

# IMMERSED VIRTUAL ELEMENT METHODS FOR ELLIPTIC INTERFACE PROBLEMS\*

SHUHAO CAO<sup>†</sup>, LONG CHEN<sup>‡</sup>, RUCHI GUO<sup>‡</sup>, AND FRANK LIN<sup>‡</sup>

**Abstract.** This article presents an immersed virtual element method for solving a class of interface problems that combines the advantages of both body-fitted mesh methods and unfitted mesh methods. A background body-fitted mesh is generated initially. On those interface elements, virtual element spaces are constructed as solution spaces to local interface problems, and exact sequences can be established for these new spaces involving discontinuous coefficients. The discontinuous coefficients of interface problems are recast as Hodge star operators that is the key to project immersed virtual functions to classic immersed finite element (IFE) functions for computing numerical solutions. The proposed method is capable of handling more complicated interface element configuration, and provides better performance than the conventional penalty-type IFE method for the  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$ -interface problem. It also brings a connection between various methods such as body-fitted methods, IFE methods, and virtual element methods etc.

**Key words.**  $H^1$  and  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  Interface problems, fitted mesh methods, unfitted mesh methods, virtual element methods, immersed finite element elements, de Rham complex.

**AMS subject classifications.** 65N15, 65N30

**1. Introduction.** Interface problems widely appear in many engineering and physical applications involving multiple materials or media that incorporate discontinuous coefficients for the related partial differential equations (PDEs). For example, Figure 1 illustrates a two-dimensional domain  $\Omega$  that is formed by two different materials separated by a closed smooth curve  $\Gamma \in C^{1,1}$ , i.e.,  $\Gamma$  separates  $\Omega$  into sub-domains  $\Omega^+$  and  $\Omega^-$  such that  $\bar{\Omega} = \Omega^+ \cup \Omega^- \cup \Gamma$ . The main challenge of using standard finite element methods (FEMs) is that solutions of interface problems are not smooth across interface. It is well known that FEMs can be used to solve interface problems with optimal accuracy [48, 52, 57] based on body-fitted shape regular meshes. The “body-fittedness” refers to that the interface is well-approximated by edges of elements [43], i.e., the piecewise linear approximated interface cannot intersect any element interior. However, it is nontrivial and time-consuming to generate such a shape regular mesh that fits the interface, as it generally requires certain global modification. This issue will become more severe for complex geometry or moving interface problems especially in three dimensions.




Fig. 1: The domain and a uniform triangulation for the interface problem

So, it becomes critical for the purpose of efficiency to relax the mesh restriction for interface problems. Generally speaking, two different groups of methods can be found in this field: (i) modify the finite element spaces or finite difference stencils to encode the jump conditions into the discretization; (ii) modify the mesh only near the interface and then apply either continuous or discontinuous Galerkin formulation.

The first approach employs meshes which are completely independent of the interface, i.e., the so-called unfitted mesh methods. As the mesh cannot resolve interface geometry, special treatments are needed on interface elements. For example, the Nitsche’s idea [51] uses penalties to enforce the jump condition, see CutFEM [10] or unfitted FEM [30]. Another strategy is to construct special FEM functions or finite difference stencils on interface elements, such as the immersed interface method [42], the MIB method [56], the multiscale FEM [20], and the immersed finite element (IFE) methods [45, 46, 29] to be discussed. In particular, for the IFE method, a set of local basis functions

\*Submitted to the editors DATE.

**Funding:** This work was funded in part by NSF grants DMS-1913080 and DMS-2012465.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO (s.cao@wustl.edu).

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of California Irvine, Irvine, CA (chenlong@math.uci.edu, ruchig@uci.edu, fmlin@uci.edu).

on interface elements are devised as piecewise polynomials that include jump conditions in their connection in a pointwise or an averaging sense. The convergence of IFE methods for  $H^1$  interface problems have been established in [45, 46, 29] and improved recently in [25, 27, 39, 38]. These methods still obtain the optimal convergence order where the hidden constant is independent of interface location relative to the mesh. However, for almost all these unfitted mesh methods, the approximation spaces are not conforming. It may bring difficulty for some challenging problems that are sensitive to conformity, for example, the considered  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  interface problems arising from Maxwell equations, see the discussions in [14, 15, 28].

For the second approach, as the modification is only performed locally near the interface, shape regularity in general cannot be achieved. Instead, the refined meshes are required to satisfy the maximum angle condition [3, 40, 41] to obtain robust optimal convergence rates. A work in this direction can be found in [18]. However, even if the maximum angle condition is the only requirement, such a refined mesh may not be easy to obtain in the 3D case. Recently, the authors in [16] proposed directly using polygonal or polyhedral elements cut from interface instead of refining them to simplices, and a virtual element method (VEM) is used on these elements for discretization. The key of VEM is to directly employ degrees of freedom (DoFs) through imposing local problems associated with the original equations, see [7, 6, 21, 22] and the reference therein. The virtual shape functions, which are non-computable  $H^1$  functions solved from local problems, are then projected to polynomial spaces for computation. One key advantage is its flexibility for polygonal and polyhedral element shapes. As the interface may intersect elements arbitrarily which generates elements with high aspect ratio, for the aforementioned approach in [16], one major difficulty is to obtain a robust a priori error estimate independent of the potential anisotropic subelement shapes. Some anisotropic error analysis of VEM can be found in [11, 12, 13] for different interface problems.

Inspired by VEM [16] and IFE methods in the literature, is it possible for a numerical method to take both the advantages of conformity provided by virtual element spaces and robust optimal approximation capabilities of IFE spaces? The question serves as one major motivation for this work. For this purpose, we shall develop  $H^1$ ,  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  and  $\mathbf{H}(\text{div})$  virtual element spaces involving discontinuous coefficients, i.e., they are solution spaces to some local interface problems incorporating jump conditions related to the underlying equations. As the interface is immersed into the design of the virtual element spaces, we shall call it *immersed virtual element method* (IVEM). The key idea is to use the conforming virtual element spaces on a shape regular background unfitted mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h$  for discretization, and project them to the IFE spaces on interface elements which are cut by the interfaces from the background mesh; for details please refer to Section 2.1. It can offer sufficient and robust approximation capabilities locally.

In particular, we will consider the following two models. The first one is an  $H^1$ -elliptic interface problem

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (\beta \nabla u) &= f && \text{in } \Omega^- \cup \Omega^+, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

with  $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ , and the continuity and flux jump conditions

$$(1.2a) \quad [u]_\Gamma := u^+ - u^- = 0,$$

$$(1.2b) \quad [\beta \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}]_\Gamma := \beta^+ \nabla u^+ \cdot \mathbf{n} - \beta^- \nabla u^- \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0,$$

where  $\mathbf{n} := \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})$  denotes the unit normal vector to  $\Gamma$  at  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \Gamma$  pointing from  $\Omega^-$  to  $\Omega^+$ . In the following discussion,  $\mathbf{n}$  always denotes the unit outward normal vector, and  $\mathbf{t}$  denotes the tangential vector which is a counterclockwise rotation of  $\mathbf{n}$  by  $\pi/2$ .

The second model we are interested in is an  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  interface problem arising from Maxwell equations:

$$(1.3a) \quad \mathbf{curl} (\alpha \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u}) + \beta \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega^- \cup \Omega^+,$$

$$(1.3b) \quad \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{t} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

with  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega)$ , where the operator  $\text{curl}$  is for vector functions  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2)^\top$  such that  $\text{curl} \mathbf{v} = \partial_{x_1} v_2 - \partial_{x_2} v_1$  while  $\mathbf{curl}$  is for scalar functions  $v$  such that  $\mathbf{curl} v = (\partial_{x_2} v, -\partial_{x_1} v)^\top$  with “ $\top$ ” denoting the transpose herein. The following jump conditions at the interface  $\Gamma$  are imposed:

$$(1.4a) \quad [\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{t}]_\Gamma := \mathbf{u}^+ \cdot \mathbf{t} - \mathbf{u}^- \cdot \mathbf{t} = 0,$$

$$(1.4b) \quad [\alpha \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u}]_\Gamma := \alpha^+ \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u}^+ - \alpha^- \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u}^- = 0,$$

$$(1.4c) \quad [\beta \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}]_\Gamma := \beta^+ \mathbf{u}^+ \cdot \mathbf{n} - \beta^- \mathbf{u}^- \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0.$$

In the equations (1.1) and (1.3), the coefficients  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in  $\Omega$  are assumed to be positive piecewise constant functions of which the locations of the discontinuity align with one another:

$$\alpha(x, y) = \begin{cases} \alpha^+, & (x, y) \in \Omega^+, \\ \alpha^-, & (x, y) \in \Omega^-, \end{cases} \quad \beta(x, y) = \begin{cases} \beta^+, & (x, y) \in \Omega^+, \\ \beta^-, & (x, y) \in \Omega^-. \end{cases}$$

Note that the two models above share the same parameter  $\beta$  which can be interpreted from the perspective of de Rham complex. The proposed virtual spaces can inherit this kind of structure on each interface element. We refer to [37] for the mixed IFE methods for elliptic interface problems (1.1), i.e.,  $\mathbf{H}(\text{div})$  interface problems.

Similar to the standard virtual spaces in the literature, our new  $H^1$ ,  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  and  $\mathbf{H}(\text{div})$  virtual spaces admit the nodal and edge DoFs which make them conforming in the relative Sobolev spaces even if the interface exists and the parameters are discontinuous. Those DoFs also enable us to establish the global exact sequence and commutative diagrams

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathbb{R} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h) & \xrightarrow{\nabla} & \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h) & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & \tilde{H}^1(\alpha; \mathcal{T}_h) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow I_h^n & & \downarrow I_h^e & & \downarrow \pi_h^{\alpha_h} \\ \mathbb{R} & \longrightarrow & V_h^n & \xrightarrow{\nabla} & \mathbf{V}_h^e & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & Q_h^{\alpha_h} \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

See Sections 2.2 and 3.1.4 for definitions of spaces and operators.

Moreover, as subelements of elements are treated together through the jump conditions instead of independently as anisotropic polygons, it is highlighted that the coercivity can be established of which the hidden constants are independent of subelement shape. This property does not hold for virtual spaces defined only on subelements [11, 16], where the coercivity constant may depend on the anisotropy of polygons or polyhedra, and refined analysis is needed to establish the robust error analysis.

Constructing special shape functions by solving local problems to capture certain behavior of solutions can be traced back to the fundamental work of Babuška et al. in [4, 5]. In particular, for a 1D case, the basis functions in [4, 5] are the solutions of

$$(1.6) \quad -(\beta(x)u_h')' = 0 \quad \text{in } [a, b]$$

subject to some boundary conditions at the ending points  $a, b$ . It could be considered as the local problems of VEM with variable coefficients. Due to the trivial 1D geometry, solutions of (1.6) can be expressed as  $\int_a^x \beta^{-1}(x) dx$ . When  $\beta$  is a piecewise constant function, they become exactly the 1D IFE functions [44]. Namely, for this case, the 1D VEM and IFE spaces are identical, but they are distinguished in higher dimensions due to more complicated geometry. From this point of view, on one hand, the proposed IVEM is a more straightforward generalization of the early approach of Babuška et al. On the other hand, the conventional IFE space is also important to provide robust local approximation capabilities, and thus is suitable for constructing projections.

We also note that the newly constructed  $H^1$  virtual element space is similar to the multiscale finite element space in [20] in the sense that local interface problems are used to develop the approximation spaces. In both approaches, standard polynomials on interface elements cannot be used to approximate the solutions to these local interface problems due to the nonsmoothness across the interface. In [20], the authors generate a local mesh and use standard finite element functions for approximation. In this work, we propose projecting the virtual spaces to IFE spaces consisting of piecewise polynomials that can accurately capture the jump conditions. We will show that, similar to the conventional VEM, these projections are indeed computable directly through the DoFs.

The proposed method is not only a new formulation of IFE or VEM in the literature, but also inherits the advantages of both the two methods, or even the general fitted mesh and unfitted mesh methodology. First, it is still able to solve interface problems on a background unfitted mesh. However, different from most of the unfitted mesh methods aforementioned that do not impose any DoFs on edges or nodes associated with cutting points of interface, the proposed one does impose these newly added DoFs. With this property, it may better resolve the more complex geometry but without generating an extra triangulation near the interface. In other words, we use a virtual body-fitted mesh. Second, it is known that IFE shape functions satisfying certain DoFs are in general not easy to construct, and theoretically their existence are subject some geometric conditions [24, 28, 37]. Within the VEM framework, this issue has been completely addressed, since the DoFs are imposed through virtual functions which always exist by solving local problems. Third, compared with the anisotropic analysis for conventional VEM [9, 11], the robust error analysis of the proposed method can be, thanks to the shape regularity of background meshes and properties of IFE spaces, easily and systematically obtained regardless of subelement shape. Finally, compared with other penalty-type methods in the literature [27, 46], the proposed method requires only a locally computed edge term within each element, and thus makes the assembling procedure easier as the stabilization term does not need explicitly the interaction of neighbor elements' DoFs.

One remarkable advantage of using the proposed method is to recover the optimal convergence for solving  $H(\text{curl})$  interface problems on unfitted meshes. The  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  equations are sensitive to the conformity of the approximated spaces due to its low regularity. Discontinuous Galerkin methods can obtain an optimal convergence,

but this is based on the fact that the broken non-conforming space contains an  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$ -conforming subspace, see the analysis in [32, 33, 34]. Unfortunately, many aforementioned conventional unfitted mesh methods do not preserve this property which may cause the loss of accuracy. This phenomenon has been numerically observed and theoretically proved in [14, 15] for Nitsche's penalty methods. In [47], the authors assume higher regularity to overcome this issue. As for IFE methods, standard penalty-type methods still do not achieve optimal convergence, and a Petrov-Galerkin method can be applied, see [28], and achieve optimal order convergence with certain conditions. The IVEM proposed in this paper is able to circumvent this issue since the underlying IVE space is always conforming which is distinguished from many conventional unfitted mesh methods. The resulting linear algebraic system remains symmetric and positive definite unlike the one obtained from Petrov-Galerkin formulation [28].

The rest of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2, some existing results are presented to help us to establish the error analysis. In Section 3, we introduce the immersed virtual space and its properties, and review IFE spaces. In Section 4, we show some novel estimates for IFE spaces that help in our error analysis. In Section 5 and Section 6, the convergence is shown for the  $H^1$  and  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  interface problems, respectively.

**2. Preliminary.** In this section, we introduce some mesh assumptions and define some notation. We also recall some existing fundamental estimates which are critical for our analysis. Throughout this paper, we assume  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is a simply connected and convex polygon. Usually it can be chosen as a rectangle enclosing the interface.

**2.1. Meshes.** Let  $\mathcal{T}_h = \{K\}$  be a shape regular triangulation of the domain  $\Omega$  that may not be fitted to the interface. A triangle  $K$  is called an interface triangle if  $|K \cap \Omega^+| > 0$  and  $|K \cap \Omega^-| > 0$ ; otherwise  $K$  is called a non-interface element. The collection of interface elements and non-interface elements are denoted as  $\mathcal{T}_h^i$  and  $\mathcal{T}_h^n$ , respectively. Throughout the paper we make the following assumption on the triangulation  $\mathcal{T}_h$ .

*Assumption 2.1* (Assumption on the background mesh). For each interface triangle  $K$  in the background mesh,  $\Gamma$  intersects with  $K$  at most two distinct points on two different edges.

We note that this assumption can be satisfied if  $\mathcal{T}_h$  is sufficiently fine [20, 25] provided that  $\Gamma \in C^{1,1}$ , i.e., the interface is locally flat enough. Even if the interface intersects an element with multiple times see Figures 2b and 2c, the proposed method can easily handle this situation, since the immersed virtual functions always exist from solving local problems, which is one of the major difference from the conventional IFEM. So, we make this assumption only to simplify the analysis.

For a non-interface element  $K$ , the local finite element space is simply defined as the linear polynomial space  $\mathbb{P}_1(K)$  or the lowest order Nédélec space  $\mathcal{ND}_0(K)$  [50, 49]. The usage whether to choose the nodal or edge shape functions depends on the problem. For convenience of the reader,  $\mathcal{RT}_0(K)$  is the lowest order Raviart-Thomas space [53] on  $K$  as well. If  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ , see Figure 2a for example,  $\mathbf{b}_1$  and  $\mathbf{b}_2$  denote the intersection points of the interface and  $\partial K$ , and we let  $\Gamma_h^K = \mathbf{b}_1\mathbf{b}_2$ . In addition, we let  $\mathcal{N}_K$  be collection of vertices and cutting points of  $K$ , and let  $\mathcal{E}_K$  be collection of cut segments from the original edges of  $K$ , for example  $\mathcal{N}_K = \{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3, \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2\}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_K = \{\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_1\mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_2\mathbf{a}_3, \mathbf{a}_3\mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_2\mathbf{a}_1\}$  for the interface element  $K$  in Figure 2a. Namely, we treat  $K$  as pentagon. Moreover, let  $\mathcal{N}_h$  and  $\mathcal{E}_h$  be the collection of all the vertices and edges of  $\mathcal{N}_K$  and  $\mathcal{E}_K$  overall all the  $K$ , respectively.




Fig. 2: Possible configuration for an interface element. (2a), (2b), (2c):  $\Gamma$  intersects at an interface at 2, 3, 4 points.

We define the union of cut segments  $\Gamma_h^K$  of all the interface elements as the approximated interface  $\Gamma_h$ , which also separates the original domain  $\Omega$  into two subdomains  $\Omega_h^\pm$ , in which the  $\pm$  are determined by the area overlap with  $\Omega^\pm$ . Define  $\alpha_h = \alpha^\pm, \beta_h = \beta^\pm$  on  $\Omega_h^\pm$ . For each interface triangle  $K$ ,  $\delta K$  is the subset of  $K$  such that  $\beta \neq \beta_h$  (i.e. mismatch region). Using Figure 2a as an example, without loss of generality,  $K_h^+ := \text{Conv}(\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{b}_1\mathbf{b}_2)$  and  $K_h^-$

the quadrilateral complement formed by  $\text{Conv}(\mathbf{a}_2\mathbf{a}_3\mathbf{b}_2\mathbf{b}_1)$ , and the relevant definitions and proofs follow similarly when  $\pm$  swaps.

**2.2. Sobolev Spaces and Norms.** Let  $H^k(D)$   $k \geq 0$  be the standard Hilbert space on a domain  $D$  with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{H^k(D)}$  and the seminorm  $|\cdot|_{H^k(D)}$ . Due to the discontinuity of the coefficient  $\beta$ , the solution to the  $H^1$  interface problem in (1.1) is not in  $H^2(\Omega)$  globally. For this piecewise Sobolev space, given any subdomain  $D \subset \Omega$  intersecting  $\Gamma$ , we introduce

$$H^k(\cup D^\pm) = \{u \in H^1(D) \text{ and } u^\pm \in H^k(D^\pm)\}$$

and the piecewise  $H^k$ -norm is defined by  $\|u\|_{H^k(\cup D^\pm)}^2 = \|u\|_{H^k(D^+)}^2 + \|u\|_{H^k(D^-)}^2$  for any  $u \in H^k(\cup D^\pm)$ . If there is no danger of confusion, in the following discussion, we shall employ a simple notation for the norms:  $\|\cdot\|_{k,D} = \|\cdot\|_{H^k(D)}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{k,\cup D^\pm} = \|\cdot\|_{H^k(\cup D^\pm)}$ , and the seminorms similarly. For the  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  interface problem, we let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}^k(\text{curl}; D) &= \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; D) : \text{curl } \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^k(D)\}, \\ \mathbf{H}^k(\text{div}; D) &= \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; D) : \text{div } \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^k(D)\}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we introduce the following spaces

$$\begin{aligned} (2.1a) \quad H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h) &= H^1(\Omega) \cap \{u \in H^2(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h^n\} \cap \\ &\quad \{u \in H^2(\cup K^\pm) : \beta \nabla u \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i\}, \\ (2.1b) \quad \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h) &= \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; \Omega) \cap \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}; K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h^n\} \cap \\ &\quad \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}; \cup K^\pm) : \beta \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; K), \alpha \text{curl } \mathbf{u} \in H^1(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i\}, \\ (2.1c) \quad \mathbf{H}^1(\text{div}, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h) &= \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega) \cap \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\text{div}; K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h^n\} \cap \\ &\quad \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\text{div}; \cup K^\pm) : \beta \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i\}, \\ (2.1d) \quad \tilde{H}^1(\alpha, \mathcal{T}_h) &= L^2(\Omega) \cap \{u \in H^1(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h^n\} \cap \\ &\quad \{u \in H^1(\cup K^\pm) : \alpha u \in H^1(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is not hard to see these spaces are mesh-dependent and are constructed based on the associated jump conditions. Under the setting introduced in Section 1 that  $f \in L^2(\Omega)$  and  $\Gamma \in C^{1,1}$ , it can be shown that (see e.g. [19, 20, 35]), the solution to the  $H^1$  elliptic interface problem satisfies  $u \in H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm)$ , and thus, with the jump conditions,  $u \in H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ . As for  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  interface problem, we follow [36, 31] to assume  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}; \cup \Omega^\pm)$ . With the jump condition, we have  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ .

Given an interface element  $K$ , we let  $H^2(\beta; K)$ ,  $\mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; K)$  and  $\tilde{H}^1(\alpha, K)$  be the local spaces of their corresponding global spaces in (2.1) on  $K$ . These spaces together with the classic Sobolev spaces admit the following diagram in the continuous level:

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathbb{R} & \longrightarrow & H^2(\beta; K) & \xrightarrow{\nabla} & \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; K) & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & \tilde{H}^1(\alpha, K) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow I & & \downarrow \beta & & \downarrow \alpha & & \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & L^2(K) & \xleftarrow{\text{div}} & \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; K) & \xleftarrow{\text{curl}} & H^1(K) & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{R}. \end{array}$$

We highlight that the scalar multiplication  $\beta \cdot$  and  $\alpha \cdot$  can be understood as Hodge stars [2] as shown by the downward arrows in (2.2). We shall construct virtual spaces to mimic this diagram in the discrete level.

LEMMA 2.2. *Assume  $\Gamma$  and  $\partial\Omega$  are smooth enough, and they do not intersect. Then, the following complex*

$$(2.3) \quad \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h) \xrightarrow{\nabla} \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h) \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} \tilde{H}^1(\alpha; \mathcal{T}_h) \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact.

*Proof.* We first recall the standard exact sequence of the de Rham complex:

$$(2.4) \quad \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow H^1(D) \xrightarrow{\nabla} \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; D) \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} H(D) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $D$  is any contractible subdomain of  $\Omega$  with Lipschitz boundary  $\partial D$ .

By definition, for  $v \in H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ ,  $\nabla v \in \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; \Omega)$  satisfies the regularity condition and the jump conditions associated with  $\mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$  and obviously  $\text{curl } \nabla v = 0$ . Conversely, let  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$  such that  $\text{curl } \mathbf{u} = 0$ . We are going to find  $v \in H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$  such that  $\mathbf{u} = \nabla v$ .

By the standard exact sequence, since  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; \Omega)$ , there exists  $v \in H^1(\Omega)$  such that  $\nabla v = \mathbf{u}$ . We need to verify the extra conditions associated with  $H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$  for  $v$ . Given each  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^n$ ,  $\nabla v = \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(K)$  implies  $v \in H^2(K)$ . On each  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ , similarly  $\nabla v = \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\cup K^\pm)$  implies  $v \in H^2(\cup K^\pm)$ . In addition,  $\beta \nabla v \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; K)$  is trivial by (2.1b). Thus,  $v \in H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ .

Next, let us show  $\text{curl} : \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h) \rightarrow \tilde{H}^1(\alpha; \mathcal{T}_h)$  is surjective. Given any  $f \in \tilde{H}^1(\alpha; \mathcal{T}_h) \subset L^2(\Omega)$ , consider a function  $\varphi$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} (2.5a) \quad & \text{curl } \beta^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \varphi = -\text{div}(\beta^{-1} \nabla \varphi) = f && \text{in } \cup \Omega^\pm, \\ (2.5b) \quad & [\varphi]_\Gamma = 0, && \text{on } \Gamma, \\ (2.5c) \quad & [\beta^{-1} \nabla \varphi \cdot \mathbf{n}]_\Gamma = 0, && \text{on } \Gamma, \\ (2.5d) \quad & \beta^{-1} \nabla \varphi \cdot \mathbf{n} = |\partial\Omega|^{-1} \int_\Omega f \, dx && \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Note that (2.5) is a pure Neumann boundary value problem with the compatibility satisfied, which guarantees the solution  $\varphi$  being unique up to a constant. Thus,  $\mathbf{curl} \varphi$  is unique and we let  $\mathbf{w} = \beta^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \varphi$ . As  $f \in L^2(\Omega)$  with the geometry assumption for  $\Omega$  and  $\Gamma$ , by the elliptic regularity we have  $\varphi \in H^2(\cup \Omega^\pm)$ , thus further obtain  $\mathbf{w}|_{\Omega^\pm} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega^\pm)$ . Besides, (2.5a) shows  $\text{curl } \mathbf{w} = f$  in  $\Omega^\pm$ , (2.5b) shows  $[\beta \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n}]_\Gamma = [\mathbf{curl} \varphi \cdot \mathbf{n}]_\Gamma = [\nabla \varphi \cdot \mathbf{t}]_\Gamma = 0$ , and (2.5c) yields  $[\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{t}]_\Gamma = [\beta^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \varphi \cdot \mathbf{t}]_\Gamma = [\beta^{-1} \nabla \varphi \cdot \mathbf{n}]_\Gamma = 0$ . Therefore,  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$  which completes the proof.  $\square$

Next,  $u_E^\pm := Eu^\pm \in H^2(\Omega)$  denotes the standard smooth Sobolev extensions that are bounded in the  $H^2$ -norm (see e.g., [1]). As for the  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  spaces, the continuous extension operator is given by the following result:

**THEOREM 2.3** (Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.5 in [31]). *There exist two bounded linear operators*

$$(2.6) \quad \mathbf{E}_{\text{curl}}^\pm : \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}; \Omega^\pm) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}; \Omega)$$

such that for each  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}; \Omega^\pm)$ :

1.  $\mathbf{E}_{\text{curl}}^\pm \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}$  a.e. in  $\Omega^\pm$ .
2.  $\|\mathbf{E}_{\text{curl}}^\pm \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}; \Omega)} \leq C_E \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}; \Omega^\pm)}$  with the constant  $C_E$  only depending on  $\Omega$  and  $\Gamma$ .

Using the extension operators, we can define  $\mathbf{u}_E^\pm = \mathbf{E}_{\text{curl}}^\pm \mathbf{u}^\pm$  which are the keys in the analysis later.

In the rest of the paper, all constants in  $\lesssim$  are  $\beta$  and  $\alpha$ -dependent but independent of the cut point locations unless stated otherwise.

**2.3. Fundamental Inequalities.** We review some fundamental estimates that are crucial for our analysis. The first one concerns the mismatch region of the partitions by the exact interface  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma_h^K$ , i.e.,  $\delta K$ . For any subdomain  $D \subseteq \Omega$  with the interface  $\Gamma$ , define

$$D_\delta = \{x \in D : \text{dist}(x, \Gamma) < \delta\}.$$

Clearly, there hold

$$\bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i} \delta K \subset \Omega_{\delta_0}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i} K \subset \Omega_{h_\Gamma}$$

where  $\delta_0$  is the maximum distance from  $\Gamma_h$  to  $\Gamma$ , while  $h_\Gamma$  is the maximum diameter of  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$  with  $h_\Gamma \lesssim h$ . By the well-known geometric estimate, see [25, Lemma 3.2] for example, we have  $\delta_0 \lesssim h^2$ . The following result can be found in [17, 43].

**LEMMA 2.4** (A norm estimate on a strip region). *For each  $u \in H^1(\cup \Omega^\pm)$ , there holds*

$$\|u\|_{0, \Omega_\delta} \lesssim \sqrt{\delta} \|u\|_{1, \cup \Omega^\pm}.$$

We will also need the following trace theorems and Poincaré-type inequalities.

**LEMMA 2.5** (A trace inequality [9]). *Let  $e$  be an edge of an element  $K$ . Then, for all  $v \in H^1(K)$ , there holds*

$$\|v\|_{0, \partial K}^2 \lesssim h^{-1} \|v\|_{0, K}^2 + h |v|_{1, K}^2.$$

**LEMMA 2.6** (A trace inequality on interface [55]). *On any interface element  $K$ , for all  $v \in H^1(K)$ , there holds*

$$(2.7) \quad \|v\|_{L^2(\Gamma_h^K)} \lesssim h_K^{-1/2} \|v\|_{0, K} + h_K^{1/2} |v|_{1, K}.$$



**THEOREM 2.7** (Poincaré-Friedrich's type inequalities [9, 11]). *Given a polygon  $K$  with Lipschitz boundary  $\partial K$  and the number of edges of  $K$  is uniformly bounded, there holds, for each  $e \subset \partial K$ ,*

$$(2.8a) \quad \|v\|_{0,e} \lesssim h_K^{-1/2} \left| \int_{\partial K} v \, ds \right| + h_K^{1/2} |v|_{1/2, \mathcal{E}_K},$$

wherein the seminorm  $|\cdot|_{1/2, \mathcal{E}_K}$  is defined in Section 5.1 below. Furthermore, if  $K$  is shape regular in the sense that it is star-shaped with respect to a disk with radius  $\rho h_K$ , then for each  $v \in H^1(K)$ , there hold

$$(2.8b) \quad \|v\|_{0,K} \lesssim \left| \int_{\partial K} v \, ds \right| + h_K |v|_{1,K}.$$

**3. Immersed Virtual Element and Immersed Finite Element Spaces.** In this section, we introduce the immersed virtual element (IVE) and the immersed finite element (IFE) spaces. Then we describe the associated projection and interpolation operators. We connected them by commuting diagrams.

**3.1. Immersed Virtual Element Spaces.** The proposed IVE space is a group of novel virtual element spaces with an interface immersed inside the element.

**3.1.1.  $H^1$  Virtual Element Spaces.** For each interface element  $K$ , we begin with an  $H^1$  virtual element space that encodes the interface into its elements:

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} V_h^n(K) = \{v_h : \operatorname{div}(\beta_h \nabla v_h) = 0, \quad v_h|_e \in \mathbb{P}_1(e), \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_K, \quad v_h \in C^0(\partial K), \\ [v_h]_{\Gamma_h^K} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad [\beta_h \nabla v_h \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}}]_{\Gamma_h^K} = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we note that the jump conditions in (3.1) are imposed on the approximate interface  $\Gamma_h^K$  instead of on the exact interface  $\Gamma$ , the barred notation  $\bar{\mathbf{n}}$  denotes the unit normal vector to  $\Gamma_h^K$  that points roughly in the same direction with  $\mathbf{n}$ . Similarly,  $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$  is the unit tangential vector to  $\Gamma_h^K$  that is an approximation to  $\mathbf{t}$ . The motivation to impose the jump conditions on  $\Gamma_h^K$  is that the IFE space defined later becomes a subspace of  $V_h^n(K)$ , which facilitates a simpler analysis. There will be no essential difficulty if the jump conditions of the virtual spaces are defined on  $\Gamma$  as the analysis follows the VEM meta-framework.

Clearly,  $V_h^n(K)$  is not empty. The reason is that we can treat  $V_h^n(K) \subseteq H^1(K)$  as the space of the weak solutions to a boundary value problem. Then, the dimension of  $V_h^n(K)$  is that of the boundary conditions, i.e., the dimension of  $\Pi_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} \mathbb{P}_1(e) \cap C^0(\partial K)$ , which further can be identified by the number of the vertices on  $\partial K$ . Consequently,  $V_h^n(K)$  is unisolvent: if the DoFs  $v_h(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  at each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_K$ , which implies the boundary value  $v_h = 0$  on  $\partial K$ , then  $v_h = 0$  in  $K$  by the uniqueness of the local problem. This space can be understood as a natural generalization of the classic linear virtual space in [6, 7] to the case of discontinuous coefficients. Furthermore, referred to (1.6), we can see the space is also a generalization of 1D space by Babuška et al. in [4, 5].

Note that  $V_h^n(K) \subset H^1(K) \cap \{\beta_h \nabla u \in \mathbf{H}(\operatorname{div}; K)\}$ . Inside the interface element  $K$ , the piecewise constant function  $\beta_h$  serves as a Hodge star which maps the function  $\nabla u \in \mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl}; K)$  to a function  $\beta_h \nabla u \in \mathbf{H}(\operatorname{div}; K)$ .

The global space is then defined as

$$(3.2) \quad V_h^n = \{v_h \in H_0^1(\Omega) : v|_K \in V_h^n(K) \text{ if } K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i \text{ and } v|_K \in \mathbb{P}_1(K) \text{ if } K \in \mathcal{T}_h^n\}$$

which is an  $H^1$ -conforming space. Lastly, we can define the Lagrange type interpolation  $I_h^n$  using the nodal DoFs, for continuous  $u$ ,

$$(3.3) \quad (I_h^n u)(\mathbf{x}) = u(\mathbf{x}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_h.$$

**3.1.2.  $\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl})$  Virtual Element Spaces.** Next, let us consider an  $\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl})$  virtual space involving discontinuous coefficients. Given an interface element  $K$ , we define

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}_h^e(K) = \{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl}; K) : \beta_h \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\operatorname{div}; K), \quad \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{t}_e \in \mathbb{P}_0(e), \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_K, \\ \operatorname{div} \beta_h \mathbf{v}_h = 0, \quad \alpha_h \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{P}_0(K)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Again  $\beta_h$  is a Hodge star operator which maps  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl}; K)$  to  $\beta_h \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\operatorname{div}; K)$  and  $\alpha_h$  is another Hodge star which maps  $\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h \in L^2(K)$  to  $\alpha_h \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h \in H^1(K)$ .

With this definition, it is easy to see

$$(3.5) \quad \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{V}_h^e(K) = \{c \text{ is a piecewise constant on } K_h^\pm : \alpha_h^+ c^+ = \alpha_h^- c^-\}.$$

In the rest of this section, we denote the weighted average of  $\alpha$  on  $K$  by

$$(3.6) \quad \alpha_K = (|K_h^+|\alpha_h^- + |K_h^-|\alpha_h^+)/|K|.$$

If a piecewise constant vector  $\mathbf{c} := \mathbf{c}^\pm$  on  $K_h^\pm$  satisfies  $\beta^+ \mathbf{c}^+ \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}} = \beta^- \mathbf{c}^- \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}}$  and  $\mathbf{c}^+ \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} = \mathbf{c}^- \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}}$ , then  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$  is non-empty, and upon a closer inspection it is not hard to see that the aforementioned  $\mathbf{c}^\pm$  form the gradient of the  $H^1$  IFE space on  $K$  (see the definition of IFE spaces in Subsection 3.2.1). Furthermore, the local problem arising from (3.4) can be formulated as: for  $f \in L^2(K)$  and  $g \in L^2(\partial K)$ , find  $\mathbf{v}_h$  such that

$$(3.7a) \quad \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h = f \quad \text{in } K,$$

$$(3.7b) \quad \operatorname{div}(\beta_h \mathbf{v}_h) = 0 \quad \text{in } K,$$

$$(3.7c) \quad \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} = g \quad \text{on } \partial K.$$

Let us establish the well-posedness of this equation.

LEMMA 3.1. *The equation in (3.7) is well-posed if the compatibility condition is met:*

$$(3.8) \quad \int_K f \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\partial K} g \, ds.$$

*Proof.* By the constraint  $\operatorname{div} \beta_h \mathbf{v}_h = 0$ , the exact sequence property implies that there exists  $\varphi \in H^1(K)$  such that  $\mathbf{curl} \varphi = \beta_h \mathbf{v}_h$ . Then the argument basically mimics the one in the proof of Lemma 2.2 locally on an element. In particular, the problem (3.7) then becomes a pure Neumann problem:

$$(3.9a) \quad \operatorname{curl}(\beta_h^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \varphi) = -\operatorname{div}(\beta_h^{-1} \nabla \varphi) = f \quad \text{in } K,$$

$$(3.9b) \quad \beta_h^{-1} \nabla \varphi \cdot \mathbf{n} = -g \quad \text{on } \partial K.$$

Clearly, for any boundary condition  $g$  and source term  $f$  satisfying the compatibility condition (3.8), (3.9) has a unique solution  $\varphi \in H^1(K)/\mathbb{R}$ , and thus a unique  $\mathbf{v}_h = \beta_h^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \varphi$ .  $\square$

The well-posedness of the local problem shows that the DoFs on edges in  $\mathcal{E}_K$  suffice to uniquely determine a function in  $\mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$  as follows.

LEMMA 3.2. *The DoFs  $\{\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{t}_e, e \in \mathcal{E}_K\}$  are unisolvent on the space  $\mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$  for any  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we show the result on an interface element  $K$ . By the definition of (3.4), we let  $f \in \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$  and  $g$  be a piecewise constant function on edges in  $\mathcal{E}_K$ . Despite the fact that  $\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$  in (3.5) gives an extra 1 dimension,  $f$  in (3.9) can be uniquely determined by the boundary value to impose the compatibility condition (3.8): let  $c_0 \in \mathbb{P}_0(K)$ ,  $f = \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h = c_0/\alpha_h$ , then  $f$  can be obtained through

$$(3.10) \quad \int_{\partial K} \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds = \int_K \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h \, d\mathbf{x} = |K_h^+| \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h^+ + |K_h^-| \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h^- = \frac{|K| \alpha_K}{\alpha_h^+ \alpha_h^-} c_0.$$

As a result, the well-posedness of the local problem (3.7) for such  $f$  and  $g$  inherits from that of the pure Neumann problem by Lemma 3.1. In addition, the dimension of the space consisting  $\mathbf{v}_h$  (number of DoFs  $\{\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{t}_e, e \in \mathcal{E}_K\}$ ) is equal to the dimension of the solution space satisfying the problem (3.7). This solution space is in turn determined by the boundary value  $g \in \Pi_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} \mathbb{P}_0(e)$ , of which the dimension is  $\dim \Pi_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} \mathbb{P}_0(e) = |\mathcal{E}_K|$ . Therefore, the unisolvence follows from the uniqueness of the local problem (3.7).  $\square$

It is important to note that the identity in (3.10) suggests  $\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h$  is readily computable for  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$  through the DoFs. In particular, we have

$$(3.11) \quad \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h^+ = \frac{1}{|K|} \frac{\alpha_h^-}{\alpha_K} \int_{\partial K} \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds, \quad \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h^- = \frac{1}{|K|} \frac{\alpha_h^+}{\alpha_K} \int_{\partial K} \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds.$$

Thanks to the edge DoFs, we can also construct a globally  $\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl})$ -conforming space

$$(3.12) \quad \mathbf{V}_h^e = \{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega) : \mathbf{v}_h|_K \in \mathbf{V}_h^e(K) \text{ if } K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i \text{ and } \mathbf{v}_h|_K \in \mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}_0(K) \text{ if } K \in \mathcal{T}_h^n\}.$$

We can define the edge interpolation  $I_h^e \mathbf{u}$  as, provided  $\mathbf{u}$  is smooth enough,

$$(3.13) \quad \int_e I_h^e \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds = \int_e \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds, \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h.$$



**3.1.3.  $\mathbf{H}(\text{div})$  Virtual Element Spaces.** Similarly, given an interface element  $K$ , the  $\mathbf{H}(\text{div})$  virtual space involving discontinuous coefficients is defined as

$$(3.14) \quad \mathbf{V}_h^f(K) = \{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; K) : \beta_h^{-1} \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; K), \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_e \in \mathbb{P}_0(e), \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_K, \\ \text{div } \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{P}_0(K), \text{curl } \beta_h^{-1} \mathbf{v}_h = 0\}.$$

Different from the standard virtual element spaces,  $\mathbf{V}_h^f(K)$  is not exactly the rotation of  $\mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$ . Indeed, the Hodge star is defined by  $\beta_h^{-1}$  which maps a function  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; K)$  to  $\beta_h^{-1} \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; K)$ .

By a similar argument to Section 3.1.2 that leads to Lemma 3.2, we can show that the definition (3.14) yields a well-defined local space with DoFs being  $\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_e, \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_K$ , and thus has the dimension  $|\mathcal{E}_K|$ . Similarly,  $\text{div } \mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h^f(K)$  is computable using these DoFs through the integration by parts:  $|K| \text{div } \mathbf{v}_h = \int_K \text{div } \mathbf{v}_h \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\partial K} \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n} \, ds$ . Then, the global  $\mathbf{H}(\text{div})$  virtual element space is

$$(3.15) \quad \mathbf{V}_h^f = \{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega) : \mathbf{v}_h|_K \in \mathbf{V}_h^f(K) \text{ if } K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i \text{ and } \mathbf{v}_h|_K \in \mathcal{RT}_0(K) \text{ if } K \in \mathcal{T}_h^n\}.$$

We can also define the edge interpolation  $I_h^f \mathbf{u}$  as, provided  $\mathbf{u}$  is smooth enough,

$$(3.16) \quad \int_e I_h^f \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, ds = \int_e \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, ds, \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_h.$$

We note that both  $I_h^e$  and  $I_h^f$  are just standard edge interpolation on non-interface elements.

**3.1.4. A discrete de Rham Complex.** The commuting diagram and discrete de Rham complex also hold for the newly constructed virtual spaces. Given each element  $K$  and a weight function  $w \in L^2(K)$  that is piecewise constant  $w^\pm$  on  $K_h^\pm$ , let  $\pi_K^w$  be the projection, defined with the inner product  $(w \cdot, \cdot)_K$ , onto

$$Q_h^w(K) = \{c \text{ is a piecewise constant on } K_h^\pm : w^+ c^+ = w^- c^-\}.$$

Namely, for  $z \in L^2(K)$  there holds

$$(3.17) \quad (w \pi_K^w z, v)_K = (w z, v)_K, \quad \forall v \in Q_h^w(K).$$

In particular, if  $K$  is simply a non-interface element or  $w = 1$ ,  $\pi_K^w$  reduces to the standard  $L^2$  projection onto  $Q_h^1(K) = \mathbb{P}_0(K)$ . If  $K$  is an interface element and  $w = \alpha_h$ , from (3.5) we have  $Q_h^{\alpha_h}(K) = \text{curl } \mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$ .

We first summarize the aforementioned Hodge star operators associated with  $V_h^n(K)$  and  $\mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$  through the following diagram

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathbb{R} & \longrightarrow & V_h^n(K) & \xrightarrow{\nabla} & \mathbf{V}_h^e(K) & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & Q_h^{\alpha_h}(K) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow I & & \downarrow \beta_h & & \downarrow \alpha_h & & \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & L^2(K) & \xleftarrow{\text{div}} & \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; K) & \xleftarrow{\text{curl}} & H^1(K) & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{R}. \end{array}$$

We note that this diagram exactly mimics the one in (2.2) which shows the proposed spaces nicely inherit this feature locally on interface elements.

Furthermore, given  $w \in L^2(\Omega)$  that is piecewise constant weight function on each element and subelement of interface elements, we let  $Q_h^w$  be a piecewise constant space satisfying  $Q_h^w|_K = Q_h^w(K)$ . Let the global projection be  $\pi_h^w|_K = \pi_K^w$ . Then, we have our diagram in (1.5). Let us proceed to show its exactness and commutative property.

LEMMA 3.3. *There holds*

$$\nabla V_h^n \subset \mathbf{V}_h^e \cap \text{Ker}(\text{curl}).$$

Consequently, together with  $\text{curl } \mathbf{V}_h^e = Q_h^{\alpha_h}$ , the discrete sequence on the bottom of (1.5) is a complex.

*Proof.* We first show the local subset result and focus on interface elements  $K$ , since the argument for non-interface elements is standard. Given  $v_h \in V_h^n(K)$ ,  $[v_h]_{\Gamma_h^K} = 0$  and  $[\beta_h \nabla v_h \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}}]_{\Gamma_h^K} = 0$  imply  $\nabla v_h \in \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; K)$  and  $\beta_h \nabla v_h \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; K)$ , respectively. In addition, we also have  $\text{div}(\beta_h \nabla v_h) = 0$  by the local problem (3.7). Besides,  $v_h|_e \in \mathbb{P}_1(e)$  implies  $\nabla v_h|_e \cdot \mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{P}_0(e)$ . Moreover, it is trivial that  $\text{curl}(\nabla v_h) = 0$  which gives the desired local subset result. It leads to the global one by their DoFs.  $\square$

LEMMA 3.4. *The discrete sequence on the bottom of (1.5), is exact.*

*Proof.* Given  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h^e \cap \text{Ker}(\text{curl})$ , there exists a  $\varphi_h \in H^1(\Omega)$  such that  $\nabla\varphi_h = \mathbf{v}_h$  by the classical exact sequence. We need to show  $\varphi_h \in V_h^n$ . On non-interface elements  $K$ , as  $\mathbf{v}_h$  is a constant vector, there simply holds  $\varphi_h \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ . on any  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ , as  $\text{div}(\beta_h \mathbf{v}_h) = 0$ , we also have  $-\nabla \cdot (\beta_h \nabla \varphi_h) = 0$ . The jump conditions for  $\varphi_h$  are thus satisfied due to those of  $\mathbf{v}_h$ . It follows from the DoFs  $\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} = \nabla\varphi_h \cdot \mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{P}_0(e)$  that  $\varphi_h \in \mathbb{P}_1(e)$ ,  $\forall e \in \mathcal{E}_K$ . These results lead to  $\varphi_h \in V_h^n(K)$ . Thus, we have  $\varphi_h \in V_h^n$  through their DoFs.

To show curl is surjective, we construct an auxiliary mesh  $\mathcal{T}_h^A$  by simply refining interface elements into several triangles. Given  $q_h \in Q_h^{\alpha_h} \subset \tilde{H}^1(\alpha_h, \Omega)$ , it is trivial that  $q_h$  can be considered as a piecewise constant function on  $\mathcal{T}_h^A$ . Then, the classic exact sequence yields a curl-conforming Nédélec element  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; \Omega)$  with  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_h|_K \in \mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}_0(K)$ ,  $\forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h^A$  such that  $\text{curl } \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_h = q_h$ . We set  $\mathbf{w}_h = I_h^e \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_h$ . It is trivial that  $\text{curl } \mathbf{w}_h = \text{curl } \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_h = q_h$  on  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^n$ . We only need to verify it on interface elements. Given  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ , we let  $q_h^\pm = q_h|_{K^\pm}$ . With integration by parts, there holds  $\int_K \text{curl } \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_h \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\partial K} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds$ . Then, by  $\alpha^+ q_h^+ = \alpha^- q_h^-$  we have

$$q_h^\pm = \frac{1}{|K|} \frac{\alpha_h^\mp}{\alpha_K} \int_{\partial K} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds = \frac{1}{|K|} \frac{\alpha_h^\mp}{\alpha_K} \int_{\partial K} \mathbf{w}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds$$

with  $\alpha_K$  defined in (3.6). Using (3.11), we have concluded  $\text{curl } \mathbf{w}_h = q_h$ .  $\square$

*Remark 3.5.* The global Nédélec edge element constructed in the proof above can be understood as a function in the virtual space developed in [13] with discontinuous coefficients, in which the DoFs associated with the internal edges of an interface element are eliminated by imposing a single constant curl value.

Note that for standard FEM on non-interface elements,  $\text{curl } I_h^e \mathbf{u}$  is the projection of  $\mathbf{u}$  onto the constant space, which is the well-known commuting property for de Rham complex. For the new virtual spaces, the commuting property also holds.

LEMMA 3.6. *The diagram in (1.5) is commutative.*

*Proof.* It suffices to establish the result on interface elements. To this end, given one interface element  $K$ , we shall first show for any  $u \in H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ , there holds

$$(3.19) \quad I_h^e \nabla u = \nabla I_h^n u.$$

As shown in Lemma 3.3, we have  $\nabla I_h^n u \in \mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$ ; so by the unisolvence in Lemma 3.2, to prove (3.19), it remains to check their DoFs coincide. Indeed, given each  $e \in \mathcal{E}_K$  with the ending points  $\mathbf{a}_e$  and  $\mathbf{b}_e$ , we have

$$\int_e \nabla I_h^n u \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds = I_h^n u(\mathbf{a}_e) - I_h^n u(\mathbf{b}_e) = u(\mathbf{a}_e) - u(\mathbf{b}_e) = \int_e \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds = \int_e I_h^e \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds.$$

Furthermore, we need to show for any  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; K)$ , there holds

$$(3.20) \quad \text{curl } I_h^e \mathbf{u} = \pi_K^{\alpha_h} \text{curl } \mathbf{u}.$$

Note that functions in  $Q_h^{\alpha_h}(K)$  are simply  $\alpha_h^{-1}c$  with any constant  $c$ . Then, Green's theorem gives

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_K \alpha_h \text{curl } I_h^e \mathbf{u} \alpha_h^{-1} c \, d\mathbf{x} &= \int_K \text{curl } I_h^e \mathbf{u} \, c \, d\mathbf{x} = c \int_{\partial K} I_h^e \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds \\ &= c \int_{\partial K} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds = \int_K \text{curl } \mathbf{u} \, c \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_K \alpha_h \text{curl } \mathbf{u} \alpha_h^{-1} c \, d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired result.  $\square$

*Remark 3.7.* It is highlighted that the commutative property essentially only depends on the DoFs of the IVE spaces. It makes the definition of IVE spaces quite flexible. For example, the property still holds if the IVE spaces are defined with the original interface  $\Gamma$  instead of the approximate interface  $\Gamma_h$ .

Here we assume higher regularity for the spaces in the continuous level so that the canonical interpolation operator  $I_h^n$  and  $I_h^e$  are well-defined. In the rest of this article, we simply denote the interpolations by  $u_I$  and  $\mathbf{u}_I$  if there is no confusion. It is possible to follow the approach in [23, 54] to construct quasi-interpolation operators without extra smoothness requirement and establish the commutative property.

**3.2. Immersed Finite Element Spaces.** Similar to the standard VEM [6, 7], the virtual functions themselves are not computable which demands projections. Due to jump conditions, the standard polynomial spaces are not appropriate choices onto which the virtual spaces are projected. As the IFE space consists of piecewise polynomials satisfying the jump conditions on  $\Gamma_h^K$ , naturally it can be used as a computable space for projecting. Now, let us review three types of IFE spaces including the  $H^1$ ,  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$ , and  $\mathbf{H}(\text{div})$  spaces.

**3.2.1.  $H^1$  IFE Spaces.** First, we consider the  $H^1$  case. Given an interface element  $K$ , we consider the approximate jump conditions to (1.2) defined on the segment  $\Gamma_h^K$ :

$$(3.22a) \quad v_h^+ = v_h^- \quad \text{at } \Gamma_h^K,$$

$$(3.22b) \quad \beta_h^+ \nabla v_h^+ \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}} = \beta_h^- \nabla v_h^- \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}} \quad \text{at } \Gamma_h^K.$$

Note that (3.22a) leads to  $\nabla v_h^+ \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} = \nabla v_h^- \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}}$ , which together with (3.22b) leads to the relation

$$(3.23) \quad \nabla v_h^+ = M \nabla v_h^- \quad ,$$

where  $M$  is a matrix encoded with the jump information

$$(3.24) \quad M = \begin{bmatrix} n_2^2 + \rho n_1^2 & (\rho - 1)n_1 n_2 \\ (\rho - 1)n_1 n_2 & n_1^2 + \rho n_2^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

with  $\bar{\mathbf{n}} = (n_1, n_2)$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{t}} = (t_1, t_2) = (n_2, -n_1)$ , and  $\rho = \beta^- / \beta^+$ . Accordingly, we can express the  $H^1$  IFE functions explicitly as follows:

$$(3.25) \quad v_h(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} M\mathbf{c} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^m) + c_0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in K_h^+, \\ \mathbf{c} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^m) + c_0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in K_h^-, \end{cases}$$

where  $\mathbf{x}^m = (x_1^m, x_2^m)^\top$  is the mid-point of  $\Gamma_h^K$ , and  $c_0$  and  $\mathbf{c}$  are constant scalar and vector that can be viewed as the DoFs for the polynomial space. Now, the  $H^1$  local IFE space on  $K$  is then defined as

$$(3.26) \quad S_h^n(K) := \{v_h|_{K_h^\pm} \in \mathbb{P}_1(K_h^\pm) : v_h \text{ satisfies (3.22)}\}.$$

By counting the number of constraints,  $\dim S_h^n(K) = 3$ . Comparing it with the virtual space (3.1), it is straightforward to conclude that  $S_h^n(K) \subset V_h^n(K)$ . In the classical definition of IFE, e.g. [25], the IFE space admits the DoFs as the values at the vertices of a triangular element  $K$ . In contrast, this nodal basis–DoF pair is now different, as the DoFs are imposed through the virtual element space. Note that the IFE basis in (3.25) is not the conventional nodal IFE basis, and the formula in (3.25) is easier to be derived and only used for computing projections.

**3.2.2.  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  IFE Spaces.** The  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  IFE space is developed in [28] which employs the approximate jump conditions for piecewise polynomials  $\mathbf{v}_h^\pm \in \mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}_0(K_h^\pm)$

$$(3.27a) \quad \mathbf{v}_h^+ \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} = \mathbf{v}_h^- \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} \quad \text{at } \Gamma_h^K,$$

$$(3.27b) \quad \alpha_h^+ \text{curl } \mathbf{v}_h^+ = \alpha_h^- \text{curl } \mathbf{v}_h^- \quad \text{at } \Gamma_h^K,$$

$$(3.27c) \quad \beta_h^+ \mathbf{v}_h^+ \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}} = \beta_h^- \mathbf{v}_h^- \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}} \quad \text{at } \mathbf{x}^m.$$

Then, the  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  IFE space is defined as

$$(3.28) \quad \mathbf{S}_h^e(K) = \{\mathbf{v}_h|_{K_h^\pm} \in \mathcal{N}\mathcal{D}_0(K_h^\pm) : \mathbf{v}_h \text{ satisfies (3.27)}\}.$$

Comparing the virtual space (3.4) and the IFE space (3.28), we find that the only difference is that  $\beta_h \mathbf{v}_h \notin \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; K)$ , since the normal continuity only holds at one point as shown in (3.27c). Thus,  $\mathbf{S}_h^e(K) \not\subseteq \mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$  which is different from the  $H^1$  case, but it is sufficient to capture the jump information with optimal accuracy. Furthermore, it is not hard to see

$$(3.29) \quad \text{curl } \mathbf{V}_h^e = \text{curl } \mathbf{S}_h^e(K) = Q_h^{\alpha_h}(K).$$

The functions in  $\mathbf{S}_h^e(K)$  admit the following explicit representation:

$$(3.30) \quad \mathbf{v}_h = \begin{cases} M\mathbf{c} + \frac{c_0}{\alpha^+}(-(x_2 - x_2^m), x_1 - x_1^m)^\top & \text{in } K_h^+, \\ \mathbf{c} + \frac{c_0}{\alpha^-}(-(x_2 - x_2^m), x_1 - x_1^m)^\top & \text{in } K_h^-, \end{cases}$$

where  $M$  is given by (3.24), and  $c_0$  and  $\mathbf{c}$  are arbitrary constant and constant vector.

**3.2.3.  $\mathbf{H}(\text{div})$  IFE Spaces.** To derive a systematic framework, we also recall the  $\mathbf{H}(\text{div})$  IFE space [37] which is used to approximate  $\beta \nabla u \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; K)$ . The related approximate jump conditions are defined as

$$(3.31a) \quad \mathbf{v}_h^+ \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}} = \mathbf{v}_h^- \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_h^K,$$

$$(3.31b) \quad (\beta_h^+)^{-1} \mathbf{v}_h^+(\mathbf{x}^m) \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} = (\beta_h^-)^{-1} \mathbf{v}_h^-(\mathbf{x}^m) \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}}, \quad \text{on } \Gamma_h^K.$$

together with the condition

$$(3.31c) \quad \text{div } \mathbf{v}_h^+ = \text{div } \mathbf{v}_h^-.$$

We note that (3.31c) is proposed in [37] for guaranteeing unisolvence, but it is interesting to note that it also mimics the condition of the face IVE space in (3.14), i.e.  $\text{div } v_h$  is a constant in  $K$ . We emphasize again that the jump condition is from the discrete Hodge star  $\beta_h^{-1}$  which maps  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; K)$  to  $\beta_h^{-1} \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; K)$ .

Then, the  $\mathbf{H}(\text{div})$  IFE space is defined as

$$(3.32) \quad \mathbf{S}_h^f(K) = \{\mathbf{v}_h|_{K_h^\pm} \in \mathcal{RT}_0(K_h^\pm) : \mathbf{v}_h \text{ satisfies (3.31)}\}.$$

In this case, we still do not have  $\mathbf{S}_h^f(K) \not\subseteq \mathbf{V}_h^f(K)$  since the tangential continuity only holds at  $\mathbf{x}^m$ . Again, we can derive the explicit formulas for functions in  $\mathbf{S}_h^f(K)$ :

$$(3.33) \quad \mathbf{v}_h = \begin{cases} M' \mathbf{c} + c_0(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^m) & \text{in } K_h^+, \\ \mathbf{c} + c_0(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^m) & \text{in } K_h^-, \end{cases}$$

where  $\mathbf{c}$  and  $c_0$  are arbitrary constant vector and constant, and  $M' = \rho^{-1}M$ .

**3.2.4. The Exact Sequence for IFE Spaces.** Let us recall the discrete de Rham complex and exact sequence for IFE spaces which will be useful in the later discussion. Here, we only need the local ones: [28, Theorem 3.5] shows

$$(3.34) \quad S_h^n(K) \xrightarrow{\nabla} \mathbf{S}_h^e(K) \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} Q_h^{\alpha_h}(K).$$

A similar exact sequence is

$$(3.35) \quad \tilde{S}_h^n(K) \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} \mathbf{S}_h^f(K) \xrightarrow{\text{div}} Q_h^1(K).$$

Here,  $\tilde{S}_h^n(K)$  is an  $H^1$  IFE spaces but with the parameter  $\beta_h^{-1}$  and a rotated gradient, i.e., (3.22) is replaced by

$$(3.36) \quad (\beta_h^+)^{-1} \mathbf{curl} v_h^+ \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} = (\beta_h^-)^{-1} \mathbf{curl} v_h^- \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_h^K.$$

We mention that  $\mathbf{S}_h^f(K)$  is the space used in [37] for mixed IFE methods. Then, we have the following result.

LEMMA 3.8. *The Hodge star operator  $\beta_h \cdot$  induces a one-to-one mapping from  $\nabla S_h^n(K)$  to  $\mathbf{curl} \tilde{S}_h^n(K)$ :*

$$(3.37) \quad \beta_h \nabla S_h^n(K) = \mathbf{curl} \tilde{S}_h^n(K).$$

*Proof.* For a function  $v_h \in S_h^n(K)$ ,  $\nabla v_h$  is a piecewise constant vector in  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; K)$ , i.e., with tangential continuity. By construction  $\beta_h \nabla v_h \in \mathbf{S}_h^f(K)$  is a piecewise constant vector but now continuous at normal direction. Therefore,  $\text{div } \beta_h \nabla v_h = 0$ . So we have proved  $\beta_h \nabla S_h^n(K) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\text{div}) \cap \mathbf{S}_h^f(K) = \mathbf{curl} \tilde{S}_h^n(K)$ . By the same argument but switching  $S_h^n(K)$  and  $\tilde{S}_h^n(K)$ , we have  $\beta_h^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \tilde{S}_h^n(K) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\text{curl}) \cap S_h^n(K) = \nabla S_h^n(K)$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 3.9.* Lemma 3.1 shows for each  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h^e$ , there uniquely exists  $\varphi_h \in H^1(K)$  such that  $\beta_h^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \varphi_h = \mathbf{v}_h$  and  $\int_{\partial K} \varphi \, ds = 0$ . If  $\mathbf{v}_h$  is a constant IFE function, then  $\varphi_h \in \tilde{S}_h^n(K)$ . Moreover, with the Poincaré-Friedrich's inequality (2.8b) and the trace inequality in Theorem 2.5, we can show the stability:

$$(3.38) \quad h_K^{1/2} \|\varphi_h\|_{0, \partial K} + \|\varphi_h\|_{0, K} \lesssim h_K \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{0, K}.$$

**3.3. Projections.** It can be shown that the IFE spaces  $S_h^n(K)$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_h^e(K)$  and  $\mathbf{S}_h^f(K)$  are unisolvent by the nodal DoFs [25], edge DoFs  $\int_e \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds$  [28] and  $\int_e \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n} \, ds$  [37], respectively. These DoFs are critical for the conventional IFE methods in both analysis and computation. Proofs of the unisolvence with respect to the DoFs are generally very technical and rely on mesh assumption, for example the “no-obtuse-angle” condition introduced in [28, 37]. For some other problems, the unisolvence may not even hold, such as the elasticity problem [26], or the case that the interface intersects an element multiple times. It is highlighted that both the analysis and implementation of the proposed method do not rely on the unisolvence of the DoFs for the IFE spaces themselves, as they only serve as a computable projection space of the underlying virtual spaces that offers a sufficient approximation power. Roughly speaking, the usual IFE shape functions will be replaced by a certain projection of  $\phi_h$  to IFE spaces, where  $\phi_h$ 's are the shape functions of the virtual element spaces. This is one of the major difference of the proposed method from those classical IFE works. With this property, the IVE is more flexible and generalizable.

Let us describe how to compute the projection from the IVE spaces to the IFE spaces. For the  $H^1$  case, we introduce a projection  $\Pi_K^{\beta_h} : V_h^n(K) \rightarrow S_h^n(K)$ :

$$(3.39) \quad (\beta_h \nabla \Pi_K^{\beta_h} u_h, \nabla v_h)_K = (\beta_h \nabla u_h, \nabla v_h)_K, \quad \forall v_h \in S_h^n(K), \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\partial K} (u_h - \Pi_K^{\beta_h} u_h) \, ds = 0.$$

By the continuity of  $u_h \in V_h^n(K)$  and flux jump condition of  $v_h \in S_h^n(K)$ , applying integration by parts, we have

$$(3.40) \quad \int_K \beta_h \nabla u_h \cdot \nabla v_h \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\partial K} \beta_h u_h \nabla v_h \cdot \mathbf{n} \, ds,$$

which is computable, since  $u_h|_{\partial K}$  is explicitly known, and  $v_h \in S_h^n(K)$  can have its gradient evaluated explicitly. This projection exactly mimics the usual one used in the VEM literature.

As for the  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  interface problem, let us introduce the weighted  $L^2$  projection  $\mathbf{\Pi}_K^{\beta_h} : \mathbf{V}_h^e(K) \rightarrow \nabla S_h^n(K)$ :

$$(3.41) \quad (\beta_h \mathbf{\Pi}_K^{\beta_h} \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h)_K = (\beta_h \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h)_K, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \nabla S_h^n(K).$$

Since  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \nabla S_h^n(K)$ , by (3.37) we have  $\beta_h \mathbf{v}_h \in \beta_h \nabla S_h^n(K) = \mathbf{curl} \tilde{S}_h^n(K)$ . Hence, there exists  $\varphi_h \in \tilde{S}_h^n(K)$  such that  $\mathbf{curl} \varphi_h = \beta_h \mathbf{v}_h$ . In particular, we can use (3.25) to express  $\varphi_h$  as

$$(3.42) \quad \varphi_h(\mathbf{x}) = R_{-\frac{\pi}{2}} \beta_h \mathbf{v}_h \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^m) + c_0,$$

where  $R_{-\frac{\pi}{2}}$  is the counterclockwise  $\frac{\pi}{2}$  rotation matrix, and  $c_0$  can be taken as an arbitrary constant with respect to which the projected vector is invariant. Then, it follows from integration by parts that

$$(3.43) \quad \int_K \beta_h \mathbf{\Pi}_K^{\beta_h} \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_K \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{curl} \varphi_h \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_K \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u}_h \varphi_h \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\partial K} \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} \varphi_h \, ds,$$

where  $\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u}_h$  is computable through DoFs as shown in (3.11). Notice that as  $[\mathbf{u}_h \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}}] = 0$  and  $\varphi_h$  is continuous on  $\Gamma_h^K$ , there is no contribution from the integral on  $\Gamma_h^K$ .

In the rest of this article, for the sake of simplicity, we shall drop  $\beta_h$  of the projections  $\mathbf{\Pi}_K^{\beta_h}$  and  $\mathbf{\Pi}_K^{\beta_h}$ , and furthermore  $\Pi_K$  and  $\mathbf{\Pi}_K$ , regardless of being interface element or not, are adopted to maintain a consistent and concise set of notations. For each non-interface element, the projection is simply the identity operator.

**4. Properties of IFE Functions.** In this section, we recall some properties for IFE functions and show some novel ones to be used. In the following discussion, any subdomain  $D \subseteq \Omega$ , we denote for simplicity

$$\|u\|_{E,k,D} := \|u_E^+\|_{k,D} + \|u_E^-\|_{k,D} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,\text{curl},k,D} := \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,k,D} + \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{u}\|_{E,k,D},$$

where  $k$  is a non-negative constant, and  $u_E^\pm$  are the Sobolev extensions defined before Theorem 2.3. For scalar- or vector-valued functions, their corresponding seminorms adopt this notation convention as well. We also need the patch of an interface element  $K$  which is the collection of elements neighboring  $K$ :

$$\omega_K := \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h, \bar{K} \cap \bar{T} \neq \emptyset} T, \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_K^\pm := \omega_K \cap \Omega^\pm.$$

**4.1. The  $H^1$  IFE Functions.** Let us first discuss the approximation results for the projection  $\Pi_K$  defined by (3.39). Similar to the standard  $H^1$  projection, with the known approximation results for IFE interpolations in the literature [25, 29], the results for  $\Pi_K$  may directly follow from the best approximation property of the projection. However, we shall see that the analysis further demands the approximation of each polynomial component of  $\Pi_K$  on the whole element  $K$ . To this end, with a slight abuse of notation, we consider the two polynomial Sobolev extensions of  $\Pi_K u|_{K^\pm}$  defined on the entire element  $K$

$$(4.1) \quad \Pi_K^\pm u := (\Pi_K u)|_E^\pm,$$

where  $(\Pi_K u)|_E^\pm$  are trivial extensions of  $\Pi_K u|_{K^\pm}$ . Namely, we need to estimate  $u|_E^\pm - \Pi_K^\pm u$  on the entire element.

For this purpose, we need to employ a quasi-interpolation operator introduced in [29] as an intermediate tool which is denoted by  $J_K u$ . But, since our IFE functions are defined with approximate interface  $\Gamma_h$ , we need to slightly modify the definition here. Define the interpolation operator  $J_K$  such that

$$(4.2) \quad J_K u = \begin{cases} J_K^+ u, & \text{in } \omega_K^+, \\ J_K^- u, & \text{in } \omega_K^-, \end{cases}$$

where  $J_K^\pm u$  are two linear polynomials satisfying the following conditions

$$(4.3a) \quad J_K^- u|_{\Gamma_h^K} = J_K^+ u|_{\Gamma_h^K} := \pi_{\omega_K} u|_{\Gamma_h^K},$$

$$(4.3b) \quad \beta^- \nabla J_K^- u \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}}_K = \beta^+ \nabla J_K^+ u \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}}_K := \beta^- \nabla \pi_{\omega_K} u|_{\Gamma_h^K},$$

where  $\pi_{\omega_K}$  is the standard  $L^2$  projection onto  $\mathbb{P}_1(\omega_K)$ . We note that the only difference between  $J_K$  and the one in [29] (denoted by  $I_T$  in (3.4) therein) is that the jump conditions are imposed on  $\Gamma_h^K$ .

Similar to (4.1), we denote the two polynomials that are trivial  $H^2$ -extensions of  $J_K u|_{K^\pm}$  still as  $J_K^\pm$ , which is defined on the whole element  $K$ . Moreover, these two polynomials have the desired optimal approximation to their corresponding functions  $u|_E^\pm$  on the whole element which is given by the lemma below. This crucial property serves as the key in our analysis.

LEMMA 4.1. *For  $u \in H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ , on any  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$  there holds*

$$(4.4) \quad |u|_E^\pm - J_K^\pm u|_{1,K} \lesssim h_K \|u\|_{E,2,\omega_K}.$$

*Proof.* The argument is the same as Lemmas 3-5 in [29].  $\square$

A similar estimate for  $\Pi_K^\pm$  can be established on the whole element  $K$ . The analysis needs to employ the quasi interpolation  $J_K$  as a bridge.

LEMMA 4.2. *For  $u \in H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ , on any  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$  there holds*

$$(4.5) \quad |u|_E^\pm - \Pi_K^\pm u|_{1,K} \lesssim h_K \|u\|_{E,2,\omega_K} + |u|_{E,1,\delta K}.$$

*Proof.* By the triangle inequality and Lemma 4.1, it suffices to estimate the difference  $|J_K^\pm u|_{1,K} - \Pi_K^\pm u|_{1,K}$ . Without loss of generality, we only discuss the + piece. We have the following trivial split

$$(4.6) \quad |J_K^+ u - \Pi_K^+ u|_{1,K} \lesssim \underbrace{|J_K^+ u - \Pi_K^+ u|_{1,K_h^+}}_{(I)} + \underbrace{|J_K^+ u - \Pi_K^+ u|_{1,K_h^-}}_{(II)}.$$

The estimate for (I) follows from inserting  $u$

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} |J_K^+ u - \Pi_K^+ u|_{1,K_h^+} &\lesssim |u - \Pi_K^+ u|_{1,K_h^+} + |u - J_K^+ u|_{1,K_h^+} \\ &\lesssim |u - \Pi_K u|_{1,K} + |u - J_K u|_{1,K} \\ &\lesssim |u - J_K u|_{1,K} \lesssim |u|_E^\pm - J_K^\pm u|_{1,K} + |u|_{E,1,\delta K} \end{aligned}$$

where in the third inequality we have used the best approximation property for  $\Pi_K$  under energy norm which is equivalent to the  $|\cdot|_{1,K}$  norm.

By the jump conditions on  $\Gamma_h^K$  and employing the matrix in (3.24), we have the following identity for gradients of an IFE function  $v_h \in S_h^n(K)$ :  $\nabla v_h^+ = M \nabla v_h^-$  with  $M$  given in (3.24). It clearly shows  $\|\nabla v_h^+\| \simeq \|\nabla v_h^-\|$ , where  $\|\cdot\|$  are just Euclidean norms for vectors, and the hidden constant depends on  $\beta$  through the eigenvalues of  $M$ . Therefore, by letting  $v_h = J_K u - \Pi_K u$ , we have

$$(4.8) \quad |J_K^+ u - \Pi_K^+ u|_{1,K_h^-} \lesssim |J_K^- u - \Pi_K^- u|_{1,K_h^-}$$

where the later one can be proved similarly to (4.7).  $\square$



At the end, for reader's sake, let us also recall the trace inequalities for the  $H^1$  IFE functions.

**THEOREM 4.3** (A trace inequality for  $H^1$  IFE functions [46]). *For each interface element  $K$  and its edge  $e$ , there holds*

$$(4.9) \quad h_K^{1/2} \|\nabla v_h\|_{0,e} \lesssim \|\nabla v_h\|_{0,K}, \quad \forall v_h \in S_h^n(K).$$

Note that for IFE functions,  $\nabla v_h$  is piecewise constant and thus (4.9) can be proved using existing tools. While for IVE function  $v_h$ , such trace result may not be easy to establish.

**4.2. The  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  IFE Functions.** The similar situation also exists for the  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  case, i.e., we need the estimates for the two polynomial components  $\mathbf{\Pi}_K^\pm$  on the entire element (the notation is similar to (4.1)). The similar quasi interpolation introduced in [28], see (4.3), can be used as a bridge for this case. Here we denote it as  $\mathbf{J}_K$  to be distinguished from the  $H^1$  scalar case of which the approximation is recalled below:

**LEMMA 4.4** (Theorem 4.1 in [28]). *For  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ , on any  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$  there holds*

$$(4.10) \quad \|\mathbf{J}_K^\pm \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_E^\pm\|_{\mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; K)} \lesssim h_K \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E, \text{curl}, 1, \omega_K}.$$

We also recall the following result.

**LEMMA 4.5** (Lemma 4.2 in [28] and Lemma 5.4 in [13]). *For  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ , on any  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ , the difference of the extensions on the approximate interface  $\Gamma_h^K$  along the tangential direction  $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$  satisfies*

$$(4.11) \quad \|\mathbf{u}_E^+ \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} - \mathbf{u}_E^- \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}}\|_{0,K} \lesssim h_K \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E, 1, \omega_K}.$$

Then we can show the estimates for  $\mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}$  and  $\text{curl } \mathbf{u}_I$ . For the curl case, we need to eliminate the mismatch term on  $\delta K$  in the error bound. For this purpose, we note that the mismatched term is essentially caused by the fact that  $\mathbf{u}$  itself is partitioned by  $\Gamma$  but  $\mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{u}_I$  are partitioned by  $\Gamma_h$ . So, it inspires us to introduce a new function  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} := \mathbf{u}_E^\pm$  on  $K_h^\pm$  as the bridge, and present the following estimate. Note that  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  differs from  $\mathbf{u}$  only on the mismatched region  $\delta K$  and, in particular, they match on  $\partial K$  and thus  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_I = \mathbf{u}_I$ . But  $[\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}}]_{\Gamma_h^K} \neq 0$ . For an analog of this heuristic in a 1-dimensional setting, please refer to Figure 3.




Fig. 3: A 1D analog of the comparison used in Lemma 4.6: (3a)–(3b):  $u$  and  $\tilde{u} := u_E^\pm$  on  $K_h^\pm$ ; (3c)–(3d):  $\mathbf{\Pi}_K^\pm u$  versus  $\mathbf{\Pi}_K^\pm \tilde{u}$ . Functions in the figures can be viewed as the tangential component of the vector functions in the actual proof for Lemma 4.6.

**LEMMA 4.6.** *Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} := \mathbf{u}_E^\pm$  on  $K_h^\pm$ , then there holds*

$$(4.12a) \quad \|\mathbf{\Pi}_K^\pm \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{\Pi}_K^\pm \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K} \lesssim h_K \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E, \text{curl}, 1, \omega_K},$$

$$(4.12b) \quad \text{curl } \mathbf{u}_I = \text{curl } \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_I.$$

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  match on  $\partial K$ , (4.12b) is trivial from integration by parts. We estimate  $\mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \tilde{\mathbf{u}} := \mathbf{w}_h$ . Given each  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \nabla S_h^n(K)$ , by (3.37), we can find  $\varphi_h \in \tilde{S}_h^n(K)$  satisfying  $\text{curl } \varphi_h = \beta_h \mathbf{v}_h$  given in Remark 3.9. For  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}$  or  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ , a similar formula to (3.43) leads to

$$(4.13) \quad \int_K \beta_h \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \, dx = \int_K \text{curl } \mathbf{v} \varphi_h \, dx - \int_{\partial K} \mathbf{v} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} \varphi_h \, ds - \int_{\Gamma_h^K} [\mathbf{v} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}}] \varphi_h \, ds$$

where the last term vanishes for  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}$ . Using the fact that  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  match on  $\partial K$  and taking subtraction of (4.13) for  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ , we have

$$(4.14) \quad \int_K \beta_h \mathbf{w}_h \cdot \mathbf{v}_h \, d\mathbf{x} = \underbrace{\int_{\delta K} \operatorname{curl}(\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) \varphi_h \, d\mathbf{x}}_{(I)} - \underbrace{\int_{\Gamma_h^K} (\mathbf{u}_E^+ \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} - \mathbf{u}_E^- \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}}) \varphi_h \, ds}_{(II)}$$

By Hölder's inequality and (3.38), we have

$$(4.15) \quad (I) \lesssim \|\operatorname{curl}(\mathbf{u}_E^+ - \mathbf{u}_E^-)\|_{0,\delta K} \|\varphi_h\|_{0,K} \lesssim h_K \|\operatorname{curl}(\mathbf{u}_E^+ - \mathbf{u}_E^-)\|_{0,\delta K} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K}.$$

The trace inequality in Lemma 2.6 with (3.38) yield

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} (II) &\lesssim (h_K^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{u}_E^+ \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} - \mathbf{u}_E^- \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}}\|_{0,K} + h_K^{1/2} |\mathbf{u}_E^+ \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} - \mathbf{u}_E^- \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}}|_{1,K}) \cdot (h_K^{-1/2} \|\varphi_h\|_{L^2(K)} + h_K^{1/2} |\varphi_h|_{H^1(K)}) \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_E^+ \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} - \mathbf{u}_E^- \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}}\|_{0,K} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K} + h_K |\mathbf{u}_E^+ \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}} - \mathbf{u}_E^- \cdot \bar{\mathbf{t}}|_{1,K} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K} \\ &\lesssim h_K \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,1,\omega_K} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K} \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 4.5 in the third inequality. Putting (4.15) and (4.16) into (4.14), letting  $\mathbf{v}_h = \mathbf{w}_h$ , and cancelling one  $\|\mathbf{w}_h\|_{0,K}$  on each side, we obtain

$$(4.17) \quad \|\Pi_K \mathbf{u} - \Pi_K \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K} \lesssim h_K (\|\operatorname{curl}(\mathbf{u}_E^+ - \mathbf{u}_E^-)\|_{0,\delta K} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,1,\omega_K}).$$

Note that  $\Pi_K \mathbf{u} - \Pi_K \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \nabla S_h^n(K)$  by the exact sequence. So, using the argument similar to (4.8), we directly induce (4.12a) from (4.17).  $\square$

With this preparation, we will present the following crucial estimate.

LEMMA 4.7. *For  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\operatorname{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ , on any  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$  there holds*

$$(4.18a) \quad \|\Pi_K^\pm \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_E^\pm\|_{0,K} \lesssim h_K \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,\operatorname{curl},1,\omega_K},$$

$$(4.18b) \quad \|\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_E^\pm - \operatorname{curl}^\pm \mathbf{u}_I\|_{0,K} \lesssim h_K \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,\operatorname{curl},1,\omega_K},$$

where  $\operatorname{curl}^\pm \mathbf{u}_I = (\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I)^\pm$  are the two constants used on the whole element.

*Proof.* The argument is similar to Lemma 4.2 but slightly more complicated, since we need to avoid the mismatched region  $\delta K$  by employing the function  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  introduced in Lemma 4.6. We decompose the argument into several steps.

Step 1. We show

$$(4.19) \quad \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \Pi_K \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K} \lesssim h_K \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,\operatorname{curl},1,\omega_K}.$$

Thanks to (3.30), we can write  $\mathbf{J}_K \mathbf{u}$  as

$$(4.20) \quad \mathbf{J}_K \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{p} + p_0(-(x_2 - x_2^m), x_1 - x_1^m)^\top,$$

where  $p_0$  and  $\mathbf{p}$  are piecewise constant (vector). In particular, we have  $\mathbf{p} \in \nabla S_h(K) = \operatorname{Ker}(\operatorname{curl}) \cap \mathbf{S}_h^e(K)$ , and  $p_0 = \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{J}_K \mathbf{u}/2$ . Then, by the best approximation property of the projection, we have

$$(4.21) \quad \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \Pi_K \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K} \lesssim \|\sqrt{\beta_h}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \Pi_K \tilde{\mathbf{u}})\|_{0,K} \lesssim \|\sqrt{\beta_h}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{p})\|_{0,K} \lesssim \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{J}_K \mathbf{u}\|_{0,K} + h_K \|\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{J}_K \mathbf{u}\|_{0,K},$$

where in the last inequality we have inserted  $p_0(x_2 - x_2^m, -(x_1 - x_1^m))^\top$ . Noticing that the partition of  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  exactly matches  $\mathbf{J}_K \mathbf{u}$ , i.e., they are both piecewise defined by  $\Gamma_h^K$ . Hence, applying Lemma 4.4 yields (4.19).

Step 2. We refine the estimate in (4.19) to the entire element; namely, with  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^\pm = \mathbf{u}_E^\pm$ , we need to show

$$(4.22) \quad \|\mathbf{u}_E^\pm - \Pi_K^\pm \tilde{\mathbf{u}}\|_{0,K} \lesssim h_K \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,\operatorname{curl},1,\omega_K}.$$

Without loss of generality, we focus on  $\Pi_K^+ \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{u}_E^+$ . Similar to the argument in Lemma 4.2, we only need to estimate  $\|\Pi_K^+ \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{J}_K^+ \mathbf{u}\|_{0,K_h^-}$ . Again, let us write

$$(4.23) \quad \Pi_K^+ \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{J}_K^+ \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{q} + q_0(x_2 - x_2^m, -(x_1 - x_1^m))^\top,$$

where  $q_0$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  are piecewise constant (vector). This time we notice  $\mathbf{q}^+ = M\mathbf{q}^-$  and  $\alpha^+q_0^+ = \alpha^-q_0^-$ . Then, we have

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\Pi_K^+ \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{J}_K^+ \mathbf{u}\|_{0,K_h^-} &\lesssim \|\mathbf{q}^+\|_{0,K_h^-} + h_K \|q_0^+\|_{0,K_h^-} \lesssim \|M\mathbf{q}^-\|_{0,K_h^-} + h_K \|q_0^-\|_{0,K_h^-} \\ &\lesssim \|\Pi_K^- \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{J}_K^- \mathbf{u}\|_{0,K_h^-} + h_K \|\operatorname{curl}(\Pi_K^- \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{J}_K^- \mathbf{u})\|_{0,K_h^-}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have inserted  $q_0^-(-x_2 - x_2^m, x_1 - x_1^m)^\top$  and used  $q_0 = \operatorname{curl}(\Pi_K \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{J}_K \mathbf{u})$ . Now, inserting  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}^- = \mathbf{u}_E^-$  in the right-hand side of (4.24) and applying Lemma 4.4 and (4.19) leads to (4.22) for the case of  $+$ . Combing (4.12a) and (4.22) through the triangle inequality finishes the proof of (4.18a)

Step 3. As for (4.18b), by Lemma 3.6 and (4.12b), we use that the projections are the best approximation to obtain

$$(4.25) \quad \|\sqrt{\alpha_h}(\operatorname{curl} \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0,K} \leq \|\sqrt{\alpha_h}(\operatorname{curl} \tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{J}_K \mathbf{u})\|_{0,K} \lesssim h_K \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,\operatorname{curl},1,\omega_K},$$

where we have also applied Lemma 4.4. Again, we have taken the advantage that both  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  and  $\mathbf{J}_K \mathbf{u}$  are piecewise defined by  $\Gamma_h^K$ . Then, similar to the argument above, it only remains to estimate

$$\|\operatorname{curl}(\mathbf{J}_K^+ \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I^+)\|_{0,K_h^-} \leq \frac{\alpha_h^-}{\alpha_h^+} \|\operatorname{curl}(\mathbf{J}_K^- \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I^-)\|_{0,K_h^-}$$

of which the estimate follows from inserting  $\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_E^-$  together with (4.25) and Lemma 4.4.  $\square$

Finally, the trace inequality also holds for  $\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl})$  IFE functions regardless of interface location.

LEMMA 4.8 (A trace inequality for  $\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl})$  IFE functions [28]). *For each interface element  $K$  and its edge  $e$ , there holds*

$$(4.26) \quad \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2(e)} \lesssim h_K^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K}, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{S}_h^e(K).$$

**5.  $H^1$  elliptic interface problems.** In this section, we present the immersed virtual element method for solving the  $H^1$ -elliptic interface problem and give the optimal order convergence analysis.

**5.1. Scheme.** Define the local bilinear form on an element  $K$  as:  $a_h^{n,K}(\cdot, \cdot) : H^1(K) \times H^1(K) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  where

$$(5.1) \quad a_h^{n,K}(u_h, v_h) := (\beta_h \nabla \Pi_K u_h, \nabla \Pi_K v_h)_K + S_K^n(u_h - \Pi_K u_h, v_h - \Pi_K v_h).$$

One of the keys for VEM is the choice of the stabilization term. Here, following [11], we consider the one associated with the  $H^{1/2}(e)$  seminorm on  $e \in \mathcal{E}_K$ :

$$(5.2) \quad (w_h, z_h)_{1/2,e} := \int_e \int_e \beta_e \frac{(w_h(\mathbf{x}) - w_h(\mathbf{y}))(z_h(\mathbf{x}) - z_h(\mathbf{y}))}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2} \, ds(\mathbf{x}) \, ds(\mathbf{y}),$$

where  $\beta_e = \beta_h|_e$ . Accordingly,  $|\cdot|_{1/2,\mathcal{E}_K}$  is defined for any  $w \in \Pi_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} H^{1/2}(e)$  as  $|w|_{1/2,\mathcal{E}_K}^2 := \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} (w, w)_{1/2,e}$ . Then, the stabilization term  $S_K^n(\cdot, \cdot)$  is

$$(5.3) \quad S_K^n(w_h, z_h) := \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} \beta_e (w_h, z_h)_{1/2,e} = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} \beta_e (w_h(\mathbf{b}_e) - w_h(\mathbf{a}_e))(z_h(\mathbf{b}_e) - z_h(\mathbf{a}_e)).$$

where the second identity is due to that both  $w_h$  and  $z_h$  are linear functions on each  $e \in \mathcal{E}_K$ . Then, the proposed IVE scheme for solving (1.1) is to find  $u_h \in V_h^n$  such that

$$(5.4) \quad a_h^n(u_h, v_h) := \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} a_h^{n,K}(u_h, v_h) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (f, \Pi_K v_h)_K, \quad \forall v_h \in V_h^n.$$

**5.2. An Error Equation.** We define the energy norm

$$(5.5) \quad \|v_h\|_n^2 := a_h^n(v_h, v_h).$$

LEMMA 5.1.  $\|\cdot\|_n$  is a norm on  $H_0^1(\Omega) \cap V_h^n$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $\|v_h\|_n = 0$  for some  $v_h \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap V_h^n$ . on any  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ , by (5.1),  $\|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K v_h\|_{0,K} = 0$  implies  $\Pi_K v_h \in \mathbb{P}_0(K)$ . Moreover,  $|(I - \Pi_K)v_h|_{1/2,e} = 0$  implies  $v_h \in \mathbb{P}_0(e)$  on each  $e \in \mathcal{E}_K$ . By  $v_h \in C^0(\partial K) \cap H^1(K)$  in (3.1),  $v_h \in \mathbb{P}_0(K)$ . The same result holds on non-interface elements trivially. Therefore, the continuity in (3.2) and the boundary condition on  $\partial\Omega$  lead to  $v_h \equiv 0$ .  $\square$

Given  $u \in H^2(\beta, \mathcal{T}_h)$ , since the global virtual space  $V_h^n$  is conforming, there always holds  $u_I \in H^1(\Omega)$ . Our analysis is based on the following error decomposition:

$$(5.6) \quad \xi_h = u - u_I \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_h = u_I - u_h.$$

The estimate of  $\xi_h$  is from the interpolation error estimate and  $\eta_h$  will be derived from an error equation. The IVE and IFE coincide with the standard simplicial finite element consisting only polynomials, thus the proposed stabilization vanishes. As a result, estimates on non-interface elements fall into the standard FEM regime; and our focus will be thus on the interface elements.

We follow [11] to derive an error equation for  $\eta_h = u_I - u_h$ .

LEMMA 5.2 (Error equation). *Let  $u \in H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$  be the solution to (1.1) and  $u_h$  be the solution to (5.4). Denote by  $\eta_h = u_h - u_I$ , then the following identity holds*

$$(5.7) \quad \|\eta_h\|_n^2 = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\{ (\beta_h \nabla \Pi_K (u - u_I), \nabla \Pi_K \eta_h)_K + (\beta_h \nabla (u - \Pi_K u) \cdot \mathbf{n}, \eta_h - \Pi_K \eta_h)_{\partial K} - S_K^n(u_I - \Pi_K u_I, \eta_h - \Pi_K \eta_h) + ((\beta - \beta_h) \nabla u, \nabla \Pi_K \eta_h)_K \right\}.$$

*Proof.* We start by the following

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\eta_h\|_n^2 &= a_h^n(u_h, \eta_h) - a_h^n(u_I, \eta_h) \\ (\text{Problem (5.4)}) &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (f, \Pi_K \eta_h)_K - a_h^n(u_I, \eta_h) \\ (\text{Original PDE}) &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (-\nabla \cdot (\beta \nabla u), \Pi_K \eta_h)_K - a_h^n(u_I, \eta_h) \\ (\text{Integration by parts}) &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left[ \underbrace{(\beta \nabla u, \nabla \Pi_K \eta_h)_K}_{(I)} - \underbrace{(\beta \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}, \Pi_K \eta_h)_{\partial K}}_{(II)} \right] - a_h^n(u_I, \eta_h). \end{aligned}$$

In the last identity above, the flux jump conditions of  $u$  (1.2) and the continuity of  $\Pi_K \eta_h$  on  $K$  are also used. For the term (I) in (5.8), using the definition of  $\Pi_K$  we have

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{aligned} (I) &= (\beta_h \nabla u, \nabla \Pi_K \eta_h)_K + ((\beta - \beta_h) \nabla u, \nabla \Pi_K \eta_h)_K \\ &= (\beta_h \nabla \Pi_K u, \nabla \Pi_K \eta_h)_K + ((\beta - \beta_h) \nabla u, \nabla \Pi_K \eta_h)_K. \end{aligned}$$

For the term (II), since  $\beta = \beta_h$  on  $\partial K$ , we obtain

$$(5.10) \quad \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (II) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\beta_h \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}, \Pi_K \eta_h)_{\partial K} = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\beta_h \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}, \Pi_K \eta_h - \eta_h)_{\partial K},$$

where in the second identity we have used  $\eta_h = u_h - u_I$  being continuous across each edge as it is in the virtual element space  $V_h^n$ . Using integration by parts on the subelements  $K_h^\pm$ , the flux jump conditions of the IFE functions on  $\Gamma_h^K$ ,  $\eta_h - \Pi_K \eta_h$  being continuous across  $\Gamma_h^K$ , and definition of the projection  $\Pi_K$ , we have

$$(5.11) \quad \begin{aligned} (\beta_h \nabla \Pi_K u \cdot \mathbf{n}, \eta_h - \Pi_K \eta_h)_{\partial K} &= \sum_{s=\pm} (\beta_h \nabla \Pi_K u \cdot \mathbf{n}, \eta_h - \Pi_K \eta_h)_{\partial K_h^s} \\ &= \sum_{s=\pm} (\beta_h \nabla \Pi_K u, \nabla (\eta_h - \Pi_K \eta_h))_{K_h^s} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (5.10) further becomes

$$(5.12) \quad \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (II) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\beta_h \nabla (u - \Pi_K u) \cdot \mathbf{n}, \Pi_K \eta_h - \eta_h)_{\partial K}.$$

Putting (5.9) and (5.12) into (5.8), and using the formula of  $a_h^n(u_I, v_h)$ , we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

In the derivation above, there are two steps involving integration by parts: the one in (5.8) is for the exact solution  $u$  with respect to the subelements  $K^\pm$ , and another one in (5.11) is for IVE and IFE functions with respect to the subelements  $K_h^\pm$ . Their difference corresponds to their respective jump conditions imposed on  $\Gamma$  or  $\Gamma_h^K$ , such that those extra terms occurring on  $\Gamma$  or  $\Gamma_h^K$  can be cancelled.

**5.3. Error Estimates.** In this section, we proceed to estimate the solution errors. Based on the error equation in Lemma 5.2, we first get an error bound for  $u_h - u_I$ .

**THEOREM 5.3** (A priori error bound). *Let  $u \in H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$  be the solution to (1.1) and  $u_h$  be the solution to (5.4). Denote by  $\eta_h = u_h - u_I$ . Then there holds*

$$(5.13) \quad \|\eta_h\|_n \lesssim \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left[ \|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K(u - u_I)\|_{0,K} + h_K^{1/2} \|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla(u - \Pi_K u) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,\partial K} \right.$$

$$(5.14) \quad \left. + |\beta_h^{1/2}(u_I - \Pi_K u_I)|_{1/2,\mathcal{E}_K} + \|\beta_{\max}^{1/2} \nabla u\|_{0,\delta K} \right].$$

*Proof.* Note that  $\beta \neq \beta_h$  only on  $\delta K$ , thus for the error equation in Lemma 5.2, applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$(5.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\eta_h\|_n^2 &\leq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left( \|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K(u - u_I)\|_{0,K} \|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K \eta_h\|_{0,K} \right. \\ &\quad + \|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla(u - \Pi_K u) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,\partial K} \|\beta_h^{1/2}(\eta_h - \Pi_K \eta_h)\|_{0,\partial K} \\ &\quad + |\beta_h^{1/2}(u_I - \Pi_K u_I)|_{1/2,\mathcal{E}_K} |\beta_h^{1/2}(\eta_h - \Pi_K \eta_h)|_{1/2,\mathcal{E}_K} \\ &\quad \left. + \|\beta_{\max}^{1/2} \nabla u\|_{0,\delta K} \|\beta_{\max}^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K \eta_h\|_{0,K} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In the bound above, it is clear that  $\|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K \eta_h\|_{0,K}$  and  $|\beta_h^{1/2}(\eta_h - \Pi_K \eta_h)|_{1/2,\mathcal{E}_K}$  are bounded above by  $\|\eta_h\|_n$ , and  $\|\beta_{\max}^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K \eta_h\|_{0,K}$  is also bounded above by  $\|\eta_h\|_n$  with a  $\beta$  dependent constant.

To estimate the remaining second term in (5.15), we note that  $\int_{\partial K} (\eta_h - \Pi_K \eta_h) \, ds = 0$ , thus applying (2.8a) edge-wise in Theorem 2.7 yields

$$\|\beta_h^{1/2}(\eta_h - \Pi_K \eta_h)\|_{0,\partial K} \lesssim h_K^{1/2} |\beta_h^{1/2}(\eta_h - \Pi_K \eta_h)|_{1/2,\mathcal{E}_K} \lesssim h_K^{1/2} \|\eta_h\|_n.$$

Combining the estimates above and cancelling out a  $\|\eta_h\|_n$  on each side, we get the desired a priori estimate.  $\square$

To get the optimal order of convergence of the proposed method, our task is to estimate each term in the right-hand side of the error bound (5.13). Before getting into the estimate, we emphasize that the set  $\mathcal{E}_K$  consists of the edges formed by element vertices and cut points. Therefore, to avoid confusion in the following discussion, for each edge  $e \in \mathcal{E}_K$  that connects an element vertex and a cut point, we will use  $\hat{e}$  to denote the edge containing  $e$  on the triangle in the background mesh (e.g.  $e = \overline{AD}$  to  $\hat{e} = \overline{AB}$  in Figure 2a). Now, let us first derive the estimate of the first term in the right-hand side of the error bound in (5.13).

**LEMMA 5.4.** *Let  $u \in H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ , then on any  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$  there holds*

$$(5.16) \quad \|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K(u - u_I)\|_{0,K} \lesssim h_K \|u\|_{E,2,\omega_K}.$$

*Proof.* By the definition of projection, we immediately have

$$\|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K(u - u_I)\|_{0,K}^2 = (\beta_h \nabla \Pi_K(u - u_I), \nabla \Pi_K(u - u_I))_K = (\beta_h \nabla \Pi_K(u - u_I), \nabla(u - u_I))_K.$$

Using integration by parts on the subelements  $K_h^\pm$ ,  $\Pi_K(u - u_I)$  satisfying the jump condition on  $\Gamma_K$ , and  $u - u_I \in H^1(K)$ , we have

$$(5.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K(u - u_I)\|_{0,K}^2 &= (\beta_h \nabla \Pi_K(u - u_I) \cdot \mathbf{n}, u - u_I)_{\partial K} \\ &\leq \|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K(u - u_I) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,\partial K} \|\beta_h^{1/2}(u - u_I)\|_{0,\partial K}. \end{aligned}$$

For each edge on  $\partial K$ , applying the IFE trace inequality in (4.3), we obtain

$$(5.18) \quad \|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K(u - u_I) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,e} \leq \|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K(u - u_I) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,\hat{e}} \lesssim h_K^{-1/2} \|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K(u - u_I)\|_{0,K}.$$

Putting (5.18) into (5.17) and cancelling out the term  $\|\beta_h^{1/2}\nabla\Pi_K(u - u_I)\|_{0,K}$  leads to

$$(5.19) \quad \|\beta_h^{1/2}\nabla\Pi_K(u - u_I)\|_{0,K} \lesssim h_K^{-1/2}\|\beta_h^{1/2}(u - u_I)\|_{0,\partial K}.$$

So it remains to estimate the right-hand side above. Notice  $\beta_h$  is constant on each edge  $e \in \mathcal{E}_K$ . Without loss of generality, consider an  $e \subset \partial K^+$ , by the interpolation estimate on this edge, we have

$$(5.20) \quad \|\beta_h^{1/2}(u - u_I)\|_{0,e} \lesssim h_e^{3/2}|u|_{3/2,e} \lesssim h_K^{3/2}|u_E^+|_{3/2,\hat{e}} \lesssim h_K^{3/2}|u_E^+|_{2,K}$$

where in the last inequality, we have also applied the trace inequality in [11, Lemma 6.2] on  $\nabla u_E^+|_{\hat{e}}$ . Putting (5.20) into (5.19) gives the desired estimate on this edge. Similar arguments apply to the case  $e \subset \partial K^-$  which together finishes the proof.  $\square$

The estimate of the second and third terms in the right-hand side of the error bound (5.13) relies on the estimate of every polynomial component of  $\Pi_K^\pm$  on the whole element  $K$  which has been established in Lemma 4.2.

LEMMA 5.5. *Let  $u \in H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ , then on any  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$  there holds*

$$(5.21) \quad \|\beta_h^{1/2}\nabla(u - \Pi_K u) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,\partial K} \lesssim h_K^{1/2}\|u\|_{E,2,\omega_K} + h_K^{-1/2}|u|_{E,1,\delta K}.$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we only consider + side. Given an edge  $e \in \mathcal{E}_K$  with  $e \subseteq K_h^+$  and its extension  $\hat{e}$  as an edge of  $K$ , we apply the trace inequality to obtain

$$\|\beta_h \nabla(u - \Pi_K u) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,e} \leq (\beta^+)^{1/2} \|\nabla(u_E^+ - \Pi_K^+ u) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,\hat{e}} \lesssim h_K^{-1/2}|u_E^+ - \Pi_K^+ u|_{1,K} + h_K^{1/2}|u_E^+|_{2,K}$$

which yields the desired result by Lemma 4.2.  $\square$

LEMMA 5.6. *Let  $u \in H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ , then on any  $K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$  there holds*

$$(5.22) \quad |\beta_h^{1/2}(u_I - \Pi_K u_I)|_{1/2,\mathcal{E}_K} \lesssim h_K \|u\|_{E,2,\omega_K} + |u|_{E,1,\delta K}.$$

*Proof.* It suffices to establish an edge-wise estimate under  $|\cdot|_{1/2,e}$ . For each edge, since  $\beta_h$  is a constant,

$$|\beta_h^{1/2}(u_I - \Pi_K u_I)|_{1/2,e} \lesssim \underbrace{|u_I - \Pi_K u|_{1/2,e}}_{(I)} + \underbrace{|\Pi_K(u - u_I)|_{1/2,e}}_{(II)}.$$

In the following discussion, without loss of generality we only consider  $e \subseteq K_h^+$ . For (I), since  $u_I - \Pi_K u$  is linear on  $e$ , and  $u$  and  $u_I$  match at the end points  $\mathbf{a}_e$  and  $\mathbf{b}_e$  of  $e$ , we obtain

$$(5.23) \quad (I) = |(u_I - \Pi_K^+ u)|_{\mathbf{a}_e^e}^{\mathbf{b}_e^e}| = |(u - \Pi_K^+ u)|_{\mathbf{a}_e^e}^{\mathbf{b}_e^e}| = \left| \int_e \partial_e (u - \Pi_K^+ u) ds \right| \leq h_e^{1/2} |u - \Pi_K^+ u|_{1,e}.$$

Replacing  $u$  by its extension  $u_E^+$  and recalling that  $\Pi_K^+ u$  is a polynomial being trivially used on the whole element  $K$ , we apply the standard trace inequality and Lemma 4.2 to get

$$(5.24) \quad (I) \leq h_K^{1/2} |u_E^+ - \Pi_K^+ u|_{1,\hat{e}} \lesssim |u_E^+ - \Pi_K^+ u|_{1,K} + h_K |u_E^+|_{2,K} \lesssim h_K \|u_E^+\|_{2,\omega_K} + |u_E^+|_{1,\delta K}.$$

For (II), applying the trace inequality for IFE functions in Theorem 4.3, and Lemma 5.4, we obtain

$$(5.25) \quad (II) = |\Pi_K(u - u_I)|_{\mathbf{a}_e^e}^{\mathbf{b}_e^e}| = \left| \int_e \partial_e \Pi_K(u - u_I) ds \right| \leq h_e^{1/2} |\Pi_K(u - u_I)|_{1,\hat{e}} \lesssim h_K^{-1/2} h_e^{1/2} |\Pi_K(u - u_I)|_{1,K} \leq h_K \|u_E^\pm\|_{2,\omega_K}.$$

Combining the estimates of (I) and (II), we have the desired result.  $\square$

Combining the results of Lemma 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 and the error bound in Theorem 5.3, we achieve the following conclusion.

THEOREM 5.7. *Let  $u \in H^2(\beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$  be the solution to (1.1) and  $u_h$  be the solution to (5.4), we have*

$$(5.26) \quad \|u - u_h\|_n \lesssim h \|u\|_{2,\cup\Omega^\pm}.$$



*Proof.* Triangle inequality yields  $\|u - u_h\|_n \leq \|u - u_I\|_n + \|u_I - u_h\|_n$ . For  $\|u_I - u_h\|_n$ , combining the results of Lemmas 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 and the error bound in Theorem 5.3, we have

$$(5.27) \quad \|u_I - u_h\|_n \lesssim \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h^n} h_K \|u\|_{2,K} + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i} (h_K \|u\|_{E,2,\omega_K} + |u|_{E,1,\delta K}) \lesssim h \|u\|_{E,2,\Omega} \lesssim h \|u\|_{2,\cup\Omega^\pm},$$

where we have used the finite overlapping property of  $\omega_K$  and the strip argument in Lemma 2.4 to control  $|u|_{1,\delta K}$  and finally the boundedness for Sobolev extensions.

Then we proceed to estimate  $\|u - u_I\|_n$ . Since it is trivial on non-interface elements, we only need to estimate it on interface elements. By the triangle inequality, we have

$$(5.28) \quad \|u - u_I\|_n \lesssim \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i} \|\beta_h^{1/2} \nabla \Pi_K(u - u_I)\|_{0,K} + |u - u_I|_{1/2,\mathcal{E}_K} + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h^n} h_K \|u\|_{H^2(K)}.$$

The first term can be handled by Lemma 5.4. For the second term, given  $e \in \mathcal{E}_K$  and without loss of generality assuming it is  $K_h^+$ , by the interpolation estimate in 1D and the standard trace inequality on  $K$ , we have

$$(5.29) \quad |u - u_I|_{1/2,e} \lesssim h_e |u|_{3/2,e} \lesssim h_e |u_E^+|_{3/2,\hat{e}} \lesssim h_K \|u_E^+\|_{2,K}$$

where  $\hat{e}$  is the extension of  $e$ . Putting (5.29) to (5.28) and applying the boundedness for Sobolev extensions, we have the desired result.  $\square$

**6. H(curl) Interface Problems.** In this section, we present an IVEM for the  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$ -elliptic interface problem and give an optimal order error estimate.

**6.1. Scheme.** We first present the scheme for the  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  interface problem. Define the local discrete bilinear form on an interface element  $K$  as:  $a_h^{e,K}(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; K) \times \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; K) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  where

$$(6.1) \quad a_h^{e,K}(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) := (\alpha_h \text{curl } \mathbf{u}_h, \text{curl } \mathbf{v}_h)_K + (\beta_h \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{v}_h)_K + S_K^e(\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{v}_h).$$

Following [13], using the same  $\beta_e$  in (5.3), we directly employ the DoFs to construct the stabilization  $S_K^e(\cdot, \cdot) :$

$$(6.2) \quad S_K^e(\mathbf{w}_h, \mathbf{z}_h) := \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} \beta_e (\mathbf{w}_h \cdot \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{z}_h \cdot \mathbf{t})_{0,e}.$$

With these preparations, the IVEM for solving (1.3a) is to find  $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h^e$  such that

$$(6.3) \quad a_h^e(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) := \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} a_h^{e,K}(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{v}_h)_K, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h^e.$$

*Remark 6.1.* Note that the scaling in (6.2) is different from the conventional VEM using  $h^{1/2}$  [13, 8, 22]. On the non-interface triangles, because the global space in (3.12) uses conforming Nédélec elements, the stabilization term in (6.1) vanishes. While on interface elements, the constant weight stabilization is one of the keys to ensure the optimal order of convergence (see Lemma 6.9).

**6.2. Coercivity.** We begin with defining an energy norm:

$$(6.4) \quad \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_e^2 := a_h^e(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{v}_h).$$

We first show the quantity in (6.4) is indeed a norm.

LEMMA 6.2. *Given  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$ , there holds*

$$(6.5) \quad \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K} \lesssim \frac{\beta_{\max}}{\beta_{\min}} \left( h_K \|\text{curl } \mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K} + h_K^{1/2} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} \|\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{t}\|_{0,e} \right).$$

*Proof.* Given each  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$ , let  $\varphi_h$  be the corresponding function in Remark 3.9. Then,  $-\nabla \cdot (\beta_h^{-1} \nabla \varphi) = \text{curl } \mathbf{v}_h$  and  $\beta_h^{-1} \nabla \varphi \cdot \mathbf{n} = -\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{t}$  on  $\partial K$ . Using integration by parts, we obtain

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K}^2 &= \int_K \beta_h^{-1} \text{curl } \varphi_h \cdot \beta_h^{-1} \text{curl } \varphi_h \, d\mathbf{x} \lesssim \beta_{\min}^{-1} \int_K \beta_h^{-1} \nabla \varphi_h \cdot \nabla \varphi_h \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \beta_{\min}^{-1} \left( - \int_K \varphi_h \nabla \cdot (\beta_h^{-1} \nabla \varphi_h) \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\partial K} \varphi_h \beta_h^{-1} \nabla \varphi_h \cdot \mathbf{n} \, ds \right) \\ &\lesssim \beta_{\min}^{-1} \left( \|\varphi_h\|_{0,K} \|\text{curl } \mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K} + \|\varphi_h\|_{0,\partial K} \|\mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{t}\|_{0,\partial K} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (3.38) and cancelling one term of  $\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K}$  leads to the desired result.  $\square$

We highlight the hidden constant in Lemma 6.2 is still independent of the interface location. But, compared with Proposition 4.1 of [22], our result involves the extra term  $h_K \|\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K}$ . It yields the following coercivity.

LEMMA 6.3. *For all  $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h^e$ , there holds*

$$(6.7) \quad \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl};\Omega)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_e.$$

*Proof.* As the norm induced by  $a_h^{e,K}(\cdot, \cdot)$  agrees with  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl};\Omega)}$  on non-interface elements, it suffices to establish the estimates on an interface element  $K$ . The triangle inequality directly yields

$$(6.8) \quad \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K} \leq \|\mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K} + \|\mathbf{v}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K}.$$

We note that  $\mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h^e(K)$ , then it follows from Lemma 6.2 and  $h_K \lesssim \mathcal{O}(1)$  that

$$(6.9) \quad \|\mathbf{v}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K} \lesssim h_K \|\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v}_h\|_{0,K} + h_K^{1/2} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_K} \|(\mathbf{v}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{v}_h) \cdot \mathbf{t}\|_{0,e}.$$

Summing up (6.8) and (6.9) on all elements yields the desired result.  $\square$

In particular (6.7) implies the coercivity of the bilinear form  $a_h^{e,K}(\cdot, \cdot)$  and thus guarantee the existence and uniqueness of the solution to (6.3). Compare (6.9) and the stabilization term (6.2), we see such coercivity is obtained by adding a stronger stabilization term  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  v.s.  $\mathcal{O}(h_K^{1/2})$  which may cause the degeneracy of the convergence order. An overall optimal order convergence will be still established, thanks to the fact that this over-stabilization is (i) for the  $L^2$ -term, (ii) only applied on interface elements, the  $L^2$ -sum of whose measure is an order smaller.

**6.3. An Error Equation.** Similar to the  $H^1$  case, the analysis is based on the following error decomposition:

$$(6.10) \quad \boldsymbol{\xi}_h = \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\eta}_h = \mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u}_I.$$

Let us present the error equation and error bounds.

LEMMA 6.4 (Error equation). *Let  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\operatorname{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$  be the solution to (1.3a) and  $\mathbf{u}_h$  be the solution to (6.3). Then the following identity holds*

$$(6.11) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_h\|_e^2 = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\{ \int_{\partial K} \alpha_h (\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u} - \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I) (\boldsymbol{\eta}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h \cdot \mathbf{t}) \, ds + ((\beta - \beta_h) \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_K \right. \\ \left. + (\beta_h (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_I), \mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_K - S_K^e (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_I, \boldsymbol{\eta}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h) \right\}.$$

*Proof.* We proceed similarly as (5.8) in Lemma 5.2. Using the discretized problem (6.3), the original PDE (1.3a), and integration by parts elementwisely, we have

$$(6.12) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_h\|_e^2 = a_h^e(\mathbf{u}_h, \boldsymbol{\eta}_h) - a_h^e(\mathbf{u}_I, \boldsymbol{\eta}_h) \\ = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_K - (\alpha_h \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I, \operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_K - (\beta_h \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_I, \mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_K - S_K^e (\mathbf{u}_I - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_I, \boldsymbol{\eta}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h) \\ = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \underbrace{(\operatorname{curl} \alpha \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_K}_{\text{(Ia)}} - \underbrace{(\alpha_h \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I, \operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_K}_{\text{(Ib)}} \\ + \underbrace{(\beta \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h)}_{\text{(IIa)}} - \underbrace{(\beta_h \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_I, \mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_K}_{\text{(IIb)}} - S_K^e (\mathbf{u}_I - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_I, \boldsymbol{\eta}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h).$$

For (Ia), integration by parts and the continuity conditions for  $\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u} \in \tilde{H}^1(\alpha, \mathcal{T}_h)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)$  imply

$$(6.13) \quad \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \text{(Ia)} = - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\partial K} \alpha \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u} (\mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h \cdot \mathbf{t}) \, ds = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\partial K} \alpha \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u} (\boldsymbol{\eta}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h \cdot \mathbf{t}) \, ds.$$

In addition, since  $\alpha_h \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I$  is a constant and  $\mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h \in \nabla S_h^n(K)$  by the exact sequence (3.34), we obtain

$$(6.14) \quad \int_{\partial K} \alpha_h \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I (\mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h \cdot \mathbf{t}) \, ds = \alpha_h \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I \int_{\partial K} \mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds = 0.$$

So, using integration by parts again together with (6.14), we have

$$(6.15) \quad (\text{Ib}) = \int_{\partial K} \alpha_h \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I (\boldsymbol{\eta}_h \cdot \mathbf{t}) \, ds = \int_{\partial K} \alpha_h \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I (\boldsymbol{\eta}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h \cdot \mathbf{t}) \, ds.$$

As  $\alpha$  matches  $\alpha_h$  on  $\partial K$ , we obtain

$$(6.16) \quad \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\text{Ia}) + (\text{Ib}) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\partial K} \alpha_h (\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u} - \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I) (\boldsymbol{\eta}_h \cdot \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h \cdot \mathbf{t}) \, ds.$$

For the terms (II), we simply have

$$(6.17) \quad (\text{IIa}) - (\text{IIb}) = ((\beta - \beta_h) \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_K + (\beta_h (\mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_I), \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_K.$$

As for the stabilization term, using the fact that  $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_h - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\eta}_h) \cdot \mathbf{t} =: c$  is a constant on  $e$ , applying the definition of the interpolation  $\int_e (\mathbf{u}_I \cdot \mathbf{t}) c \, ds = \int_e (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{t}) c \, ds$  yields the desired result.  $\square$

With the error equation above, we are able to derive the error bound for  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h$ .

**THEOREM 6.5** (A priori error bound). *Let  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\operatorname{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$  be the solution to (1.3a) and  $\mathbf{u}_h$  be the solution to (6.3). Then it follows that*

$$(6.18) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_h\|_e \lesssim \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left( \|\alpha_h (\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u} - \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0, \partial K} + \|\sqrt{\beta_h} (\mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0, K} + \|\sqrt{\beta_h} (\mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0, \partial K} \right) + h \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1, \Omega}.$$

*Proof.* It directly follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the definition of stabilization  $S_K^e(\cdot, \cdot)$ , where the last term is due to Lemma 2.4.  $\square$

**6.4. Convergence Analysis.** We proceed to estimate each term in (6.18).

**LEMMA 6.6.** *Let  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\operatorname{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ . Then it follows that*

$$(6.19) \quad \|\alpha_h (\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u} - \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0, \partial K} \lesssim h_K^{1/2} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E, \operatorname{curl}, 1, \omega_K}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $K$  is shape regular, given an edge  $e \in \mathcal{E}_K$ , suppose  $e \subset K^+$  without loss of generality, then the trace inequality yields

$$(6.20) \quad \|\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u} - \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I\|_{0, e} \lesssim h_K^{-1/2} \|\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_E^+ - \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_I^+\|_{0, K} + h_K^{1/2} \|\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{u}_E^+\|_{1, K}$$

which yields the desired result by (4.18b) in Lemma 4.7.  $\square$

In order to estimate the rest terms of (6.18), we need the following result.

**LEMMA 6.7.** *Let  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\operatorname{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ . Then it follows that*

$$(6.21) \quad \|\sqrt{\beta_h} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0, K} \lesssim h_K \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E, 1, K}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_K (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I) \in \nabla S_h(K)$ , by (3.37) we have a  $\varphi_h \in \tilde{S}_h^n(K)$  from Remark 3.9 such that  $\operatorname{curl} \varphi_h = \beta_h \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I)$ . Then, integration by parts leads to

$$(6.22) \quad \|\sqrt{\beta_h} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0, K}^2 = \int_K \operatorname{curl} \varphi_h \cdot (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I) \, d\mathbf{x} = - \int_{\partial K} \varphi_h (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I) \cdot \mathbf{t} \, ds.$$

Next, the Hölder's inequality, (3.38) and the definition of  $\mathbf{u}_I$  together lead to

$$(6.23) \quad \|\sqrt{\beta_h} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0, K}^2 \leq \|\varphi_h\|_{0, \partial K} \|(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I) \cdot \mathbf{t}\|_{0, \partial K} \lesssim h_K^{1/2} \|\beta_h \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0, K} h_K^{1/2} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1/2, \partial K}.$$

Note that  $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{1/2, \partial K} \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E, 1, K}$ . Hence, cancelling one term  $\|\sqrt{\beta_h} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0, K}$  yields the desired result.  $\square$

**LEMMA 6.8.** *Let  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\operatorname{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ . Then it follows that*

$$(6.24) \quad \|\sqrt{\beta_h} (\mathbf{u} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0, K} \lesssim h_K \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E, \operatorname{curl}, 1, \omega_K} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E, 0, \delta K}.$$

*Proof.* The desired result directly follows from the following decomposition

$$(6.25) \quad \|\sqrt{\beta_h}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0,K} \leq \|\sqrt{\beta_h}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u})\|_{0,K} + \|\sqrt{\beta_h} \mathbf{\Pi}_K(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0,K}$$

together with (4.19) and Lemma 6.7.  $\square$

LEMMA 6.9. *Let  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$ . Then it follows that*

$$(6.26) \quad \|\sqrt{\beta_h}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0,\partial K} \lesssim h_K^{1/2} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,\text{curl},1,\omega_K}.$$

*Proof.* Similar to (6.25), we first write

$$(6.27) \quad \|\sqrt{\beta_h}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0,\partial K} \leq \|\sqrt{\beta_h}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u})\|_{0,\partial K} + \|\sqrt{\beta_h} \mathbf{\Pi}_K(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0,\partial K}.$$

Given an edge  $e \in \mathcal{E}_K$ , suppose  $e \subset K^+$  without loss of generality. Then, (4.18a) in Lemma 4.7 and the trace inequality lead to

$$(6.28) \quad \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \mathbf{u}\|_{0,e} \lesssim h_K^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{u}_E^+ - \mathbf{\Pi}_K^+ \mathbf{u}\|_{0,K} + h_K^{1/2} |\mathbf{u}_E^+|_{1,K} \lesssim h_K^{1/2} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,\text{curl},1,\omega_K}.$$

The estimate of the second term in (6.27) follows from the trace inequality for IFE functions in Lemma 4.8 and Lemma 6.7.  $\square$

We are ready to present the main theorem in this section.

THEOREM 6.10. *Let  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}, \alpha, \beta; \mathcal{T}_h)$  be the solution to (1.3a) and  $\mathbf{u}_h$  be the solution to (6.3). Then,*

$$(6.29) \quad \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_e \lesssim h_K \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}; \cup \Omega^\pm)}.$$

*Proof.* Note the decomposition  $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h = \boldsymbol{\xi}_h + \boldsymbol{\eta}_h$  in (6.10). The estimates on non-interface elements are standard. Using Theorem 6.5 with the Lemmas 6.6–6.9, we obtain

$$(6.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_h\|_e &\lesssim \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h^i} \left( h_K^{1/2} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,\text{curl},1,\omega_K} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,0,\delta K} \right) + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h^n} h_K \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}; K)} \\ &\lesssim h_K^{1/2} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,\text{curl},1,\Omega_{h_\Gamma}} + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{E,\text{curl},1,\Omega_{\delta_0}} + h \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}; \cup \Omega^\pm)} \lesssim h \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(\text{curl}; \cup \Omega^\pm)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 2.4 with the estimates for  $h_\Gamma$  and  $\delta_0$ . In addition, by the definition of  $\|\cdot\|_e$ , we have

$$(6.31) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_h\|_e \lesssim \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\text{curl } \boldsymbol{\xi}_h\|_{0,K} + \|\mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\xi}_h\|_{0,K} + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_h - \mathbf{\Pi}_K \boldsymbol{\xi}_h\|_{0,\partial K}$$

where the estimates of the first two terms follow from (4.18b) in Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 6.7, respectively. For the last term in (6.31), we notice that

$$(6.32) \quad \|(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I) - \mathbf{\Pi}_K(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0,\partial K} \leq \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I\|_{0,\partial K} + \|\mathbf{\Pi}_K(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_I)\|_{0,\partial K}$$

where the estimate of the first term is similar to (6.23), and the estimate of the second term comes from the trace inequality for IFE functions in Theorem 4.3 together with Lemma 6.7.  $\square$

**7. Concluding Remarks.** We have developed IVE methods for solving  $H^1$  and  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  elliptic interface problems. Conventional finite element spaces are conforming but do not satisfy the jump conditions, while the IFE spaces in the literature satisfy the jump conditions but are not conforming. The proposed IVE spaces both are conforming and satisfy the jump conditions such that they can be regarded as “ideal” spaces for solving interface problems. This property makes the proposed methods inherit the advantages of both fitted and unfitted mesh methods. Similar to the classic VEM, the newly constructed spaces are projected to the IFE spaces which is computable directly through DoFs.

There are several major differences of the proposed IVEM from the classic IFEM. First, the proposed one does not require those DG-like edge terms originated from integration by parts. The only edge-based term is the stabilization term. As a result, the discretization is parameter-free, and yields a symmetric system which can be solved by fast linear solvers. This is particularly useful for the  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  case, since it avoids using  $h^{-1}$  scaling in the stabilization that may cause loss of accuracy for non-conforming methods [14, 15, 28]. Second, the form of the stabilization is completely local, and then the assembling does not need to compute the interaction between two

neighbor elements' DoFs thus is more parallelizable. In addition, there are more DoFs locally on each interface element, and the extra are introduced by the cutting points which can better resolve the geometry.

The proposed method is also distinguished from the classic VEM in the fact that anisotropic elements cut by the interface are treated together as a shape regular element. Thanks to this treatment and the properties of IFE spaces, the robust error analysis with respect to cutting points can be achieved which is also much easier and more systematic. In fact, for the analysis of classical VEM on anisotropic elements [11, 13], the main difficulty is to obtain an error bound that is independent of element anisotropy such as shrinking elements. We highlight that one of the key obstacles for anisotropic analysis is the failure of the standard trace inequalities as the height of an edge may be very small and thus unable to support a smooth extension of a function defined on an edge toward the interior. For example for the present situation, in the estimation of (5.18) and (5.25), the standard trace inequality cannot be applied directly to each polynomial on each subelement as it may shrink, and thus the hidden constant may not be uniform with respect  $h$  anymore. Consequently, the estimation for VEM generally requires some dedicated analysis techniques such as the Poincaré inequality on an anisotropic cut element developed in [11, 13]. This is especially difficult for the  $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$  case that demands a virtual mesh, see [13]. These specialized analysis may limit the scope of its applicable elements. However, in the proposed analysis of this paper, these special treatments are not needed anymore. This improvement comes from the benefit of adopting the piecewise polynomial IFE functions as our projection space, which do admit cutting geometry-independent trace inequalities on interface elements as shown in Lemmas 4.3 and 4.8. These trace inequalities significantly simplify the analysis, which are now streamlined to resemble more to the standard analysis on isotropic elements.

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. A. ADAMS AND J. J. FOURNIER, *Sobolev spaces*, vol. 140, Elsevier, 2003. 6
- [2] D. N. ARNOLD, R. S. FALK, AND R. WINTHER, *Finite element exterior calculus: from Hodge theory to numerical stability*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 47 (2000). 5
- [3] I. BABUŠKA AND A. K. AZIZ, *On the Angle Condition in the Finite Element Method*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 13 (1976), pp. 214–226, <https://doi.org/10.1137/0713021>, <https://doi.org/10.1137/0713021>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/https://doi.org/10.1137/0713021>. 2
- [4] I. BABUŠKA, G. CALOZ, AND J. E. OSBORN, *Special finite element methods for a class of second order elliptic problems with rough coefficients*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 31 (1994), pp. 945–981, <https://doi.org/10.1137/0731051>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/0731051>. 3, 7
- [5] I. BABUŠKA AND J. E. OSBORN, *Generalized finite element methods: their performance and their relation to mixed methods*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 20 (1983), pp. 510–536, <https://doi.org/10.1137/0720034>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/0720034>. 3, 7
- [6] L. BEIRÃO DA VEIGA, F. BREZZI, A. CANGIANI, G. MANZINI, L. D. MARINI, AND A. RUSSO, *Basic principles of virtual element methods*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 23 (2013), pp. 199–214, <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218202512500492>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218202512500492>. 2, 7, 10
- [7] L. BEIRÃO DA VEIGA, F. BREZZI, L. D. MARINI, AND A. RUSSO, *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Virtual Element Method*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 24 (2014), pp. 1541–1573, <https://doi.org/10.1142/S021820251440003X>, <https://doi.org/10.1142/S021820251440003X>. 2, 7, 10
- [8] L. BEIRÃO DA VEIGA, F. DASSI, AND L. M. G. MANZINI, *Virtual elements for Maxwell's equations*, arXiv:2102.00950, (2021). 21
- [9] S. C. BRENNER AND L.-Y. SUNG, *Virtual element methods on meshes with small edges or faces*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 28 (2018), pp. 1291–1336. 3, 6, 7
- [10] E. BURMAN, S. CLAUS, P. HANSBO, M. G. LARSON, AND A. MASSING, *CutFEM: Discretizing geometry and partial differential equations*, Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg., 104 (2015), pp. 472–501. 1
- [11] S. CAO AND L. CHEN, *Anisotropic Error Estimates of the Linear Virtual Element Method on Polygonal Meshes*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 56 (2018), pp. 2913–2939, <https://doi.org/10.1137/17M1154369>, <https://doi.org/10.1137/17M1154369>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/https://doi.org/10.1137/17M1154369>. 2, 3, 7, 17, 18, 20, 25
- [12] S. CAO AND L. CHEN, *Anisotropic error estimates of the linear nonconforming virtual element methods*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 57 (2019), pp. 1058–1081. 2
- [13] S. CAO, L. CHEN, AND R. GUO, *A Virtual Finite Element Method for Two Dimensional Maxwell Interface Problems with a Background Unfitted Mesh*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.04582, (2021). 2, 10, 15, 21, 25
- [14] R. CASAGRANDE, R. HIPTMAIR, AND J. OSTROWSKI, *An a priori error estimate for interior penalty discretizations of the Curl-Curl operator on non-conforming meshes*, J. Math. Ind., 6 (2016), p. 4, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13362-016-0021-9>, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13362-016-0021-9>. 2, 4, 24
- [15] R. CASAGRANDE, C. WINKELMANN, R. HIPTMAIR, AND J. OSTROWSKI, *DG Treatment of Non-conforming Interfaces in 3D Curl-Curl Problems*, in Scientific Computing in Electrical Engineering, Cham, 2016, Springer International Publishing, pp. 53–61. 2, 4, 24
- [16] L. CHEN, H. WEI, AND M. WEN, *An interface-fitted mesh generator and virtual element methods for elliptic interface problems*, Journal of Computational Physics, 334 (2017), pp. 327–348. 2, 3
- [17] Z. CHEN, Z. WU, AND Y. XIAO, *An adaptive immersed finite element method with arbitrary Lagrangian-Eulerian scheme for parabolic equations in time variable domains.*, International Journal of Numerical Analysis & Modeling, 12 (2015). 6
- [18] Z. CHEN, Y. XIAO, AND L. ZHANG, *The adaptive immersed interface finite element method for elliptic and Maxwell interface problems*, J. Comput. Phys., 228 (2009), pp. 5000–5019, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2009.03.044>, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021999109001612>. 2



- [19] Z. CHEN AND J. ZOU, *An Augmented Lagrangian Method for Identifying Discontinuous Parameters in Elliptic Systems*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 37 (1999), 5
- [20] C.-C. CHU, I. G. GRAHAM, AND T.-Y. HOU, *A new multiscale finite element method for high-contrast elliptic interface problems*, Math. Comp., 79 (2010), pp. 1915–1955, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-2010-02372-5>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-2010-02372-5>, 1, 3, 4, 5
- [21] L. B. DA VEIGA, F. BREZZI, L. D. MARINI, AND A. RUSSO,  *$H(\text{div})$  and  $H(\text{curl})$ -conforming virtual element methods*, Numer. Math., 133 (2016), pp. 303–332, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-015-0746-1>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-015-0746-1>, 2
- [22] L. B. DA VEIGA AND L. MASCOTTO, *Interpolation and stability properties of low order face and edge virtual element spaces*, arXiv:2011.12834, (2020). 2, 21, 22
- [23] A. ERN AND J.-L. GUERMOND, *Finite element quasi-interpolation and best approximation*, ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis, 51 (2017), pp. 1367–1385. 10
- [24] R. GUO AND T. LIN, *A Group of Immersed Finite Element Spaces For Elliptic Interface Problems*, IMA J.Numer. Anal., 39 (2017), pp. 482–511. 3
- [25] R. GUO AND T. LIN, *A group of immersed finite-element spaces for elliptic interface problems*, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis, 39 (2019), pp. 482–511. 2, 4, 6, 11, 13, 14
- [26] R. GUO, T. LIN, AND Y. LIN, *Approximation Capabilities of the Immersed Finite Element Spaces for Elasticity Interface Problems*, Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations, 35 (2018), pp. 1243–1268, <https://doi.org/10.1002/num.22348>. 13
- [27] R. GUO, T. LIN, AND Q. ZHUANG, *Improved error estimation for the partially penalized immersed finite element methods for elliptic interface problems*, Int. J. Numer. Anal. Model, 16 (2019), pp. 575–589. 2, 3
- [28] R. GUO, Y. LIN, AND J. ZOU, *Solving two dimensional  $H(\text{curl})$ -elliptic interface systems with optimal convergence on unfitted meshes*, arXiv:2011.11905, (2020). 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 24
- [29] J. GUZMÁN, M. A. SÁNCHEZ, AND M. SARKIS, *A finite element method for high-contrast interface problems with error estimates independent of contrast*, Journal of Scientific Computing, 73 (2017), pp. 330–365. 1, 2, 14
- [30] A. HANSBO AND P. HANSBO, *An unfitted finite element method, based on Nitsche’s method, for elliptic interface problems*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg., 191 (2002), pp. 5537–5552, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0045-7825\(02\)00524-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0045-7825(02)00524-8), [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0045-7825\(02\)00524-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0045-7825(02)00524-8). 1
- [31] R. HIPTMAIR, J. LI, AND J. ZOU, *Convergence analysis of finite element methods for  $H(\text{curl}; \Omega)$ -elliptic interface problems*, Numer. Math., 122 (2012), pp. 557–578, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-012-0468-6>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-012-0468-6>. 5, 6
- [32] P. HOUSTON, I. PERUGIA, A. SCHNEEBELI, AND D. SCHÖTZAU, *Interior penalty method for the indefinite time-harmonic Maxwell equations*, Numerische Mathematik, 100 (2005), pp. 485–518, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-005-0604-7>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-005-0604-7>. 4
- [33] P. HOUSTON, I. PERUGIA, AND D. SCHÖTZAU, *Mixed Discontinuous Galerkin Approximation of the Maxwell Operator*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 42 (2004), pp. 434–459, <https://doi.org/10.1137/S003614290241790X>, <https://doi.org/10.1137/S003614290241790X>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/https://doi.org/10.1137/S003614290241790X>. 4
- [34] P. HOUSTON, I. PERUGIA, AND D. SCHÖTZAU, *Mixed Discontinuous Galerkin Approximation of the Maxwell Operator: Non-Stabilized Formulation*, Journal of Scientific Computing, 22 (2005), pp. 315–346, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10915-004-4142-8>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10915-004-4142-8>. 4
- [35] J. HUANG AND J. ZOU, *Some new a priori estimates for second-order elliptic and parabolic interface problems*, Journal of Differential Equations, 184 (2002), pp. 570–586. 5
- [36] J. HUANG AND J. ZOU, *Uniform a priori estimates for elliptic and static Maxwell interface problems*, Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-B, 7 (2007), p. 145. 5
- [37] H. JI, *An immersed Raviart-Thomas mixed finite element method for elliptic interface problems on unfitted meshes*, arXiv:2105.03227, (2021). 3, 12, 13
- [38] H. JI, F. WANG, J. CHEN, AND Z. LI, *Analysis of nonconforming ife methods and a new scheme for elliptic interface problems.*, 2021. 2
- [39] H. JI, F. WANG, J. CHEN, AND Z. LI, *A new parameter free partially penalized immersed finite element and the optimal convergence analysis*, 2021, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.10025>. 2
- [40] K. KOBAYASHI AND T. TSUCHIYA, *Error analysis of Lagrange interpolation on tetrahedrons*, Journal of Approximation Theory, 249 (2020), p. 105302, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jat.2019.105302>, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021904519300991>. 2
- [41] M. KRÍŽEK, *On the Maximum Angle Condition for Linear Tetrahedral Elements*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 29 (1992), pp. 513–520, <https://doi.org/10.1137/0729031>, <https://doi.org/10.1137/0729031>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/https://doi.org/10.1137/0729031>. 2
- [42] R. J. LEVEQUE AND Z. LI, *The immersed interface method for elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients and singular sources*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 31 (1994), pp. 1019–1044, <https://doi.org/10.1137/0731054>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/0731054>. 1
- [43] J. LI, J. M. MELENK, B. WOHLMUTH, AND J. ZOU, *Optimal a priori estimates for higher order finite elements for elliptic interface problems*, Appl. Numer. Math., 60 (2010), pp. 19–37. 1, 6
- [44] Z. LI, *The immersed interface method using a finite element formulation*, Appl. Numer. Math., 27 (1998), pp. 253–267, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9274\(98\)00015-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9274(98)00015-4), [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9274\(98\)00015-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9274(98)00015-4). 3
- [45] Z. LI, T. LIN, Y. LIN, AND R. C. ROGERS, *An immersed finite element space and its approximation capability*, Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations: An International Journal, 20 (2004), pp. 338–367. 1, 2
- [46] T. LIN, Y. LIN, AND X. ZHANG, *Partially penalized immersed finite element methods for elliptic interface problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 53 (2015), pp. 1121–1144, <https://doi.org/10.1137/130912700>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/130912700>. 1, 2, 3, 15
- [47] H. LIU, L. ZHANG, X. ZHANG, AND W. ZHENG, *Interface-penalty finite element methods for interface problems in  $H^1$ ,  $H(\text{curl})$ , and  $H(\text{div})$* , Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg., 367 (2020), <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cma.2020.113137>, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0045782520303224>. 4
- [48] R. LÖHNER, J. R. CEBRAL, F. E. CAMELLI, S. APPANBOYINA, J. D. BAUM, E. L. MESTREAU, AND O. A. SOTO, *Adaptive embedded and immersed unstructured grid techniques*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg., 197 (2008), pp. 2173–2197, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cma.2008.05.011>. 1



- <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cma.2007.09.010>, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0045782507003714>. 1
- [49] P. MONK, *Finite Element Methods for Maxwell's Equations*, Oxford University Press, 2003. 4
- [50] J.-C. NÉDÉLEC, *Mixed finite elements in  $\mathbf{R}^3$* , Numer. Math., 35 (1980), pp. 315–341, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01396415>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01396415>. 4
- [51] J. NITSCHKE, *Über ein Variationsprinzip zur Lösung von Dirichlet-Problemen bei Verwendung von Teilräumen, die keinen Randbedingungen unterworfen sind*, Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg, 36 (1971), pp. 9–15, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02995904>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02995904>. 1
- [52] P.-O. PERSSON AND G. STRANG, *A Simple Mesh Generator in MATLAB*, SIAM Review, 46 (2004), pp. 329–345, <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0036144503429121>, <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0036144503429121>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/https://doi.org/10.1137/S0036144503429121>. 1
- [53] P.-A. RAVIART AND J. M. THOMAS, *A mixed finite element method for 2nd order elliptic problems*, in Mathematical aspects of finite element methods (Proc. Conf., Consiglio Naz. delle Ricerche (C.N.R.), Rome, 1975), Springer, Berlin, 1977, pp. 292–315. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 606. 4
- [54] J. SCHÖBERL, *Commuting quasi-interpolation operators for mixed finite elements*, 2nd European Conference on Computational Mechanics, (2001). 10
- [55] F. WANG, Y. XIAO, AND J. XU, *High-Order Extended Finite Element Methods for Solving Interface Problems*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg., 364 (2020). 6
- [56] S. YU, Y. ZHOU, AND G. WEI, *Matched interface and boundary (MIB) method for elliptic problems with sharp-edged interfaces*, J. Comput. Phys., 224 (2007), pp. 729–756, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2006.10.030>, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S002199910600547X>. 1
- [57] X. ZHENG AND J. LOWENGRUB, *An interface-fitted adaptive mesh method for elliptic problems and its application in free interface problems with surface tension*, Advances in Computational Mathematics, 42 (2016), pp. 1225–1257, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10444-016-9460-5>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10444-016-9460-5>. 1