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We present a discontinuous Galerkin internal-penalty scheme that is applicable to a large class of linear and non-linear elliptic partial differential equations. The scheme constitutes the foundation of the elliptic solver for the SpECTRE numerical relativity code. As such it can accommodate (but is not limited to) elliptic problems in linear elasticity, general relativity and hydrodynamics, including problems formulated on a curved manifold. We provide practical instructions that make the scheme functional in a production code, such as instructions for imposing a range of boundary conditions, for implementing the scheme on curved and non-conforming meshes and for ensuring the scheme is compact and symmetric so it may be solved more efficiently. We report on the accuracy of the scheme for a suite of numerical test problems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Many important problems in physics involve numerically solving second-order elliptic partial differential equations (PDEs). Such elliptic problems often represent static field configurations under the effect of external forces and arise, for example, in electrodynamics, in linear or non-linear elasticity and in general relativity. Elliptic problems also often accompany time evolutions, where they constrain the evolved fields at every instant in time or provide admissible initial data for the evolution.

Discontinuous Galerkin (DG) methods are gaining popularity in the computational physics and engineering community and are currently most prevalently used for time evolutions of hyperbolic boundary-value problems [1–4]. See also Refs. [5–7] for a literature overview of DG methods in relativistic astrophysics and numerical relativity. Many properties that make DG methods advantageous for time evolutions also apply to elliptic problems, which lead to the development of DG schemes for elliptic PDEs [8, 9]. In particular, DG schemes provide a flexible mechanism for refining the computational grid, retaining exponential convergence even in the presence of discontinuities when adaptive mesh-refinement (AMR) techniques are employed [7, 10]. Furthermore, some difficulties with DG schemes in time evolutions, such as shock capturing, are not present in elliptic problems and their static nature makes it often (but not always) straightforward to place grid boundaries at discontinuities, thus relieving the AMR scheme from the responsibility of resolving them.

The main drawback to implementing DG schemes in large-scale production-quality codes is their relative complexity compared to simple and robust finite-difference schemes and even to spectral methods. This article aims to reduce these difficulties by presenting a ready-to-implement DG scheme that is applicable to a large class of elliptic problems and suited to solve real-world scenarios (as well as some out-of-this-world scenarios such as initial data for black-hole and neutron-star evolutions).

These elliptic problems often come with complications, such as a variety of boundary conditions and domain geometries, that we address in this article and provide practical instructions for.

The scheme presented in this article constitutes the foundation of the elliptic solver for the SpECTRE numerical relativity code [6, 11, 12]. It builds upon earlier work that explored the feasibility of the DG method for elliptic problems in numerical relativity [7]. This article extends that work by formulating a DG scheme suitable to solve a significantly larger class of elliptic problems. In particular, the scheme presented here encompasses all elliptic problems that we are aiming to solve in the foreseeable future with the SpECTRE code, most notably the extended conformal thin sandwich (XCTS) formulation of the general-relativistic Einstein constraint equations and associated boundary conditions [13–15]. Solutions to the XCTS equations can provide admissible initial data for general-relativistic time evolutions, for scenarios such as two orbiting black holes or neutron stars [16–19]. To the best of our knowledge, this article presents the first discontinuous-Galerkin solution of the full Einstein constraint equations.

The scheme presented in this article also applies to a much wider range of elliptic problems, including the equations of linear elasticity, Poisson-type equations such as the equation for general-relativistic puncture initial data [15], as well as coupled systems of such equations. We extend particular consideration to equations formulated on curved manifolds. DG methods have been developed for hyperbolic equations on curved manifolds [5, 20, 21], but we are not aware of any such studies for elliptic DG schemes. Accommodating curved manifolds is necessary to solve many general-relativistic problems, and the technology also applies to equations formulated in curved coordinate-systems. Finally, we pay special attention to support a wide range of boundary conditions, since practical problems in computational physics often go beyond the standard Dirichlet or von-Neumann boundary conditions that many studies of elliptic DG schemes have considered. We are aware only of Ref. [22] studying a non-linear boundary condition for an elliptic DG problem.
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This article is structured as follows. Section II details the generic first-order flux formulation that serves as the starting point for our DG discretization. The scheme presented in this article is a generalization of the Poisson equation in the literature, of which the scheme presented in this article is a generalization. In Section IV we apply the DG scheme to a set of increasingly challenging test problems. The test problems include scenarios derived from general relativity that feature sets of coupled, strongly non-linear equations on a curved manifold with non-linear boundary conditions, solved on curved meshes. We conclude in Section V.

II. FIRST-ORDER FLUX FORMULATION

We consider second-order elliptic PDEs of one or more primal variables \( u_A(x) \), where the index \( A \) labels the variables. The variables can be scalars (like in the Poisson equation) or tensorial quantities (like in an elasticity problem). We reduce the PDEs to first order by introducing auxiliary variables \( v_A(x) \), which typically are gradients of the primal variables. We then restrict our attention to problems that can be formulated in first-order flux form

\[
- \partial_i F^{i}_{\alpha} [u_A, v_A; x] + S_{\alpha}[u_A, v_A; x] = f_{\alpha}(x),
\]

where the index \( \alpha \) enumerates both \( u_A \) and \( v_A \). Here the fluxes \( F^{i}_{\alpha} \) and the sources \( S_{\alpha} \) are functionals of the variables \( u_A \) and \( v_A \), but not their derivatives, as well as the coordinates \( x \). The fixed-sources \( f_{\alpha}(x) \) are independent of the variables. We employ the Einstein sum convention to sum over repeated indices.

The flux form (1) is general enough to encompass a wide range of elliptic problems. For example, a flat-space Poisson equation in Cartesian coordinates

\[
- \partial_i \partial_i u(x) = f(x)
\]

has the single primal variable \( u(x) \). Choosing the auxiliary variable \( v_i = \partial_i u \) we can formulate the Poisson equation with the fluxes and sources

\[
F^{i}_{v} = u \delta^{i}_j, \quad S_{v} = v_j, \quad f_{v} = 0, \quad F^{i}_{u} = v_i, \quad S_{u} = 0, \quad f_{u} = f(x),
\]

where \( \delta^{i}_j \) denotes the Kronecker delta. Note that Eq. (3a) is the definition of the auxiliary variable, and Eq. (3b) is the Poisson equation (2). A linear flat-space elasticity problem in Cartesian coordinates

\[
- \partial_i Y^{ijkl} \partial_k \xi_l = f^j(x)
\]

has the primal variable \( \xi^i(x) \), describing the vectorial deformation of an elastic material. The constitutive relation \( Y^{ijkl}(x) \) captures the elastic properties of the material in the linear regime. Choosing the symmetric strain \( S_{ij} = \partial_i \xi_j + \partial_j \xi_i / 2 \) as auxiliary variable we can formulate the elasticity equation with the fluxes and sources

\[
F^{i}_{S} = \delta^{i}_j \xi_k, \quad S_{S} = S_{jk}, \quad f_{S} = 0, \quad F^{i}_{\xi} = Y^{ijkl} S_{kl}, \quad S_{\xi} = 0, \quad f_{\xi} = f^j(x). \quad \tag{5b}
\]

Again, Eq. (5a) is the definition of the auxiliary variable and Eq. (5b) is the elasticity equation (4). The fluxes and sources for the elasticity system (5) have higher rank than those for the Poisson system (3).

Our elliptic PDEs are generally formulated on a metric background \( g_{ij}(x) \), which defines the geometry of the underlying manifold. They typically involve covariant derivatives \( \nabla \) compatible with \( g_{ij} \). To formulate the equations in flux form (1) we expand covariant derivatives in partial derivatives and Christoffel symbols \( \Gamma^i_{jk} = \frac{1}{2} g^{il} \left( \partial_j g_{kl} + \partial_k g_{lj} - \partial_l g_{jk} \right) \). Christoffel-symbol terms appear also when formulating equations in curvilinear coordinates. The partial-derivative terms contribute to the fluxes \( F^i \) and the Christoffel-symbol terms contribute to the sources \( S \). For example, a curved-space Poisson equation

\[
- g^{ij} \nabla_i \nabla_j u(x) = f(x)
\]

with auxiliary variable \( v_i = \nabla_i u \) can be formulated with the fluxes and sources

\[
F^{i}_{v} = u \delta^{i}_j, \quad S_{v} = v_j, \quad f_{v} = 0, \quad F^{i}_{u} = g^{ij} v_j, \quad S_{u} = -\Gamma^i_{jk} g^{jk} v_k, \quad f_{u} = f(x). \quad \tag{7b}
\]

The strategy of expanding covariant derivatives is different to the formulations employed for relativistic hyperbolic conservation laws in Ref. [5], where fluxes are always vector fields and therefore the covariant divergence can always be written in terms of partial derivatives and the metric determinant.\(^1\) In contrast, fluxes in the elliptic equations (1) can be higher-rank tensor fields.

Note that the fixed-sources \( f_{\alpha}(x) \) can, in principle, be absorbed in the sources \( S_{\alpha} \). However, it is useful to keep these variable-independent contributions separate for two reasons: First, they remain constant throughout an elliptic solve, so they need not be re-computed when the dynamic variables change. Second, they present a non-linearity in the variables \( u_A \) and \( v_A \) when included in the sources \( S_{\alpha} \). In cases where the fluxes \( F^{\alpha i} \) and sources \( S_{\alpha} \) can be made linear in \( v_A \) and \( u_A \) by moving variable-independent contributions to the fixed-sources \( f_{\alpha} \) we can avoid an explicit linearization procedure.

\(^1\) See Eq. (2.3) in Ref. [5].
III. DG-DISCRETIZATION OF THE FLUX FORMULATION

In this section we formulate the DG scheme for the generic elliptic flux formulation (1). We follow Ref. [5] whenever possible and refer to Ref. [2] for details that have become standard in the DG literature.

The basic strategy to solve linear elliptic PDEs numerically is to discretize the equations to obtain a matrix equation

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{b}, \quad (8)$$

where \( \mathbf{u} \) is a discrete representation of all variables, \( \mathbf{b} \) is a discrete representation of the fixed-sources in the PDEs (1), and \( \mathbf{A} \) is a matrix. Once discretized, we can solve the matrix equation (8) numerically for \( \mathbf{u} \), typically iteratively and without ever explicitly constructing the full matrix \( \mathbf{A} \). Non-linear PDEs are typically solved by repeatedly solving their linearization.

The discontinuous Galerkin discretizations approximate fields using a space of polynomial basis functions (essentially corresponding to columns of the operator matrix \( \mathbf{A} \)) and project the equations on that same space of basis functions to compute residuals (essentially corresponding to rows of the operator matrix \( \mathbf{A} \)). The discontinuous Galerkin method breaks the space of basis functions into a direct sum of polynomial spaces, where each is defined only in a limited region of the computational domain (essentially corresponding to the approximate block-diagonal structure of the operator matrix \( \mathbf{A} \)). In this article we will refer to such regions as elements that cover the entire computational domain. Elements do not overlap, but they share boundaries. Neighboring elements may approximate fields with different sets of polynomials. Therefore, the approximation is double-valued on element boundaries. Combining the double-valued field approximations from both sides of shared element boundaries in a consistent way introduces couplings between the elements and is often referred to as a choice of numerical flux (essentially corresponding to the entries in the operator matrix \( \mathbf{A} \) that break the block-diagonal structure). In this section we will consider each of the constituents of the DG scheme in turn, beginning with the discretization of fields on the computational domain and leading up to the discretization of the DG residuals (8).

A. Domain decomposition

We adopt the same domain decomposition based on deformed cubes detailed in Refs. [5–7] and summarize it here.

The domain \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) is composed of non-overlapping elements \( \Omega_k \subset \Omega \) in \( d \) dimensions, such that \( \Omega = \bigcup_k \Omega_k \). Each element carries an invertible map \( \xi(x) \) from the coordinates \( x \in \Omega_k \), in which the elliptic equations (1) are formulated, to logical coordinates \( \xi \in [-1,1]^d \) representing a \( d \)-dimensional reference cube. Inversely, \( x(\xi) \) maps the reference cube to the element \( \Omega_k \). We define its Jacobian as

$$J_j^i := \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial \xi^j}, \quad (9)$$

with determinant \( J \) and inverse \( J^{-1} \).

Within each element \( \Omega_k \) we choose a set of \( N_{k,i} \) grid points in every dimension \( i \). We place them at logical coordinates \( \xi_{p,i} \), where the index \( p_i \in \{1, \ldots, N_{k,i}\} \) identifies the grid point along dimension \( i \). The points are laid out in a regular grid along the logical coordinate-axes, so an element has a total of \( N_k = \prod_{i=1}^d N_{k,i} \) \( d \)-dimensional grid points \( \xi_p = (\xi_{p_1}, \ldots, \xi_{p_d}) \). The index \( p \in \{1, \ldots, N_k\} \) identifies the grid point regardless of dimension. The full domain has \( N_{\text{points}} = \sum_k N_k \) grid points. The grid points within each element are not uniformly spaced in logical coordinates. Instead, we choose Legendre-Gauss-Lobatto (LGL) collocation points, i.e. the points \( \xi_p \) fall at the roots.

---

2 Reference [5] underpins the hyperbolic DG formulations in the \texttt{SpECTRE} code. Formulating elliptic and hyperbolic DG schemes in a similar way allows us to share some of the DG implementation details.
of the \((N_{k,i} - 1)\)-th Legendre polynomial plus a point on each side of the element, at \(-1\) and \(1\).\(^3\) It is equally possible to choose Legendre-Gauss (LG) collocation points, i.e. the roots of the \(N_{k,i}\)-th Legendre polynomial.\(^4\) Figure 1 illustrates the geometry of an element.

Fields are represented numerically by their values at the grid points. To facilitate this we construct the one-dimensional Lagrange polynomials

\[
\ell_{p_i}(\xi) := \prod_{q_i=1}^{N_{k,i}} \frac{\xi - \xi_{q_i}}{\xi_{p_i} - \xi_{q_i}}, \quad \text{with } \xi \in [-1, 1] \tag{10}
\]

and employ their product to define the \(d\)-dimensional basis functions

\[
\psi_p(\xi) := \prod_{i=1}^{d} \ell_{p_i}(\xi^i) \text{ with } \xi \in [-1, 1]^d. \tag{11}
\]

The choice of Lagrange polynomials makes Eq. (11) a nodal basis with the useful property \(\psi_p(\xi_q) = \delta_{pq}\). We use the nodal basis (11) to approximate any field \(u(\mathbf{x})\) within an element \(\Omega_k\) by its discretization

\[
\psi_p[k] := \sum_{p=1}^{N_k} u_p \psi_p(\xi(\mathbf{x})) \text{ with } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega_k, \tag{12}
\]

where the coefficients \(u_p = u(\mathbf{x}(\xi_p))\) are just the field values at the grid points. We denote the set of discrete field values within \(\Omega_k\) as \(\psi[k] = (u_1, \ldots, u_{N_k})\), and the collection of discrete field values over all elements as \(\psi\).

The discretization (12) approximates fields with polynomials of degree \((N_{k,i} - 1)\) in dimension \(i\). Although rarely needed, field values at other points within an element can be obtained by Lagrange interpolation (12). Note that field values at element boundaries are always double-valued because the Lagrange interpolation from neighboring elements to their shared boundary is double-valued. This means that field approximations can and generally will be discontinuous across element boundaries.

The test problems in Section IV illustrate a few examples of domain decompositions. We refer the reader to e.g. Ref. [2] for further details on the choice of collocation points, basis functions and their relation to spectral properties of DG schemes.

### B. DG residuals

Up to this point we have described how to discretize fields over the computational domain and thus the "input" to the operator \(\mathcal{A}\). We will now describe how to compute the DG residuals (8) that form the "output" of the operator \(\mathcal{A}\). The DG residuals represent the set of equations that any direct or iterative solver will aim to solve. The derivation follows the standard procedure, e.g. laid out in Ref. [2], applied to the generic elliptic flux formulation (1), and taking details such as a curved background geometry into account.

In the spirit of a Galerkin scheme we project our target PDEs (1) onto the same set of basis functions \(\psi_p(\xi)\) that we used to approximate fields within an element \(\Omega_k\),

\[
- (\psi_p, \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \mathcal{F})|_{\Omega_k} + (\psi_p, S)_{\Omega_k} = (\psi_p, f)_{\Omega_k}. \tag{13}
\]

Here we dropped the index \(\alpha\) that enumerates the equations and define the inner product on \(\Omega_k\),

\[
(\phi, \pi)_{\Omega_k} := \int_{\Omega_k} \phi(\mathbf{x}) \pi(\mathbf{x}) \sqrt{\gamma} \, d\mathbf{x} \tag{14a}
\]

\[
= \int_{[-1, 1]^d} \phi(\mathbf{x}(\xi)) \pi(\mathbf{x}(\xi)) \sqrt{\gamma} J \, d\xi. \tag{14b}
\]

These integrals are defined with respect to proper volume \(d\mathbf{V} = \sqrt{\gamma} d\mathbf{x} = \sqrt{\gamma} J d\xi\), where \(\gamma\) denotes the metric determinant in the coordinates \(\mathbf{x}\) that the equations (1) are formulated in. It refers to the metric that covariant derivatives in the equations are compatible with. Note that the basis polynomials are functions of logical coordinates but we abbreviate \(\psi_p(\xi(\mathbf{x}))\) with \(\psi_p(\mathbf{x})\).

The terms without derivatives in Eq. (13) are straightforward to discretize. We approximate the field \(f\), or similarly \(S\), using the expansion in basis functions (12) to find

\[
(\psi_p, f)_{\Omega_k} \approx (\psi_p, \psi_q)_{\Omega_k} f_q = M_{pq} f_q, \tag{15}
\]

where we have defined the symmetric mass matrix on the element \(\Omega_k\),

\[
M_{pq} := (\psi_p, \psi_q)_{\Omega_k} \tag{16a}
\]

\[
= \int_{[-1, 1]^d} \psi_p(\xi) \psi_q(\xi) \sqrt{\gamma} J \, d\xi. \tag{16b}
\]

We will discuss strategies to evaluate the mass matrix on the elements of the computational domain in Section III F.

The divergence term in Eq. (13) encodes the principal part of the elliptic PDEs and requires more care in its discretization. The derivatives in this term will help us couple grid points across element boundaries. To this end we integrate by parts to obtain a boundary term

\[
(\psi_p, \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{n}} \mathcal{F})|_{\partial \Omega_k} = - (\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \psi_p, \mathcal{F})|_{\partial \Omega_k} + (\psi_p, n_i \mathcal{F})|_{\partial \Omega_k}, \tag{17}
\]

where \(n_i\) is the outward-pointing unit normal one-form on the element boundary \(\partial \Omega_k\). The unnormalized face-normal is computed from the Jacobian as \(\hat{n}_i = \text{sgn}(\xi^j)(J^{-1})_{ij}\), where \(\xi^j\) is the logical coordinate that is constant on the particular face and no sum over \(j\) is implied. The face normal is normalized as \(n_i = \hat{n}_i / \sqrt{\hat{n}_k \hat{n}_l g_{kl}}\).
using the inverse metric $g^{ij}(x)$. The surface integral in Eq. (17) is defined just like Eq. (14),

$$
\left(\phi, \pi\right)_{\partial k} := \int_{\partial k} \phi(\xi) \pi(\xi) \sqrt{g^{ij}} \frac{d^d-1}{d^d-1} \xi,
$$

(18a)

$$
= \int_{[-1,1]^{d-1}} \phi(\xi) \pi(\xi) \sqrt{g^{ij}} J^i \frac{d^d-1}{d^d-1} \xi,
$$

(18b)

where we have defined the element boundary's $(d-1)$-dimensional proper volume $d\Sigma = \sqrt{g^{ij}} \frac{d^d-1}{d^d-1} = \sqrt{g^{ij}} J^i \frac{d^d-1}{d^d-1} \xi$, where $g^{ij}$ is the surface metric determinant induced by the metric $g_{ij}$ and $J^i$ is the surface Jacobian.

The crucial step that couples grid points across element boundaries follows from the field $u_i F^i$ being double-valued on any section of the boundary that an element shares with a neighbor. We have alluded to this fact before and noted in Section III A that both broken polynomial spaces of neighboring elements have support on the shared boundary. In other words, any field on the computational grid has a Lagrange interpolation from either element to the shared boundary. Therefore, we must make a choice of how to combine the two values from either side of a shared element boundary. This choice is often referred to as a numerical flux. For now we will denote the function that combines values from both sides of a boundary as $(u_i F^i)^*$ and refer to Section III D for details on our particular choice of numerical flux. Substituting the numerical flux in Eq. (17) yields the weak form of the equations,

$$
\left(\psi_p, \partial_i F^i\right)_{\partial k} = -\left(\partial_i \psi_p, F^i\right)_{\partial k} + \left(\psi_p, (u_i F^i)^*\right)_{\partial k}.
$$

(19)

The numerical flux in Eq. (19) introduces a coupling between neighboring elements that allows us to obtain numerical solutions spanning the full computational domain. Another integration by parts of Eq. (19) yields the strong form of the equations,

$$
\left(\psi_p, \partial_i F^i\right)_{\partial k} = \left(\psi_p, \partial_i F^i\right)_{\partial k} + \left(\psi_p, (u_i F^i)^* - u_i F^i\right)_{\partial k}.
$$

(20)

We will make use of both the strong and the weak form to obtain symmetric DG operators (see Section III I). Approximating $F^i$ using its expansion in basis functions (12) we find

$$
\left(\psi_p, \partial_i F^i\right)_{\partial k} \approx \left(\psi_p, \partial_i \psi_q\right)_{\partial k} F^i_{pq} = MD_{i,pq} F^i_q,
$$

(21)

where we have defined the stiffness matrix on the element $\Omega_k$,

$$
MD_{i,pq} := \left(\psi_p, \partial_i \psi_q\right)_{\partial k} = \int_{[-1,1]^{d-1}} \psi_p(\xi) \frac{\partial \psi_q}{\partial \xi_i}(\xi) \sqrt{g} J^i \frac{d^d-1}{d^d-1} \xi.
$$

(22a)

The divergence term in its weak form can be expressed in terms of the stiffness-matrix transpose $MD^T_{i,pq} = MD_{i,pq}$, where we denote the function that enumerates the equations, the DG residuals (26) are algebraic equations for the discrete values $u_i$ and $\psi$ on all elements and grid points in the computational domain. The left-hand side of Eq. (26) is an operator $A(\partial_\alpha, \partial_\beta)$ and the right-hand side of Eq. (26) is a fixed value at every grid point, so Eq. (26) has the structure $A(\partial_\alpha, \partial_\beta) = \psi$. If the fluxes and sources are linear, the DG operator $A(\partial_\alpha, \partial_\beta)$ can be represented as a square matrix and Eq. (26) has the form of Eq. (8). The size of the DG operator $A(\partial_\alpha, \partial_\beta)$ is the product of $N_{\text{points}}$ with the number of both primal and auxiliary variables.

Similarly to the mass matrix, we will need to evaluate the stiffness matrix and its transpose on the elements of the computational domain (see Section III F).

We now turn towards discretizing the last remaining piece of the DG residuals, the boundary integrals in Eqs. (19) and (20). It involves a "lifting" operation: The integral only depends on field values on the element boundary but it may contribute to every component $p$ of the DG residual, hence it is "lifted" to the volume. However, on an LGL grid all components $p$ that correspond to grid points away from the boundary evaluate to zero because they contain at least one Lagrange polynomial that vanishes at the boundary collocation point. This is not the case on an LG grid, where evaluating the Lagrange polynomials on the boundary produces an interpolation into the volume. Expanding the boundary fluxes in basis functions (12) we find

$$
\left(\psi_p, (u_i F^i)^*\right)_{\partial k} \approx \left(\psi_p, \psi_q\right)_{\partial k} (u_i F^i)^* = ML_{pq} (u_i F^i)^* q,
$$

(24)

where we have defined the lifting operator on the element $\Omega_k$,

$$
ML_{pq} := \left(\psi_p, \psi_q\right)_{\partial k} = \int_{[-1,1]^{d-1}} \psi_p(\xi) \psi_q(\xi) \sqrt{g} J^i \frac{d^d-1}{d^d-1} \xi.
$$

(25a)

Again, Section III F provides details on evaluating the lifting operator.

Assembling the pieces of the discretization and restoring the index $\alpha$ that enumerates the equations, the DG residuals on the element $\Omega_k$ are

$$
-MD_i \cdot F^i_{\alpha} - ML \cdot ((u_i F^i)^* - u_i F^i) + M \cdot S_{\alpha} = M \cdot f_{\alpha},
$$

(26a)

in strong form, or

$$
MD^T_i \cdot F^i_{\alpha} - ML \cdot (u_i F^i)^* + M \cdot S_{\alpha} = M \cdot f_{\alpha},
$$

(26b)

in weak form, where we choose either the strong or the weak form for each variable $\alpha$, and where $\cdot$ denotes a matrix multiplication with the field values over the computational grid of an element. Since the fluxes and sources are computed from the primal and auxiliary variables, the DG residuals (26) are algebraic equations for the discrete values $u_i$ and $\psi$ on all elements and grid points in the computational domain.
and the computational cost for solving it. In this section we eliminate the auxiliary degrees of freedom from the DG operator, denoting them to quantities that are only computed temporarily.

Many publications on DG formulations for the Poisson equation adopt a "primal formulation" to eliminate auxiliary degrees of freedom from the DG operator. However, in practice we have found a simpler approach taking a Schur complement of the discretized equations in flux form, e.g. applied in Ref. [24], more suited to the generic implementation of DG schemes. The resulting DG operator remains equivalent to the original operator, i.e. it has the same solutions up to numerical precision. This strategy is facilitated by the auxiliary equations defining the auxiliary variables \( v_A \). We assume here that the auxiliary fluxes depend only on the primal variables, \( \mathcal{F}_{v_A}^i = \mathcal{F}_{v_A}^i [u_A; \bm{x}] \), and the auxiliary sources have the form

\[
\mathcal{S}_{v_A} = v_A + \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{v_A} [u_A; \bm{x}],
\]

where \( \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{v_A} \) depends only on the primal variables. We further assume \( f_{v_A} = 0 \) for convenience. All elliptic systems that we consider in this article fulfill these assumptions. We insert Eq. (27) into the strong DG residuals (26a) and solve for \( v_A \) by inverting the mass matrix to find

\[
v_A = D_1 \cdot \mathcal{F}_{v_A}^i + L \cdot [(n_i \mathcal{F}_{v_A}^i)^* - n_i \mathcal{F}_{v_A}^i] - \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{v_A},
\]

where we define \( D_1 := M^{-1}M_D \) and \( L := M^{-1}M_L \). Note that the right-hand side of Eq. (28) depends only on the primal variables \( u_A \). Evaluating the DG residuals now amounts to first computing the auxiliary variables (28), and then using them to evaluate the primal equations. We can select either the strong form (26a) or the weak form (26b) for the primal equations,

\[
-MD_1 \cdot \mathcal{F}_{u_A}^i - ML \cdot [(n_i \mathcal{F}_{u_A}^i)^* - n_i \mathcal{F}_{u_A}^i] = M \cdot f_{u_A}
\]

in strong form, or

\[
MD_1^T \cdot \mathcal{F}_{u_A}^i - ML \cdot (n_i \mathcal{F}_{u_A}^i)^* + M \cdot \mathcal{S}_{u_A} = M \cdot f_{u_A}
\]

in weak form. We found the strong scheme slightly easier to implement because the primal and auxiliary equations involve the same set of operators. The strong-weak scheme, i.e. selecting the strong form for the auxiliary equations (28) and the weak form for the primal equations (29b), has the advantage that the DG operator can be symmetric as discussed in Section IIII.

5 See e.g. Section 7.2.2 in Ref. [2] or Section 3 in Ref. [9] for derivations of primal formulations for the Poisson equation.
For linear equations the strategy employed in Eq. (28) of eliminating the auxiliary variables is equivalent to taking a Schur complement of the DG operator with respect to the (invertible) mass matrix, but the strategy works for non-linear equations as well. The result is an operator $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{u}_A)$ of only the discrete primal variables on all elements and grid points in the computational domain. The size of the operator is the product of $N_{\text{points}}$ with the number of primal variables. No auxiliary degrees of freedom from the first-order formulation inflate the size of the operator. We refer to such DG operators $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{u}_A)$ of only the primal degrees of freedom as compact if they also only involve couplings between nearest-neighbor elements [25.]

The coupling between elements is related to the choice of numerical flux $(n_i\mathcal{F}_a^i)^*$ and the subject of Section III.D. If the fluxes and sources are linear, $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{u}_A)$ can be represented as a square matrix.

Figures 3 and 4 present visualizations of the operator for a Poisson equation and an elasticity equation, respectively. The block-diagonal structure in Fig. 3 represents the DG-discretized two-dimensional Laplacian on the four elements of the computational domain. The entries that break the block-diagonal structure represent the coupling between nearest-neighbor elements through the numerical flux (Section III.D).

**D. A generalized internal-penalty numerical flux**

Up to this point we have not made a choice for the numerical flux $(n_i\mathcal{F}_a^i)^*$ that combines double-valued field values on element boundaries. The numerical flux is a function of the field values on both sides of the boundary. From the perspective of one of the two adjacent elements we refer to the field values on itself as interior and to the field values the neighboring element as exterior. Contrary to much of the DG literature we formulate the numerical flux entirely in terms of the primal and auxiliary boundary flux quantities $n_i\mathcal{F}_{u_A}^i$ and $n_i\mathcal{F}_{v_A}^i$ on either side of the boundary instead of the primal and auxiliary variables $u_A$ and $v_A$. This choice keeps our scheme applicable to the wide range of elliptic problems defined in Section II.

The numerical flux presented here is a generalization of the symmetric internal penalty (SIP) scheme that is widely used in the literature [2, 7, 9, 26]. Our generalized internal-penalty numerical flux is

$$
(n_i\mathcal{F}_{u_A}^i)^* = \frac{1}{2} \left[ n_i^{\text{int}} \mathcal{F}_{u_A}^i (u_A^{\text{int}}) - n_i^{\text{ext}} \mathcal{F}_{u_A}^i (u_A^{\text{ext}}) \right],
$$

(30a)

$$
(n_i\mathcal{F}_{v_A}^i)^* = \frac{1}{2} \left[ n_i^{\text{int}} \mathcal{F}_{v_A}^i (\partial_j v_A^i) - \tilde{s}_{v_A} (u_A^{\text{int}}) \right. \\
- \left. n_i^{\text{ext}} \mathcal{F}_{v_A}^i (\partial_j v_A^i) - \tilde{s}_{v_A} (u_A^{\text{ext}}) \right] - \sigma \left[ n_i^{\text{int}} \mathcal{F}_{u_A}^j (n_j^{\text{int}}) - n_i^{\text{ext}} \mathcal{F}_{u_A}^j (n_j^{\text{ext}}) \right].
$$

(30b)

The numerical flux for the auxiliary equations, Eq. (30a), averages the boundary fluxes of the two adjacent elements.
The numerical flux for the primal equations, Eq. (30b), is an average augmented with a penalty contribution with parameter $\sigma$.

Note that the numerical flux (30) involves only the primal fields and their derivatives, and thus is independent of the auxiliary fields altogether, as is typical for internal-penalty schemes. This has the practical advantage that the contribution from either side of the boundary to both the primal and the auxiliary numerical flux in Eqs. (28) and (29) can be computed early in the algorithm and communicated together, coupling only nearest-neighbor elements and thus making the DG operator compact. If the primal numerical flux (30b) depended on the auxiliary fields, evaluating the DG operator (29) would require a separate communication once the boundary corrections have been added to the auxiliary equation (28), effectively coupling nearest-neighbor elements as well as next-to-nearest-neighbor elements.\(^6\)

DG literature usually assumes that the face normals on either side of the boundary are exactly opposite: $n^{\text{ext}}_i = -n^{\text{int}}_i$. This assumption breaks when the background geometry responsible for the normalization of the face normal depends on the dynamic variables, since those are discontinuous across the boundary. All of the elliptic problems that we are expecting to solve in the near future are formulated on a fixed background geometry, but it is useful to distinguish between the interior and exterior face normals nonetheless because the quantity $n_i \mathcal{F}^i$ is cheaper to communicate than $\mathcal{F}^i$. Therefore, we always project an element’s boundary fluxes onto the face normal before communicating the quantity.

For a simple flat-space Poisson system (3) our generalized internal-penalty numerical flux (30) reduces to the canonical SIP,\(^7\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\quad (n_i \mathcal{F}_{\nu}^i)^* &= n^{\text{int}}_j u^* = \frac{1}{2} n^{\text{int}}_j \left( u^{\text{int}} + u^{\text{ext}} \right) \\
\quad (n_i \mathcal{F}_{u}^i)^* &= n^{\text{int}}_i u^* = \frac{1}{2} n^{\text{int}}_i \left( \partial_i u^{\text{int}} + \partial_i u^{\text{ext}} \right) - \sigma \left( u^{\text{int}} - u^{\text{ext}} \right).
\end{align*}
\]

As is well studied for the canonical SIP numerical flux, the penalty factor $\sigma$ is responsible for removing zero-eigenmodes and impacts the conditioning of the linear operator to be solved [2, 27]. It scales inversely with the element size $h$ and quadratically with the polynomial degree $p$, both orthogonal to the element face.\(^8\) Both $h$ and $p$ can be different on either side of the element boundary, so we choose

\[
\sigma = C \left( \frac{\max(p^{\text{int}}, p^{\text{ext}}) + 1}{\min(h^{\text{int}}, h^{\text{ext}})} \right)^2,
\]

where we follow Ref. [28] in choosing the scaling with the polynomial degree $p$ on hexahedral meshes, and we follow Ref. [7] in our definition of the element size $h = 2/\sqrt{n_i n_j g^{ij}}$.\(^9\) Note that $h$ generally varies over the element face on curved meshes or on a curved manifold, and that the min-operation in Eq. (32) is taken pointwise, so $\sigma$ also varies over the element face. The remaining penalty parameter $C \geq 1$ remains freely specifiable. Note also that we do not need to include a problem-specific scale in the penalty factor, as is done in Refs. [29–31], because the generic numerical flux (30b) already includes such scales in the fluxes $\mathcal{F}^i$.

### E. Boundary conditions

The flux formulation allows imposing a wide range of boundary conditions relatively easily ”through the fluxes” without the need to treat external boundaries any differently than internal boundaries between neighboring elements. Imposing boundary conditions amounts to specifying the exterior quantities in the numerical flux (30). This strategy is often referred to as imposing boundary conditions through ”ghost” elements. As suggested in e.g. [2], we impose boundary conditions on the average of the boundary fluxes to obtain faster convergence. Therefore, on external boundaries, we choose for the exterior quantities in the numerical flux (30)

\[
(n_i \mathcal{F}_{\alpha}^i)^{\text{ext}} = (n_i \mathcal{F}_{\alpha}^i)^{\text{int}} - 2(n_i \mathcal{F}_{\alpha}^i)^{b},
\]

where we set the quantities $(n_i \mathcal{F}_{\alpha}^i)^b$ according to the boundary conditions at hand. Here we define $n^b_i = n^{\text{int}}_i$, i.e. we choose to compute external boundary fluxes with the face normal pointing out of the computational domain. The symmetry between the primal and the auxiliary equations in the first-order flux formulation (1) that we employ throughout this article makes this approach of imposing boundary conditions particularly straight-forward: A choice of auxiliary boundary fluxes $(n_i \mathcal{F}_{uA}^i)^b$ imposes Dirichlet-type boundary conditions and a choice of primal boundary fluxes $(n_i \mathcal{F}_{uA}^i)^b$ imposes Neumann-type boundary conditions. The choice between Dirichlet-type and Neumann-type boundary conditions can be made separately for every primal variable $u_A$ and every external boundary face, simply by setting either $(n_i \mathcal{F}_{uA}^i)^b$ or $(n_i \mathcal{F}_{uA}^i)^b$ and setting the remaining boundary fluxes to their interior values $(n_i \mathcal{F}^i)^b = (n_i \mathcal{F}^i)^{\text{int}}$. Note that we

\(^6\) Couplings to next-to-nearest-neighbor elements is a well-known disadvantage of LDG-type numerical fluxes and has lead to the development of compact schemes such as Ref. [25].

\(^7\) See Eq. (3.21) in Ref. [9] or Section 7.2 in Ref. [2].

\(^8\) See Ref. [27] for sharp results for the optimal penalty factor on triangular and tetrahedral meshes, and Table 3.1 in Ref. [28] for a generalization to hexahedral meshes.

\(^9\) Note that Ref. [7] omits the factor of 2 in the definition of $h$, which we include so the definition reduces to the canonical element size on rectilinear meshes.
neither need to distinguish between primal and auxiliary variables in Eq. (33), nor take the choice of Dirichlet-type or Neumann-type boundary conditions into account, but require only \((n_i \mathcal{F}_A)^b\) be chosen appropriately for every variable. Then, the Neumann-type boundary conditions enter the DG residuals directly through the numerical flux in Eq. (29), and the Dirichlet-type boundary conditions enter the DG residuals through the numerical flux in Eq. (28), which is substituted in Eq. (29).

In practice, this setup means we can initialize \((n_i \mathcal{F}_A)^b = (n_i \mathcal{F}_A)^{\text{int}}\) for all variables on a particular external boundary face when preparing to apply the numerical flux, decide which boundary fluxes to modify based on the boundary conditions we wish to impose on the particular face, and then evaluate Eq. (33) to compute the exterior quantities in the numerical flux (30). To impose Neumann-type boundary conditions we set the primal boundary fluxes \((n_i \mathcal{F}_A)^b\) directly, but to impose Dirichlet-type boundary conditions we typically choose the primal field values \(u_A^b\) and compute the auxiliary boundary fluxes as \((n_i \mathcal{F}_A)^b = n_i^{\text{int}} \mathcal{F}_A^i (u_A^b)\).

The auxiliary (Dirichlet-type) external boundary fluxes may depend on the interior primal fields \(u_A^{\text{int}}\), and the primal (Neumann-type) external boundary fluxes may depend on both the interior primal fields \(u_A^b\) as well as the interior auxiliary fields \(v_A^{\text{int}}\). This means we can impose a wide range of boundary conditions that may depend linearly or non-linearly on the dynamic fields. For example, a Robin boundary condition for the Poisson equation (2) or (6),

\[
a u + b n^i \partial_i u = g(x) \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega, \tag{34}
\]

where \(a\) and \(b\) are constants and \(g(x)\) is a function defined on the boundary, can be implemented as Neumann-type for \(b \neq 0\),

\[
(n_i \mathcal{F}_A)^b = \frac{1}{b} \left( g(x) - a u^{\text{int}} \right), \tag{35}
\]

and as Dirichlet-type for \(b = 0\),

\[
u^b = \frac{1}{a} g(x). \tag{36}
\]

An important consideration is that boundary conditions are generally non-linear. Even for linear PDEs, such as the Poisson equation, a simple inhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition \(u^b \neq 0\) introduces a non-linearity in the DG operator because \(\mathcal{A}(0) \neq 0\). Therefore, we always linearize boundary conditions. For non-linear equations the boundary conditions linearize along with the DG operator and require no special attention (see Section III J). However, for linear equations the inhomogeneity in the boundary conditions is the only non-linearity present in the DG operator, so we skip the full linearization procedure. Instead, we contribute the inhomogeneous boundary conditions \(\delta \mathcal{A}\) to the fixed-sources, leaving only the linearized boundary conditions in the DG operator,

\[
\frac{\delta \mathcal{A}}{\delta u} u = b - \mathcal{A}(0), \tag{37}
\]

where \(\frac{\delta \mathcal{A}}{\delta u}\) is just \(\mathcal{A}\) with linearized boundary conditions. Note that this strategy is equivalent to the full linearization procedure described in Section III J at \(u = 0\). In practice, evaluating \(\mathcal{A}(0)\) simplifies significantly for linear equations because only the lifted external boundary corrections contribute to it.

**F. Evaluating the mass, stiffness and lifting matrices**

The mass matrix (16), the stiffness matrix (22) and the lifting operator (25) are integrals that must be evaluated on every element of the computational domain. We evaluate these integrals on the same grid on which we expand the dynamic fields, which amounts to a Gauss-Lobatto quadrature of an order set by the number of collocation points in the element. This strategy is commonly known as mass-lumping.\(^{10}\) Employing mass-lumping and our choice of nodal basis (11), the mass matrix (16) evaluates to

\[
M_{pq} \approx \delta_{pq} \sqrt{\mathcal{G}}_{\text{int}} \mathcal{J} \prod_{i=1}^{d} w_{p_i}. \tag{38}
\]

Here the coefficients \(w_{p_i}\) denote the Legendre-Gauss-Lobatto quadrature weights associated with the collocation points \(\xi_{p_i}\), and the geometric quantities \(\sqrt{\mathcal{G}}\) and \(\mathcal{J}\) are evaluated directly on the collocation points.\(^{11}\) Recall from Section III A that the index \(p\) enumerates grid points in the regular \(d\)-dimensional grid and that \(p_i\) denotes the grid point’s index along the \(i\)-th dimension. The diagonal mass-lumping approximation (38) has the advantage that it is computationally efficient to apply, invert and store since it amounts to a pointwise multiplication over the computational grid. Note that Eq. (38) is exact on a rectilinear LG grid with a flat background geometry, and can be made exact on rectilinear LGL grids by including a correction term without increasing the computational cost for applying or inverting it \([32]\). The quadrature weights \(w_{p_i}\) can be cached and re-used by all elements with the same number of collocation points in a dimension.

The strong stiffness matrix (22) evaluates to

\[
M D_{r,pq} \approx M_{pr} D_{1,rq}, \tag{39a}
\]

with

\[
D_{1,rq} = \sum_{j=1}^{d} (\mathcal{J}^{-1})_{ij} l_{q_j}(\xi_{r_j}) \prod_{k=1}^{d} \delta_{q_k r_k}. \tag{39b}
\]

\(^{10}\) This is the approach taken in Ref. [5]. See Eq. (3.7) in Ref. [5] for details on the mass-lumped mass matrix on \(d\)-dimensional hexahedral elements. Note that Ref. [5] absorbs the metric determinant in the dynamic variables.

\(^{11}\) See e.g. Algorithm 25 in Ref. [23] for details on computing Legendre-Gauss-Lobatto quadrature weights, and Algorithm 23 for Legendre-Gauss quadrature weights.
Here $\ell_q^p(\xi_r)$ are the one-dimensional “logical” differentiation matrices obtained by differentiating the Lagrange polynomials (10) and evaluating them at the collocation points.\textsuperscript{12} The stiffness matrix is essentially a “massive” differentiation operator that decomposes into one-dimensional differentiation matrices due to the product-structure of the basis functions (11) on our hexahedral meshes. The one-dimensional logical differentiation matrices can be cached and re-used by all elements with the same number of collocation points in a dimension, keeping the memory cost associated with the stiffness operator to a minimum. The weak stiffness matrix can be computed analogously from the transpose of the local differentiation matrices.

The lifting operator (25) evaluates to

$$M_{pq} \approx M_{pr} L_{rq},$$

(40a)

with

$$L_{rq} = \delta_{rq} \sum_{i=1}^d \left( \delta_{q,1} + \delta_{q,i} N_{i,r} \right) \frac{1}{w_{q,i}} \sqrt{g^{jk}(J^{-1})^j_i (J^{-1})^k_q}.$$

(40b)

It is diagonal and has a contribution from every face of the element. Note that each face only contributes to the LGL grid points on the respective face. On LG grids additional interpolation matrices from the face into the volume appear in this expression. Also note that the root in Eq. (40b) is simply the magnitude of the unnormalized face normal $\hat{n}_j$ [5].

Recall that the objective of these matrices is to evaluate the compact DG operator (29) along with Eq. (28) on every element of the computational domain. In practice, neither matrix must be assembled explicitly and stored on the elements: The mass matrix (38) reduces to a multiplication over the computational grid, the stiffness matrix (39) involves logical one-dimensional differentiation matrices that are shared between elements, and the lifting operation (40) reduces to a multiplication over the grid points on the element face. Since both the stiffness and the lifting operator decompose into a mass matrix and a “massless” operation, the same set of operations can be used to evaluate both Eqs. (28) and (29), and the mass matrix factors out of the DG operator entirely. Nevertheless, we will see in Section IIII that it is advantageous to keep the mass matrix in the operator (29).

G. A note on de-aliasing

The integral expressions discussed in Section IIIF involve geometric quantities that are typically known analytically, namely the Jacobian and the background metric.

Limiting the resolution of the integrals to the quadrature order of the elements can make the scheme susceptible to geometric aliasing because these quantities are resolved with limited precision, potentially reducing the accuracy of the scheme on curved meshes or on a curved manifold. To combat geometric aliasing we can, in principle, pre-compute the matrices on every element at high accuracy, but at a significant memory cost. Pre-computing the matrices is possible in elliptic problems because the geometric quantities remain constant. This is different to time-evolution systems that often involve time-dependent Jacobians (“moving meshes”). Alternatively, a number of de-aliasing techniques are available to combat geometric aliasing, and also to combat aliasing arising from evaluating other background quantities on the collocation points, i.e. quantities in the PDEs that are independent of the dynamic variables and known analytically [33]. For example, Ref. [7] interpolates data from the primary LGL grid to an auxiliary LG grid, on which the Jacobian is evaluated, to take advantage of the higher-order quadrature. However, these de-aliasing techniques can significantly increase the computational cost for applying the DG operator. We have chosen to employ the simple mass-lumping scheme detailed in Section IIII to minimize the complexity, computational cost and memory consumption of the DG operator. Detailed studies of cost-efficient de-aliasing techniques are a possible subject of future work.

H. Mesh refinement

The domain decomposition into elements, each with their own set of basis functions, allows for two avenues to control the resolution: We can split the domain into more and smaller elements (h-refinement) or increase the number of basis functions within an element (p-refinement). We can perform h- and p-refinement in each dimension independently.

Both h-refinement and p-refinement can lead to non-conforming boundaries between elements, meaning that grid points on the two sides of the boundary do not coincide. Since we need to work with data from both sides of an element boundary when considering numerical fluxes (see Section III D) we place mortars between elements. A mortar is a $(d - 1)$-dimensional mesh that has sufficient resolution to exactly represent discretized fields from both adjacent element faces. Specifically, a mortar $\partial\Omega_{kk}$ between the elements $\Omega_k$ and $\Omega_{\tilde{k}}$ that share a boundary orthogonal to dimension $j$ has $\max(N_{k,i},N_{\tilde{k},i})$ grid points in dimension $i \neq j$. We limit the h-refinement of our computational domains such that an element shares its boundary with at most two neighbors per dimension in every direction (“two-to-one balance”). This means a mortar covers either the full element face or a logical half of it in every dimension. Figure 5 illustrates an hp-refined scenario with non-conforming element boundaries.

To project field values from an element face to a mortar...
we employ the \((d-1)\)-dimensional prolongation operator

\[
P_{pp} = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \xi_{p_i}(\tilde{\xi}_{p_i}),
\]

where \(p\) enumerates grid points on the coarser (element face) mesh, \(\tilde{p}\) enumerates grid points on the finer (mortar) mesh, and \(\tilde{\xi}_{p_i}\) are the coarse-mesh logical coordinates of the fine-mesh collocation points. For mortars that cover the full element face in dimension \(i\) the coarse-mesh logical coordinates are just the fine-mesh collocation points: \(\xi_{\tilde{p}_i} = \xi_{\tilde{p}_i}\). For mortars that cover the lower or upper logical half of the element face in dimension \(i\) they are \(\tilde{\xi}_{\tilde{p}_i} = (\xi_{\tilde{p}_i} - 1)/2\) or \(\tilde{\xi}_{\tilde{p}_i} = (\xi_{\tilde{p}_i} + 1)/2\), respectively. Note that the prolongation operator (41) is just a Lagrange interpolation from the coarser (element face) mesh to the finer (mortar) mesh. The interpolation retains the accuracy of the polynomial approximation because the mortar has sufficient resolution. The prolongation operator is also an \(L_2\)-projection (or Galerkin projection) because it minimizes the \(L_2\)-norm \(\int_{\partial \Omega_{kk}} (u^k - \tilde{u}^k)^2 d^{-1}x\) \(\forall u^k\), where \(\tilde{u}^k = P(u^k)\) denotes the prolonged field values on the finer (mortar) mesh.

To project field values from a mortar back to an element face we employ an adjoint \(R\) of the prolongation operator such that \(RP = 1\). We also refer to this operation as restriction because it truncates higher modes from the mortar down to the resolution of the element face.

Specifically, we employ the mass-conservative adjoint

\[
\int_{\partial \Omega_{kk}} R(u^k) u^d x = \int_{\partial \Omega_{kk}} u^k P(u^k) d^{-1}x \quad \forall u^k, \tilde{u}^k.
\]

In matrix notation the restriction operator reduces to

\[
R = M^{-1} P^T \tilde{M},
\]

where \(M^{-1}\) is the inverse mass matrix on the coarser (element face) mesh, \(\tilde{M}\) is the mass matrix on the finer (mortar) mesh, and \(P^T\) is the transpose of the prolongation operator (41).

Note that the \(d\)-dimensional restriction- and prolongation-operators can serve not only to project field values to and from mortars, but also to project field values to and from elements that cover the computational domain at different \(h\)- and \(p\)-refinement levels. We make no use of projections across refinement levels in this article but will do so in upcoming work for the purpose of adaptive mesh-refinement strategies and for multigrid solvers.\(^{13}\)

I. A note on symmetry

For practical applications it is often advantageous to work with a symmetric operator. For example, some iterative linear solvers such as Conjugate Gradients take advantage of the symmetry to invert the operator more efficiently. One can also often show stronger convergence bounds for iterative linear solvers applicable to non-symmetric matrices, such as GMRES, if the matrix is symmetric [34].

The compact strong-weak scheme presented in Eq. (29b) with the generalized SIP numerical flux (30) is symmetric unless the elliptic equations break the symmetry, e.g. with an asymmetric coupling between equations. Note that a curved background geometry will typically break the symmetry because it involves first derivatives in Christoffel-symbol contributions to the primal sources (see e.g. Eq. (7)). It is straight-forward to see how the strong-weak scheme can make the DG operator symmetric if the elliptic equations allow it: The strong-weak operator involves a symmetric stiffness term of the schematic form \((MD)^T D = D^T MD\), whereas the strong scheme has a non-symmetric expression of the form \(MDD\) instead. Note that the "massless" variant of the strong-weak scheme, schematically \(M^{-1}D^T MD\), is not generally symmetric, and neither is the "massless" strong scheme \(DD\).

\(^{13}\) See also Sections 3.2 and 3.3 in Ref. [24] for details on the restriction- and prolongation-operators in the context of multigrid solvers.
J. Linearizing the operator

To solve non-linear elliptic equations $A(u) = b$ we typically employ a correction scheme, repeatedly solving the linearized equations for a correction quantity $\Delta u$. For example, a simple Newton-Raphson correction scheme solves the linearized problem $\frac{\partial A}{\partial u}(u) \Delta u = b - A(u)$ at fixed $u$ and then iteratively corrects $u \rightarrow u + \Delta u$. Since the fluxes $F^i$ are already linear for all elliptic systems we consider, the linearization $\frac{\partial A}{\partial u}(u)$ involves only linearizing the sources $S$ and the boundary conditions.

K. Variations of the scheme

We have made a number of choices to formulate the DG discretization in the preceding sections. This section summarizes some of the choices and presents possible variations to explore in future work.

Massive vs. massless scheme: We can eliminate the mass matrix in Eq. (29) to obtain a "massless" DG operator. However, we have found evidence that iterative linear solvers converge faster when solving the "massive" DG operator. We attribute this behaviour to the symmetry considerations discussed in Section III.

Mass-lumping: We diagonally-approximate the mass matrix to reduce the computational cost to apply, invert and store it, and to simplify the scheme (see Section IIII). De-aliasing techniques can potentially increase the accuracy of the scheme on curved meshes as discussed in Section IIII.

LGL vs. LG mesh: We chose to discretize the DG operator on LGL meshes to take advantage of the collocation points on element boundaries, which simplify computations of boundary corrections. Switching to LG meshes can have the advantage that quadratures are one degree more precise, making the mass-lumping exact on rectilinear grids (see Section IIII).

Numerical flux: The generalized internal-penalty numerical flux presented in Section IIII has proven a viable choice for a wide range of problems so far. However, the ability to switch out the numerical flux is a notable strength of DG methods, and augmenting the numerical flux in the elliptic DG scheme may improve its convergence properties or accuracy. In particular, the choice of penalty, Eq. (32), on curved meshes remains a subject of further study.

Strong vs. weak formulation: We have chosen the strong formulation (29a) over the strong-weak formulation (29b) because it is slightly simpler and we have, so far, found no evidence that the strong-weak formulation converges faster than the strong formulation, despite the symmetry considerations discussed in Section III. However, the strong-weak formulation can be of interest if a symmetric DG operator is necessary, e.g. to take advantage of specialized iterative solvers.

Flux vs. primal formulation: We have eliminated auxiliary degrees of freedom in the DG operator with a Schur-complement strategy. An alternative strategy is to derive a "primal formulation" of the DG operator (see Section IIII). We have found the flux formulation easier to implement due to its similarity to hyperbolic DG schemes. Furthermore, Ref. [24] suggest the flux formulation can be advantageous in conjunction with a multigrid solver.

IV. TEST PROBLEMS

The following numerical tests confirm the DG scheme presented in this article can solve a variety of elliptic problems. The test problems involve linear and non-linear systems of PDEs with non-linear boundary conditions on curved manifolds, discretized on hp-refined domains with curved meshes and non-conforming element boundaries.

All test problems have an analytic solution. Therefore, we quantify the accuracy of the numerical solutions by computing an $L_2$-error to the analytic solution over all primal variables,

$$
\|u - u_{\text{analytic}}\| := \left( \frac{\sum_{A,k} \int_{\Omega_k} (u_A - u_{\text{A,analytic}})^2 \, dV}{\sum_k \int_{\Omega_k} dV} \right)^{1/2},
$$

where the integrals are evaluated with Gauss-Lobatto quadrature on the elements of the computational domain.

To assess the DG operator is functional for our test problems we study the convergence of the discretization error (44) under uniform hp-refinement of the computational domain (see Section IIII). We compute the h-convergence order under pure uniform h-refinement

$$
\tau_h := \frac{\Delta_h \ln(\|u - u_{\text{analytic}}\|)}{\Delta_h \ln(h)},
$$

where $\Delta_h$ denotes the difference between successive h-refinement levels and $h$ is the size of an element. Since we always split elements in half along all logical axes we use $\Delta_h \ln(h) = \ln(2)$. We also compute the exponential convergence scale under pure uniform p-refinement

$$
\tau_p := \Delta_p \log_{10}(\|u - u_{\text{analytic}}\|),
$$

where $\Delta_p$ denotes the difference between successive p-refinement levels.

A. A Poisson solution

With this first test problem we establish a simple baseline that the following tests build upon. It is reduced to
See also Fig. 7.9 in Ref. [2].

The exponential convergence scale \( \tau \) we choose the fixed-source within each element. This domain is isotropically h-refined once, i.e. split once in both dimensions, resulting in four elements. Each element has six grid points per dimension, so fields are represented as polynomials of degree five. This is the domain that Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 are based on, and that is circled in Fig. 7.

the absolute essentials to illustrate the basic concepts of the scheme. We solve a flat-space Poisson equation (2) in two dimensions for the analytic solution

\[
u_{\text{analytic}}(x) = \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y)
\] (47)

on a rectilinear domain \( \Omega = [0, 1]^2 \). The domain is illustrated in Fig. 6. To obtain the solution (47) numerically we choose the fixed-source \( f(x) = 2\pi^2 \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y) \), select homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions \( u^b = 0 \), and solve the strong compact DG-discretized problem (29a) with \( C = 1 \). This essentially means we invert the matrix depicted in Fig. 3 and apply it to the discretization of the fixed-source \( f(x) \). Instead of inverting the matrix directly we employ the iterative elliptic solver of the SpECTRE code [11] presented in Ref. [12]. However, note that the technology we use to solve the DG-discretized problem is not relevant for the purpose of this article, since the matrix equation has a unique solution. Assuming the matrix equation is solved to sufficient precision, Eq. (44) quantifies the discretization error of the DG scheme.

We solve the problem on a series of uniformly and isotropically refined domains and present the convergence of the discretization error in Fig. 7. Under h-refinement the scheme recovers optimal \( O(h^{p+1}) \)-convergence, where \( P \) denotes the polynomial degree of the elements. It also recovers the odd-order superconvergence feature expected for the antisymmetric problem (47).\(^{14}\) Under p-refinement the scheme recovers exponential convergence. The exponential convergence scale \( \tau_p \) is modulated by the superconvergence feature and its mean increases linearly with the h-refinement level.

## B. Thermal noise in a cylindrical mirror

In this second test problem we solve the equations of linear elasticity (4) on a curved mesh with non-conforming element boundaries. The test problem represents a cylindrical mirror that is deformed by pressure from a laser beam incident on one of the sides. This problem arises in studies of Brownian thermal noise in interferometric gravitational-wave detectors [35, 36].\(^{15}\) Here we consider an analytic solution to this problem that applies in the limit of an isotropic and homogeneous mirror material with constitutive relation

\[
Y^{ijkl} = \lambda \delta^{ij} \delta^{kl} + \mu \left( \delta^{ik} \delta^{jl} + \delta^{il} \delta^{jk} \right),
\] (48)

characterized by the Lamé parameter \( \lambda \) and the shear modulus \( \mu \), or equivalently by the Poisson ratio \( \nu = \frac{\lambda}{2(\lambda + \mu)} \). Young’s modulus \( E = \frac{\mu(3\lambda + 2\mu)}{\lambda + \mu} \), or the bulk modulus \( K = \lambda + \frac{2}{3} \mu \). We assume the material fills the infinite half-space \( z \geq 0 \), choose a vanishing force density \( f(x) = 0 \), and a Gaussian profile of the laser beam incident at \( z = 0 \),

\[
n_i T^{ij} = n_i \frac{1}{r_0} e^{-r^2/r_0^2}.
\] (49)

Here \( T^{ij} = -Y^{ijkl} S_{kl} \) is the stress, \( n_i \) is the unit normal pointing away from the mirror, i.e. in negative \( z \)-direction, \( r = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2} \) is the radial coordinate-distance from the axis of symmetry, and \( r_0 \) is the beam width. Under these assumptions the displacement field \( \xi(x) \) has the analytic solution [37–39–

\[
\begin{align*}
\xi^r &= \frac{1}{2\mu} \int_0^\infty dk J_1(kr) e^{-kz} \left( 1 - \frac{\lambda + 2\mu}{\lambda + \mu} + k \right) \tilde{p}(k). \\
\xi^z &= \frac{1}{2\mu} \int_0^\infty dk J_0(kr) e^{-kz} \left( 1 + \frac{\mu}{\lambda + \mu} + k \right) \tilde{p}(k)
\end{align*}
\] (50a)

\[
\begin{align*}
\xi^r &= \frac{1}{2\mu} \int_0^\infty dk J_1(kr) e^{-kz} \left( 1 - \frac{\lambda + 2\mu}{\lambda + \mu} + k \right) \tilde{p}(k). \\
\xi^z &= \frac{1}{2\mu} \int_0^\infty dk J_0(kr) e^{-kz} \left( 1 + \frac{\mu}{\lambda + \mu} + k \right) \tilde{p}(k)
\end{align*}
\] (50b)

\(^{14}\) See also Fig. 7.9 in Ref. [3].

\(^{15}\) See also Section 11.9.2 in Ref. [37] for an introduction to the thermal noise problem.
FIG. 7. Convergence of the two-dimensional Poisson problem detailed in Section IV A with uniform hp-refinement. Solid lines connect numerical solutions where the domain is split into an increasing number of elements (isotropic h-refinement), and dotted lines connect numerical solutions with increasing polynomial order (isotropic p-refinement). The DG scheme recovers optimal $O(h^{p+1})$-convergence with odd-order superconvergence under h-refinement (right panel) and exponential convergence under p-refinement (bottom panels). For reference, the circled configuration is pictured in Fig. 6.

FIG. 8. A cut through the cylindrical domain used in the elasticity problem (Section IV B). The domain consists of four wedges enveloping a cuboid, and two vertical layers. The layers are partitioned vertically at $z = r_0$ and the cuboid lies radially within $r = r_0$. In the top layer, the wedges are h-refined radially once and the cuboid is h-refined in the $x$- and $y$-directions once, resulting in 12 elements in the top layer and 5 elements in the bottom layer. Elements in this example have six grid points per dimension, and the wedge-shaped elements have two additional grid points in their angular direction.

and $\xi^0 = 0$ in cylindrical coordinates $\{r, \phi, z\}$. Here $J_0$ and $J_1$ are Bessel functions of the first kind, and $	ilde{p}(k) = \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{-(kr_0/2)^2}$ is the Hankel transform of the laser-beam profile. We evaluate these integrals numerically at every collocation point in the computational domain to determine the analytic solution.

To obtain numerical solutions to the thermal noise problem we DG-discretize the equations of linear elasticity (5) on a cylindrical domain with height and radius $R$, employing the strong compact DG operator (29a). Since the stress $T^{ij} = -F^{ij} \xi$ is the negative primal flux in the elasticity equations (5) we impose Eq. (49) as a Neumann-type boundary condition on the base of the cylinder at $z = 0$. We impose the analytic solution (50) as Dirichlet-type boundary conditions on the remaining external boundaries of the domain, i.e. on the base at $z = R$ and on the mantle at $r = R$. These boundary conditions mean that we solve for a finite cylindrical section of the infinite half-space analytic solution (50). We choose a penalty parameter of $C = 100$ for this problem to eliminate variations in the discretization error arising from curved-mesh contributions to the penalty (32) at high resolutions. Table I summarizes the remaining parameters we use in the numerical solutions.

Figure 8 illustrates the cylindrical domain. It is refined more strongly toward the origin $x = 0$ where the Gaussian laser beam applies pressure. The refinement is both anisotropic and inhomogeneous, leading to non-conforming element boundaries with different polynomial
degrees on either side of the boundary, multiple neighbors adjacent to an element face, or both. Specifically, elements facing the top-layer cuboid or the interface between top and bottom layer are matched two-to-one, and wedge-shaped elements have two additional angular grid points. Therefore, the elements facing the cuboid are both $p$-nonconforming and $h$-nonconforming in the top layer, and $p$-nonconforming in the bottom layer. The elements facing the layer interface are $h$-nonconforming.

Figure 9 presents the convergence of the discretization error under uniform $hp$-refinement. Specifically, we split every element in two along all three dimensions to construct additional $h$-refinement levels, and increment every polynomial degree by one to construct additional $p$-refinement levels, retaining the non-conforming element boundaries. Note that the wedge-shaped elements retain a higher polynomial degree of $P + 2$ along their angular direction throughout the refinement procedure, where $P$ is the polynomial degree of all other elements and dimensions. The DG scheme recovers optimal $O(h^{P+1})$-convergence under $h$-refinement and exponential convergence under $p$-refinement. Note that the exponential convergence scale $\tau_p$ depends on the domain geometry, the structure of the solution, the placement of grid points and the refinement strategy. We have chosen to refine the domain as uniformly as possible here to reliably measure convergence properties of the DG scheme. Optimizing

\[
\psi = 1, \quad \alpha = \left(1 + \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1/2}, \quad \beta^i = \frac{2M}{r} \alpha^2 \hat{\nu}^i , \quad \tilde{\gamma}_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + \frac{2M}{r} l_i l_j
\]

C. A black hole in general relativity

Finally, we apply the DG scheme to solve the Einstein constraint equations of general relativity in the XCTS formulations, which is a set of coupled, non-linear, elliptic PDEs on a curved manifold (see Appendix 2). Solutions to the XCTS equations describe admissible configurations of general-relativistic spacetime and provide initial data for general-relativistic time evolutions.

In this test problem we solve the XCTS equations (A.6) for a Schwarzschild black hole in Kerr-Schild coordinates,
spherical shell, as illustrated in Fig. 10. The domain envelops an excised sphere that represents the black hole, so it has an outer and an inner external boundary that require boundary conditions. To obtain the Schwarzschild solution in Kerr-Schild coordinates we impose Eqs. (51a) to (51c) as Dirichlet-type boundary conditions at the outer boundary of the spherical shell at \( r = 10M \). We place the inner radius of the spherical shell at \( r = 2M \) and impose non-spinning apparent-horizon boundary conditions at the inner boundary,

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi \partial^k \psi &= \frac{\psi^3}{8\alpha} n^i n^j \left( \bar{L} \beta \right)^{ij} - \bar{u}^{ij} \\
- \frac{\psi}{4} \tilde{m}^{ij} \bar{\nabla}_i n_j &= \frac{1}{6} K \psi^\beta, \\
\beta^{i} &= - \frac{\alpha}{\psi^2} n^{i},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \tilde{m}^{ij} = \tilde{\gamma}^{ij} - n^i n^j \). These boundary conditions are not specific to the Schwarzschild solution but ensure the excision surface is an apparent horizon \([14]\). Since the Schwarzschild solution in Kerr-Schild coordinates has an apparent horizon at \( r = 2M \) we recover the solution (51) when we place the inner radius of the spherical shell at that radius. The apparent-horizon boundary conditions (52) do not constrain the lapse \( \alpha \), so we impose Eq. (51b) at the inner boundary. The apparent-horizon boundary conditions are of Neumann-type for the variable \( \psi \), of Dirichlet-type for \( \alpha \psi \) and \( \beta^i \), and are non-linear.

Since the XCTS equations (A.4) and the apparent-horizon boundary conditions (52) are non-linear the initial guess for the iterative non-linear solver becomes relevant. We choose an initial guess close to the analytic solution for the non-linear black-hole problem recovers \( O(h^P) \)-convergence under h-refinement, which is an order lower than obtained for the two preceding linear test problems. We find higher-order convergence for pure Dirichlet boundary conditions for this problem, suggesting the apparent-horizon boundary conditions (52) are responsible for the reduction of the convergence order. For a Poisson problem with non-linear boundary conditions the authors of Ref. [22] also find a loss of convergence under h-refinement. Under p-refinement the scheme recovers exponential convergence and the mean exponential convergence scale \( \tau_p \) increases linearly with the h-refinement level.

---

16 See Table 2.1 in Ref. [15].
FIG. 11. Convergence of the three-dimensional black-hole solution with uniform hp-refinement. Plotted is the $L_2$-error (44) over all variables of the XCTS equations $\{\psi, \alpha \psi, \beta\}$. The circled configuration is pictured in Fig. 10. The DG scheme recovers $O(h^P)$-convergence under h-refinement (right panel) and exponential convergence under p-refinement (bottom panels).

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

Since the convergence properties of the DG scheme are sensitive to the specifics of the computational domain, we have chosen to refine the domains as uniformly as possible while retaining some important features, such as curved meshes and non-conforming element boundaries. For practical applications it is typically more important to obtain steep rather than uniform convergence, in order to conserve computational resources and thus achieve faster or more precise solves. Therefore, a focus of future work will be to develop adaptive mesh-refinement strategies for the elliptic DG scheme that place grid points in regions and dimensions of the domain that dominate the discretization error.

Important for practical applications of the DG scheme are numerical techniques for solving the DG-discretized problems. Sophisticated linear and non-linear iterative algorithms are necessary to solve high-resolution elliptic problems in parallel on large computing clusters. Many of the choices we have made in the development of the DG scheme are motivated by such large-scale applications. We are developing a scalable Multigrid-Schwarz preconditioned Newton-Krylov iterative solver with task-based parallelism for the SpECTRE code to solve such large-scale elliptic problems [12].
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Appendix: Physical systems

1. Puncture equation

A popular approach to produce initial data for general-relativistic time evolutions involving black holes is to reduce the Einstein constraint equations to a single non-linear elliptic PDE, the puncture equation \(^{18}\)

\[-\partial_t \partial^t u = \beta \left( \alpha (1 + u) + 1 \right)^{-7}, \tag{A.1}\]

written here in Cartesian coordinates. The puncture equation (A.1) is solved for the field \(u(x)\) from which an admissible spacetime metric can be constructed [15]. The quantities

\[\frac{1}{\alpha} = \sum_I M_I r_I, \tag{A.2a}\]

\[\beta = \frac{1}{8} \alpha^7 \bar{A}_{ij} \bar{A}^{ij}, \tag{A.2b}\]

\[\bar{A}^{ij} = \frac{3}{2} \sum_I \frac{1}{r_I} \left( 2P^{ij}_I n_I^k n_I^n - (\delta^{ij} - n_I^i n_I^n) P^k_I n_I^k \right) + \frac{4}{3} n_I^i (\epsilon_{ij}^{kl} S_{kl}^I n_I^n) \tag{A.2c}\]

are background fields that define a configuration of multiple black holes. The black holes are parametrized by their puncture masses \(M_I\), positions \(C_I\), linear momenta \(P_I\) and spins \(S_I\). In Eq. (A.2), \(r_I = \|x - C_I\|\) is the Euclidean coordinate-distance to the \(I\)-th black hole and \(n_I = (x - C_I)/r_I\) is the radial unit normal to the \(I\)-th black hole.

To formulate the puncture equation (A.1) in first-order flux form (1) we can choose the auxiliary variable \(v_i = \partial_i u\) and the fluxes and sources

\[\mathcal{F}_{ij}^v = u \delta_{ij}, \quad \mathcal{S}_{ij}^v = v_j, \tag{A.3a}\]

\[\mathcal{F}_u^v = v^i, \quad \mathcal{S}_u = -\beta \left( \alpha (1 + u) + 1 \right)^{-7}, \tag{A.3b}\]

along with both \(f_a = 0\). Other Poisson-type equations with non-linear sources can be formulated analogously.

2. The XCTS equations of general relativity

The XCTS equations

\[\bar{\nabla}^2 \psi = \frac{1}{8} \psi \bar{R} + \frac{1}{12} \psi^5 K^2 - \frac{1}{8} \psi^{-7} \bar{A}_{ij} \bar{A}^{ij} - 2\pi \psi^5 \rho \tag{A.4a}\]

\[\bar{\nabla}^2 (\alpha \psi) = \psi^3 \left( \frac{7}{8} \psi^{-8} \bar{A}_{ij} \bar{A}^{ij} + \frac{5}{12} \psi^4 K^2 + \frac{1}{8} \bar{R} \right) + 2\pi \psi^4 (\rho + 2S) - \psi^5 \bar{\partial}_i K + \psi^5 \bar{\beta}^i \bar{\nabla}_i K \tag{A.4b}\]

\[\bar{\nabla}_i (\bar{\beta}^i) = (\bar{\beta}^i) \bar{\nabla}_i \ln(\bar{\alpha}) + \bar{\alpha} \bar{\nabla}_i \left( \bar{\alpha}^{-1} \bar{u}^i \right) \tag{A.4c}\]

with \(\bar{A}^{ij} = \frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}} \left( (\bar{\beta}^i)^j - \bar{u}^i \bar{u}^j \right)\) and \(\bar{\alpha} = \alpha \psi^{-6}\) are a set of non-linear elliptic equations that the spacetime metric of general relativity must satisfy at all times \([13]\). \(^{19}\)

They are solved for the conformal factor \(\psi\), the product of lapse and conformal factor \(\alpha \psi\), and the shift vector \(\beta^i\). The remaining quantities in the equations, i.e. the conformal metric \(\gamma_{ij}\), the trace of the extrinsic curvature \(K\), their respective time derivatives \(\bar{u}_{ij}\) and \(\bar{\partial}_i K\), the energy density \(\rho\), the stress-energy trace \(S\) and the momentum density \(S^i\), are freely-specifiable fields that define the scenario at hand. Of particular importance is the conformal metric \(\gamma_{ij}\), which defines the background geometry, the covariant derivative \(\bar{\nabla}\), the Ricci scalar \(\bar{R}\) and the longitudinal operator

\[(\bar{L}^\beta)^i_j = \bar{\nabla}^i \bar{\beta}^j + \bar{\nabla}^j \bar{\beta}^i - \frac{2}{3} \bar{\gamma}^{ij} \bar{\nabla}_k \beta^k. \tag{A.5}\]

Note that the XCTS equations are essentially two Poisson equations and one elasticity equation with coupled, non-linear sources on a curved manifold. In this analogy, the longitudinal operator plays the role of the elastic constitutive relation that connects the symmetric "shift strain" \(\bar{\nabla}_i (\bar{\beta}^i)\) with the "stress" \((\bar{L}^\beta)^i_j\) of which we take the divergence in the momentum constraint (A.4c). This particular constitutive relation is equivalent to an isotropic and homogeneous material (48) with bulk modulus \(K = 0\) (not to be confused with the extrinsic curvature trace \(K\) in this context) and shear modulus \(\mu = 1\).

To formulate the XCTS equations in first-order flux form (1) we choose for auxiliary variables the gradient of the conformal factor, \(v_i = \partial_i \psi\), the gradient of the lapse times the conformal factor, \(w_i = \partial_i (\alpha \psi)\), and the symmetric shift strain \(B_{ij} = \bar{\nabla}_i (\bar{\beta}^i)_j\). Then, the XCTS equations (A.4) can be formulated with the fluxes and

\(^{18}\) See e.g. Section 12.2 in Ref. [15] for an introduction to puncture initial data.

\(^{19}\) See e.g. Ref. [15] for an introduction to the XCTS equations, in particular Box 3.3.
for Eq. (A.4a),
\[ F_{v}^{i,j} = \delta_{j}^{i} \psi, \quad S_{v,j} = v_{j}, \]  
(A.6a)
\[ F_{\psi}^{i,j} = \tilde{\gamma}^{ij} w_{j}, \quad S_{\psi} = - \tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^{i,j} + \frac{1}{8} \psi \tilde{R} + \frac{1}{12} \psi^{5} K^{2} \]
\[ - \frac{1}{8} \psi^{-7} A_{ij} A^{ij} - 2 \pi \psi^{5} \rho \]  
(A.6b)

for Eq. (A.4b),
\[ F_{w}^{i,j} = \delta_{j}^{i} \alpha \psi, \quad S_{w,j} = w_{j}, \]  
(A.6c)
\[ F_{(\alpha \psi)}^{i,j} = \tilde{\gamma}^{ij} w_{j}, \quad S_{(\alpha \psi)} = - \tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^{i,j} F_{(\alpha \psi)}^{j} \]
\[ + \alpha \psi \left( \frac{7}{8} \psi^{-8} A_{ij} A^{ij} + \frac{5}{12} \psi^{4} K^{2} \right) \]
\[ + \frac{1}{8} \tilde{R} + 2 \pi \psi^{5} \left( \rho + 2 \Sigma \right) \]  
(A.6d)
\[ - \psi^{5} \partial_{j} K + \psi^{5} \beta \tilde{\nabla}_{j} K \]

for Eq. (A.4c). All fixed-sources \( f_{\alpha} \) vanish. Note that Eq. (A.7c) is \( F_{\beta}^{ij} = (\tilde{L}_{\beta})^{ij} \), expressed in the auxiliary variables.

\[ F_{B}^{ij} = \delta_{j}^{i} \tilde{g}_{k}^{l} \beta_{k}^{l}, \]  
(A.7a)
\[ S_{B,j} = B_{jk} + \tilde{g}_{ijk} \beta_{k}, \]  
(A.7b)
\[ F_{\beta}^{ij} = 2 \left( \tilde{g}^{ik} \tilde{g}^{jl} - \frac{1}{3} \tilde{g}^{ij} \tilde{g}^{kl} \right) B_{kl}, \]  
(A.7c)
\[ S_{\beta}^{i} = - \tilde{g}_{jk}^{i} F_{\beta}^{ik} - \tilde{g}_{jk}^{i} F_{\beta}^{jk} \]
\[ + \left( F_{\beta}^{ij} - \tilde{w}_{ij} \right) \tilde{g}_{jk} \left( \frac{F_{(\alpha \psi)}^{k}}{\alpha \psi} - 7 \frac{F_{\psi}^{k}}{\psi} \right) \]
\[ + \tilde{\nabla}_{j} \tilde{w}_{ij} + \frac{4}{3} \alpha \tilde{\nabla}^{i} K + 16 \pi \alpha \psi^{4} S^{i} \]  
(A.7d)

[22] M. Feistauer, F. Roskovec, and A.-M. Sändig, Discontinuous Galerkin method for an elliptic problem with


