

Performance of nonconforming spectral element method for Stokes problems

N. Kishore Kumar^{*} and Shubhashree Mohapatra[†]

Abstract

In this paper, we study the performance of the non-conforming least-squares spectral element method for Stokes problem. Generalized Stokes problem has been considered and the method is shown to be exponential accurate. The numerical method is nonconforming and higher order spectral element functions are used. The same order spectral element functions are used for both velocity and pressure variables. The normal equations in the least-squares formulation are solved efficiently using preconditioned conjugate gradient method. Various test cases are considered including the Stokes problem on curvilinear domains, Stokes problem with mixed boundary conditions and a generalized stokes problem in \mathbb{R}^3 to verify the accuracy of the method.

Keywords: Stokes equations, Velocity, Pressure, Spectral element, Nonconforming, Exponential accuracy, PCGM

MSC: 65N35, 65F10, 35J57

1 Introduction

The stationary Stokes equations are linearization of the stationary Navier-Stokes equations. These equations describe the flow of the incompressible fluids. Stokes problems arise in various applications in physics and engineering. The numerical solution of stationary Stokes equations has been extensively studied in the literature. Finite difference method, Finite element method, Spectral methods, discontinuous Galerkin methods, Least-squares finite element methods and meshless methods etc. are popular methods among the numerical techniques to solve the Stokes problem.

Standard central differences do not give stable discretizations on uniform grids to Stokes equations due to the failure of discrete inf-sup condition [33]. The marker and cell method (MAC Scheme) is simple and more efficient numerical scheme for solving Stokes and Navier-Stokes problems. Finite difference MAC scheme has been studied in [33, 50]. Details of the other finite difference schemes can be found in [71, 72, 73]. Finite volume MAC scheme has been studied in [67] and the references therein.

Finite element method for Stokes problem has been widely studied. Standard Galerkin formulation is viewed as saddle-point problem. Mixed FEM impose restrictions such as inf-sup or Ladyzhenskaya-Babuska-Brezzi (LBB) condition while choosing approximation spaces for different unknowns, because of which same order polynomials can not be used for different unknowns. So it uses two different finite element spaces for velocity and pressure respectively. The analysis of mixed FEM is based on the theory of saddle point problem which has been developed in [7, 23]. Use of different order polynomial spaces makes computation cumbersome. Also choosing a suitable

^{*}BITS-Pilani Hyderabad Campus, Hyderabad, Email: naraparaju@hyderabad.bits-pilani.ac.in

[†]IIT Delhi, Email: subhashree@iiitd.ac.in

pair of polynomial order spaces is not easy in general. Mass conservation is another issue in the approximation of the solution of the Stokes problem.

To overcome the problem of using different finite element spaces for velocity and pressure variables, in stabilized finite element method, the standard bilinear form is modified such that any pair of finite element spaces can be chosen. Stabilized finite element method for Stokes problem has been introduced in [24, 48, 49]. Details of several other stabilized finite element formulations can be found in [5, 8, 13, 20, 35, 40] and the references therein. Divergence-free finite element methods have been studied in [12, 37, 58, 76] and the references therein. Divergence-free methods eliminate the pressure variable from the saddle point system and results in positive definite linear systems and also avoids the mass conservation issue.

Least squares methods have gained lots of attention for solving differential equations over the last few decades [6, 14, 44, 46, 51]. These methods offer various advantages compared to Galerkin methods (known as mixed methods), when applied to system of differential equations. First of all, least squares based methods are free from any stabilizing condition or parameters as mentioned above. Apart from this, least squares methods always lead to a symmetric positive definite system of equations when applied to linear problems which is one of the most desirable property while solving a system of equations. In the least-squares formulation Stokes problem is transformed into a first-order system. There are different first order formulations for Stokes system. For example velocity-vorticity-pressure formulation [3, 16, 22, 28, 32, 41, 42, 51], velocity-stress-pressure formulation [15, 22, 53] and acceleration-pressure formulation [30].

Though least squares methods offer various theoretical and computational advantages, it makes users skeptical when mass conservation is measured. Continuity equation is minimized in a least squares sense which raises this issue [38]. Here we briefly discuss existing literature addressing mass conserving properties of least squares methods. Chang et. al. [31] have proposed a least squares finite element method, which enforces continuity using Lagrange multiplier technique in the least squares functional. The proposed method works well while conserving mass properly, however loses one of the desirable property, the positive definiteness of the system. A comparative study for three different formulations of Stokes equations has been provided by Bolton et. al. in [21]. The investigation concludes that lack of mass conservation may lead to extremely poor results. Least squares method for velocity-vorticity-pressure formulation has been used by Proot et. al. [66]. An interesting observation from this investigation is: least squares methods might lack good mass conservation property, but provide better momentum conservation. Applying weights to continuity equation in the least squares functional might disturb the momentum conservation.

Stokes problem also has been studied using spectral/spectral element methods. Spectral method has been proposed for this problem in [69]. Proot et. al. [64, 65, 66] have proposed a least squares spectral element scheme for Stokes equations in velocity-vorticity-pressure formulation. Numerical results conclude that the pressure variable to be one order less accurate compared to velocity variable as pressure is not prescribed on the boundary. Least-squares spectral collocation method have been studied in [47, 52]. If the data in the given problem is analytic then these methods give exponential convergence.

Nonconforming methods like mortar finite element methods [9, 10], discontinuous Galerkin methods [26, 36, 56, 61, 62] and some other in [4, 17, 18, 19] provide numerical approximation to the Stokes equations. Meshless methods always avoid the problem of mesh generation on the domains with complex geometries. Meshless methods for the Stokes problem have been studied in [1, 39, 57, 74, 75].

In this article we have also considered the generalized Stokes problem. This problem occurs in the numerical treatment of the time dependent Navier-Stokes equations. Generalized Stokes equations look very similar to the Stokes equations. This problem has been studied in [8, 25, 27, 29, 34, 35, 55, 63, 68].

In [59] an exponentially accurate non-conforming least-squares spectral element method for Stokes equations on non-smooth domains has been proposed. This is different from the standard least-squares FEM formulations where the Stokes system is converted into a first order system as

mentioned earlier. The minimizing functional in the least-squares formulation includes the residuals in the partial differential equations and residuals in the boundary conditions in appropriate Sobolev norms. The method is nonconforming and higher order spectral element functions have been used.

In this article we study the performance of this method for Stokes problem on smooth domains including curvilinear domains with different boundary conditions and also for the generalized Stokes problem. The normal equations in the least-squares formulation are solved using preconditioned conjugate gradient method without storing the matrix. Exponential accuracy of the method is verified through various numerical tests.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2, introduces few notations that are needed for our analysis and proposes stability estimates for velocity and pressure components in generalized Stokes equations. The numerical scheme and error estimates are described in Section 3. Numerical results are presented in Section 4. Finally we conclude with Section 5.

Here we give some notations and define required function spaces. Let $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^2$, be an open bounded set with sufficiently smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$. $H^m(\Omega)$ denotes the Sobolev space of functions with square integrable derivatives of integer order less than or equal to m on Ω equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{H^m(\Omega)}^2 = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \|D^\alpha u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Further, let $I = (-1, 1)$. Then we define fractional norms ($0 < s < 1$) by :

$$\|w\|_{s,I}^2 = \|w\|_{0,I}^2 + \int_I \int_I \frac{|w(\xi) - w(\xi')|^2}{|\xi - \xi'|^{1+2s}} d\xi d\xi',$$

where I denotes an interval contained in \mathbb{R} . Moreover,

$$\|w\|_{1+s,I}^2 = \|w\|_{0,I}^2 + \left\| \frac{\partial w}{\partial \xi} \right\|_{s,I}^2 + \left\| \frac{\partial w}{\partial \eta} \right\|_{s,I}^2.$$

We shall denote the vectors by bold letters. For example, $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2)^T$, $\mathbf{H}^k(\Omega) = H^k(\Omega) \times H^k(\Omega)$, etc. The norms are given by $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{k,\Omega}^2 = \|u_1\|_{k,\Omega}^2 + \|u_2\|_{k,\Omega}^2$ for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^k(\Omega)$, $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{s,I}^2 = \|u_1\|_{s,I}^2 + \|u_2\|_{s,I}^2$, etc.

2 Discretization and Stability Estimate

In this section we describe the discretization of the domain and derive the numerical formulation.

2.1 Generalized Stokes problem

Consider the generalized Stokes equations in $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, with sufficiently smooth boundary $\partial\Omega = \Gamma$ (as shown in fig. 1).

$$\alpha \mathbf{u} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u} + \nabla p = \mathbf{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad (1)$$

$$-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = h \quad \text{in } \Omega \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{g} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \quad (3)$$

Here, \mathbf{u} is the velocity field, p is the pressure and $\alpha, \nu > 0$. Assume that the positive parameters α, ν are not simultaneously zero. When $\alpha = 0$ it reduces to Stokes problem.

Let $h \in L^2(\Omega)$ and such that $\int_\Omega h dx = 0$ and \mathbf{g} satisfies the compatibility condition $\int_\Gamma \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ where \mathbf{n} is the unit outward normal to Γ . Let $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)$, $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$. Then the generalized Stokes problem (1-3) has the solution $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$, where p is unique up to a additive constant. p can be obtained uniquely in $L^2(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}$ or in $L_0^2(\Omega) = \{u \in L^2(\Omega) | \int_\Omega u = 0\}$.

Further, the following regularity estimate also holds good. This fundamental regularity estimate is based on ADN (Agmin-Douglis-Nirenberg) theory [2].

Regularity Estimate

Let Ω be an open bounded subset of class $C^r, r = \max(m+2, 2)$. For $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{W}^{1,2}(\Omega)$, $p \in L^2(\Omega)$ being solutions of the generalized Stokes equations (1)-(3) and for $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{W}^{m,2}(\Omega)$, $h \in W^{m+1,2}(\Omega)$ and $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbf{W}^{m+\frac{3}{2},2}(\Gamma)$, then $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{W}^{m+2,2}(\Omega)$, $p \in W^{m+1,2}(\Omega)$ and there exists a constant $C_0(\alpha, m, \Omega)$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{W}^{m+2,2}(\Omega)} + \|p\|_{W^{m+1,2}(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}} \leq C_0 \left(\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathbf{W}^{m,2}(\Omega)} + \|h\|_{W^{m+1,2}(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{g}\|_{\mathbf{W}^{m+\frac{3}{2},2}(\Gamma)} \right) \quad \blacksquare \quad (4)$$

Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u}, p)$ and $\mathcal{D}\mathbf{u}$ be the differential operators for the momentum equations and the continuity equation respectively. Thus,

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u}, p) = \alpha \mathbf{u} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u} + \nabla p$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u}) = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}.$$

2.2 Discretization and spectral element functions




Figure 1: Domain Ω and its discretization

The domain Ω is divided into L quadrilaterals $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \dots, \Omega_L$ as shown in the figure 1 (some of them are curvilinear elements). Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2)$ be any point in the domain. A set of nonconforming spectral element functions are defined on these elements which are a sum of tensor products of polynomials of degree W . Let S denote the master element $S = (-1, 1)^2$. Now there is an analytic map $M_l(\xi, \eta)$ from S to Ω_l which has an analytic inverse (blending function mapping [45])

$$x_1 = X_1^l(\xi, \eta) \text{ and } x_2 = X_2^l(\xi, \eta).$$

Define the spectral element functions $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_l$ and \hat{p}_l on S by

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}}(\xi, \eta) = \sum_{i=0}^W \sum_{j=0}^W \mathbf{a}_{i,j} \xi^i \eta^j, \quad \hat{p}(\xi, \eta) = \sum_{i=0}^W \sum_{j=0}^W b_{i,j} \xi^i \eta^j.$$

Then \mathbf{u}_l and p_l on Ω_l are given by

$$\mathbf{u}_l(x_1, x_2) = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_l(M_l^{-1}) \text{ and } p_l(x_1, x_2) = \hat{p}_l(M_l^{-1}).$$

Let $\Pi^{L,W} = \left\{ \{\mathbf{u}_l\}_{1 \leq l \leq L}, \{p_l\}_{1 \leq l \leq L} \right\}$ be the space of spectral element functions consisting of the above tensor products of polynomials of degree W .

2.3 Stability estimate

Let $J_l(\xi, \eta)$ be the Jacobian of the mapping $M_l(\xi, \eta)$ from $S = (-1, 1)^2$ to Ω_l for $l = 1, 2, \dots, L$. Now

$$\int_{\Omega_l} |\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u}_l|^2 dx_1 dx_2 = \int_S |\mathcal{L}\hat{\mathbf{u}}_l|^2 J_l d\xi d\eta.$$

Define $\mathcal{L}_l \hat{\mathbf{u}}_l = \mathcal{L}\hat{\mathbf{u}}_l \sqrt{J_l}$. Then

$$\int_{\Omega_l} |\mathcal{L}\mathbf{u}_l|^2 dx_1 dx_2 = \int_S |\mathcal{L}_l \hat{\mathbf{u}}_l|^2 d\xi d\eta.$$

Similarly, we define $\mathcal{D}_l \hat{\mathbf{u}}_l = \mathcal{D}\hat{\mathbf{u}}_l \sqrt{J_l}$.

Since the approximation is nonconforming, to enforce the continuity along the inter element boundaries we introduce the jumps in \mathbf{u} , \mathbf{u}_{x_1} , \mathbf{u}_{x_2} and p in suitable Sobolev norms. Let the edge γ_s be common to the adjacent elements Ω_l and Ω_m . Assume that edge γ_s is the image of $\eta = 1$ under the map M_l which maps S to Ω_l and also the image of $\eta = -1$ under the map M_m which maps S to Ω_m . Then the jumps along the inter-element boundaries are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\mathbf{u}]\|_{0, \gamma_s}^2 &= \|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_m(\xi, -1) - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_l(\xi, 1)\|_{0, I}^2, \\ \|[\mathbf{u}_{x_k}]\|_{\frac{1}{2}, \gamma_s}^2 &= \|(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_m)_{x_k}(\xi, -1) - (\hat{\mathbf{u}}_l)_{x_k}(\xi, 1)\|_{\frac{1}{2}, I}^2, \\ \|[p]\|_{\frac{1}{2}, \gamma_s}^2 &= \|\hat{p}_m(\xi, -1) - \hat{p}_l(\xi, 1)\|_{\frac{1}{2}, I}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here $I = (-1, 1)$. The expressions on the right hand side in the above equation are given in the transformed coordinates ξ and η .

Let us consider the boundary condition. Let $\gamma_s \subseteq \partial\Omega \cap \Omega_l$ be the image of $\xi = 1$ under the mapping M_l which maps S to Ω_l . Then

$$\|\mathbf{u}_l\|_{\frac{3}{2}, \gamma_s}^2 = \|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_l(1, \eta)\|_{\frac{3}{2}, I}^2.$$

Let $\mathbf{u}, p \in \Pi^{L, W}$. We now define the quadratic form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}^{L, W}(\mathbf{u}, p) &= \sum_{l=1}^L \|\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u}_l, p_l)\|_{0, \Omega_l}^2 + \sum_{l=1}^L \|\mathcal{D}\mathbf{u}_l\|_{1, \Omega_l}^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{\gamma_s \subseteq \bar{\Omega} \setminus \partial\Omega} \left(\|[\mathbf{u}]\|_{0, \gamma_s}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^2 \|[\mathbf{u}_{x_k}]\|_{\frac{1}{2}, \gamma_s}^2 + \|[p]\|_{\frac{1}{2}, \gamma_s}^2 \right) + \sum_{\gamma_s \subseteq \partial\Omega \cap \Omega_l} \|\mathbf{u}_l\|_{\frac{3}{2}, \gamma_s}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Next, we define the quadratic form

$$\mathcal{U}^{L, W}(\mathbf{u}, p) = \sum_{l=1}^L \|\mathbf{u}_l\|_{2, S}^2 + \sum_{l=1}^L \|p_l\|_{1, S}^2. \quad (6)$$

Then, we have the following result.

Theorem 2.1: For W large enough there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that the estimate

$$\mathcal{U}^{L, W}(\mathbf{u}, p) \leq C(\ln W)^2 \mathcal{V}^{L, W}(\mathbf{u}, p) \quad (7)$$

holds.

The proof of this one is very similar to Theorem 4.1 in [59].

3 Numerical scheme and error estimates

In this section we describe the numerical scheme which is based on the stability estimate Theorem 2.1 and state the error estimate. We also brief the residual computations.

3.1 Numerical scheme

We search for a minimizer which minimizes the sum of the residuals in the partial differential equations, the residuals in the boundary conditions and the jumps in the velocity variable, derivatives of velocity variable and pressure variable along the inter element boundaries in appropriate fractional Sobolev norms. To formulate the numerical scheme we define a functional $\mathcal{R}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p)$, closely related to the quadratic form $\mathcal{V}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p)$.

As defined in section 2, let $M_l(\xi, \eta)$ be a mapping from S to Ω_l . Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\xi, \eta)$. Let $\mathbf{f}_l(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \mathbf{f}(M_l(\xi, \eta))$, $h_l(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = h(M_l(\xi, \eta))$, for $l = 1, 2, \dots, L$. Let $J_l(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ denote the Jacobian of the mapping M_l from S to Ω_l . Define $\mathbf{F}_l(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \mathbf{f}_l(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\sqrt{J_l(\hat{\mathbf{x}})}$, $H_l(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = h_l(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\sqrt{J_l(\hat{\mathbf{x}})}$. Now consider the boundary condition $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{g}$ on $\partial\Omega$. Let $\gamma_s \subseteq \partial\Omega$ be the image of $\xi = 1$ under the mapping M_l which maps S to Ω_l . Let $\mathbf{g}_l = \mathbf{g}(M_l(1, \eta))$. We now define the least-squares functional

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p) = & \sum_{l=1}^L \|\mathcal{L}_l \hat{\mathbf{u}}_l - \mathbf{F}_l\|_{0,S}^2 + \sum_{l=1}^L \|\mathcal{D}_l \hat{\mathbf{u}}_l - H_l\|_{1,S}^2 \\ & + \sum_{\gamma_s \subseteq \partial\Omega \setminus \partial\Omega} \left(\|\llbracket \mathbf{u} \rrbracket\|_{0,\gamma_s}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^2 \|\llbracket \mathbf{u}_{x_k} \rrbracket\|_{\frac{1}{2},\gamma_s}^2 + \|\llbracket p \rrbracket\|_{\frac{1}{2},\gamma_s}^2 \right) + \sum_{\gamma_s \subseteq \partial\Omega \cap \Omega_l} \|\mathbf{u}_l - \mathbf{g}_l\|_{\frac{3}{2},\gamma_s}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

We now formulate the numerical scheme as follows: *Find unique $(\mathbf{z}, q) \in \Pi^{L,W}$ which minimizes the functional $\mathcal{R}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p)$ over all $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in \Pi^{L,W}$. Here, $\Pi^{L,W}$ denotes the space of spectral element functions.*

Error estimates

Theorem 3.1: Let (\mathbf{z}, q) minimize $\mathcal{R}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p)$. Then for W large enough there exists constants C and b (being independent of W) such that the estimate

$$\sum_{l=1}^L \|\mathbf{z}_l(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \mathbf{u}_l(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\|_{2,S}^2 + \sum_{l=1}^L \|q_l(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - p_l(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\|_{1,S}^2 \leq C e^{-bW} \quad (9)$$

holds true.

Proof of the this theorem easily follows from theorem 4.2 from [59].

Remark: After obtaining a nonconforming solution a set of corrections can be made such that velocity variable \mathbf{z} becomes conforming [54, 70]. So $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)$ and we have the following error estimate

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{z}\|_{1,\Omega} + \|p - q\|_{0,\Omega} \leq C e^{-bW}. \quad (10)$$

3.2 Residue computations and preconditioner

The solution is obtained at Gauss-Legendre-Lobatto (GLL) quadrature points by minimizing the residue $\mathcal{R}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p)$. The normal equations obtained from the minimization are solved using preconditioned conjugate gradient method (PCGM) without storing the matrix. At each iteration step, PCGM requires only the action of the matrix on a vector whose entries are the values of velocity and pressure variable at GLL points and arranged in lexicographic order. The details of the residual computations in each element and procedure of solving the normal equations is shown in detail in [43, 54, 59].

Since the jumps across the inter-element boundaries in velocity and pressure variables and also in the derivatives of velocity variable are included in the numerical formulation, a small size of data have to be interchanged between the elements at each iteration step of the PCGM. The details of the preconditioner which we have used is given below.

Using Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\mathcal{U}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p) \leq C(\ln W)^2 \mathcal{V}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p). \quad (11)$$

Using the trace theorem for Sobolev spaces, we get for some constant \tilde{C}

$$\tilde{C} \mathcal{V}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p) \leq \mathcal{U}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p) \leq C(\ln W)^2 \mathcal{V}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p). \quad (12)$$

Hence the two quadratic forms $\mathcal{U}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p)$, $\mathcal{V}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p)$ are spectrally equivalent and we choose $\mathcal{U}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p)$ as our preconditioner so that the condition number of the preconditioned system is polylogarithmic in W , where W is the degree of the polynomial. In each element preconditioner consists of three blocks, first two blocks correspond to H^2 norm of velocity variable and third block corresponds to H^1 norm of pressure variable.

4 Numerical results

Here we verify the exponential convergence of the numerical scheme by considering various numerical examples. The numerical examples includes the Stokes equations on curvilinear domains, Stokes problem with mixed boundary conditions and generalized Stokes equations in two and three dimensions. Spectral element functions of higher order of degree W are used and uniform W is used for all the elements in the discretization. Let \mathbf{z} and q be the approximate solutions of the velocity \mathbf{u} and pressure p respectively. $\|\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1 = \frac{\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{z}\|_1}{\|\mathbf{u}\|_1}$ denotes the relative error in \mathbf{u} in H^1 norm, $\|E_p\|_0 = \frac{\|p-q\|_0}{\|p\|_0}$ denotes relative error in pressure in L^2 norm and $\|E_c\|_0$ denotes error in continuity equation in L^2 norm. 'Iter' denotes the total number of iterations required to reach the desired accuracy. In the case of Dirichlet boundary value problem, pressure is specified to be zero at one point of the domain to ensure the uniqueness in each problem.

Example 1: Generalized Stokes problem on $[0, 1]^2$




Figure 2: Discretization of $[0, 1]^2$

Consider the generalized Stokes equation (1-3) with $\alpha = 1, \nu = 1$ and $h = 0$ on $[0, 1]^2$. Chosen the data such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &= \sin \pi x_1 \sin \pi x_2, \\ u_2 &= \cos \pi x_1 \cos \pi x_2, \\ p &= 150 \left(x_1 - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(x_2 - \frac{1}{2}\right) + c. \end{aligned}$$

The domain $[0, 1]^2$ is divided into 4 elements with equal step size $h = \frac{1}{2}$ in both x_1 and x_2 directions (see fig. 2). The approximate solution is obtained and the relative errors $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$ and $\|E_p\|_0$ for various values of W are shown in Table 1. Table 1 also shows the total number of iterations of PCGM to reach the achieved accuracy and the error in continuity equation $\|E_c\|_0$. One can see that the errors $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$, $\|E_p\|_0$ and $\|E_c\|_0$ decays exponentially. Fig. 3 shows the graph of log of the relative errors $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$ and $\|E_p\|_0$ against the log of W . The curves are almost linear. This shows the exponential decay of the errors.

W	$\ E_{\mathbf{u}}\ _1$	$\ E_p\ _0$	$\ E_c\ _0$	Iter
2	5.139862909E-01	1.547329906E-01	1.177314788E-00	22
3	9.320542876E-02	5.595518233E-02	1.701809578E-01	116
4	1.644416626E-02	6.011788360E-03	3.465516273E-02	227
5	1.611022198E-03	6.748736448E-04	3.739501208E-03	442
6	1.693357558E-04	6.570180017E-05	4.172145413E-04	761
7	2.471931274E-05	7.480811937E-06	6.553699066E-05	1204
8	3.451649675E-06	4.728984810E-07	8.701982919E-06	1788

Table 1: Error $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$, $\|E_p\|_0$ and $\|E_c\|_0$ for different W




Figure 3: Log of relative error vs. $\log(W)$

Example 2: Stokes problem involving Reynolds number

Consider the following equation on $\Omega = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \times [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{1}{Re} \Delta \mathbf{u} + \nabla p &= \mathbf{f} \text{ in } \Omega \\
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} &= 0 \text{ in } \Omega \\
\mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{g} \text{ on } \Gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Choose the data such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &= 1 - e^{\lambda x_1} \cos(2\pi x_2), \\ u_2 &= \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} e^{\lambda x_1} \sin(2\pi x_2), \\ p &= \frac{1}{2} e^{2\lambda x_1} + c. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\lambda = \frac{Re}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{(Re)^2}{4} + 4\pi^2}$ and Re is Reynolds number [58].

The domain is divided into 4 elements with step size $\frac{1}{2}$ in both directions. We have obtained the approximate solution of the given Stokes system for different values of $Re = 1, 10, 100, 1000$. Table 2 shows the relative errors $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$ and $\|E_p\|_0$ for various values of W for $Re = 1, 10$. Table 3 shows the relative errors $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$ and $\|E_p\|_0$ for various values of W for $Re = 100, 1000$.

$Re = 1$				$Re = 10$		
W	$\ E_{\mathbf{u}}\ _1$	$\ E_p\ _0$	Iter	$\ E_{\mathbf{u}}\ _1$	$\ E_p\ _0$	Iter
4	2.366975497E-01	4.34268366E-01	12	1.131661632E-01	1.198261163E-01	40
5	4.869971324E-02	1.76876076E-01	129	1.184006906E-02	1.227193197E-02	120
6	8.623443013E-03	8.20262592E-02	321	3.004801200E-03	1.629441123E-03	195
7	1.518313601E-03	1.30971235E-02	733	2.839200284E-04	3.512941780E-04	346
8	2.667438050E-04	3.12678320E-03	1206	3.181384304E-05	4.256880275E-05	561
9	4.391290170E-05	6.57675621E-04	1862	1.053751269E-06	9.059197820E-06	967
10	7.408947632E-06	1.56727777E-04	2539	1.718964312E-07	2.683927048E-07	1843

Table 2: Relative errors against W for $Re = 1, 10$

$Re = 100$				$Re = 1000$		
W	$\ E_{\mathbf{u}}\ _1$	$\ E_p\ _0$	Iter	$\ E_{\mathbf{u}}\ _1$	$\ E_p\ _0$	Iter
4	4.270224166E-01	1.971826154E-01	26	3.7944941768E-01	2.480889414E-01	36
5	4.244262501E-02	1.618248455E-02	179	3.8779299147E-02	2.947725331E-02	654
6	3.958119651E-03	1.747850562E-03	325	2.3764211892E-03	5.438172800E-04	1703
7	3.201794986E-04	1.504988745E-04	514	1.9140466720E-04	5.837954856E-05	3190
8	1.265052314E-05	3.527247772E-05	748	1.5032229108E-05	5.156661742E-06	4569
9	3.187641118E-06	2.098243693E-06	936	3.5580252816E-06	1.602969000E-06	5721
10	3.037312630E-07	1.211241028E-07	1271	7.451543690E-07	6.117219799E-07	7160

Table 3: Relative errors against W for $Re = 100, 1000$

Fig. 4a shows the graph of log of the relative error $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$ vs. $\log(W)$ and fig. 4b shows the graph of log of the relative error $\|E_p\|_0$ vs. $\log(W)$ for $Re = 1, 10, 100$ and 1000 . Both the graphs shows that the error decays exponentially. One can see that the iteration count is high for $Re = 1000$ to achieve the relative errors of $O(10^{-7})$ and $O(10^{-6})$, but the iteration count is not high to achieve the accuracy of $O(10^{-4})$ or $O(10^{-5})$.




Figure 4: Log of the relative errors against $\text{log}(W)$

Example 3: Stokes problem on annular domain

Consider the Stokes problem (problem (1-3) with $\alpha = 0$, $\nu = 1$ and $h = 0$) on the annular domain $\Omega = \{(r, \theta) : 1 \leq r \leq 4 \text{ and } 0 \leq \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{2}\}$ with Dirichlet boundary condition on the boundary.




Figure 5: Annular domain Ω and its discretization

The domain is divided into 4 curvilinear elements as shown in figure 5. Blending elements have been used [45]. The data is chosen such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &= 20 x_1 x_2^3, \\ u_2 &= 5(x_1^4 - x_2^4), \\ p &= 60x_1^2 x_2 - 20x_2^3 + c. \end{aligned}$$

Table 4 shows the relative errors $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$, $\|E_p\|_0$ and $\|E_c\|_0$ for various values of W . Fig. 6 shows the log of the relative errors against $\text{log}(W)$. This shows that the error decays exponentially in $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$ and $\|E_p\|_0$ norms.




Figure 6: Log of relative errors against $\log(W)$

W	$\ E_{\mathbf{u}}\ _1$	$\ E_p\ _0$	$\ E_c\ _0$	Iter
2	3.73710182E-01	1.000929095E-00	558.6790137E-00	4
3	5.47325472E-02	1.019245995E-01	149.7030088E-00	91
4	9.27471997E-03	1.026087077E-02	17.92350320E-00	178
5	2.27183319E-03	4.526209660E-03	7.016461256E-00	360
6	4.61843438E-04	6.175899621E-04	1.262648344E-00	451
7	4.52049220E-05	1.124195597E-04	1.507379559E-01	935
8	8.47350232E-06	5.888507439E-06	2.122666602E-02	1252
9	7.82707160E-07	1.396124323E-06	2.061182562E-03	1930
10	1.52518872E-07	1.042122306E-07	3.131737628E-04	2748

Table 4: $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$, $\|E_p\|_0$ and $\|E_c\|_0$ for various values of W

Example 4. Stokes problem on a square domain with a circular hole

Consider the Stokes problem on a square domain $[0, 1]^2$ with a circular hole where the circle is centered at $(0.5, 0.5)$ with radius 0.2 (see fig. 7). As shown in the figure 7, we have the boundaries on the sides of the unit square and also on the circle.

The data is chosen such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 u_1 &= x_1 + x_2^2 - 2x_1x_2 + x_1^3 - 3x_1x_2^2 + x_2x_1^2, \\
 u_2 &= -x_2 - 2x_1x_2 + x_2^2 - 3x_2x_1^2 + x_1^3 - x_1x_2^2, \\
 p &= x_1x_2 + x_1 + x_2 + x_1^3x_2^2 + c.
 \end{aligned}$$




Figure 7: The unit square with a circular hole

The given domain is decomposed into 4 elements as shown in the figure 7. Table 5 shows the relative errors $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$ and $\|E_p\|_0$ for various values of W .

W	$\ E_{\mathbf{u}}\ _1$	$\ E_p\ _0$	Iter
2	4.00582657E-01	9.966591533E-01	7
3	5.16654423E-02	4.800859188E-01	275
4	1.93312527E-02	1.275050913E-01	650
5	6.28902440E-03	7.890462696E-02	1106
6	7.75971037E-04	1.230099037E-02	2324
7	2.26932864E-04	1.648187450E-03	4211
8	3.16373881E-05	1.992534346E-04	5781

Table 5: $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$ and $\|E_p\|_0$ for various values of W

So far we have considered the Stokes problem with Dirichlet condition on the boundary. Here we consider Stokes problem with mixed boundary conditions. We consider the following Neumann type boundary conditions on some part of the boundary of the domain [11, 60]

$$\gamma_N(\mathbf{u}, p) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} - p\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{g}^N \text{ or}$$

$$\gamma_N(\mathbf{u}, p) = ((\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^T) - pI) \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{g}^N$$

where $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2)$ is unit outward normal vector and I is 2×2 identity matrix.

Details of the existence and regularity of the solution of the Stokes problem with mixed boundary conditions can be found in [11]. The numerical method proposed in this article also works for mixed boundary conditions. In this case, we add the following term to the minimizing functional $\mathcal{R}^{L,W}(\mathbf{u}, p)$ defined in (8)

$$\sum_{\gamma_s \subseteq \Gamma^N \cap \Omega_l} \|\gamma_N(\mathbf{u}, p) - \mathbf{g}^N\|_{\frac{1}{2}, \gamma_s}^2$$

where Γ^N is the part of the boundary of the domain on which the Neumann type of boundary condition is specified.

Example 5: Stokes problem with mixed boundary conditions on a square domain

Consider the Stokes problem (equation (1-3) with $\alpha = 0$ and $\mu = 1$) on $[0, 1]^2$ with mixed boundary conditions. Dirichlet boundary condition is considered on the sides $x = 0, x = 1$ and $y = 1$ and the following Neumann type boundary condition is taken on the side $y = 0$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial \mathbf{n}} - p\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{g}^N.$$

Chosen the data such that the exact solution of the problem is

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &= \sin \pi x_1 \sin \pi x_2, \\ u_2 &= \cos \pi x_1 \cos \pi x_2, \\ p &= 150 \left(x_1 - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(x_2 - \frac{1}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The domain $[0, 1]^2$ is divided into 4 elements with equal step size $h = \frac{1}{2}$ in each direction. The relative errors $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$, $\|E_p\|_0$ and $\|E_c\|_0$ for various values of W are shown in Table 6.

W	$\ E_{\mathbf{u}}\ _1$	$\ E_p\ _0$	$\ E_c\ _0$	Iter
2	4.113397300E-01	1.58492332E-01	1.16867122E-00	18
3	9.728812767E-02	4.46496670E-02	1.89027751E-01	94
4	1.580428850E-02	5.59220475E-03	4.28144621E-02	177
5	1.518175283E-03	4.89795131E-04	4.296603984E-03	328
6	1.585801041E-04	4.96285704E-05	4.48482140E-04	572
7	1.706519975E-05	5.07498200E-06	5.12235349E-05	968
8	1.489101173E-06	4.36770285E-07	4.43246894E-06	1570

Table 6: Errors $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$, $\|E_p\|_0$ and $\|E_c\|_0$ for different W

Example 6: Stokes problem with mixed boundary conditions on an annular domain

Consider the Stokes problem on the annular domain which was considered in the example 3. The following Neumann type boundary condition is considered on the side $y = 0$

$$((\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^T) - pI) \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{g}^N.$$

Dirichlet boundary conditions are considered on the other parts of boundary of the annular domain.

We have considered the same data as in example 3 and the domain is divided into 4 elements (see fig. 5). Table 7 shows the relative errors $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$ and $\|E_p\|_0$ for various values of W . The error decays quickly and this shows the exponential accuracy of the numerical method. The iteration count is also less compared to the number of iterations in the example 3.

W	$\ E_{\mathbf{u}}\ _1$	$\ E_p\ _0$	Iter
2	1.26290947E-01	8.027834607E-01	9
3	6.83953499E-02	2.414437390E-01	64
4	7.82886019E-03	3.957910344E-02	124
5	2.84134327E-03	7.704636202E-03	252
6	9.23139284E-05	4.655347741E-04	452
7	4.62497985E-05	1.716386607E-04	851
8	3.99904145E-06	1.361305052E-05	1063
9	6.49902194E-07	2.398434401E-06	1642
10	1.26666857E-07	3.200850628E-07	2314

Table 7: $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$ and $\|E_p\|_0$ for various values of W

Example 7. Generalized Stokes equations on a cube

Consider the generalized Stokes problem (problem (1-3) in \mathbb{R}^3 with $\alpha = 1$) on the domain $[-1, 1]^3$ with Dirichlet boundary condition on the boundary. Let $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ be a point in the domain and $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$ be the velocity vector. The force function and boundary data are chosen such

that the exact solution of the given problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
u_1(x_1, x_2, x_3) &= 4x_1^2x_2x_3(1-x_1)^2(1-x_2)(1-x_3)(x_3-x_2) \\
u_2(x_1, x_2, x_3) &= 4x_1x_2^2x_3(1-x_1)(1-x_2)^2(1-x_3)(x_1-x_3) \\
u_3(x_1, x_2, x_3) &= 4x_1x_2x_3^2(1-x_1)(1-x_2)(1-x_3)^2(x_2-x_1) \\
p(x_1, x_2, x_3) &= -2x_1x_2x_3 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_1x_2 + x_1x_3 + x_2x_3 - x_1 - x_2 - x_3.
\end{aligned}$$

Only one element is considered (i.e $[-1, 1]^3$) and obtained the approximate solution of the Generalized Stokes problem for $\nu = 1, 10$. The table 8 shows the errors $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$, $\|E_p\|_0$ and $\|E_c\|_0$ against different values of W for $\nu = 1$ and table 9 shows for $\nu = 10$.

W	$\ E_{\mathbf{u}}\ _1$	$\ E_p\ _0$	$\ E_c\ _0$	Iter
2	1.1458E+01	1.5106E+02	7.4993E-01	41
4	4.3799E-03	8.9338E-02	1.8608E-02	142
6	2.6778E-04	4.5485E-03	1.4657E-04	331
8	3.3323E-06	7.1232E-07	1.7715E-07	1068
10	3.4672E-08	6.5445E-08	2.4394E-08	1776

Table 8: Errors $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$, $\|E_p\|_0$ and $\|E_c\|_0$ against W for $\nu = 1$

W	$\ E_{\mathbf{u}}\ _1$	$\ E_p\ _0$	$\ E_c\ _0$	Iter
2	1.4913E+01	1.4505E+01	2.9320E-01	68
4	3.8626E-04	9.5183E-04	2.7758E-02	279
6	1.1037E-04	6.9155E-04	8.0836E-05	800
8	3.1704E-06	7.7042E-07	1.8919E-07	1797
10	3.3793E-08	6.4958E-08	2.2812E-08	2861

Table 9: Errors $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$, $\|E_p\|_0$ and $\|E_c\|_0$ against W for $\nu = 10$

The results shows that the errors $\|E_{\mathbf{u}}\|_1$, $\|E_p\|_0$ and $\|E_c\|_0$ decays exponentially. We have presented the error in the continuity equation $\|E_c\|_0$ against W in few other examples also in this section. The decay of $\|E_c\|_0$ shows the mass conservation property of the method. Similar behavior has been observed in all the other examples too.

5 Conclusion and future work

In this article we have studied the performance of the nonconforming least-squares spectral element method for Stokes problems on smooth domains. The generalized Stokes equation, Stokes problem with mixed boundary conditions and also the Stokes problem on curvilinear domains were considered. Spectral approximation is nonconforming and same order spectral element functions are used for both velocity and pressure variables. The numerical results shows that the method is exponentially accurate in both \mathbf{u} and p . Since the numerical method is least-squares, the obtained linear system is symmetric positive definite. In addition to these advantages, the numerical scheme have good mass conservation property. The decay of the error in continuity equation in L^2 norm shows that the method works very well while conserving the mass. Studying the performance of this approach for unsteady flow problems on curvilinear domains is under progress. The Stokes interface problems is under consideration for the future work.

Acknowledgements

References

- [1] M. Ahmad, Siraj-ul-Islam and B. Ullah, Local radial basis function collocation method for stokes equations with interface conditions, *Eng. Anal. with Boun. Ele.*, 119, 246–256, 2020.
- [2] S. Agmon, A. Douglis and L. Nirenberg, Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions II, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math*, 17, 35-92, 1964.
- [3] A. Amara, E. Chacon Vera and D. Trujillo, Vorticity-velocity-pressure formulation for Stokes problem, *Math. of Comp.*, Vol. 73, 248, 1673-1697, 2003.
- [4] T. Apel, V. Kempf, A. Linke and C. Merden, A nonconforming pressure robust finite element method for the Stokes equations on anisotropic meshes, *arXiv:2002.1217V1*, 2020.
- [5] D. Arnold, F. Brezzi and M. Fortin, A stable finite element for the Stokes equations, *Calcolo*, 21(4), 337– 344, 1984.
- [6] A. K. Aziz, R. B. Kellog and A. B. Stephens, Least squares methods for elliptic systems, *Math. Comp.*, 44, 169, 53-70, 1985.
- [7] I. Babuska, The finite element method with Lagrangian multipliers, *Num. Math.*, 20, 179-192, 1973.
- [8] G. Barrenechea and Frederic Valentin, An unusual stabilized finite element method for a generalized Stokes problem, *Num. Math.*, 92, 653–677, 2002.
- [9] F. B. Belgacem, The Mixed Mortar Finite Element Method for the Incompressible Stokes Problem: Convergence Analysis, *SIAM J. on Num. Ana.*, 37(4), 1085-1100, 2000.
- [10] F. B. Belgacem, L. K. Chilton and P. Seshaiyer, Non-Conforming hp Finite Element Methods for Stokes Problems, In: Pavarino L.F., Toselli A. (eds) *Recent Developments in Domain Decomposition Methods. Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering*, Vol. 23, 2002.
- [11] M. Benes and P. Kucera, Solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations with mixed boundary conditions in two-dimensional bounded domains, *Math. Nach.*, 289(2-3), 194-212, 2016.
- [12] L. Blank, On divergence-free finite element methods for the Stokes equations, Master thesis, Frie Universitat, Berlin, 2014.
- [13] J. Blasco, A pressure-stabilized formulation of incompressible flow problems on anisotropic finite element meshes, *Comp. Math. Appl.*, 53(6), 895-909, 2007.
- [14] P. B. Bochev and M. D. Gunzburger, Finite element methods of least-square type, *SIAM Rev.*, 40(4), 789-837, 1998.
- [15] P. B. Bochev and M. D. Gunzburger, Least-squares methods for the velocity-pressure-stress formulation of the Stokes equations, *Comp. Meth. Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 126, 267-287, 1995.
- [16] P. B. Bochev and M. D. Gunzburger, A locally conservative mimetic least-squares finite element method for the Stokes equations, in I. Lirkov, S. Margenov and J. Wasniewski (Eds) *In proceedings LSSC 2009, Springer Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 5910, 637-644, 2009.
- [17] P. Bochev, J. Lai and L. Olson, An non-conforming least-squares finite element method for the velocity-vorticity-pressure Stokes equations, *Int. J. for Num. Meth. in Fl.*, 1-19, 2011.

- [18] P. B. Bochev, J. Lai and L. Olson, A locally conservative discontinuous least-squares finite element method for the Stokes equations, *Int. J. Num. Meth. Fl.*, 68(6), 782-804, 2012.
- [19] P. B. Bochev, J. Lai and L. Olson, A non-conforming least-squares finite element method for incompressible fluid flow problems, *Int. J. Num. Meth. Fl.*, 72(3), 375-402, 2013.
- [20] D. Boffi, F. Brezzi and M. Fortin, Finite elements for the Stokes problem, In: Boffi D., Gastaldi L. (eds) *Mixed Finite Elements, Compatibility Conditions, and Applications. Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Vol. 1939, Springer, Berlin, 2008.
- [21] P. Bolton and R. W. Thatcher, On mass conservation in least-squares methods, *J. Comp. Phys.*, Vol. 203(1), 287-304, 2005.
- [22] J. H. Bramble and J. E. Pasciak, Least-squares methods for Stokes equations based on a discrete minus one inner product, *J. of Comp. and Appl. Math.*, 74, 155-173, 1996.
- [23] F. Brezzi, On the existence, uniqueness and approximation of saddle point problems arising from Lagrangian multipliers, *RAIRO, Ser. Rouge*, 8, 129-151, 1974.
- [24] F. Brezzi and J. Douglas Jr., Stabilized mixed methods for Stokes problem, *Num. Math.*, 53, 225-235, 1988.
- [25] E. Burman and P. Hansbo, Edge stabilization for the generalized Stokes problem: A continuous interior penalty method, *Comp. Meth. Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 195, 2393-2410, 2006.
- [26] E. Burman and B. Stamm, Bubble stabilized discontinuous Galerkin method for Stokes problem, *Math. Model. and Meth. in Appl. Sci.*, 20(2), 297-313, 2010.
- [27] M. M. Butt, On multigrid solver for generalized Stokes equations, *J. of Math.*, 50(3), 53-66, 2018.
- [28] Z. Cai, T. A. Manteuffel and S. F. McCormick, First-order system least squares for velocity-vorticity-pressure form of the Stokes equations, with application to linear elasticity, *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, 3, 150-159, 1995.
- [29] C. Calgaro and J. Laminie, On the domain decomposition method for the Generalized Stokes problem with continuous pressure, *Num. Meth. for Par. Dif. Eq.*, 16(1), 84-106, 2000.
- [30] C. L. Chang, A mixed finite element method for the Stokes problem, an acceleration-pressure formulation, *Appl. Math. Comp.*, 36, 135-146, 1990.
- [31] C. L. Chang and J. Nelson, Least-squares finite element method for the Stokes problem with zero residual of mass conservation, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 34, 480-489, 1997.
- [32] C. L. Chang and S. Y. Yang, Analysis of the L^2 least-squares finite element method for the velocity-vorticity-pressure Stokes equations with velocity boundary conditions, *Appl. Math. Comp.*, 130, 121-144, 2002.
- [33] L. Chen, Finite difference scheme for Stokes equations: MAC Scheme, Technical Report, University of California.
- [34] S. H. Chou, Analysis and convergence of a covolume method for the generalized Stokes problem, *Math. Comp.*, 66(217), 85-104, 1997.
- [35] R. Codina, A stabilized finite element method for generalized stationary incompressible flows, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 190, 2681-2706, 2001.
- [36] B. Cockburn, G. Kanschat, D. Schotzau and Ch. Schwab, Local discontinuous Galerkin methods for the Stokes system, *SIAM J. Num. Anal.*, 40(1), 319-343, 2002.

- [37] M. Crouzeix and P. Raviart, Conforming and nonconforming finite element methods for solving the stationary Stokes equations, *RAIRO Anal. Num.*, 7, 33-76, 1973.
- [38] J. M. Deang and M. D. Gunzburger, Issues related to least-squares finite element methods for the Stokes equations, *SIAM J. Sci. Comp.*, 20, 878-906, 1998.
- [39] H. Desimone, S. Urquiza, H. Arrieta and E. Pardo, Solution of Stokes equations by moving least-squares, *Comm. Num. Meth. Eng.*, 14, 907-920, 1998.
- [40] J. Douglas Jr. and J. Wang, An Absolutely Stabilized Finite Element Method for the Stokes Problem, *Math. of Comp.*, 52(186), 495-508, 1989.
- [41] H. Y. Duan and G. P. Liang, On the velocity-pressure-vorticity least-squares mixed finite element method for the 3D Stokes equations, *SIAM J. Num. Anal.*, 41, 6, 2114-2130, 2003.
- [42] F. Dubois, Vorticity-velocity-pressure formulation for the Stokes problem, *Math. Meth. in the Appl. Sci.*, 25(13), 1091-1119, 2002.
- [43] P. K. Dutt, N. Kishore Kumar and C. S. Upadhyay, Non-conforming $h - p$ spectral element methods for elliptic problems, *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. (Math. Sci.)*, 117(1), 109-145, 2007.
- [44] E. D. Eason, A review of least-squares methods for solving partial differential equations, *Int. J. Math.*, 10, 1021-1046, 1976.
- [45] W. J. Gordan and C. A. Hall, Transfinite element methods: Blending-function interpolation over arbitrary curved element domains, *Numer. Math.*, 21(2), 109-129, 1973.
- [46] M. D. Gunzburger and P. B. Bochev, *Least-squares finite element methods*, Springer, 2009.
- [47] W. Heinrichs, Least-squares spectral collocation for the Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Sci. Comp.*, 21, 81-90, 2004.
- [48] T. J. R. Hughes and L. P. Franca, A new finite element formulation for computational fluid mechanics: VII. The Stokes problem with various wellposed boundary conditions: Symmetric formulation that converges for all velocity/pressure spaces, *Com. Meth. in Appl. Mech. and Engg.*, 65(1), 85-96, 1987.
- [49] T. J. R. Hughes, L. P. Franca and M. Balestra, A new finite element formulation for computational fluid mechanics: V. Circumventing the Babuska-Brezzi condition: A stable Petrov-Galerkin formulation of the Stokes problem accommodating equal order interpolation, *Com. Meth. in Appl. Mech. and Engg.*, 59, 85-99, 1986.
- [50] K. Ito and J. Qiao, A high order compact MAC finite difference scheme for the Stokes equations: Augmented variable approach, *J. of Comp. Phys.*, 227, 8177-8190, 2008.
- [51] B. N. Jiang, On the least-squares method, *Comp. Meth. Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 152, 239-257, 1998.
- [52] S. D. Kim, H. C. Lee and B. C. Shin, Least-squares spectral collocation method for the Stokes equations, *Numer. Meth. Part. Diff. Eqns.*, 20(1), 128-139, 2003.
- [53] S. D. Kim and B. C. Shin, H^{-1} least-squares method for the velocity-pressure-stress formulation of the Stokes problem, *Appl. Num. Math.*, 40(4), 451-465, 2002.
- [54] N. Kishore Kumar, Nonconforming spectral element method for elasticity interface problems, *J. of Appl. Math. and Inf.*, 32(5-6), 761-781, 2014.
- [55] M. Larin and A. Reusken, A comparative study of efficient iterative solvers for generalized Stokes equations, *Num. Lin. Alg. Appl.*, 15(1), 13-34, 2007.

- [56] R. Li, Z. Sun and Z. Yang, A discontinuous Galerkin method for Stokes equation by divergence-free patch reconstruction, *Num. Meth. Part. Diff. Eqn.*, 36, 756-771, 2020.
- [57] X. Li, A meshless interpolating Galerkin boundary node method for Stokes flows, *Eng. Anal. with Boun. Ele.*, 51, 112-122, 2015.
- [58] L. Mu and X. Ye, A simple finite element method for the Stokes equations, *Adv. in Comp. Math.*, 43, 1305-1324, 2017.
- [59] S. Mohapatra, P. Dutt, B. V. Rathish Kumar and Marc I. Gerritsma, Non-conforming least-squares spectral element method for Stokes equations on non-smooth domains, *J. Comp. and Appl. Math.*, 372, 112696, 2020.
- [60] H. Manouzi, The Stokes problem and the mixed boundary conditions, *C. R. Math. Rep. Acad. Sci. Canada*, Vol. XII, No. 5, 155-160, 1990.
- [61] A. Montlaur, S. Fernandez-Mendez and A. Huerta, Discontinuous Galerkin methods for the Stokes equations using divergence-free approximation, *Int. J. for Num. Meth. in Flu.*, 1-19, 2007.
- [62] A. Montlaur and S. Fernandez-Mendez, Analysis of the discontinuous Galerkin interior penalty method with Solenoidal approximations for the Stokes equations, *Int. J. of Num. Anal. and Model.*, 11(4), 715-725, 2014.
- [63] K. Nafa, Improved local projection for the generalized Stokes problem, *Adv. Appl. Math. Mech.*, 1(6), 862-873, 2009.
- [64] M. M. J. Proot and M. I. Gerritsma, A least-squares spectral element formulation for the Stokes problem, *J. Sci. Comp.*, 17, 285-296, 2002.
- [65] M. Proot and M. I. Gerritsma, Least-squares spectral elements applied to the Stokes problem, *J. Comp. Phy.*, 181, 454-477, 2002.
- [66] M. M. J. Proot and M. I. Gerritsma, Mass and momentum conservation of the least-squares spectral element method for Stokes problem, *J. Sci. Comp.*, 27, 389-401, 2006.
- [67] H. Rui and X. Li, Stability and Superconvergence of MAC scheme for Stokes Equations on nonuniform grids, *SIAM J. Num. Anal.*, 55(3), 1135-1158, 2017.
- [68] V. Sarin and A. Samesh, An efficient iterative method for the generalized Stokes problem, *SIAM J. Sci. Comp.*, 19(1), 206-226, 1998.
- [69] M. R. Schumack, W. W. Schultz and J. P. Boyd, Spectral method solution of the Stokes equations on nonstaggered grids, *J. of Comp. Phy.*, 94(1), 30-58, 1991.
- [70] Ch. Schwab, p and $h - p$ Finite element methods, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1998.
- [71] L. Song, P. W. Li, Y. Gu and C. M. Fan, Generalized finite difference method for solving stationary 2D and 3D Stokes equations with a mixed boundary condition, *Comp. and Math. with Appl.*, 80, 1726-1743, 2020.
- [72] J. C. Strikwerda, An iterative method for solving finite difference approximations to the Stokes equations, *SIAM J. on Num. Anal.*, 21(3), 447-458, 1984.
- [73] J. C. Strikwerda, Finite difference methods for Stokes and Navier-Stokes equations, *SIAM J on Sci. and Stat. Comp.*, 5(1), 56-68, 1984.
- [74] F. Tan, Y. Zhang and Y. Li, Development of a meshless hybrid boundary node method for Stokes flows, *Eng. Anal. with Boun. Ele.*, 37, 899-908, 2013.

- [75] N. Traska, M. Maxeya and Xiaozhe Hub, A compatible higher-order meshless method for the Stokes equations with applications to suspension flows, arXiv:1611.03911, 2016.
- [76] J. Wang, Y. Wang and X. Ye, A robust numerical method for Stokes equations based on divergence-free $H(\text{DIV})$ finite element methods, SIAM J. Sci. Comp., 31, 2784-2802, 2009.