

OBTAINING HIGHER-ORDER GALERKIN ACCURACY WHEN THE BOUNDARY IS POLYGONALLY APPROXIMATED

TODD DUPONT, JOHNNY GUZMÁN, AND L. RIDGWAY SCOTT

ABSTRACT. We study two techniques for correcting the geometrical error associated with domain approximation by a polygon. The first was introduced some time ago [2] and leads to a nonsymmetric formulation for Poisson's equation. We introduce a new technique that yields a symmetric formulation and has similar performance. We compare both methods on a simple test problem.

1. INTRODUCTION

When a Dirichlet problem on a smooth domain is approximated by a polygon, an error occurs that is suboptimal for quadratic approximation [1, 10, 11]. However, this can be corrected by a modification of the variational form [2]. Here we review this approach and suggest a new one.

Let Ω be a smooth, bounded, two-dimensional domain. Consider the Poisson equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions:

$$(1) \quad -\Delta u = f \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = g \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

We assume that f and g are sufficiently smooth that u can be extended to be in $H^{k+1}(\widehat{\Omega})$, where $\widehat{\Omega}$ contains a neighborhood of the closure of Ω .

One way to discretize (1) is to approximate the domain Ω by polygons Ω_h , where the edge lengths of $\partial\Omega_h$ are of order h in size. Then conventional finite elements can be employed, with the Dirichlet boundary conditions being approximated by the assumption that $u_h = \hat{g}$ on $\partial\Omega_h$ [3], with \hat{g} appropriately defined. For example, let us suppose for the moment that $g \equiv 0$ and we take $\hat{g} \equiv 0$ as well. In particular, we assume that Ω_h is triangulated with a quasi-uniform mesh \mathcal{T}_h of maximum triangle size h , and the boundary vertices of Ω_h are in $\partial\Omega$. We define $\mathring{W}_h^k := H_0^1(\Omega) \cap W_h^k$ where

$$W_h^k = \{v \in C(\Omega_h) : v|_T \in \mathcal{P}_k(T), \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}.$$

Then the standard finite element approximation finds $u_h \in \mathring{W}_h^k$ satisfying

$$(2) \quad a_h(u_h, v) = (f, v)_{L^2(\Omega_h)}, \quad \forall v \in \mathring{W}_h^k,$$

where $a_h(u, v) := \int_{\Omega_h} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx$. Here we assume that f is extended smoothly outside of Ω .

This approach for $k = 1$ (piecewise linear approximation) leads to the error estimate

$$\|u - u_h\|_{H^1(\Omega_h)} \leq Ch \|u\|_{H^2(\widehat{\Omega})}.$$

However, when this approach is applied with piecewise quadratic polynomials ($k = 2$), the best possible error estimate is

$$(3) \quad \|u - u_h\|_{H^1(\Omega_h)} \leq Ch^{3/2},$$

which is less than optimal order by a factor of \sqrt{h} . The reason of course is that we have made only a piecewise linear approximation of $\partial\Omega$. Table 1 summarizes some computational experiments for

k	M	L2 err	rate	H1 err	rate	seg	hmax
1	2	1.84e+00	NA	6.25e+00	NA	10	1.05e+00
1	4	2.93e-01	2.65	1.89e+00	1.73	20	4.94e-01
1	8	9.55e-02	1.62	1.06e+00	0.83	40	2.61e-01
1	16	2.47e-02	1.95	5.45e-01	0.96	80	1.35e-01
2	2	4.18e-01	NA	1.41e+00	NA	10	1.05e+00
2	4	9.44e-02	2.15	4.26e-01	1.73	20	4.94e-01
2	8	2.30e-02	2.04	1.59e-01	1.42	40	2.61e-01
2	16	5.62e-03	2.03	5.45e-02	1.54	80	1.35e-01
3	2	3.17e-01	NA	8.25e-01	NA	10	1.05e+00
3	4	8.81e-02	1.85	2.94e-01	1.49	20	4.94e-01
3	8	2.22e-02	1.99	1.07e-01	1.46	40	2.61e-01
3	16	5.53e-03	2.01	3.82e-02	1.49	80	1.35e-01

TABLE 1. Errors $u_h - u_I$ in $L^2(\Omega_h)$ and $H^1(\Omega_h)$, as a function of the maximum mesh size (hmax) for the polygonal approximation (2) for test problem in Section 2.1 using various polynomial degrees k . Key: “ M ” is input parameter to `mshr` function `circle` used to generate the mesh, “seg” is the number of boundary edges. The approximate solutions were generated using (2).

the test problem in Section 2.1. We see a significant improvement for quadratics over linears, but there is almost no improvement with cubics. Moreover, we will see that a significant improvement using quadratics can be obtained using simple approaches that modify the variational form.

There have been many techniques introduced to circumvent the loss of accuracy with quadratics (and higher-order piecewise polynomials) [11, 6]. However, all of them require some modification of the quadrature for the elements at the boundary.

Here we review an approach by Bramble et al. [2] that solves directly on Ω_h , but with a modified variational form based on the method of Nitsche [6]. The method [2] has been modified and applied in many ways [4]. However, the method in [2] leads to a non symmetric bilinear form. Given this shortcoming we define a new method that is symmetric and solves the problem on Ω_h that has similar convergence results. As we will see in the next section, one main idea in [2] is that one uses a Taylor series of the solution near the boundary to define appropriate boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega_h$. We should mention that this idea has been used recently (see for example [5, 8]).

2. THE BRAMBLE-DUPONT-THOMÉE APPROACH

The method [2] of Bramble-Dupont-Thomée (BDT) achieves high-order accuracy by modifying Nitsche’s method [6] applied on Ω_h . We assume that $\Omega_h \subset \Omega$ and we do not necessarily assume that the boundary vertices of Ω_h belong to $\partial\Omega$. The bilinear form used in [2] is



$$(4) \quad N_h(u, v) = a_h(u, v) - \int_{\partial\Omega_h} \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} v \, ds - \int_{\partial\Omega_h} \left(u + \delta \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} \right) \left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial n} - \gamma h^{-1} v \right) ds$$

Here, n denotes the outward-directed normal to $\partial\Omega_h$ and

$$\delta(x) = \min \{s > 0 : x + sn \in \partial\Omega\}.$$

Contrast the definition of δ to the closely related function d defined by

$$d(x) = \min \{|x - y| : y \in \partial\Omega\}.$$

FIGURE 1. Definitions of (a) δ and (b) d .FIGURE 2. Errors $u_h - u_I$ in (a) $L^2(\Omega_h)$ and (b) $H^1(\Omega_h)$ as a function of the maximum mesh size for the BDT method with $\gamma = 100$. The asterisks indicate data for (a) $k = 4$ and (b) $k = 5$.

For simplicity we assume that $g = 0$. Then the BDT method will find $u_h \in W_h^k$ such that

$$N_h(u_h, v) = \int_{\Omega_h} f v \, dx \quad \text{for all } v \in W_h^k.$$

If δ were 0, this would be Nitsche's method on Ω_h .

Corrections of arbitrary order, involving terms $\delta^\ell \frac{\partial^\ell u}{\partial n^\ell}$ for $\ell > 1$ are studied in [2], but for simplicity we restrict attention to the first-order correction to Nitsche's method given in (4). The error estimates obtained in [2] are as follows

$$\| \| u - u_h \| \|_1 \leq C h^k \| u \|_{H^{k+1}(\Omega)} + C h^{7/2} \| u \|_{W_\infty^2(\Omega)},$$

where

$$\| \| v \| \|_1 := \left(a_h(v, v) + h^{-1} \int_{\partial\Omega_h} v^2 \, ds + h \int_{\partial\Omega_h} \left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial n} \right)^2 \, ds \right)^{1/2}.$$

Thus using the variational form (4) leads to an approximation that is optimal-order with quadratics and cubics and is only suboptimal for quartics by a factor of \sqrt{h} .

2.1. An example of a circle. We consider a numerical example. Consider the case where Ω is a disc of radius R centered at the origin, in which case we have $d(x) = R - |x|$. However, it is more difficult to evaluate $\delta(x)$. We have $x + \delta(x)n \in \partial\Omega$ for $x \in \partial\Omega_h$, where n denotes the

k	M	hmax	L2 error	rate	H1 error	rate
1	8	0.261	0.0947	1.61	1.06	0.82
1	16	0.135	0.0245	1.95	0.544	0.96
1	32	0.0688	0.00639	1.94	0.277	0.97
1	64	0.0353	0.00158	2.02	0.137	1.02
2	8	0.261	2.81e-03	2.61	0.103	1.57
2	16	0.135	3.70e-04	2.93	0.0277	1.89
2	32	0.0688	4.77e-05	2.96	0.00717	1.95
2	64	0.0353	5.91e-06	3.01	0.00179	2.00
3	8	0.261	1.56e-04	3.92	5.31e-03	2.54
3	16	0.135	9.44e-06	4.05	7.06e-04	2.91
3	32	0.0688	5.81e-07	4.02	9.23e-05	2.94
3	64	0.0353	3.57e-08	4.02	1.15e-05	3.00
4	8	0.261	1.49e-04	3.96	7.41e-04	3.42
4	16	0.135	9.29e-06	4.00	6.63e-05	3.48
4	32	0.0688	5.80e-07	4.00	5.90e-06	3.49
4	64	0.0353	3.63e-08	4.00	5.22e-07	3.50
5	8	0.261	1.47e-04	3.96	7.10e-04	3.41
5	16	0.135	9.27e-06	3.99	6.44e-05	3.46
5	32	0.0688	5.80e-07	4.00	5.77e-06	3.48
5	64	0.0353	3.62e-08	4.00	5.12e-07	3.49

TABLE 2. Errors $u_h - u_I$ in $L^2(\Omega_h)$ and $H^1(\Omega_h)$ as a function of mesh size (hmax) for the the BDT approximation in Section 2, with $\gamma = 100$, for various polynomial degrees k . Key: M is the value of the `meshsize` input parameter to the `mshr` function `circle` used to generate the mesh. The number of boundary edges was set to $5M$, and hmax is the maximum mesh size.

outward normal to Ω_h . We can write $x = (x \cdot n)n + (x \cdot t)t$, and $(x \cdot t)^2 = |x|^2 - (x \cdot n)^2$. Since $|x + \delta(x)n| = R$, we have

$$R^2 = (x \cdot t)^2 + (x \cdot n + \delta(x))^2 = |x|^2 - (x \cdot n)^2 + ((x \cdot n + \delta(x)))^2.$$

Then

$$\delta(x) = \pm \sqrt{R^2 - |x|^2 + (x \cdot n)^2} - x \cdot n.$$

Note that for $x \in \partial\Omega_h$, $|x| \leq R$ and $x \cdot n > 0$. Since $\delta(x) \geq 0$, we must pick the plus sign, so

$$\delta(x) = \sqrt{R^2 - |x|^2 + (x \cdot n)^2} - x \cdot n.$$

It is not hard to see that $d - \delta = \mathcal{O}(h^4)$ in this case.

This problem is simple to implement using the FEniCS Project code `dolfin` [7]. We take $R = 1$, $u(x, y) = 1 - (x^2 + y^2)^3$, and $f = 36(x^2 + y^2)^2$ in the computational experiments described subsequently. Computational results for this example are given in Table 2 where we see optimal order approximation for $k \leq 3$, improvement for $k = 4$ over $k = 3$ (suboptimal by a factor $h^{-1/2}$), and no improvement for quintics. These errors are depicted in Figure 2.

3. A NEW METHOD BASED ON A ROBIN-TYPE APPROACH

One issue with the BDT method is that the resulting linear system is not symmetric, although it is possible to symmetrize the method as we discuss in Section 8. Here we develop a technique

that leads to a symmetric system. Moreover, this method does not require the parameter(s) from Nitsche's method. For Nitsche's method to succeed, γ must be chosen appropriately [9].

We first separate $\partial\Omega$ to its piecewise linear part and its curvilinear part. We will assume that $\partial\Omega = \Gamma^0 \cup S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_\ell$ where Γ^0 is a piecewise linear segment and S_i 's are C^2 and nowhere linear. We let the end points of S_i to be y_{i-1}, y_i .

For the method in this section we assume that the vertices of Ω_h belong to $\partial\Omega$ and hence Ω_h might not be a subdomain of Ω . Hence, we need to define δ in this case. We assume that for every $x \in \partial\Omega_h$ that is there is a unique smallest number $\delta(x)$ in absolute value such that $\Omega \setminus \Gamma^0$

$$x + \delta(x)n(x) \in \partial\Omega.$$

We assume that the approximate domain boundary $\partial\Omega_h$ can be decomposed into three parts, as follows. Let \mathcal{E}_h be the edges of $\partial\Omega_h$.

$$(5) \quad \Gamma^\pm = \cup \{e \in \mathcal{E}_h : \pm\delta|_{e^o} > 0\},$$

where e^o denotes the interior of e . Let $\Gamma = \Gamma^+ \cup \Gamma^-$. We assume the following.

Assumption 1. *We assume that all the vertices of $\partial\Omega_h$ belong to $\partial\Omega$ and that each y_i (for $0 \leq i \leq \ell$) is a vertex of $\partial\Omega_h$. Finally, we assume that*

$$\partial\Omega_h = \Gamma^0 \cup \Gamma.$$

Our method is based on a Robin type of boundary condition on Γ . In fact, our method will be based on the closely related problem:

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta w &= f, & \text{on } \Omega, \\ w &= 0, & \text{on } \Gamma^0, \\ w + \delta \frac{\partial w}{\partial n} &= \hat{g}, & \text{on } \Gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Here we define $\hat{g}(x) = g(x + \delta(x)n(x))$ for $x \in \Gamma$ and not a vertex of $\partial\Omega_h$. The key here is that, using that u vanishes on $\partial\Omega$, for $x \in \Gamma$ (x not a vertex of $\partial\Omega_h$) we have

$$(6) \quad u(x) + \delta \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x) = \hat{g}(x) - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \partial_{nn} u(z),$$

where z lies in the line segment with end points x and $x + \delta(x)n(x)$.

Now we can write the method. We start by defining the finite element space we will use

$$V_h^k = \{W_h^k : v = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma^0, v(x) = 0 \text{ for all vertices of } x \text{ of } \partial\Omega_h\}.$$

Also define

$$V_h^k(g) = \{W_h^k : v = g_I \text{ on } \Gamma^0, v(x) = Ig(x) \text{ for all vertices of } x \text{ of } \partial\Omega_h\}.$$

where $g_I \in C(\partial\Omega_h)$ is a suitable approximation of g and is a piecewise polynomial of degree at most k on $\partial\Omega_h$.

The bilinear form is given by

$$b_h(u, v) := a_h(u, v) + c_h(u, v),$$

where

$$c_h(u, v) = \int_{\Gamma} \delta^{-1} uv \, ds.$$

Then the method solves:

Find $u_h \in V_h^k(g)$ such that

$$(7) \quad b_h(u_h, v) = \int_{\Omega_h} Fv + \int_{\Gamma} \delta^{-1} \hat{g}v \, ds. \quad \text{for all } v \in V_h^k.$$

Here

$$F = \begin{cases} f & \text{on } \Omega \cap \Omega_h \\ I^1 f & \text{on } \Omega_h \setminus \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where I^1 is the linear interpolant onto W_h^1 . Note that we can define $I^1 f$ only knowing f on Ω . Alternatively, if we have an analytic representation of f we can define F as a smooth extension of f outside of Ω .

4. ERROR ANALYSIS

4.1. Stability Analysis. Unfortunately, the bilinear form b_h is not positive definite. However, we will be able to prove stability of method. In order to do so, we need to decompose the space V_h^k into its boundary contribution and interior contribution. More precisely, we can write

$$V_h^k = \mathring{W}_h^k \oplus \mathcal{B}_h^k,$$

where $\mathcal{B}_h^k = \{v \in V_h^k : v(x) = 0 \text{ for all interior Lagrange points } x\}$. We will define a norm on V_h^k :

$$\|v\|_a^2 := a_h(v, v)$$

and a semi-norm

$$|v|_c^2 := \int_{\Gamma} \frac{v^2}{|\delta|} \, ds.$$

Note that $|\cdot|_c$ is in fact a norm on \mathcal{B}_h^k .

The following crucial lemma will allow us to prove stability.

Lemma 1. *There exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that*

$$(8) \quad \|v\|_a \leq c_1 \sqrt{h} |v|_c \text{ for all } v \in \mathcal{B}_h^k.$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{E}_h^Γ be the collection of edges that are a subset of Γ and let \mathcal{T}_h^Γ be triangles T such that T has an edge in \mathcal{E}_h^Γ . Then, if $v \in \mathcal{B}_h^k$ and using inverse estimates we have

$$\|v\|_a^2 = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(T)}^2 \leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^\Gamma} \frac{C}{h_T^2} \|v\|_{L^2(T)}^2 \leq \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^\Gamma} \frac{C}{h_e} \|v\|_{L^2(e)}^2.$$

The result is complete after we use that $\max_{x \in e} |\delta(x)| \leq Ch_e^2$ for $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^\Gamma$. \square

We note that $c_h(u, v)$ may not be well defined for all $u, v \in V_h^k$. Therefore, we need to make an assumption on δ such that this is not the case.

Assumption 2. *We assume that δ is such that*

$$(9) \quad |c_h(u, v)| < \infty \quad \forall u, v \in V_h^k.$$

For example, if δ has a lower bound as follows, then (9) will hold. Suppose that the end points of $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^\Gamma$ are x_0 and x_1 . Then we assume that there exists a constant $c > 0$ and a $p < 3$ such that

$$|x - x_0|^p |x - x_1|^p \leq c |\delta(x)| \quad \text{for all } x \in e,$$

where c is independent of $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^\Gamma$. Under these conditions, Assumption 2 holds.

We can now prove the stability result.

Theorem 1. *We assume that Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 hold. Suppose that G is a bounded linear function on V_h^k and suppose that $u_h \in V_h^k$ solves*

$$b_h(u_h, v) = G(v), \quad \text{for all } v \in V_h^k.$$

Then, assuming $c_1\sqrt{h} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ we have

$$\|u_h\|_a \leq 2 \left(\sup_{v_h \in \dot{W}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{\|v_h\|_a} \right) + \frac{11}{3}c_1\sqrt{h} \left(\sup_{v_h \in \mathcal{B}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{|v_h|_c} \right).$$

and

$$|u_h|_c \leq \frac{3}{2} \left(\sup_{v_h \in \dot{W}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{\|v_h\|_a} \right) + \frac{5}{3} \left(\sup_{v_h \in \mathcal{B}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{|v_h|_c} \right).$$

Proof. We know we can write $u_h = w_h + s_h$ where $w_h \in \dot{W}_h^k$ and $s_h \in \mathcal{B}_h^k$. Define $\phi_h \in \mathcal{B}_h^k$ by

$$\phi_h = \begin{cases} s_h & \text{on } \Gamma^+ \\ -s_h & \text{on } \Gamma^- \\ 0 & \text{on } \Gamma^0. \end{cases}$$

Note that $|\phi_h|_c = |s_h|_c$. Now we can estimate s_h .

$$|s_h|_c^2 = c_h(s_h, \phi_h) = b_h(u_h, \phi_h) - a_h(u_h, \phi_h) = G(\phi_h) - a_h(u_h, \phi_h).$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |s_h|_c^2 &\leq \left(\sup_{v_h \in \mathcal{B}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{|v_h|_c} \right) |\phi_h|_c + \|u_h\|_a \|\phi_h\|_a \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{v_h \in \mathcal{B}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{|v_h|_c} \right) |s_h|_c + c_1\sqrt{h}(\|w_h\|_a + c_1\sqrt{h}|s_h|_c)|s_h|_c. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used (8) twice. In particular, we used $\|u_h\|_a \leq \|w_h\|_a + \|s_h\|_a \leq \|w_h\|_a + c_1\sqrt{h}|s_h|_c$. Assuming $hc_1^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}$ we have

$$\frac{3}{4}|s_h|_c^2 \leq \left(\sup_{v_h \in \mathcal{B}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{|v_h|_c} \right) |s_h|_c + \frac{1}{2}\|w_h\|_a |s_h|_c.$$

Hence,

$$(10) \quad |s_h|_c \leq \frac{4}{3} \left(\sup_{v_h \in \mathcal{B}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{|v_h|_c} \right) + \frac{2}{3}\|w_h\|_a$$

Next,

$$\|w_h\|_a^2 = a_h(w_h, w_h) = a_h(u_h, w_h) - a_h(s_h, w_h) = b_h(u_h, w_h) - a_h(s_h, w_h) = G(w_h) - a_h(s_h, w_h).$$

We therefore have

$$\|w_h\|_a^2 \leq \left(\sup_{v_h \in \dot{W}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{|v_h|_a} \right) \|w_h\|_a + \|s_h\|_a \|w_h\|_a.$$

Hence, we obtain using (10)

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_h\|_a &\leq \left(\sup_{v_h \in \dot{W}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{\|v_h\|_a} \right) + \|s_h\|_a \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{v_h \in \dot{W}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{\|v_h\|_a} \right) + c_1 \sqrt{h} \|s_h\|_c \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{v_h \in \dot{W}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{\|v_h\|_a} \right) + \frac{4}{3} c_1 \sqrt{h} \left(\sup_{v_h \in \mathcal{B}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{|v_h|_c} \right) + \frac{1}{3} \|w_h\|_a \end{aligned}$$

Thus we arrive at

$$\|w_h\|_a \leq \frac{3}{2} \left(\sup_{v_h \in \dot{W}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{\|v_h\|_a} \right) + 2c_1 \sqrt{h} \left(\sup_{v_h \in \mathcal{B}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{|v_h|_c} \right).$$

From this and (10) we get

$$|u_h|_c = |s_h|_c \leq \frac{3}{2} \left(\sup_{v_h \in \dot{W}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{\|v_h\|_a} \right) + \frac{5}{3} \left(\sup_{v_h \in \mathcal{B}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{|v_h|_c} \right).$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_h\|_a &\leq \|w_h\|_a + \|s_h\|_a \leq \|w_h\|_a + c_1 \sqrt{h} \|s_h\|_c \\ &\leq 2 \left(\sup_{v_h \in \dot{W}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{\|v_h\|_a} \right) + \frac{11}{3} c_1 \sqrt{h} \left(\sup_{v_h \in \mathcal{B}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{|v_h|_c} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

We can now prove error estimates after we make an assumption more stringent than Assumption 2.

Assumption 3. Suppose that the end points of $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^\Gamma$ are x_0 and x_1 . Then we assume that there exists a constant $\beta > 0$ such that

$$|x - x_0||x - x_1| \leq \beta |\delta(x)| \quad \text{for all } x \in e,$$

where β is independent of $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^\Gamma$.

Note that this assumption does not allow $\partial\Omega$ and $\partial\Omega_h$ to be tangent on the vertices of Γ . Assumption 3 implies Assumption 2; in particular, the example after Assumption 2 holds with $p = 1$.

Theorem 2. We assume Assumptions 1 and 3 hold. We assume that u solves (1) and belongs to $u \in W^{s,\infty}(\Omega)$ where $s = \max\{k+1, 4\}$. We assume that $g_I = u_I|_{\partial\Omega_h}$ where $u_I \in W_h^k$ is the Lagrange interpolant of u . Let $u_h \in V_h^k(g)$ solve (7) and assume that u solves (1) then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_h\|_a &\leq Ch^k \|u\|_{H^{k+1}(\hat{\Omega})} + Ch^{k+1/2} \|u\|_{W^{k+1,\infty}(\Gamma)} \\ &\quad + C \left(h^4 \|u\|_{W^{4,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})} + h^{7/2} \|u\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |u - u_h|_c &\leq Ch^k \|u\|_{H^{k+1}(\hat{\Omega})} + Ch^k \|u\|_{W^{k+1,\infty}(\Gamma)} \\ &\quad + C \left(h^4 \|u\|_{W^{4,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})} + h^3 \|u\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We let $e_h = u_I - u_h \in V_h^k$. Then we see that

$$b_h(e_h, v) = G(v) \quad \text{for all } v \in V_h^k,$$

where $G(v) = G_1(v) + G_2(v)$, $G_1(v) = \int_{\Omega_h} Fv dx - b_h(u, v)$ and $G_2(v) = b_h(u - u_I, v)$.

Note that using integration by parts we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(v) &= \int_{\Omega_h} Fv + \int_{\Gamma} \delta^{-1} \hat{g}v ds - \int_{\Omega_h} (-\Delta u)v dx - \int_{\Gamma} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} + \frac{1}{\delta}(u - \hat{g}) \right) v \\ &= \int_{\Omega_h \setminus \Omega} (I^1(-\Delta u) - (-\Delta u))v dx - \int_{\Gamma} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} + \frac{1}{\delta}(u - \hat{g}) \right) v. \end{aligned}$$

First consider $v \in \mathring{W}_h^k$ then we have

$$|G_1(v)| \leq h^2 \|u\|_{W^{4,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})} \|v\|_{L^1(\Omega_h \setminus \Omega)}$$

However, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{L^1(\Omega_h \setminus \Omega)} &\leq Ch^2 \|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_h \setminus \Omega)} \\ &\leq Ch^3 \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\ &\leq Ch^2 \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = Ch^2 \|v\|_a. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get

$$\sup_{v \in \mathring{W}_h^k} \frac{|G_1(v)|}{|v|_a} \leq Ch^4 \|u\|_{W^{4,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})}.$$

□

Now consider $v \in \mathcal{B}_h^k$.

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(v) &= h^4 \|u\|_{W^{4,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})} \|v\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma)} + \|\delta^{-1/2}(\delta \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} + u - \hat{g})\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma)} \|v\|_c \\ &\leq h^{7/2} \|u\|_{W^{4,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})} \|v\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} + h^3 \|u\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})} \|v\|_c \\ &\leq h^{9/2} \|u\|_{W^{4,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})} |v|_c + h^3 \|u\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})} \|v\|_c. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used (6).

Hence,

$$\sqrt{h} \left(\sup_{v \in \mathcal{B}_h^k} \frac{|G_1(v)|}{|v|_c} \right) \leq C (h^{7/2} \|u\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})} + h^5 \|u\|_{W^{4,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})}).$$

Now lets consider G_2 . If we let $v \in \mathring{W}_h^k$ then

$$G_2(v) = a_h(u - u_I, v) \leq \|u - u_I\|_a \|v\|_a$$

Hence,

$$\sup_{v \in \mathring{W}_h^k} \frac{|G_2(v)|}{\|v\|_a} \leq Ch^k \|u\|_{H^k(\hat{\Omega})}.$$

Now let $v \in \mathcal{B}_h^k$ we then have

$$G_2(v) = \|u - u_I\|_a \|v\|_a + |u - u_I|_c |v|_c \leq c_1 \sqrt{h} \|u - u_I\|_a \|v\|_c + |u - u_I|_c |v|_c.$$

Let $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$, $e \subset \Gamma$ with end points x_0 and x_1 . Then, we have $|(u - u_I)(x)|^2 \leq C|x - x_0||x - x_1| \|\partial_t(u - u_I)\|_{L^\infty(e)}$. Hence, using Assumption 3 we get

$$\frac{(u - u_I)^2(x)}{|\delta(x)|} \leq C\beta \|\partial_t(u - u_I)\|_{L^\infty(e)}.$$

Thus,

$$\int_e \frac{(u - u_I)^2}{|\delta|} ds \leq C\beta |e| \|\partial_t(u - u_I)\|_{L^\infty(e)}^2.$$

We then obtain the following estimate, after summing over all edges $e \subset \Gamma$,

$$|u - u_I|_c^2 \leq C \|\partial_t(u - u_I)\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma)}^2.$$

We get the following inequality after using approximation properties of the Lagrange interpolant:

$$|u - u_I|_c \leq Ch^k \|u\|_{W^{k+1,\infty}(\Gamma)}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\sqrt{h} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{B}_h^k} \frac{|G_2(v)|}{|v|_c} \leq Ch^{k+1/2} (\|u\|_{W^{k+1,\infty}(\Gamma)} + \|u\|_{H^{k+1}(\hat{\Omega})}).$$

Combining the above results we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{v \in \hat{W}_h^k} \frac{|G(v_h)|}{\|v_h\|_a} &\leq C \left(h^k \|u\|_{H^{k+1}(\hat{\Omega})} + h^4 \|u\|_{W^{4,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})} \right). \\ \sqrt{h} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{B}_h^k} \frac{|G(v)|}{|v|_c} &\leq C \left(h^{7/2} \|u\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})} + h^5 \|u\|_{W^{4,\infty}(\hat{\Omega})} \right) \\ &\quad + Ch^{k+1/2} \left(\|u\|_{W^{k+1,\infty}(\Gamma)} + \|u\|_{H^{k+1}(\hat{\Omega})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The result now follows from Theorem 1.

5. IMPLEMENTATION

One feature of Nitsche's method, that is preserved with BDT, is that one uses the full space W_h^k of piecewise polynomials without restriction at the boundary. The modification of W_h^k to obtain the space V_h^k of piecewise polynomials vanishing at boundary vertices is not trivial to implement in automated systems like FEniCS [7].

Thus it is of interest to consider a simplification to the Robin-type method (7) which removes this constraint. Thus we define, for $\epsilon > 0$,

$$b_h^\epsilon(u, v) = a_h(u, v) + c_h^\epsilon(u, v),$$

where $c_h^\epsilon(u, v) := \int_\Gamma (\epsilon \operatorname{sign}(\delta) + \delta)^{-1} uv \, ds$. We then define $\hat{W}_h^k = \{v \in W_h^k : v = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma^0\}$ and $\hat{W}_h^k(g) = \{v \in W_h^k : v = g_I \text{ on } \Gamma^0\}$.

For implementation issues we solve $u_h \in \hat{W}_h^k(g)$ by

$$(11) \quad b_h^\epsilon(u_h, v_h) = \int_{\Omega_h} Fv \, dx + c_h^\epsilon(\hat{g}, v) \quad \forall v \in \hat{W}_h^k.$$

The computational experiments used this approach. The answers do not depend on ϵ for ϵ small, as indicated in Table 3. We were even able to have $\epsilon = 0$ for (11) using `dolphin`.

k	M	segs	hmax	ϵ	L2 err	H1 err	bdry err
2	64	320	3.5e-02	1.0e-04	1.1e-03	2.1e-03	1.3e-01
2	64	320	3.5e-02	1.0e-05	1.1e-04	1.8e-03	2.5e-02
2	64	320	3.5e-02	1.0e-06	1.2e-05	1.8e-03	3.2e-03
2	64	320	3.5e-02	1.0e-07	6.0e-06	1.8e-03	3.2e-04
2	64	320	3.5e-02	1.0e-08	5.9e-06	1.8e-03	4.3e-05
2	64	320	3.5e-02	1.0e-09	5.9e-06	1.8e-03	3.1e-05
2	64	320	3.5e-02	1.0e-10	5.9e-06	1.8e-03	3.1e-05
2	128	640	1.8e-02	1.0e-07	1.3e-06	4.4e-04	6.4e-04
2	128	640	1.8e-02	1.0e-08	7.3e-07	4.4e-04	6.5e-05
2	128	640	1.8e-02	1.0e-09	7.2e-07	4.4e-04	7.3e-06
2	128	640	1.8e-02	1.0e-10	7.2e-07	4.4e-04	3.9e-06
2	128	640	1.8e-02	1.0e-11	7.2e-07	4.4e-04	3.9e-06
2	256	1280	9.0e-03	1.0e-09	8.9e-08	1.1e-04	1.3e-05
2	256	1280	9.0e-03	1.0e-10	8.9e-08	1.1e-04	1.3e-06
2	256	1280	9.0e-03	1.0e-11	8.9e-08	1.1e-04	4.9e-07
2	256	1280	9.0e-03	1.0e-12	8.9e-08	1.1e-04	4.9e-07

TABLE 3. Errors $\|u_h - u_I\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)}$, $\|u_h - u_I\|_{H^1(\Omega_h)}$, and $\|\delta|^{-1/2}(u_h - u_I)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_h)}$ as a function of ϵ and maximum mesh size (hmax) for the Robin-like approximation (7) but modified as in (11), for piecewise quadratic polynomials ($k = 2$). Key: M is the value of the `meshsize` input parameter to the `mshr` function `circle` used to generate the mesh; `segs` is the number of boundary edges.

6. COMPUTATIONAL EXPERIMENTS

6.1. Example of a circle. We return now to the computational test problem described in Section 2.1. It is not difficult to show that Assumption 3 holds for the meshes we used. We see from Table 4 that the $H^1(\Omega_h)$ error is optimal order for $k \leq 3$, consistent with Theorem 2. In these cases, the $L^2(\Omega_h)$ error is also optimal order, and the boundary error is higher order for quadratics. For $k \geq 4$ our numerical experiments seem to predict the error

$$\|u - u_h\|_{H^1(\Omega_h)} \approx C(h^{7/2} + h^k),$$

which coincides with Theorem 2.

It appears from Table 4 that the boundary error term

$$\|\delta|^{-1/2}(u - u_h)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_h)} \approx Ch^3, \quad \text{for all } k \geq 2,$$

which is consistent with Theorem 2.

6.2. An example with $\delta < 0$. Now consider the case where Ω is a disc of radius 1 centered at the origin, having a concentric disc of radius $R < 1$ removed. Again, it is not difficult to show that Assumption 3 holds for our meshes.

For boundary value problem, we take $R = \frac{1}{2}$ and $-\Delta u = f$, with

$$u(x, y) = (x^2 + y^2) - 5(x^2 + y^2)^2 + 4(x^2 + y^2)^3, \quad f = -4 + 80(x^2 + y^2) - 144(x^2 + y^2)^2$$

in the computational experiments described in Table 5. Note that u vanishes on both boundary arcs. Note that the error estimates are consistent with Theorem 2.




FIGURE 3. Errors $u_h - u_I$ in (a) $L^2(\Omega_h)$ and (b) $H^1(\Omega_h)$ as a function of the maximum mesh size for the method (7). The asterisks indicate data for (a) $k = 4$ and (b) $k = 5$.

k	M	hmax	L2 error	rate	H1 error	rate	bdry err	rate
1	16	0.135	0.0264	1.95	0.545	0.96	0.292	1.04
1	32	0.0688	0.00683	1.95	0.277	0.98	0.145	1.01
1	64	0.0353	0.00169	2.01	0.137	1.02	0.0724	1.00
2	16	0.135	3.71e-04	2.88	0.0278	1.90	0.00177	2.71
2	32	0.0688	4.80e-05	2.95	0.00719	1.95	2.52e-04	2.81
2	64	0.0353	5.94e-06	3.02	0.00179	2.00	3.12e-05	3.02
3	16	0.135	8.43e-06	3.94	7.07e-04	2.91	5.22e-04	2.98
3	32	0.0688	5.39e-07	3.97	9.25e-05	2.93	6.52e-05	3.00
3	64	0.0353	3.35e-08	4.00	1.15e-05	3.01	8.13e-06	3.01
4	16	0.135	8.43e-06	3.99	7.07e-05	3.45	5.34e-04	2.97
4	32	0.0688	5.27e-07	4.00	6.38e-06	3.47	6.74e-05	2.99
4	64	0.0353	3.29e-08	4.00	5.69e-07	3.49	8.47e-06	2.99
5	16	0.135	8.43e-06	3.99	6.80e-05	3.45	5.35e-04	2.97
5	32	0.0688	5.27e-07	4.00	6.11e-06	3.48	6.75e-05	2.99
5	64	0.0353	3.30e-08	4.00	5.45e-07	3.49	8.47e-06	2.99

TABLE 4. Errors $\|u_h - u_I\|_{L^2(\Omega_h)}$, $\|u_h - u_I\|_{H^1(\Omega_h)}$, and $\|\delta^{-1/2}(u_h - u_I)\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega_h)}$ as a function of mesh size (hmax) for the method (11) for various polynomial degrees k . The fudge factor ϵ was taken to be 10^{-13} . Results were insignificantly different for smaller values. Key: M is the value of the `meshsize` input parameter to the `mshr` function `circle` used to generate the mesh. The number of boundary edges was set to $5M$, and hmax is the maximum mesh size.

7. BOUNDARY LAYERS

It is natural to expect the error with various boundary approximations might be limited to a boundary layer, with the interior error of a smaller magnitude. Our observations indicate something like this, but the behavior is more complex. In Figure 4, we see two computations done on the same mesh based on a triangulation of Ω_h with $\partial\Omega_h$ having 80 segments and using piecewise-quadratic approximation. In Figure 4(a), we see the simple polygonal approximation

k	M	hmax	L2 error	H1 error	bdry error
2	16	0.132	8.76e-04	6.87e-02	1.39e-04
2	32	0.070	1.20e-04	1.84e-02	9.64e-06
2	64	0.036	1.54e-05	4.68e-03	6.51e-07
3	16	0.132	2.90e-05	2.29e-03	6.59e-05
3	32	0.070	1.89e-06	3.07e-04	4.13e-06
3	64	0.036	1.17e-07	3.93e-05	2.47e-07
4	16	0.132	2.23e-05	3.37e-04	7.24e-05
4	32	0.070	1.39e-06	2.97e-05	4.57e-06
4	64	0.036	8.10e-08	2.61e-06	2.76e-07

TABLE 5. Errors $u_h - u_I$ measured in $L^2(\Omega_h)$ (L2 error), $H^1(\Omega_h)$ (H1 error), and $L^2(\partial\Omega_h)$ (bdry error) as a function of mesh size (hmax) for the the Robin approximation in (11), for selected polynomial degrees k . $\epsilon = 10^{-9}$. Key: M is the value of the `meshsize` input parameter to the `mshr` function `circle` used to generate the mesh. The number of boundary edges for the outer boundary was set to $4M$, and the number of boundary edges for the inner boundary was set to $2M$.




FIGURE 4. Error with piecewise quadratics on a mesh with $\partial\Omega_h$ having 80 segments. The mesh is drawn in the plane corresponding to zero error. (a) The method (2), no boundary integral corrections. The error is uniformly positive. (b) The Robin-like method (7). The error oscillates around zero. Note the factor of ten difference in scales in the error plots.

(2). In this case, the error is somewhat larger near the boundary, but it does not decay to zero in the interior. Thus there is a significant pollution effect away from the boundary. On the other hand, Figure 4(b) shows what happens if the Robin-like method (7). Now we see that the error does decay towards zero in the interior, with the majority of the error concentrated at the boundary.

8. HIGHER ORDER AND SYMMETRIC METHODS

The Robin-type method presented in the previous section is at most of $O(h^{7/2})$. High-order methods using the same technique do not lead to symmetric systems. For simplicity assume

that $g \equiv 0$. Using that

$$\left| u|_{\partial\Omega_h} + \delta \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} \Big|_{\partial\Omega_h} + \frac{\delta^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial n^2} \Big|_{\partial\Omega_h} \right| \leq C\delta^3 \|u\|_{W_\infty^3(\Omega)},$$

we define

$$(12) \quad b_h(u, v) = a_h(u, v) + \int_{\partial\Omega_h} \delta^{-1} uv \, ds + \int_{\partial\Omega_h} \frac{\delta}{2} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial n^2} v \, ds.$$

Unfortunately, b_h is not symmetric.

One way to have higher-order, symmetric methods is by symmetrizing the approach of Bramble-Dupont-Thomée. Recall that Bramble et al. [2] developed arbitrary order methods, but that the bilinear forms are not symmetric. The lowest order method was presented in Section 2 where the bilinear N_h is given by (4). One way to symmetrize N_h and maintaining the same convergence rates is by introducing the bilinear form:

$$M_h(u, v) = N_h(u, v) + \int_{\partial\Omega_h} \gamma \delta h^{-1} \frac{\partial v}{\partial n} \left(u + \delta \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} \right) ds.$$

This is precisely what is done in [4, (2.31)]. We see that

$$M_h(u, v) = a_h(u, v) + \int_{\partial\Omega_h} \left(\gamma \frac{\delta}{h} - 1 \right) \left(\delta \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} \frac{\partial v}{\partial n} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} v + \frac{\partial v}{\partial n} u \right) ds + \frac{\gamma}{h} \int_{\partial\Omega_h} uv \, ds.$$

Note that M_h is symmetric. We will investigate this and similar methods in the near future.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Berger, R. Scott, and G. Strang. Approximate boundary conditions in the finite element method. *Symposia Mathematica*, 10:295–313, 1972.
- [2] James H. Bramble, Todd Dupont, and Vidar Thomée. Projection methods for Dirichlet’s problem in approximating polygonal domains with boundary-value corrections. *Mathematics of Computation*, 26(120):869–879, 1972.
- [3] Susanne C. Brenner and L. Ridgway Scott. *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*. Springer-Verlag, third edition, 2008.
- [4] Erik Burman, Peter Hansbo, and Mats G. Larson. A cut finite element method with boundary value correction. *Mathematics of Computation*, 2017.
- [5] Bernardo Cockburn and Manuel Solano. Solving Dirichlet boundary-value problems on curved domains by extensions from subdomains. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 34 (1), no. 1: A497–A519, 2012.
- [6] Mika Juntunen and Rolf Stenberg. Nitsche’s method for general boundary conditions. *Mathematics of Computation*, 78(267):1353–1374, 2009.
- [7] A. Logg, K.A. Mardal, and G. Wells. *Automated Solution of Differential Equations by the Finite Element Method: The FEniCS Book*. Springer, 2012.
- [8] A. Main and G. Scovazzi. The shifted boundary method for embedded domain computations. Part I: Poisson and Stokes problems. *J. Comput. Phys.* 372, 972–995: 2018.
- [9] L. Ridgway Scott. *Introduction to Automated Modeling with FEniCS*. Computational Modeling Initiative, 2018.
- [10] R. Scott. *Finite element techniques for curved boundaries*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1973.
- [11] R. Scott. Interpolated boundary conditions in the finite element method. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 12:404–427, 1975.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, DEPARTMENTS OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND OF MATHEMATICS, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, 60637

E-mail address: `dupont@cs.uchicago.edu`

DIVISION OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, BROWN UNIVERSITY, BOX F, 182 GEORGE STREET, PROVIDENCE, RI 02912

E-mail address: `johnny_guzman@brown.edu`

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, EMERITUS, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, 60637

E-mail address: `ridg@uchicago.edu`