently small $\gamma$, the following error estimates hold:

$$\|\tilde{u} - u_N\|_{DG,h} \leq C h^2(\|\tilde{u}\|_{H^s(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{u}_0\|_{H^3(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^3(\Omega)}), \tag{2.16}$$

where $C$ denotes a positive constant that is independent of $\varepsilon$ and $h$. \[5\]
3 Preliminaries

In this section, we collect some auxiliary results. Below, # represents $N$ and $DG$ because the properties of Nitsche’s and DG methods are quite similar.

Given that $\Omega$ is a $C^2$ domain, a local coordinate system $\{U_r, y_r, \phi_r\}_{r=1}^M$ exists to ensure the following:

1) $\{U_r\}_{r=1}^M$ is an open covering of $\Gamma = \partial \Omega$.

2) A congruent transformation $A_r$ exists to ensure that $y_r = (y_{r1}, y_{r}) = A_r(x)$, where $x$ is the original coordinate.

3) $\phi_r$ is a $C^2$ function in $\Delta_r := \{y_r1 \in \mathbb{R} : |y_r1| \leq \alpha\}$ and $\Gamma \cap U_r$ is a graph of $\phi_r$ with respect to the coordinate $y_r$.

Assuming that $h$ is sufficiently small if necessary, our possible assumptions are as follows:

4) A function $\phi_{rh}$ exists to ensure that $\Gamma_h \cap U_r$ is a graph of $\phi_{rh}$ with respect to the coordinate $y_r$.

In addition, we assume that $h_0$ is sufficiently small to ensure that for any $x \in \Gamma$ and $r = 1, \ldots, M$, the open ball $B(x, h_0)$ with center $x$ and radius $h_0$ is contained in a neighborhood $U_r$. Let $d(x)$ be the signed distance function defined by

$$d(x) := \begin{cases} -\text{dist}(x, \Gamma) & x \in \Omega \\ \text{dist}(x, \Gamma) & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

We define $\Gamma(\delta) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |d(x)| < \delta\}$. Then, for a sufficiently small $\delta$, the orthogonal projection $\pi$ onto $\Gamma$ exists such that

$$x = \pi(x) + d(x)\nu(\pi(x)) \quad (x \in \Gamma(\delta), \pi(x) \in \Gamma), \quad (3.1)$$

where $\nu$ is an outward unit normal vector on $\Gamma$.

Because $h$ is sufficiently small, $\pi$ is defined on $\Gamma_h \subset \Gamma(\delta)$ and for each $E \in \mathcal{E}_h$, and $\pi(E)$ comprises some local neighborhood $U_r$. In this case, $\pi|_{\Gamma_h}$ has the inverse operator $\pi^*(x) = x + t^*(x)\nu(x)$, and a positive constant $C_E$ exists satisfying

$$\|t^*\|_{W^{0, \infty}(\Gamma)} \leq C_0 h^2.$$  

Moreover, $\pi(\mathcal{E}_h) := \{\pi(E) : E \in \mathcal{E}_h\}$ is a partition of $\Gamma$.

We assume that all these properties hold for any $h \leq h_0$ by assuming that $h_0$ is sufficiently small if necessary.

In this situation, the following boundary-skin estimates are available. For the detail, refer to [18] Theorems 8.1, 8.2, and 8.3 and [17] Lemma A.1]

**Lemma 3.1** (Boundary-skin estimates). For $C_0 h^2 \leq \delta \leq 2C_0 h^2$ with a positive constant $C_0$, the following estimates hold:

$$\left| \int_{\pi(E)} f \, d\gamma - \int_{E} f \circ \pi \, d\gamma_h \right| \leq C h^2 \int_{\pi(E)} |f| \, d\gamma \quad f \in L^1(\pi(E)), E \in \mathcal{E}_h. \quad (3.2)$$

$$\|f - f \circ \pi\|_{L^p(\Gamma_h)} \leq C \delta^{1-1/p} \|f\|_{W^{1,p}(\Gamma(\delta))} \quad f \in W^{1,p}(\Gamma(\delta)). \quad (3.3)$$

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\Gamma(\delta))} \leq C(\delta \|\nabla f\|_{L^p(\Gamma(\delta))} + \delta^{1/p} \|f\|_{L^p(\Gamma)}) \quad f \in W^{1,p}(\Gamma(\delta)). \quad (3.4)$$

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega(h) \setminus \Omega)} \leq C(\delta \|\nabla f\|_{L^p(\Omega(h) \setminus \Omega)} + \delta^{1/p} \|f\|_{L^p(\Gamma_h)}) \quad f \in W^{1,p}(\Omega_h). \quad (3.5)$$

$$\|\nu_h - \nu \circ \pi\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_h)} \leq Ch, \quad (3.6)$$

Here, $\nu_h$ is the outward unit normal vector of $\Gamma_h$. 

The bilinear form $a^\#_h$ has the following properties.

**Lemma 3.2.** A positive constant $C$ that is independent of $\varepsilon$ and $h$ exists, satisfying

$$a^\#_h(w,v) \leq C \|w\|_{\#,h} \|v\|_{\#,h} \quad \forall w, v \in H^s(\Omega_h) + V_\#.$$  \hfill (3.7)

Moreover, for a sufficiently small $\gamma$, we have

$$a^\#_h(\chi, \chi) \geq C \|\chi\|_{\#}^2 \quad \forall \chi \in V_\#,$$  \hfill (3.8)

where $C$ denotes a positive constant that is independent of $\varepsilon$ and $h$. Consequently, the schemes (2.9) and (2.10) have unique solutions.

**Proof.** Estimate (3.7) is a consequence of Hölder’s inequality. Estimate (3.8) for Nitsche’s method is known (refer to [15, Theorem 3.2]). Moreover, verifying (3.8) for the DG method is necessary. Using Hölder’s inequality and trace inequality for polynomials, we have

$$a^\#_{DG}(\chi, \chi) \geq \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$$

$$+ \sum_{E \in T_h} \frac{1}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \left\{ -2 \varepsilon \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^2(E)}^2 \chi \|\chi\|_{L^2(E)}^2 - \varepsilon \gamma h_E \|\chi\|_{L^2(E)}^2 \right\},$$

$$+ \sum_{E \in T_h} \left\{ -2 \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^2(E)}^2 \|\chi\|_{L^2(E)}^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma h_E} \|\chi\|_{L^2(E)}^2 \right\}$$

$$\geq \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\delta_1} \frac{C\gamma^2 h_E}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} - \frac{C\varepsilon}{\delta_2} \frac{C\gamma h_E}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} - \frac{C\gamma h_E}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \right) \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)}^2$$

$$+ \sum_{E \in T_h} \frac{1 - \delta_1}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \|\nabla \chi\|_{L^2(E)}^2 + \sum_{E \in T_h} \frac{1 - \delta_2}{\gamma h_E} \|\chi\|_{L^2(E)}^2.$$  

If $2C\gamma < 1$, then we can choose $\delta_i$ satisfying $2C\gamma < \delta_i < 1$ for $i = 1, 2$. Therefore, we have proven (3.8). \hfill \square

A projection operator exists from $\Pi_\#$ to $V_\#$, thus satisfying

$$|w - \Pi_\# w|_{H^m(K)} \leq C h^{2-m} \|w\|_{H^2(K)} \quad \forall w \in H^2(\Omega_h), K \in T_h, m = 0, 1, 2.$$  \hfill (3.9)

**Lemma 3.3.** Assuming that $u \in H^2(\Omega)$ is the solution of (2.1), we set $\tilde{u} = Pu$. Let $u_N \in V_N$ and $u_{DG} \in V_{DG}$ be the solutions of (2.9) and (2.10), respectively. Then, for a sufficiently small $\gamma$, we have

$$\|\tilde{u} - u_\#\|_{\#} \leq C \left[ \inf_{\xi \in V_\#} \|\tilde{u} - \xi\|_{\#} + \sup_{\chi \in V_\#} |a^\#_h(\tilde{u}, \chi) - l_h(\chi)| \right] \hfill (3.10)$$

$$\|\tilde{u} - u_\#\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)} \leq C \left[ \|\tilde{u} - u_\#\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)} + h \|\tilde{u} - u_\#\|_{\#} \right.$$  

$$+ \sup_{\zeta \in H^2(\Omega)} \left\{ \|\zeta - \Pi_\# \zeta\|_{\#} \|\tilde{u} - u_\#\|_{\#} + |a^\#_h(\tilde{u}, \Pi_\# \zeta) - l_h(\Pi_\# \zeta)| \right\}, \hfill (3.11)$$

where $\tilde{z} = Pz$ for $z \in H^2(\Omega)$. Therein, $C$ denotes positive constants that are independent of $\varepsilon$ and $h$.

**Proof.** Assuming $\xi \in V_\#$ and $\chi = u_\# - \xi$, we have

$$\|\chi\|_{\#}^2 \leq C a^\#_h(\chi, \chi)$$

$$= C (a^\#_h(\tilde{u} - \xi, \chi) - a^\#_h(\tilde{u}, \chi) + l_h(\chi))$$

$$\leq C \|\tilde{u} - \xi\|_{\#} \|\chi\|_{\#} + |a^\#_h(\tilde{u}, \chi) - l_h(\chi)|,$$
where (3.8), (3.7), and the equivalence of the norms are applied. This, as well as the triangular inequality, implies (3.10).

Assuming \( \eta \in L^2(\Omega_h) \), we define \( \tilde{\eta} \) as

\[
\tilde{\eta} = \begin{cases} 
\eta & (x \in \Omega) \\
0 & \text{(otherwise)}.
\end{cases}
\]

Let \( z \in H^2(\Omega) \) be the solution of

\[
\begin{cases} 
\partial_z - \Delta z = \tilde{\eta} & \text{in } \Omega \\
\frac{\partial z}{\partial \nu} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} z = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma.
\end{cases}
\]

Then,

\[
\| z \|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C \| \eta \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \cdot (3.12)
\]

For \( w \in H^s(\Omega_h) + V_\# \) and \( v \in H^2(\Omega_h) \), by applying the integration by parts, we have

\[
(w, -\Delta v)_{\Omega_h} = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\nabla w, \nabla v)_{\Omega_h} - \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} \langle w, \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} \rangle_E - \sum_{E \in \mathcal{I}_h} \left( \| w \|, \| \nabla v \| \right)_E + \left( \| w \|, \| \nabla v \| \right)_E \\
= a_h(w, v) - \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon + \gamma h E} \langle w - \gamma h E \nu, \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} \rangle_E + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} v \rangle_E. \quad (3.13)
\]

By substituting (3.13) for \( w = \tilde{u} - u_\# \) and \( v = \tilde{z} \), we obtain

\[
(\tilde{u} - u_\#, \eta)_{\Omega_h} = (\tilde{u} - u_\#, -\Delta \tilde{z})_{\Omega_h} + (\tilde{u} - u_\#, \eta + \Delta \tilde{z})_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_h} \\
= a_h(\tilde{u} - u_\#, \tilde{z}) + a_h(\tilde{u}, \tilde{z}) - l_h(\Pi_\# z) + (\tilde{u} - u_\#, \eta + \Delta \tilde{z})_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_h} \\
- \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon + \gamma h E} \langle \tilde{u} - u_\# - \gamma h E \nu, \frac{\partial \tilde{u} - u_\#}{\partial \nu} \rangle_E + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \langle \tilde{z} \rangle_E. \quad (3.14)
\]

Given that \( \nabla \tilde{z} \cdot \nu + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \tilde{z} = 0 \) on \( \pi(E) \), by using the boundary-skin estimates, we have

\[
\sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon + \gamma h E} \langle \tilde{u} - u_\# - \gamma h E \nu, \frac{\partial \tilde{u} - u_\#}{\partial \nu} \rangle_E + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \langle \tilde{z} \rangle_E \\
\leq C \left\| \frac{\partial \tilde{z}}{\partial \nu} \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} \| \tilde{u} - u_\# \|_{\#, h} \\
\leq C \left( \| \nabla \tilde{z} \cdot (\nu \circ \pi) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \tilde{z} \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} + \| \nabla z \cdot (\nu h - \nu \circ \pi) \|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} \| \tilde{u} - u_\# \|_{\#, h} \\
\leq C h \| z \|_{H^2(\Omega)} \| \tilde{u} - u_\# \|_{\#, h}. \quad (3.15)
\]

Hence, we deduce

\[
\| \tilde{u} - u_\# \|_{L^2(\Omega_h)} = \sup_{\eta \in L^2(\Omega_h)} \frac{(\tilde{u} - u_\#, \eta)_{\Omega_h}}{\| \eta \|_{L^2(\Omega)}} \\
\leq C \| \tilde{u} - u_\# \|_{L^2(\Omega_h)} + C h \| \tilde{u} - u_\# \|_{\#, h} \\
\leq C \sup_{\eta \in L^2(\Omega_h)} \frac{a_h(\tilde{u} - u_\#, \tilde{z} - \Pi_\# \tilde{z}) + a_h(\tilde{u}, \Pi_\# \tilde{z}) - l_h(\Pi_\# \tilde{z})}{\| \eta \|_{L^2(\Omega)}}. \quad (3.16)
\]

Using (3.12) and (3.7), we have (3.11).
4 Energy error estimates (Proof of Theorem \( \square \))

**Proof of Theorem \( \square \)** By substituting (3.13) for \( v = \tilde{u} \), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_h^0(\tilde{u}, w) - l_h(w) &= -\Delta \tilde{u} - f, w)_{\Omega_h} + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial \nu_h} + \frac{\tilde{u} - \bar{u}_0}{\varepsilon} - \tilde{g}, w - \gamma h_E \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu_h} \right)_E. \\
&= (\tilde{u} - f, w)_{\Omega_h} + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial \nu_h} + \frac{\tilde{u} - \bar{u}_0}{\varepsilon} - \tilde{g}, w - \gamma h_E \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu_h} \right)_E.
\end{align*}
\]

(4.1)

Considering that \( -\Delta \tilde{u} = \tilde{f} \) on \( \Omega \), by using the boundary-skin estimates and trace inequality, we obtain

\[
|(-\Delta \tilde{u} - f, w)_{\Omega_h}| \leq \| \Delta \tilde{u} + f \|_{L^2(\Omega_h \setminus \Omega)} \| w \|_{L^2(\Omega_h \setminus \Omega)} \leq C h^2 \| u \|_{H^3(\Omega)} \| w \|_{\#_h}. 
\]

(4.2)

By using the boundary-skin estimates, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{E \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial \nu_h} + \frac{\tilde{u} - \bar{u}_0}{\varepsilon} - \tilde{g}, w - \gamma h_E \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu_h} \right)_E &\leq C \left\| \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial \nu_h} + \frac{\tilde{u} - \bar{u}_0}{\varepsilon} - \tilde{g} \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} \| w \|_{\#_h} \\
&\leq C h (\| u \|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \| \tilde{u}_0 \|_{H^1(\Gamma)} + \| \tilde{g} \|_{H^1(\Gamma)}) \| w \|_{\#_h}.
\end{align*}
\]

(4.3)

Therefore, we deduce

\[
|a_h^0(\tilde{u}, w) - l_h(w)| \leq C h (\| u \|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \| w \|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \| \tilde{u}_0 \|_{H^1(\Gamma)} + \| \tilde{g} \|_{H^1(\Gamma)}) \| w \|_{\#_h}.
\]

(4.4)

By substituting (4.4) for \( w = \chi \) and using (3.9), estimate (2.15) holds.

If \( \Omega \) is convex, then \( \Omega_h \subset \Omega \). Hence, we obtain

\[
|(-\Delta \tilde{u} - f, w)_{\Omega_h}| = 0,
\]

and

\[
|a_h^0(\tilde{u}, w) - l_h(w)| \leq C h (\| u \|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \| \tilde{u}_0 \|_{H^1(\Gamma)} + \| \tilde{g} \|_{H^1(\Gamma)}) \| w \|_{\#_h}.
\]

□

Our finite-element and DG spaces are defined using only the P1 element, and Theorem \( \square \) is optimal in the energy norm. If we use higher-order elements, then the resulting error estimate becomes non-optimal because of the difference between \( \Omega \) and \( \Omega_h \).

However, we can obtain the optimal result using the P2 element by assuming a symmetry condition. That is, we prove the following corollary. We define the two finite-element spaces \( V_{N,2} \) and \( V_{DG,2} \) as

\[
V_{N,2} = \{ \chi \in C(\overline{\Omega}) : \chi|_K \in P^2(K), \ K \in \mathcal{T}_h \},
\]

\[
V_{DG,2} = \{ \chi \in L^2(\Omega) : \chi|_K \in P^2(K), \ K \in \mathcal{T}_h \}.
\]

**Corollary 4.1.** Assume that \( \Omega = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| < 1 \} \) and the solution \( u \in H^3(\Omega) \) of (2.1) is radially symmetric. Supposing that \( u_\# \in V_{\#,2} \) is the solution of

\[
a_h^0(u_\#, \chi) = l_h(\chi) \quad \forall \chi \in V_{\#,2},
\]

we have

\[
\| \tilde{u} - u_\# \|_{\#_h} \leq C h^2 (\| u \|_{H^3(\Omega)} + \| \tilde{u}_0 \|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \| \tilde{g} \|_{H^2(\Omega)}).
\]

9
Proof. In a similar manner as the proofs of Lemma 3.3 and Theorem 1, we have

\[ \| \tilde{u} - u \|_{\#_h} \leq C \left[ \inf_{\xi \in V_{\#_h}} \| \tilde{u} - \xi \|_{\#_h} + \sup_{\chi \in V_{\#_h}} \frac{|a_h(\tilde{u}, \chi) - l_h(\chi)|}{\| \chi \|_{\#}} \right], \]

and

\[ |a_h(\tilde{u}, \chi) - l_h(\chi)| \leq C \left\| \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial \nu_h} + \frac{\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_0}{\varepsilon} - \tilde{g} \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} \| \chi \|_{\#_h}
\]

\[ \leq C \left\| \nabla u \cdot \nu_h - \nabla(u \circ \pi) \cdot (\nu \circ \pi) \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma_h)}
\]

\[ + C \left( \| u \|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \| \tilde{u}_0 \|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \| \tilde{g} \|_{H^2(\Omega)} \right) \| \chi \|_{\#_h}. \]

Given that \( u \) is radially symmetric, a function \( U \) exists such that \( U(|x|) = u(x) \) for \( x \in \Omega \).

For \( x \in \Gamma_h \), we define \( 0 \leq \alpha(x) < 1 \) satisfying \( \cos \alpha(x) = \nu_h(x) \cdot (\nu \circ \pi(x)) \). Then, we have

\[ \pi(x) = \frac{x}{|x|}, \quad \nabla u = U'(x)x, \quad \nabla u \cdot \nu_h = U'(|x|) \cos \alpha(x), \quad \nabla(u \circ \pi) \cdot (\nu \circ \pi) = U'(1). \]

Hence, we obtain

\[ \| \nabla u \cdot \nu_h - \nabla(u \circ \pi) \cdot (\nu \circ \pi) \|^2_{L^2(\Gamma_h)} \leq \int_{\Gamma_h} |U'(|x|) - U'(1)|^2 d\gamma_h + |U'(1)|^2 \int_{\Gamma_h} |1 - \cos \alpha(x)|^2 d\gamma_h \]

\[ \leq \int_{\Gamma_h} \left( \int_0^1 |U''(s)| \, ds \right)^2 d\gamma_h + C |U'(1)|^2 h^4 \]

\[ \leq C_0 h^2 \int_{\Gamma_h} \int_{1-C_0 h^2} |U''(s)|^2 \, ds \, d\gamma_h + C |U'(1)|^2 h^4 \]

\[ \leq C h^4 \| u \|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2. \tag{4.7} \]

Therefore, we achieve the estimate (4.6). \( \square \)

5 \( L^2 \) error estimate (Proof of Theorem II)

Proof of Theorem II. We define following bilinear and linear forms.

\[ a(w, v) = (\nabla w, \nabla v)_{\Omega} + b(w, v) \tag{5.1} \]

\[ b(w, v) = \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} \left\{ -\frac{\gamma h_E}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \left( \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}, v \right)_{\pi(E)} + \left( w, \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} \right)_{\pi(E)} \right\}, \]

\[ + \frac{1}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \left( w, v \right)_{\pi(E)} - \frac{\varepsilon \gamma h_E}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \left( \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}, \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} \right)_{\pi(E)} \tag{5.2} \]

\[ l(v) = \langle f, v \rangle_{\Omega} + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} \left\{ \frac{1}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \langle \tilde{u}_0, v \rangle_{\pi(E)} - \frac{\gamma h_E}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \langle \tilde{u}_0, \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} \rangle_{\pi(E)} \right\}
\]

\[ \quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \langle \tilde{g}, v \rangle_{\pi(E)} - \frac{\varepsilon \gamma h_E}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \langle \tilde{g}, \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} \rangle_{\pi(E)} \tag{5.3} \]

Then, we obtain

\[ a(u, v) = l(v) \quad \forall v \in H^s(\Omega). \]
Considering that $\tilde{u}$ and $\tilde{z}$ are continuous in $\Omega_h$, we have $J_h(\tilde{u}, \tilde{z}) = 0$. Moreover,

$$a_h^\#(\tilde{u}, \tilde{z}) - l_h(\tilde{z}) = a_h^\#(\tilde{u}, \tilde{z}) - a(\tilde{u}, \tilde{z}) + l(\tilde{z}) - l_h(\tilde{z})$$

\[
= \left( \int_{\Omega_h \setminus \Omega} (\nabla \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \tilde{z} - \tilde{f} \tilde{z}) \, dx - \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_h} (\nabla \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \tilde{z} - \tilde{f} \tilde{z}) \, dx \right) + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} \frac{1}{\varepsilon + \gamma h_E} \left[ (-\gamma h_E \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial v} + \tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_0 - \varepsilon \tilde{g}, \tilde{z})_E ight. \\
- \left. (\gamma h_E \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial v} + \tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_0 - \varepsilon \tilde{g}, \tilde{z})_{\pi(E)} \right] \\
- \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} \varepsilon \gamma h_E \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial v} + \frac{\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_0}{\varepsilon} - \frac{\partial \tilde{z}}{\partial v} \right)_{\mathcal{E}_h} \\
= I_1 + I_2 - I_3. \quad (5.4)
\]

Using (3.4), we obtain

$$|I_1| \leq C h^2 \left( \| \nabla \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \tilde{z} \|_{W^{1,1}(\tilde{\Omega})} + \| \tilde{f} \tilde{z} \|_{W^{1,1}(\tilde{\Omega})} \right)$$

\[
\leq C h^2 \| u \|_{H^3(\Omega)} \| z \|_{H^2(\Omega)} \quad (5.5)
\]

Given that

$$\langle w, v \rangle_E - \langle w, v \rangle_{\pi(E)} = \int_E (w v - (w \circ \pi)(v \circ \pi)) \, d\gamma_h + \int_E (w \circ \pi)(v \circ \pi) \, d\gamma_h - \int_{\pi(E)} w v \, d\gamma,$$

by using the boundary-skin estimates, we have

$$|I_2| \leq C h^2 \| (-\gamma h \nabla \tilde{u} \cdot \nu + \tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_0 - \varepsilon \tilde{g}) \tilde{z} \|_{L^1(\Gamma)}$$

\[
+ C \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} \left\{ \| (-\gamma h \nabla \tilde{u} \cdot (\nu \circ \pi) + \tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_0 - \varepsilon \tilde{g}) \tilde{z} - \tilde{z} \circ \pi \|_{L^2(E)} \right\} \\
+ \| (-\gamma h E \nabla \tilde{u} \cdot (\nu \circ \pi) + \tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_0 - \varepsilon \tilde{g}) - (\gamma h E \nabla \tilde{u} \cdot (\nu \circ \pi) + \tilde{u} \circ \pi - \tilde{u}_0 \circ \pi - \varepsilon \tilde{g} \circ \pi \|_{L^\infty(E)} \| \tilde{z} \|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\
+ C h \| \nabla \tilde{u} \|_{H^2(\Omega)} \| \tilde{u} \|_{H^1(\tilde{\Omega})} \| \tilde{z} \|_{H^2(\Omega)} \}
\]

\[
\leq C h^2 \| u \|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \| \tilde{u}_0 \|_{H^3(\tilde{\Omega})} + \| \tilde{g} \|_{H^2(\Omega)} \| \tilde{z} \|_{H^2(\Omega)} \langle \tilde{u}, \tilde{z} \rangle_{\pi(E)} \\
+ C h^2 \| u \|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)} + \| \tilde{u}_0 \|_{W^{1,\infty}(\tilde{\Omega})} + \| \tilde{g} \|_{W^{1,\infty}(\tilde{\Omega})} \| \tilde{z} \|_{H^2(\Omega)} + C h^2 \| \nabla \tilde{u} \|_{L^1(\Gamma_h)} \\
\leq C h^2 \| u \|_{H^4(\Omega)} + \| \tilde{u}_0 \|_{H^3(\tilde{\Omega})} + \| \tilde{g} \|_{H^3(\tilde{\Omega})} \| \tilde{z} \|_{H^2(\Omega)} \cdot \quad (5.6)
\]

Similarly, we obtain

$$|I_3| \leq C h^2 \| u \|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \| \tilde{u}_0 \|_{H^3(\tilde{\Omega})} + \| \tilde{g} \|_{H^3(\tilde{\Omega})} \| \tilde{z} \|_{H^2(\Omega)} \cdot \quad (5.7)
\]

Consequently, we deduce

$$|a_h^\#(\tilde{u}, \tilde{z}) - l_h(\tilde{z})| \leq C h^2 \| u \|_{H^4(\Omega)} + \| \tilde{u}_0 \|_{H^3(\tilde{\Omega})} + \| \tilde{g} \|_{H^3(\tilde{\Omega})} \| \tilde{z} \|_{H^2(\Omega)} \cdot \quad (5.8)
\]

By substituting (4.4) for $w = \tilde{z} - \Pi_h \tilde{z}$, we have

$$|a_h^\#(\tilde{u}, \Pi_h \tilde{z}) - l_h(\Pi_h \tilde{z})| \leq |a_h^\#(\tilde{u}, \tilde{z} - \Pi_h \tilde{z}) - l_h(\tilde{z} - \Pi_h \tilde{z})| + |a_h^\#(\tilde{u}, \tilde{z}) - l_h(\tilde{z})|$$

\[
\leq C h^2 \| u \|_{H^4(\Omega)} + \| \tilde{u}_0 \|_{H^3(\tilde{\Omega})} + \| \tilde{g} \|_{H^3(\tilde{\Omega})} \| \tilde{z} \|_{H^2(\Omega)} \cdot \quad (5.9)
\]

Finally, we have

$$\| \tilde{u} - u_h \|_{\Omega_h \setminus \Omega} \leq C h \| \tilde{u} - u_h \|_{DG,h}$$

and we obtain the estimate (2.16).
6 Numerical examples

In this section, we present some numerical results to verify the validity of our error estimates. We consider the domain \( \Omega = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| < 1 \} \).

First, we confirm the validity of the estimates described in Theorem I. Then, we consider the exact solution \( u(x_1, x_2) = \sin(x_1) \sin(x_2) \) and the corresponding \( f, g \) and \( u_0 \). Let \( \varepsilon = 1 \). We calculate the energy error \( \| \tilde{u} - u_\# \|_{\#_h} \) and the \( L^2 \) error \( \| \tilde{u} - u_\# \|_{L^2(\Omega_h)} \). Figure 1 shows the calculation results, where the left graph (a) is Nitsche’s method and the right one (b) is the DG method. As observed in the figure, the convergence orders are almost \( O(h) \) for both norms. Thus, the optimal convergence rates are actually observed and the estimates of Theorem I are confirmed.

Subsequently, we consider the exact solution \( u(x_1, x_2) = \sqrt{(x_1 + 1)^2 + x_2^2} \) and the corresponding \( f, g \) and \( u_0 \). Let \( \varepsilon = 1 \). In this case, \( u \in H^2(\Omega) \) and \( u \notin H^4(\Omega) \). That is, the assumption of Theorem II does not hold. Figure 2 illustrates the result of Nitsche’s method. As shown in the figure, the convergence orders are almost \( O(h) \) for the energy and \( L^2 \) errors. This result is consistent with Theorem II.

Finally, we verify the estimates of Corollary 4.1. We consider the exact solution \( u(x_1, x_2) = \exp(-x_1^2 - x_2^2) \), which is a radially symmetric function. Figure 3 illustrates the results of Nitsche’s method, where the left graph (a) uses the P1 element and the right one (b) utilizes the P2 element. We observe that the convergence orders are almost \( O(h^2) \) for the energy and \( L^2 \) errors using the P2 element. Therefore, the estimates of Corollary 4.1 are confirmed. The results of the non-symmetric case, \( u(x_1, x_2) = \sin(x_1) \sin(x_2) \), are shown in Figure 4. As observed in the figure, the order is almost \( O(h^{1.5}) \) for the energy error using the P2 element.

7 Conclusion

We have presented the energy and \( L^2 \) error estimates of Nitsche’s and DG methods for the Poisson equation with RBC in a smooth domain. The results are optimal for the P1 elements, and the energy error is optimal for the P2 elements in the case of a radially symmetric function. In our future work, we will extend these results to generalized RBC.
Figure 2: Energy errors and $L^2$ errors of $\sqrt{(x_1 + 1)^2 + x_2^2}$ and dynamic boundary conditions.
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Figure 3: Energy errors and $L^2$ errors of $u(x_1, x_2) = \exp(-x_1^2 - x_2^2)$


Figure 4: Energy errors and $L^2$ errors of $u(x_1, x_2) = \sin(x_1) \sin(x_2)$


