

# A POSTERIORI ERROR CONTROL FOR DPG METHODS

CARSTEN CARSTENSEN, LESZEK DEMKOWICZ, AND JAY GOPALAKRISHNAN

ABSTRACT. A combination of ideas in least-squares finite element methods with those of hybridized methods recently led to discontinuous Petrov Galerkin (DPG) finite element methods. They minimize a residual inherited from a piecewise ultraweak formulation in a nonstandard, locally computable, dual norm. This paper establishes a general *a posteriori* error analysis for the natural norms of the DPG schemes under conditions equivalent to *a priori* stability estimates. It is proven that the locally computable residual norm of *any discrete function* is a lower and an upper error bound up to explicit data approximation errors. The presented abstract framework for *a posteriori* error analysis applies to known DPG discretizations of Laplace and Lamé equations and to a novel DPG method for the stress-velocity formulation of Stokes flow with symmetric stress approximations. Since the error control does not rely on the discrete equations, it applies to inexactly computed or otherwise perturbed solutions within the discrete spaces of the functional framework. Numerical illustrations show that the error control is practically feasible.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The discontinuous Petrov Galerkin (DPG) method of [15, 16] can simultaneously be viewed either as a finite element method with nonstandard test spaces or as a least-squares finite element method (LSFEM) minimizing the residual from an ultraweak formulation in a nonstandard norm. This paper, adopting the LSFEM point of view, introduces an *a posteriori* error analysis for the DPG method and establishes the efficiency and reliability of an *a posteriori* error estimator for the DPG method. This partly justifies the adaptive computations in [19] and identifies a data approximation error. Under the same conditions which guarantee stability and *a priori* error estimates, a novel abstract analysis is presented, which applies to the known DPG method for Laplace and Lamé equations as well to a novel DPG formulation for the Stokes equations. The *a posteriori* error estimator does *not* rely on Galerkin orthogonality in the sense that, as in LSFEM, the reliability holds for *all* approximations and, in particular, allows for *inexact solve*.

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 65N30.

*Key words and phrases.* least-squares, inexact solution, discontinuous, Petrov-Galerkin, DPG, Laplacian, linear elasticity, Stokes, true fluid stress.

This work was partially supported by the NSF under grant DMS-1318916 and by the AFOSR under grant FA9550-12-1-0484. The first author thankfully acknowledges the support of a JTO Fellowship and the kind hospitality of the ICES at the University of Texas at Austin.

The functional framework for the method consists of a reflexive real Banach space  $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$  and a real Hilbert space  $(Y, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_Y)$  with associated norm  $\|\cdot\|_Y = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_Y^{1/2}$  and dual  $Y^*$  plus a continuous invertible linear operator  $B : X \rightarrow Y^*$ . Given any  $F \in Y^*$ , there exists a unique solution  $x := B^{-1}F$  of

$$(1.1) \quad Bx = F.$$

Given any finite-dimensional subspace  $X_h \subset X$ , the *idealized DPG* method computes an approximation

$$(1.2) \quad \widehat{x}_h = \arg \min_{\xi_h \in X_h} \|F - B\xi_h\|_{Y^*}$$

to  $x$  by minimizing the residual  $\|F - B\xi_h\|_{Y^*}$  in  $X_h$ . Although the DPG method was originally presented through the concept of optimal test functions, the least-squares characterization (1.2) of the method has been noted in [16]. Many well-known least-squares Galerkin methods [5] have  $Y$  set to  $L^2$ . In such cases, the evaluation of the  $Y^*$ -norm of the residual in (1.2) is standard and reduces to computation of an integral.

An essential difference in the DPG methods considered in the applications below is the use of a space  $Y$  different from  $L^2$ . As shown in the earlier papers [7, 17, 16], it is possible to use hybridization ideas to recast a boundary value problem into an ultraweak variational formulation, employing a test space  $Y$  of functions with no continuity constraints across mesh element interfaces. This localizes the evaluation of the  $Y^*$ -norm in (1.2) to decoupled calculations on mesh elements. Even if so localized, the subspace of functions in  $Y$  supported on a single element, is infinite dimensional. This motivates the *practical DPG method* with finite-dimensional subspace  $Y_h \subset Y$ : compute an approximation

$$(1.3) \quad x_h = \arg \min_{\xi_h \in X_h} \|F - B\xi_h\|_{Y_h^*}.$$

to  $x$  by minimizing the residual  $\|F - B\xi_h\|_{Y_h^*}$  in  $X_h$ .

The minimization problems (1.2)-(1.3) can be recast in terms of the bilinear form

$$(1.4) \quad b(x, y) := (Bx)(y) \quad \text{for all } x \in X \text{ and } y \in Y$$

with the duality between  $Y^*$  and  $Y$  in the right-hand side. Then (1.1) reads  $b(x, y) = F(y)$  for all  $y \in Y$ . The *ideal DPG* method (1.2) characterizes  $\widehat{x}_h$  in  $X_h$  as the solution to

$$b(\widehat{x}_h, y) = F(y) \quad \text{for all } y \in \widehat{Y}_h^{\text{opt}} := T(X_h)$$

where  $T : X \rightarrow Y$  is defined by  $\langle Tx, y \rangle_Y = b(x, y)$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$ . Similarly, the *practical DPG* method (1.3) solves

$$(1.5) \quad b(x_h, y) = F(y) \quad \text{for all } y \in Y_h^{\text{opt}} := T_h(X_h)$$

for  $x_h \in X_h$  where  $T_h : X \rightarrow Y_h$  defined by  $\langle T_h x, y \rangle_Y = b(x, y)$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y_h$ . The idea to reformulate (1.5) as a mixed formulation involving  $x_h$  and the corresponding residual is explored in [13]. The Petrov-Galerkin character of the ideal and practical DPG schemes is clearly evident from these reformulations.

The practical computation of the DPG solution  $x_h$  in (1.3) reduces to the solution of a symmetric positive definite linear system. One interpretation of the difference between the ideal and the practical DPG methods, is that the test space is *inexactly* computed in the practical version (using  $T_h$  instead of the ideal  $T$ ). The calculation of  $Tx$  requires an exact solve of a problem in  $Y$ , while the calculation of  $T_h x$  solely solves some problem in the finite-dimensional subspace  $Y_h \subset Y$ .

This paper establishes an *a posteriori* error analysis of the practical DPG method (1.3). The *a posteriori* error analysis of conforming finite element schemes is well-developed [2, 3, 4, 20, 33] and even nonstandard finite element technologies are understood [9, 11]. The residual norm

$$(1.6) \quad \eta = \|F - Bx_h\|_{Y_h^*}$$

equals the norm of the *approximate error representation function*  $\varepsilon_h \in Y_h$  of [19] computed from

$$(1.7) \quad \langle \varepsilon_h, y \rangle_Y = F(y) - b(x_h, y) \quad \text{for all } y \in Y_h.$$

The Riesz representation theorem implies

$$(1.8) \quad \eta = \|\varepsilon_h\|_Y.$$

Under certain conditions of [22] on  $Y_h$  and  $Y$ , this paper establishes reliable and efficient *a posteriori* error control

$$(1.9) \quad C_2 \eta \leq \|x - x_h\|_X \leq C_3 \eta + C_4 \text{osc}(F)$$

with mesh-independent constants  $C_2, C_3, C_4$  and the data approximation term  $\text{osc}(F)$  defined below in (1.12). In the applications, this data approximation term will be a data oscillation and of higher order for piecewise smooth data. The estimates of (1.9) follow from Theorem 2.1 below. In fact, the theorem provides such an estimate not only for the minimizer  $x_h$ , but more generally for *any*  $\tilde{x}_h \in X_h$  and corresponding  $\tilde{\eta}$ . Similar properties are shared by LSFEM.

One of the conditions in the *a priori* convergence analysis of [22] is the existence of a bounded linear operator  $\Pi : Y \rightarrow Y_h$  with the property

$$(1.10) \quad b(X_h, (I - \Pi)Y) = 0.$$

In other words, for any  $\xi_h \in X_h$  and for any  $y \in Y$ ,  $b(\xi_h, y - \Pi y) = 0$ . It is shown in [22] that this Fortin-type operator  $\Pi$  guarantees discrete stability and quasi-optimal convergence of the practical DPG method in the sense that

$$(1.11) \quad \|x - x_h\|_X \leq C_1 \min_{\xi_h \in X_h} \|x - \xi_h\|_X$$

holds with a mesh-independent constant  $C_1$ . This paper proves that (1.9) holds if the data approximation term is defined using  $\Pi$  by

$$(1.12) \quad \text{osc}(F) := \|F \circ (1 - \Pi)\|_{Y^*},$$

even when  $x_h$  is perturbed or inexactly computed.

The remaining parts of this paper are organized as follows. A set of abstract sufficient conditions in Section 2 lead to the equivalence (1.9) between the error and its estimator. The data approximation term is always efficient and results in an alternative proof of the a priori error estimate (1.11). Section 3 elucidates the a posteriori error analysis of the ultraweak formulation for the Laplace and Lamé equation and their DPG discretizations. The same section presents a new DPG method for Stokes flow featuring symmetric true fluid stress approximations. Adaptivity for these three model problems using discontinuous spaces has been heavily studied in the literature [1, 6, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32] (see the review [10] for a more exhaustive bibliography). Section 4 provides numerical evidence for reliability and efficiency and shows that the estimator is useful in practice. Finally, as a notational foreword, standard notations from functional analysis, and for Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces, applies throughout this paper.

## 2. THE ABSTRACT ERROR CONTROL

This self-contained section is devoted to the abstract framework of DPG methods and its *a posteriori* error analysis based on three ingredients (H1)-(H3):

**(H1)** Suppose  $b : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is bounded real bilinear form in the reflexive real Banach space  $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$  and the real Hilbert space  $(Y, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_Y)$  and set

$$\|b\| := \sup_{x \in X \setminus \{0\}} \sup_{y \in Y \setminus \{0\}} \frac{b(x, y)}{\|x\|_X \|y\|_Y} < \infty.$$

**(H2)** Suppose  $b$  satisfies the inf-sup condition

$$0 < \beta := \inf_{x \in X \setminus \{0\}} \sup_{y \in Y \setminus \{0\}} \frac{b(x, y)}{\|x\|_X \|y\|_Y}$$

and the uniqueness condition  $\{y \in Y : b(x, y) = 0 \forall x \in X\} = \{0\}$ .

**(H3)** The closed subspaces  $X_h \subset X$  and  $Y_h \subset Y$  admit a bounded linear operator  $\Pi : Y \rightarrow Y_h$  with operator norm  $\|\Pi\|$  and the property

$$b(X_h, (1 - \Pi)Y) = 0.$$

(This notation abbreviates  $b(\xi_h, (1 - \Pi)y) = 0$  for all  $\xi_h \in X_h$  and for all  $y \in Y$ .)

Let  $x_h$  and  $\eta$  denote the DPG solution and its error estimator  $\eta$ , given by (1.3) and (1.6), respectively. The main result below is stated for an *inexact solution*  $\tilde{x}_h$ , which is *any* discrete ansatz function in  $X_h$ . It shows that the corresponding error estimator  $\tilde{\eta}$  provides *reliable* (i.e.,  $\tilde{\eta}$  provides an upper bound for the error) and *efficient* (i.e.,  $\tilde{\eta}$  provides a lower bound for the error) error control.

**Theorem 2.1** (Reliability & Efficiency). *Assume (H1)–(H3). Let  $F \in Y^*$ ,  $x = B^{-1}F$ , and  $\tilde{x}_h \in X_h$ . Then the residual  $\tilde{\eta} := \|F - B\tilde{x}_h\|_{Y_h^*}$  and the data-approximation*

error  $\text{osc}(F) := \|F \circ (1 - II)\|_{Y^*}$  satisfy

$$(2.1) \quad \beta^2 \|x - \tilde{x}_h\|_X^2 \leq \tilde{\eta}^2 + \left( \|II\| \tilde{\eta} + \text{osc}(F) \right)^2,$$

$$(2.2) \quad \tilde{\eta} \leq \|b\| \|x - \tilde{x}_h\|_X, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(2.3) \quad \text{osc}(F) \leq \|b\| \|1 - II\| \min_{\xi_h \in X_h} \|x - \xi_h\|_X.$$

Several comments are in order before the proof of the theorem concludes this section.

*Remark 2.2* (Bijectivity of  $B$ ). It is well-known that the operator  $B : X \rightarrow Y^*$  in (1.4) is bijective under the conditions (H1)-(H2) and  $\|B^{-1}\| = 1/\beta$ .

*Remark 2.3* (Constants in error bounds). The *a posteriori* upper and lower error bounds (1.9) follow from Theorem 2.1 with  $C_2 = 1/\|b\|$ ,  $C_3 = (1 + \|II\|^2)^{1/2}/\beta$ , and  $C_4 = 1/\beta$ .

*Remark 2.4* (Data approximation error). The data approximation term  $\|F \circ (1 - II)\|_{Y^*}$  will be of higher-order in all the applications of this paper. However, it is always strictly efficient in the sense of (2.3).

*Remark 2.5* (Alternative proof of quasioptimal error estimates). Theorem 2.1 provides an alternative proof of the best approximation property (1.11). In fact, (1.3) implies, for any  $\xi_h \in X_h$ , that

$$\eta = \|F - Bx_h\|_{Y_h^*} \leq \|B(x - \xi_h)\|_{Y_h^*} \leq \|b\| \|x - \xi_h\|_X.$$

The combination of this with (2.1) and (2.3) implies

$$\beta \|x - x_h\|_X \leq \|b\| (C_3 + C_4 \|b\| \|1 - II\|) \min_{\xi_h \in X_h} \|x - \xi_h\|_X.$$

This is (1.11) with  $C_1 = C_3 + C_4 \|b\| \|1 - II\|$ . The direct *a priori* error analysis of [22, Theorem 2.1] yields the sharper constant  $C_1 = \|II\| \|b\|/\beta$ .

*Remark 2.6* (Stability is equivalent to (H3)). The aforementioned proof of a priori convergence indicates the role of (H3) as a sufficient condition for the convergence and whence for the stability of the DPG scheme. It is easy to see that the converse also holds: (H3) is necessary for stability of the DPG method.

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* The proof of the reliability estimate (2.1) involves the error  $e := x - \tilde{x}_h$ , the error representation function  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$  in  $Y$  defined by

$$(2.4) \quad \langle \tilde{\varepsilon}, y \rangle_Y = F(y) - b(\tilde{x}_h, y) \quad \text{for all } y \in Y,$$

and its approximation  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_h$  in  $Y_h$  defined by

$$(2.5) \quad \langle \tilde{\varepsilon}_h, y_h \rangle_Y = F(y_h) - b(\tilde{x}_h, y_h) \quad \text{for all } y_h \in Y_h.$$

The reliability of  $\tilde{\varepsilon}$  immediately follows from the inf-sup condition (H2),

$$(2.6) \quad \beta \|e\|_X \leq \|Be\|_{Y^*} = \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_Y.$$

To prove the reliability of  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_h$ , observe that (2.4)-(2.5) imply

$$\delta := \tilde{\varepsilon} - \tilde{\varepsilon}_h \perp Y_h,$$

where  $\perp$  denotes orthogonality with respect to the scalar product in  $Y$ . The Pythagoras theorem gives

$$(2.7) \quad \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_Y^2 = \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_h\|_Y^2 + \|\delta\|_Y^2.$$

Using  $\Pi$  from (H3), with the observation that  $\Pi\delta \in Y_h \perp \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta\|_Y^2 &= \langle \delta, \delta - \Pi\delta \rangle_Y = \langle \tilde{\varepsilon} - \tilde{\varepsilon}_h, \delta - \Pi\delta \rangle_Y \\ &= \langle \tilde{\varepsilon}, \delta - \Pi\delta \rangle_Y + \langle \tilde{\varepsilon}_h, \Pi\delta \rangle_Y. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $b(\tilde{x}_h, \delta - \Pi\delta) = 0$  by (H3),

$$\langle \tilde{\varepsilon}, \delta - \Pi\delta \rangle_Y = b(x - \tilde{x}_h, \delta - \Pi\delta) = F(\delta - \Pi\delta).$$

Combining with the previous identity

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta\|_Y^2 &= F(\delta - \Pi\delta) + \langle \tilde{\varepsilon}_h, \Pi\delta \rangle_Y \\ &\leq (\|F \circ (1 - \Pi)\|_{Y^*} + \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_h\|_Y \|\Pi\|) \|\delta\|_Y. \end{aligned}$$

In other words,

$$(2.8) \quad \|\delta\|_Y \leq \|F \circ (1 - \Pi)\|_{Y^*} + \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_h\|_Y \|\Pi\|.$$

The inequalities (2.6) and (2.8), together with the identity (2.7), prove

$$\beta^2 \|e\|_X^2 \leq \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_h\|_Y^2 + (\|F \circ (1 - \Pi)\|_{Y^*} + \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_h\|_Y \|\Pi\|)^2.$$

Since  $\|\tilde{\varepsilon}_h\|_Y = \|F - B\tilde{x}_h\|_{Y_h^*} = \tilde{\eta}$  this proves the reliability estimate (2.1).

The efficiency estimate (2.2) immediately follows from (H1),

$$\tilde{\eta} = \|Be\|_{Y_h^*} \leq \|b\| \|e\|_X.$$

It only remains to prove (2.3). Considering any  $y \in Y$  with  $\|y\|_Y = 1$  and employing (H3),

$$\begin{aligned} (F \circ (1 - \Pi))(y) &= F(y - \Pi y) = b(x, y - \Pi y) \\ &= b(x - \xi_h, y - \Pi y) \leq \|b\| \|1 - \Pi\| \|x - \xi_h\| \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\xi_h$  in  $X_h$ . This proves (2.3).  $\square$

### 3. APPLICATION TO LAPLACE, LAMÉ, AND STOKES EQUATIONS

**3.1. Laplace equation.** The DPG method for the Laplace equation was first analyzed in [17] and the effect of inexact test spaces in *a priori* error analysis was clarified later in [22].

Given a Lipschitz polyhedron  $\Omega$  in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and some  $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ , let  $u$  solve the Poisson problem

$$(3.1) \quad -\Delta u = f \text{ in } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Given a shape-regular triangulation  $\Omega_h$  of  $\Omega$  into simplices, set

$$\begin{aligned} X &:= L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N) \times L^2(\Omega) \times H_0^{1/2}(\partial\Omega_h) \times H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega_h), \\ Y &:= H(\operatorname{div}, \Omega_h) \times H^1(\Omega_h), \text{ where} \\ H(\operatorname{div}, \Omega_h) &:= \{\tau \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N) : \forall K \in \Omega_h, \tau|_K \in H(\operatorname{div}, K)\}, \\ H^1(\Omega_h) &:= \{v \in L^2(\Omega) : \forall K \in \Omega_h, v|_K \in H^1(K)\}, \\ H_0^{1/2}(\partial\Omega_h) &:= \{\eta \in \prod_{K \in \Omega_h} H^{1/2}(\partial K) : \exists w \in H_0^1(\Omega) \text{ such that} \\ &\quad \forall K \in \Omega_h, \eta|_{\partial K} = w|_{\partial K}\}, \\ H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega_h) &:= \{\eta \in \prod_{K \in \Omega_h} H^{-1/2}(\partial K) : \exists q \in H(\operatorname{div}, \Omega) \text{ such that} \\ &\quad \forall K \in \Omega_h, \eta|_{\partial K} = q \cdot n|_{\partial K}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Throughout this paper, the  $L^2$  scalar product  $(\cdot, \cdot)_\Omega$  denotes the integral over  $\Omega$  of the appropriate product of its arguments (which can be scalar, vector, or matrix valued functions). In contrast,  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\Omega_h}$  abbreviates the sum of all scalar products  $(\cdot, \cdot)_K$  over all  $K \in \Omega_h$ . The latter notation serves to clarify that any differential operators acting on its arguments are applied piecewise, element by element. The norms of  $(v, q, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n)$  in  $H^1(\Omega_h) \times H(\operatorname{div}, \Omega_h) \times H_0^{1/2}(\partial\Omega_h) \times H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega_h)$  read

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega_h)}^2 &= (v, v)_{\Omega_h} + (\operatorname{grad} v, \operatorname{grad} v)_{\Omega_h}, \\ \|q\|_{H(\operatorname{div}, \Omega_h)}^2 &= (q, q)_{\Omega_h} + (\operatorname{div} q, \operatorname{div} q)_{\Omega_h}, \\ \|\hat{u}\|_{H_0^{1/2}(\partial\Omega_h)} &= \inf_{w \in E_{\operatorname{grad}}(\hat{u})} \|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \\ \|\hat{\sigma}_n\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega_h)} &= \inf_{q \in E_{\operatorname{div}}(\hat{\sigma}_n)} \|q\|_{H(\operatorname{div}, \Omega)}, \\ \|(\sigma, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n)\|_X^2 &= \|\sigma\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\hat{u}\|_{H_0^{1/2}(\partial\Omega_h)}^2 + \|\hat{\sigma}_n\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega_h)}^2, \\ \|(\tau, v)\|_Y^2 &= \|\tau\|_{H(\operatorname{div}, \Omega_h)}^2 + \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega_h)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $E_{\operatorname{grad}}(\hat{u}) = \{w \in H_0^1(\Omega) : \forall K \in \Omega_h, \hat{u}|_{\partial K} = w|_{\partial K}\}$  and  $E_{\operatorname{div}}(\hat{\sigma}_n) = \{q \in H(\operatorname{div}, \Omega) : \forall K \in \Omega_h, \hat{\sigma}_n|_{\partial K} = q \cdot n|_{\partial K}\}$ .

Reformulating (3.1) into the first order system  $\sigma = -\operatorname{grad} u$ ,  $\operatorname{div} \sigma = f$ , an ultraweak formulation can be derived, which reads as follows: Given some  $f$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$ , find  $x \equiv (\sigma, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n) \in X$  satisfying

$$b(x, y) = F(y) \quad \text{for all } y \equiv (\tau, v) \in Y$$

with the forms  $b(\cdot, \cdot)$  and  $F(\cdot)$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned} b(x, y) &:= (\sigma, \tau)_\Omega - (u, \operatorname{div} \tau)_{\Omega_h} + \langle \hat{u}, \tau \cdot n \rangle_{\partial\Omega_h} - (\sigma, \operatorname{grad} v)_{\Omega_h} + \langle \hat{\sigma}_n, v \rangle_{\partial\Omega_h}, \\ F(y) &:= (f, v)_\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Here and throughout this paper,  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\partial\Omega_h}$  denotes the sum of duality pairings which extend the appropriate  $L^2$  inner product of scalar or vector valued functions on  $\partial K$ ,

over all  $K \in \Omega_h$ . Further details such as the formal equivalence of the ultraweak formulation with the strong and weak formulation of the Poisson model problem at hand, and a gentle derivation, can be found in [17].

Let  $p \geq 0$  denote an integer,  $P_p(K)$  denote the space of (algebraic) polynomials of degree at most  $p$ , with the convention that  $P_{-1}(K)$  is trivial,  $P_p(K; \mathbb{R}^N)$  denote the space of vector-valued functions with components in  $P_p(K)$ , and  $R_p(K) := P_p(K, \mathbb{R}^N) + xP_p(K)$  denote the standard Raviart-Thomas function space on a simplex  $K$ . Let  $P_p(\Omega_h) = \{v : v|_K \in P_p(K), \forall K \in \Omega_h\}$ . Let  $\Delta_{N-1}(K)$  denote the set of all  $(N-1)$ -dimensional subsimplices of an  $N$ -simplex  $K$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} P_p(\partial K) &:= \{\mu \in L^2(\partial K) : \mu|_F \in P_p(F) \text{ for all } F \in \Delta_{N-1}(K)\}, \\ \tilde{P}_p(\partial K) &:= P_p(\partial K) \cap C^0(\partial K). \end{aligned}$$

Set the finite-dimensional trial space  $X_h$  and the test space  $Y_h$  by

$$(3.2a) \quad X_h := \{(\sigma, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n) \in X : \forall K \in \Omega_h, \sigma|_K \in P_p(K; \mathbb{R}^N), u|_K \in P_p(K), \\ \hat{u}|_{\partial K} \in \tilde{P}_{p+1}(\partial K), \hat{\sigma}_n|_{\partial K} \in P_p(\partial K)\},$$

$$(3.2b) \quad Y_h := \{(\tau, v) \in Y : \forall K \in \Omega_h, \tau|_K \in R_{p+1}(K), v|_K \in P_{p+N}(K)\}.$$

This example meets all the assumptions of the abstract *a posteriori* analysis of the previous section, as seen next. Let  $f_K$  denote the integral mean of  $f$  over a simplex  $K$  of diameter  $h_K$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *There exist mesh-size independent positive constants  $C_1, C_2$ , and  $C_3$  such that the exact solution  $x$  of the ultraweak formulation for the Laplace equation and any discrete function  $\tilde{x}_h \in X_h$  with its error estimator  $\tilde{\eta} := \|F - B\tilde{x}_h\|_{Y_h^*}$  satisfy*

$$C_1 \|x - \tilde{x}_h\|_X^2 - C_2 \text{osc}(F)^2 \leq \tilde{\eta}^2 \leq C_3 \|x - \tilde{x}_h\|_X^2.$$

Furthermore, if  $p \geq 1$ , there is a mesh independent constant  $C_4 > 0$  such that

$$(3.3) \quad \text{osc}(F)^2 \leq C_4 \sum_{K \in \Omega_h} \|h_K(f - f_K)\|_{L^2(K)}^2.$$

The remaining parts of this section provide some details on (H1)-(H3) so that Theorem 3.1 is identified as a particular case of Theorem 2.1. Let  $0 < C < \infty$  denote a generic constant, whose values at different occurrences may differ, but will remain independent of  $h_K$  for all  $K \in \Omega_h$ . The value of  $C$  may depend on the shape (angles) of the simplices and on  $p$ .

**Lemma 3.2** ([22]). *For any  $p \geq 0$ , there exists a  $C$  and a bounded linear operator  $\Pi_{p+N}^{\text{grad}} : H^1(K) \rightarrow P_{p+N}(K)$  such that all  $v \in H^1(K)$ ,*

$$(3.4a) \quad (\Pi_{p+N}^{\text{grad}} v - v, q_{p-1})_K = 0, \quad \forall q_{p-1} \in P_{p-1}(K),$$

$$(3.4b) \quad \langle \Pi_{p+N}^{\text{grad}} v - v, \mu_p \rangle_{\partial K} = 0, \quad \forall \mu_p \in P_p(\partial K),$$

$$(3.4c) \quad \|\Pi_{p+N}^{\text{grad}} v\|_{H^1(K)} \leq C \|v\|_{H^1(K)},$$

$$(3.4d) \quad \|v - \Pi_{p+N}^{\text{grad}} v\|_{L^2(K)} \leq Ch_K |v|_{H^1(K)}.$$



*Proof.* Properties (3.4a)–(3.4c) can be found in [22, Lemma 3.2]. Although (3.4d) is not explicitly stated in [22], it follows from the arguments therein: The design of  $\Pi_{p+N}^{\text{grad}}$  in [22] shows  $v - \Pi_{p+N}^{\text{grad}}v = \Pi_0(v - v_K)$  for the integral mean  $v_K$  of  $v$  over  $K$  and some bounded linear operator  $\Pi_0 : H^1(K) \rightarrow L^2(K)$ . Then (3.4d) follows from a Poincaré inequality.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3** (see [22, Lemma 3.3]). *For any  $p \geq 0$ , there exists a  $C$  and a bounded linear operator  $\Pi_{p+2}^{\text{div}} : H(\text{div}, K) \mapsto P_{p+2}(K; \mathbb{R}^N)$  such that for all  $\tau \in H(\text{div}, K)$ ,*

$$(3.5a) \quad (\Pi_{p+2}^{\text{div}}\tau - \tau, q_p)_K = 0, \quad \forall q_p \in P_p(K; \mathbb{R}^N),$$

$$(3.5b) \quad \langle (\Pi_{p+2}^{\text{div}}\tau - \tau) \cdot n, \mu_{p+1} \rangle_{\partial K} = 0 \quad \forall \mu_{p+1} \in \tilde{P}_{p+1}(\partial K),$$

$$(3.5c) \quad \|\Pi_{p+2}^{\text{div}}\tau\|_{H(\text{div}, K)} \leq C\|\tau\|_{H(\text{div}, K)}.$$

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* The boundedness of the bilinear form  $b$  in (H1) is shown in [17, §4.4]. Recall from [17, Theorem 4.2 and Lemma 4.1] that  $\{x \in X : b(x, y) = 0 \text{ for all } y \in Y\} = \{0\}$  and that

$$0 < \beta' := \inf_{y \in Y \setminus \{0\}} \sup_{x \in X \setminus \{0\}} \frac{b(x, y)}{\|x\|_X \|y\|_Y}$$

with some mesh-size independent constant  $\beta'$ . By duality of linear operators, this implies (H2) with  $\beta = \beta'$ .

From Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, it is easy to see that the tensor product  $\Pi$ ,

$$\Pi(\tau, v) := (\Pi_{p+2}^{\text{div}}\tau, \Pi_{p+N}^{\text{grad}}v) \quad \text{for all } (\tau, v) \in Y,$$

verifies (H3). Hence the reliability and efficiency in the Theorem 3.1 follow from Theorem 2.1.

Moreover, the data approximation term  $\text{osc}(F)$  from (1.12) can be simplified: For any  $y \equiv (\tau, v) \in Y$  and any  $f_{p-1} \in P_{p-1}(\Omega_h)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (F \circ (1 - \Pi))(y) &= F(y - \Pi y) = (f, v - \Pi_{p+N}^{\text{grad}}v)_{\Omega_h} \\ &= (f - f_{p-1}, v - \Pi_{p+N}^{\text{grad}}v)_{\Omega_h}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (3.4d) implies (3.3).  $\square$

Similar arguments also prove the reliability and efficiency of the estimator for a different DPG method for the Laplacian in [18], an example omitted for brevity.

**3.2. Linearized elasticity.** The DPG method of [7] for a linear elastic body  $\Omega$  in  $N = 2$  or  $3$  space dimensions concerns the boundary value problem which, given some volume force  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ , seeks the displacement  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$  and stress  $\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$  satisfying

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} A\sigma &= \varepsilon(u) && \text{on } \Omega, \\ \text{div } \sigma &= f && \text{on } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Here and throughout this paper,  $\mathbb{S} = \text{sym}(\mathbb{M})$  and  $\mathbb{K} = \text{skw}(\mathbb{M})$  where  $\text{sym}(M) = (M + M^T)/2$  and  $\text{skw}(M) = (M - M^T)/2$  for any matrix  $M \in \mathbb{M} := \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ . The inner product between matrices  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  is the Frobenius inner product  $\sigma : \tau = \text{tr}(\sigma^T \tau)$  with the trace  $\text{tr} \tau := \tau_{11} + \dots + \tau_{NN} = \tau : I_{N \times N}$ . The divergence on matrix fields is taken row-wise and  $\varepsilon(u) = \text{sym}(\text{grad } u)$  is the linear Green strain. Let the trace-free deviatoric part of any matrix  $\tau \in \mathbb{M}$  be denoted by  $\text{dev } \tau = \tau - \frac{1}{N} \text{tr}(\tau) I_{N \times N}$ . The compliance tensor  $A \equiv A(x)$  is a self-adjoint positive-definite fourth-order tensor, which (for simplicity) is isotropic in that the positive Lamé parameters  $P, Q \in P_0(\Omega_h)$  satisfy

$$A\tau = P \text{dev } \tau + \frac{Q}{N} \text{tr}(\tau) I_{N \times N} \quad \text{for all } \tau \in \mathbb{M}.$$

The weak formulation of linear elasticity is included in the abstract setting for

$$(3.7a) \quad X = L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N) \times H_0^{1/2}(\partial\Omega_h; \mathbb{R}^N) \times H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega_h; \mathbb{R}^N) \times \mathbb{R},$$

$$(3.7b) \quad Y = H(\text{div}, \Omega_h; \mathbb{S}) \times H^1(\Omega_h; \mathbb{R}^N) \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{K}) \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Here and throughout this paper, notations for spaces of scalar-valued functions are extended to analogous spaces of vector-valued and matrix-valued functions without much ado. For instance,  $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M})$  denotes the set of matrix-valued functions whose entries belong to  $L^2(\Omega)$ ;  $H_0^{1/2}(\partial\Omega_h; \mathbb{R}^N)$  consists of vector-functions with components in  $H_0^{1/2}(\partial\Omega_h)$ ;  $H(\text{div}, \Omega_h; \mathbb{S})$  denotes symmetric matrix-valued functions with rows in  $H(\text{div}, \Omega_h)$ , etc. The notation for polynomial spaces is extended similarly, e.g., symmetric, skew-symmetric, and general matrix-valued functions with entries in  $P_p(K)$  read  $P_p(K; \mathbb{S})$ ,  $P_p(K; \mathbb{K})$ , and  $P_p(K; \mathbb{M})$ .

The weak formulation of (3.6) of [7] seeks  $x \equiv (\sigma, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n, \alpha) \in X$  with

$$b(x, y) = F(y) \quad \text{for all } y \equiv (\tau, v, q, \omega) \in Y,$$

where  $Q_0$  is the essential infimum of  $Q(x)$  over  $x \in \Omega$  and

$$(3.7c) \quad \begin{aligned} b(x, y) &:= (A\sigma, \tau)_\Omega + (u, \text{div } \tau)_{\Omega_h} - \langle \hat{u}, \tau n \rangle_{\partial\Omega_h} + Q_0^{-1}(\alpha I_{N \times N}, A\tau)_\Omega \\ &\quad + (\sigma, \nabla v)_{\Omega_h} + (\sigma, q)_\Omega - \langle \hat{\sigma}_n, v \rangle_{\partial\Omega_h} + Q_0^{-1}(A\sigma, \omega I_{N \times N})_\Omega, \\ F(y) &:= -(f, v)_\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

The DPG solution  $x_h$  for linear elasticity is defined by (1.3) for  $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and

$$(3.7d) \quad X_h := \{(\sigma, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n, \alpha) \in X : \forall K \in \Omega_h, \sigma|_K \in P_p(K; \mathbb{M}), u|_K \in P_p(K; \mathbb{R}^N), \\ \hat{u}|_{\partial K} \in \tilde{P}_{p+1}(\partial K; \mathbb{R}^N), \hat{\sigma}_n|_{\partial K} \in P_p(\partial K; \mathbb{R}^N), \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

$$(3.7e) \quad Y_h := \{(\tau, v, q, \omega) \in Y : \forall K \in \Omega_h, \tau|_K \in P_{p+2}(K; \mathbb{S}), \\ v|_K \in P_{p+N}(K; \mathbb{R}^N), q|_K \in P_p(K; \mathbb{K}), \omega \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

The second part of this section provides some details on (H1)-(H3) such that Theorem 2.1 guarantees reliable and efficient error control. The verification of (H3) utilizes the following operator constructed in [22, Lemma 4.1] using the degrees of

freedom for symmetric matrices with polynomial entries given in [21]. An operator different from tensor product (matrix version) of the operator  $\Pi_{p+2}^{\text{div}}$  given in Lemma 3.3 is required due to the symmetry of  $\tau$ .

**Lemma 3.4** (see [22, Lemma 4.1]). *For any  $p \geq 0$ , there exists a  $C > 0$  and a operator  $\Pi_{p+2}^{\text{div}, \mathbb{S}} : H(\text{div}, K; \mathbb{S}) \rightarrow P_{p+2}(K; \mathbb{S})$  such that every  $\tau \in H(\text{div}, K; \mathbb{S})$  satisfies*

$$(3.8a) \quad (\Pi_{p+2}^{\text{div}, \mathbb{S}} \tau, q_p)_K = (\tau, q_p)_K \quad \text{for all } q_p \in P_p(K; \mathbb{S}),$$

$$(3.8b) \quad \langle \Pi_{p+2}^{\text{div}, \mathbb{S}} \tau \cdot n, \mu_{p+1} \rangle_{\partial K} = \langle \mu_{p+1}, \tau \cdot n \rangle_{1/2, \partial K} \quad \text{for all } \mu_{p+1} \in \tilde{P}_{p+1}(\partial K; \mathbb{R}^N),$$

$$(3.8c) \quad \|\Pi_{p+2}^{\text{div}, \mathbb{S}} \tau\|_{H(\text{div}, K)} \leq C \|\tau\|_{H(\text{div}, K)}.$$

To verify (H3), apply the operator of Lemma (3.8) to  $\tau$ , the operator of Lemma 3.2 to each component of  $v$ , and the  $L^2$ -orthogonal projection  $P_p^{\mathbb{K}} q$  of  $q$  into  $P_p(K, \mathbb{K})$ , i.e., set

$$\Pi y = (\Pi_{p+2}^{\text{div}, \mathbb{S}} \tau, \Pi_{p+N}^{\text{grad}} v, P_p^{\mathbb{K}} q, \omega)$$

for all  $y \equiv (\tau, v, q, \omega)$  in  $Y$ .

**Lemma 3.5** (see [7, Lemma 5]). *There exists a constant  $C_0 > 0$  independent of  $\Omega_h$  and  $Q$  such that (H2) holds for the DPG method (3.7) with*

$$\beta = C_0 / \zeta^4 \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta = \|Q\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} / Q_0. \quad \square$$

This is a *locking-free* inf-sup condition because  $\beta$  does not degenerate when a homogeneous material approaches the incompressibility limit (i.e., when  $Q$  is constant on  $\Omega$  and  $Q \rightarrow 0$ ). The aforementioned results allow immediate verification of Assumptions (H1)-(H3) so that Theorem 2.1 leads to the reliability and efficiency of the error estimator for the linear elasticity formulation (3.7). The constants in these estimates are independent of  $Q$  when  $Q$  is constant on  $\Omega$ .

The remaining parts of this section concern the analysis of a symmetric variant of the above DPG method, which strongly imposes symmetry of the stress tensor and seeks  $\sigma$  in  $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{S})$ . This variant, although not presented in [7], can be easily analyzed using the above results. Given  $X, Y, X_h, Y_h, b$  as above in (3.7), ignore the variable  $q$  from the previous analysis and set

$$(3.9a) \quad X_2 := \{(\sigma, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n, \alpha) \in X : \sigma^T = \sigma\} \quad \text{and} \quad X_{2,h} := X_h \cap X_2,$$

$$(3.9b) \quad Y_2 := H(\text{div}, \Omega_h; \mathbb{S}) \times H^1(\Omega_h; \mathbb{R}^N) \times \mathbb{R}$$

$$(3.9c) \quad Y_{2,h} := \{(\tau, v, \omega) \in Y_2 : (\tau, v, 0, \omega) \in Y_h\},$$

$$(3.9d) \quad b_2((\sigma, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n, \alpha), (\tau, v, \omega)) = b((\sigma, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n, \alpha), (\tau, v, 0, \omega)).$$

The new symmetric variant of the DPG method for linear elasticity seeks  $x_2 \equiv (\sigma, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n, \alpha)$  in  $X_2$  with

$$b_2(x_2, y_2) = F(y_2) \quad \text{for all } y_2 \equiv (\tau, v, \omega) \in Y_2.$$

**Theorem 3.6.** *The statements of Theorem 3.1 hold for the DPG formulations (3.7) and (3.9) in linear elasticity.*

*Proof.* The previous analysis of this section establishes (H1)-(H3) for the formulation (3.7). The Assumptions (H1) and (H3) for the formulation (3.9) follow just as for (3.7). Assumption (H2) is verified for the symmetric formulation (3.9) in the remaining part of this proof with  $\beta = C_0/\zeta^4$  from Lemma 3.5.

Since  $(\sigma, q)_{\Omega_h} = 0$  for all  $\sigma \in X_2$  and all  $q \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{K})$ , Lemma 3.5 implies, for all  $x_2 \in X_2$ , that

$$\beta \|x_2\|_X \leq \sup_{(\tau, v, q, \omega) \in Y \setminus \{0\}} \frac{b(x_2, (\tau, v, q, \omega))}{\|(\tau, v, q, \omega)\|_Y} \leq \sup_{(\tau, v, \omega) \in Y_2 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{b_2(x_2, (\tau, v, \omega))}{\|(\tau, v, \omega)\|_{Y_2}}.$$

To complete the verification of (H2), it remains to prove that any  $y_2 \equiv (\tau, v, \omega) \in Y_2$  satisfying  $b_2(x_2, y_2) = 0$  for all  $x_2 \in X_2$  must vanish. To prove this, observe

$$b((\sigma + \eta, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n, \alpha), (\tau, v, q, \omega)) = b_2(x_2, y_2) - (r, \text{skw}(\text{grad } v) + q)_\Omega$$

for all  $x_2 \equiv (\sigma, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n, \alpha)$  in  $X_2$  and all  $r, q \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{K})$ . Given  $y_2 \equiv (\tau, v, \omega) \in Y_2$  with  $b_2(x_2, y_2) = 0$  for all  $x_2 \in X_2$  define  $q := -\text{skw}(\text{grad } v)$ . The right-hand side in the aforementioned identity vanishes. Consequently,  $y := (\tau, v, q, \omega)$  satisfies  $b(x, (\tau, v, q, \omega)) = 0$  for all  $x \in X$ . Since (H2) holds for (3.7),  $(\tau, v, q, \omega) = 0$ .  $\square$

**3.3. A new DPG formulation for Stokes flow.** The equations of Stokes describe the steady state velocity  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$  and pressure  $p : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of a homogeneous fluid of constant viscosity  $\nu = 1/2$  via

$$(3.10a) \quad -\nu \Delta u + \text{grad } p = -f \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

$$(3.10b) \quad \text{div } u = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

This is complemented by the simple homogeneous boundary condition  $u = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$  and the side restriction  $(p, 1)_\Omega = 0$ . The pseudostress  $\tilde{\sigma} := 1/2 \text{grad } u - p\delta$  is often used to reformulate (3.10) into a first order system [8, 12, 31], but  $\tilde{\sigma}$  is not symmetric in general and is not the true fluid stress.

Within the DPG formalism however, it is easy to maintain symmetry. Hence a first order formulation with the symmetric physical stress  $\sigma = \varepsilon(u) - pI_{N \times N}$  serves as the starting point:

$$\sigma + p I_{N \times N} - \varepsilon(u) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

$$\text{div } \sigma = f \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

$$\text{div } u = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Using the notation of the previous subsection for the trace-free deviatoric part, these equations give an equivalent *stress-velocity* reformulation:

$$(3.11a) \quad \text{dev } \sigma - \varepsilon(u) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega,$$

$$(3.11b) \quad \text{div } \sigma = f \text{ in } \Omega,$$

$$(3.11c) \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} \text{tr } \sigma \, dx = 0.$$

Given any element domain  $K \in \Omega_h$ , test the first two equations of (3.11) with smooth  $\tau : K \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$  and  $v : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$  and integrate by parts. The sum over all  $K \in \Omega_h$  reads

$$\begin{aligned} (\operatorname{dev} \sigma, \tau)_\Omega + (u, \operatorname{div} \tau)_{\Omega_h} - \langle \hat{u}, \tau n \rangle_{\partial \Omega_h} &= 0, \\ -(\sigma, \varepsilon(v))_{\Omega_h} + \langle \hat{\sigma}_n, v \rangle_{\partial \Omega_h} &= (f, v)_\Omega \end{aligned}$$

where the traces of  $\sigma n$  and  $u$  on element interfaces are set as independent unknowns  $\hat{\sigma}_n$  and  $\hat{u}$ . Using a Lagrange multiplier  $\alpha$  to model the constraint (3.11c), the variational problem is to find  $x \equiv (\sigma, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n, \alpha) \in X_2$  such that  $b(x, y) = F(y)$  for all  $y \equiv (\tau, v, \omega) \in Y_2$  with  $X_2, X_{2,h}, Y_2, Y_{2,h}$  from (3.9a)–(3.9c) and

$$\begin{aligned} (3.12) \quad b(x, y) &:= (\operatorname{dev} \sigma, \tau)_\Omega + (u, \operatorname{div} \tau)_{\Omega_h} - \langle \hat{u}, \tau n \rangle_{\partial \Omega_h} + (\alpha, \operatorname{tr} \tau)_\Omega \\ &\quad + (\sigma, \varepsilon(v))_{\Omega_h} - \langle \hat{\sigma}_n, v \rangle_{\partial \Omega_h} + (\operatorname{tr} \sigma, \omega)_\Omega, \\ F(y) &:= -(f, v)_\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

This novel DPG method admits the following *a priori* and *a posteriori* error estimates for the  $x_h$  from (1.3) and the  $\eta$  from (1.8). (Of course, unlike the *a priori* estimate, the *a posteriori* estimate holds even if  $x_h$  is replaced by any  $\tilde{x}_h \in X_{2,h}$  for the reasons amply clarified previously.)

**Theorem 3.7.** *For any  $p \geq 0$ , there exist mesh-independent constants  $C_1, \dots, C_4 > 0$  such that*

$$(3.13) \quad \|x - x_h\|_X \leq C_1 \min_{\xi_h \in X_h} \|x - \xi_h\|_X,$$

$$(3.14) \quad C_4 \|x - x_h\|_X^2 - C_2 \operatorname{osc}(F)^2 \leq \eta^2 \leq C_3 \|x - x_h\|_X^2.$$

If  $p \geq 1$  then  $\operatorname{osc}(F)$  satisfies (3.3).

*Proof.* Since the verification of (H1) is immediate, this proof focusses on the proof of (H2) and (H3). For all  $y \equiv (\tau, v, \omega)$  in  $Y$  set

$$\Pi y = (\Pi_{p+2}^{\operatorname{div}, \mathbb{S}} \tau, \Pi_{p+N}^{\operatorname{grad}} v, \omega) \in Y_h,$$

where the operator  $\Pi_{p+N}^{\operatorname{grad}}$  of Lemma 3.2 applies component-wise to the vector-valued  $v$  and the operator  $\Pi_{p+2}^{\operatorname{div}, \mathbb{S}}$  from Lemma 3.4 applies to the symmetric matrix function  $\tau$ . The properties of  $\Pi$  verify Assumption (H3).

The proof of (H2) utilizes a perturbation argument that links the Stokes formulation to the elasticity formulation (3.9). Let the bilinear form  $b(\cdot, \cdot)$  in (3.12) be denoted by  $b_0(\cdot, \cdot)$  for the remaining parts of this proof. Given  $0 < \kappa < 1$ , define the compliance tensor  $A$  as in linear elasticity with constant  $P \equiv 1$  and  $Q \equiv \kappa$  and denote the resulting elasticity form  $b(\cdot, \cdot)$  of (3.9d) by  $b_\kappa(\cdot, \cdot)$ . From the definitions,

$$b_\kappa((\sigma, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n, \alpha), (\tau, v, \omega)) = b_0(\sigma, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n, \alpha), (\tau, v, \omega) + \frac{\kappa}{N} (\operatorname{tr} \sigma, \operatorname{tr} \tau)_\Omega.$$

The linear operators  $B_\kappa : X \rightarrow Y^*$  associated with  $b_\kappa(\cdot, \cdot)$  satisfy

$$(3.15) \quad \|B_0 - B_\kappa\| \leq c\kappa$$

with some  $\kappa$ -independent constant  $c > 0$ .

By the previous choice of  $A$ , Lemma 3.5 implies that  $\beta = C_0$ , a constant independent of  $\kappa$ . Hence  $B_\kappa$  is invertible and  $\|B_\kappa^{-1}\| \leq C_0^{-1}$ . This and the formula

$$B_{\kappa_1}^{-1} - B_{\kappa_2}^{-1} = B_{\kappa_1}^{-1}(B_{\kappa_2} - B_{\kappa_1})B_{\kappa_2}^{-1}$$

imply that the operator  $B \equiv B_0$  is a bijection and  $\|B^{-1}\| \leq C_0^{-1}$ . This completes the verification of (H2). Hence (3.14) follows from Theorem 2.1 and (3.13) follows from Remark 2.5.  $\square$

#### 4. NUMERICAL ILLUSTRATIONS

Results using adaptive and uniform  $h$ -refinements of triangular meshes (on two-dimensional domains) for the previously considered boundary value problems are reported in this section. (No  $p$ -refinements are considered.) The  $Y$ -norm of the restriction of  $\varepsilon_h$  on any mesh element  $K \in \Omega_h$  serves as a refinement indicator that marks elements for refinement in an adaptive loop. In each adaptive iteration,  $h$ -refinement is performed via a 50% maximum criterion, the discrete solution  $x_h$  is computed on the current mesh, the corresponding error representation  $\varepsilon_h$  is locally computed, and further elements are marked for refinement as necessary based on the element-wise norms of  $\varepsilon_h$ .

All adaptive refinements in the reports below use 1-irregular triangular meshes (with at most one hanging node per edge). These meshes pose no difficulty in the presented theory if one uses the so-called minimum rule: When a parent mesh edge is split into two child edges by a hanging node, the minimum rule sets interface variables to polynomials (not piecewise polynomials) on the parent edge, so definitions for trial and test spaces like (3.2a)-(3.2b) and (3.7d)-(3.7e) remain unchanged. Since  $\Pi$  was constructed element by element in all the previous examples, verification of (H3) on 1-irregular meshes is immediate for all those examples. Note that verification of (H1) and (H2) never used mesh conformity.

Denote the effectivity index for the discrete solution  $x_h$  and its perturbations  $\tilde{x}_h$  by

$$\rho = \frac{\eta}{\|x - x_h\|_X}, \quad \tilde{\rho} = \frac{\tilde{\eta}}{\|x - \tilde{x}_h\|_X},$$

where  $\eta$  and  $\tilde{\eta}$  are defined previously and locally computable – see (1.6) and Theorem 2.1. Although the constants in the estimates of Theorem 2.1 have been shown to be mesh-independent for the previously considered examples, their values influence the effectivity indices. In particular, the theory does not guarantee that the values of  $\rho$  and  $\tilde{\rho}$  are less than one. However, the numerical reports below show that their values are fairly close to one in the examples considered.

**4.1. The Laplace example.** Consider the method of §3.1 that yields an approximation to  $x = (\sigma, u, \hat{u}, \hat{\sigma}_n)$ , namely  $x_h = (\sigma_h, u_h, \hat{u}_h, \hat{\sigma}_{n,h})$  in the space  $X_h$  defined in (3.2a). Even in cases where the exact solution  $x$  is known, the computation of  $\|x - x_h\|_X$  is nontrivial because the components  $\|\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h\|_{H_0^{1/2}(\partial\Omega_h)}$  and

$\|\hat{\sigma} - \hat{\sigma}_{n,h}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega_h)}$  in the norm are defined using an infimum over an infinite-dimensional hyperspace. Here and in the remainder, such quotient norms are always approximated by an infimum over an appropriate finite-dimensional subset. E.g.,

$$\|\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h\|_{H_0^{1/2}(\partial\Omega_h)} = \inf_{w \in E_{\text{grad}}(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)} \|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$$

is approximated by

$$\inf_{w_h \in E_{\text{grad}}^h(\hat{u}_I - \hat{u}_h)} \|w_h\|_{H^1(\Omega)},$$

a computable infimum over the finite-dimensional hyperspace  $E_{\text{grad}}^h(\hat{u}_I - \hat{u}_h) = \{w_h \in H_0^1(\Omega) : \forall K \in \Omega_h, w|_{\partial K} = (u_I - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial K} \text{ and } w_h|_K \in P_{p+1}(K)\}$  where  $u_I$  is an  $H^1$ -interpolant of  $u$  of degree  $p+1$ . Then the next higher order element bubble functions are added and the minimum is recomputed. The process is repeated until the result (to a few significant digits) of the minimization remains unchanged. Similarly,

$$\|\hat{\sigma}_n - \hat{\sigma}_{n,h}\|_{H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega_h)} = \inf_{q \in E_{\text{div}}(\hat{\sigma}_n - \hat{\sigma}_{n,h})} \|q\|_{H(\text{div}, \Omega)}$$

is approximated by the infimum of  $\|q_h\|_{H(\text{div}, \Omega)}$  over all  $q_h$  in a Raviart-Thomas subspace of  $H(\text{div}, \Omega)$  such that  $q_h \cdot n|_{\partial K} = (\sigma_I \cdot n - \hat{\sigma}_{n,h})|_{\partial K}$  for all  $K \in \Omega_h$ , where  $\sigma_I$  is an interpolant of  $\sigma$  into the Raviart-Thomas space. These approximations, or its appropriate modifications for each boundary value problem, are used in each report below. At times the simplifications afforded by the problem are exploited, e.g., if  $\hat{u}$  is the trace of a harmonic solution, the norm in the minimization is modified to an equivalent graph norm to avoid interpolation of exact solution.

The first experiment solves the DPG method for the Laplace equation on the unit square with load set so that the exact solution is  $u = \sin(\pi x_1) \sin(\pi x_2)$ . For a series of successive uniform  $h$ -refinements, the error in computed solution and the corresponding effectivity indices  $\rho$  are shown in Figures 1a and 1c for  $p = 0, 1$ , and 2. Noting that the number of degrees of freedom  $N$  in the uniform refinement case is  $O(h^{-2})$ , the observed rates of convergence are as expected from the theory. The effectivity indices are fairly close to one, indicating that the error estimator and error are close.

Next, consider the Dirichlet problem on the L-shaped domain  $\Omega = (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1) \setminus [0, 1] \times [-1, 0]$  with boundary conditions set to yield the singular exact solution  $u(r, \theta) = r^{2/3} \sin(\frac{2}{3}(\theta + \frac{\pi}{2}))$ . Results from an  $h$ -adaptive algorithm using the DPG method with  $p = 2$  are reported in Figure 1b. The error estimator is observed to closely follow the actual error. Furthermore, near the end of adaptive iteration, despite the singularity in the solution, the rate of convergence appears to stabilize to the same rate as in the uniformly refined smooth solution case of Figure 1a ( $p = 2$ ).

The remaining plots in the panel simulate the effects of inexact solvers, or partially converged iterative solutions. This is done by randomly perturbing the values of the degrees of freedom of the computed solutions by 5% using a pseudo-random number generator. The effectivity indices  $\tilde{\rho}$  obtained when perturbing the solutions




FIGURE 1. Results from the Laplace example for a smooth solution (left) and a singular solution (right). (a): Rates of error reduction for a smooth solution under uniform refinements of the unit square. (b): Error and estimator in an  $h$ -adaptive algorithm for a singular solution with  $p = 2$  on L-shaped domain. (c): Effectivity indices for the solutions of (a). (d): Effectivity indices for the solutions of (b). (e): Changes in effectivity when solutions of (a) are perturbed at each uniform refinement. (f): Changes in effectivity when solutions of (b) are perturbed at each adaptive refinement.



in uniformly and adaptively refined cases are shown in Figures 1e and 1f respectively. The values remain close to one and show that the error estimator remains useful for inexact solutions. This completes the numerical illustration of the estimates of Theorem 3.1 for both the DPG solution  $x_h$  and an arbitrary  $\tilde{x}_h$  in the Laplace example.

**4.2. The elasticity example.** Experiments similar to §4.1 were also performed with the formulation (3.9), both on the unit square and the L-shaped domain. On the unit square, setting unit Lamé parameters, and the load so that both components of the exact displacement equal  $\sin(\pi x_1) \sin(\pi x_2)$ , plots of quantities analogous to those in Figure 1 are reported in Figure 2. On the L-shaped domain, the planar elastic properties are set to that of steel and an  $h$ -adaptive algorithm is run on the DPG method with  $p = 2$ . More details on the material properties of steel and the corresponding singular solution with a stress singularity of strength  $r^{-0.3962\dots}$  can be found in [7, §7.2.2]. Effectivity is reported both for the computed solution and for the 5% random perturbations, as before. In all cases, the values of indices  $\rho$  and  $\tilde{\rho}$  are comparable to the corresponding quantities in Figure 1. Further numerical results for the other DPG formulation for linear elasticity (3.7), including results from  $hp$ -adaptivity, have already been presented in [7].

**4.3. The Stokes example.** The Stokes problem is solved using the new DPG method of §3.3 on the unit square with data set so that the exact solution is  $u = \text{curl}(\sin(\pi x_1) \sin(\pi x_2))$ . The  $h$ -convergence rates for this new method has not been previously reported. The first plot in Figure 3 shows these rates for  $p = 0, 1$ , and 2, as the unit square is successively refined in a uniform fashion. Clearly, the number of degrees of freedom  $N$  is  $O(h^{-2})$  in these uniform refinements, so these observed rates are as predicted by the *a priori* estimate (3.13). The *a posteriori* estimate (3.14) is illustrated by the plot of  $\rho$ . The remaining plot of  $\tilde{\rho}$  shows that estimator remains effective even when the solution computed at each refinement is randomly perturbed by 5% as described for the previous examples.

Results from an  $h$ -adaptive algorithm applied to the DPG method for Stokes flow on a L-shaped domain are also portrayed in Figure 3. To describe this well-known [14, 23, 30] singular Stokes solution of Osborn, let  $z = 0.544484\dots$  be the nontrivial solution of  $z^2 = \sin^2(3z\pi/2)$  with the smallest positive real part, and let  $s_{\pm} = r^{1+z} \sin((z \pm 1)\theta)$ ,  $c_{\pm} = r^{1+z} \cos((z \pm 1)\theta)$ , and  $a_{\pm} = -z \cot(3z\pi/2)/(z \pm 1)$ . The singular Stokes solution with  $u = 0$  on the two edges meeting the origin is  $u = \text{curl}(a_+ s_+ + a_- s_- + c_+ - c_-)$ . On all except those two edges, the no-slip boundary condition of (3.11) was modified to traction boundary conditions and the correspondingly revised DPG method was implemented. The results in Figure 3 show the utility of the estimator in capturing the singularity correctly.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Ainsworth. A posteriori error estimation for discontinuous Galerkin finite element approximation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 45(4):1777–1798 (electronic), 2007.




FIGURE 2. Results from the elasticity example for a smooth solution (left) and a singular solution (right). (a): Convergence rates for a smooth solution under uniform refinements of the unit square. (b): Error and estimator in an  $h$ -adaptive algorithm with  $p = 2$  on L-shaped steel. (c): Effectivity indices for the solutions of (a). (d): Effectivity indices for the solutions of (b). (e): Changes in effectivity when solutions of (a) are perturbed at each uniform refinement. (f): Changes in effectivity when solutions of (b) are perturbed at each adaptive refinement.




FIGURE 3. Results from the Stokes example for a smooth solution (left) and a singular solution (right). (a): Convergence rates for a smooth solution under uniform refinements of the unit square. (b): Error and estimator in an  $h$ -adaptive algorithm with  $p = 2$  for the singular solution of Osborn. (c): Effectivity indices for the solutions of (a). (d): Effectivity indices for the solutions of (b). (e): Changes in effectivity when solutions of (a) are perturbed at each uniform refinement. (f): Changes in effectivity when solutions of (b) are perturbed at each adaptive refinement.

- [2] M. Ainsworth and J.T. Oden. *A Posteriori Error Estimation in Finite Element Analysis*. Wiley, Chichester 2000.
- [3] I. Babuška and T. Strouboulis. *The Finite Element Method and its Reliability*. Clarendon Press, Oxford 2001.
- [4] W. Bangerth and R. Rannacher. *Adaptive Finite Element Methods for Differential Equations*. Lectures in Mathematics. ETH-Zürich. Birkhäuser, Basel 2003.
- [5] Pavel B. Bochev and Max D. Gunzburger. *Least-squares finite element methods*, volume 166 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, New York, 2009.
- [6] A. Bonito and R. H. Nochetto. Quasi-optimal convergence rate of an adaptive discontinuous Galerkin method. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 48(2):734–771, 2010.
- [7] J. Bramwell, L. Demkowicz, J. Gopalakrishnan, and W. Qiu. A locking-free *hp* DPG method for linear elasticity with symmetric stresses. *Numer. Math.*, 122(4):671–707, December 2012.
- [8] Z. Cai and Y. Wang. A multigrid method for the pseudostress formulation of Stokes problems. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 29(5):2078–2095 (electronic), 2007.
- [9] C. Carstensen. *A unifying theory of a posteriori finite element error control*. *Numer. Math.* 100: 617–637 (2005).
- [10] C. Carstensen, T. Gudi, and M. Jensen. A unifying theory of a posteriori error control for discontinuous Galerkin FEM. *Numer. Math.*, 112(3):363–379, 2009.
- [11] C. Carstensen, M. Eigel, R. H. W. Hoppe, and C. Löbhard. A review of unified a posteriori finite element error control. *Numer. Math. Theory Methods Appl.*, 5(4):509–558, 2012.
- [12] C. Carstensen, D. Kim, and E.-J. Park. *A priori* and *a posteriori* pseudostress-velocity mixed finite element error analysis for the Stokes problem. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 49(6):2501–2523, 2011.
- [13] Al. Cohen, W. Dahmen and G. Welper. Adaptivity and Variational Stabilization for Convection-Diffusion Equations. Institut fuer Geometrie und Praktische Mathematik, *Report 2011-323*.
- [14] M. Dauge. Stationary Stokes and Navier-Stokes systems on two- or three-dimensional domains with corners. I. Linearized equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 20(1):74–97, 1989.
- [15] L. Demkowicz and J. Gopalakrishnan. A class of discontinuous Petrov-Galerkin methods. Part I: The transport equation. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 199:1558–1572, 2010.
- [16] L. Demkowicz and J. Gopalakrishnan. A class of discontinuous Petrov-Galerkin methods. Part II: Optimal test functions. *Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations*, 27(1):70–105, 2011.
- [17] L. Demkowicz and J. Gopalakrishnan. Analysis of the DPG method for the Poisson equation. *SIAM J Numer. Anal.*, 49(5):1788–1809, 2011.
- [18] L. Demkowicz and J. Gopalakrishnan. A primal DPG method without a first-order reformulation. *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, 66(6):1058–1064, 2013.
- [19] L. Demkowicz, J. Gopalakrishnan, and A. Niemi. A class of discontinuous Petrov-Galerkin methods. Part III: Adaptivity. *Applied Numerical Mathematics*, 62:396–427, 2012.
- [20] K. Eriksson, D. Estep, P. Hansbo and C. Johnson. *Computational Differential Equations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1995.
- [21] J. Gopalakrishnan and J. Guzmán. Symmetric non-conforming mixed finite elements for linear elasticity. *SIAM J Numer. Anal.*, 49(4):1504–1520, 2011.
- [22] J. Gopalakrishnan and W. Qiu. An analysis of the practical DPG method. *Mathematics of Computation*, 83(286):537–552, 2014 (electronically appeared 2013).
- [23] P. Grisvard. *Singularities in boundary value problems*, volume 22 of *Recherches en Mathématiques Appliquées*. Masson, Paris, 1992.

- [24] P. Hansbo and M. G. Larson. Energy norm a posteriori error estimates for discontinuous Galerkin approximations of the linear elasticity problem. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 200(45-46):3026–3030, 2011.
- [25] P. Houston, D. Schötzau, and T. P. Wihler. Energy norm a posteriori error estimation for mixed discontinuous Galerkin approximations of the Stokes problem. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 22/23:347–370, 2005.
- [26] P. Houston, D. Schötzau, and T. P. Wihler. An *hp*-adaptive mixed discontinuous Galerkin FEM for nearly incompressible linear elasticity. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 195(25-28):3224–3246, 2006.
- [27] O. A. Karakashian and F. Pascal. A posteriori error estimates for a discontinuous Galerkin approximation of second-order elliptic problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 41(6):2374–2399 (electronic), 2003.
- [28] O. A. Karakashian and F. Pascal. Convergence of adaptive discontinuous Galerkin approximations of second-order elliptic problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 45(2):641–665 (electronic), 2007.
- [29] J.T. Oden, L. Demkowicz, T. Stroubolis and Ph. Devloo. Adaptive Methods for Problems in Solid and Fluid Mechanics. *Accuracy Estimates and Adaptive Refinements in Finite Element Computations* (I. Babuška, O.C. Zienkiewicz, J. Gago and E.R.A. de Oliveira, editors), John Wiley and Sons Ltd., London 1986.
- [30] J. Osborn. Regularity of the solutions of the Stokes problem in a polygonal domain. In B. Hubbard, editor, *Symposium on numerical solutions of partial differential equations III*, pages 393–411, 1975.
- [31] N. Roberts, T. Bui-Thanh, and L. Demkowicz. The DPG method for the Stokes problem. *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, To appear.
- [32] T. P. Wihler. Locking-free adaptive discontinuous Galerkin FEM for linear elasticity problems. *Math. Comp.*, 75(255):1087–1102, 2006.
- [33] R. Verfürth. *A Review of A Posteriori Estimation and Adaptive Mesh-Refinement Techniques*. Wiley-Teubner, New York – Stuttgart 1996.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HUMBOLDT-UNIVERSITÄT ZU BERLIN, UNTER DEN LINDEN  
6, 10099 BERLIN, GERMANY

*E-mail address:* `cc@math.hu-berlin.de`

INSTITUTE FOR COMPUTATIONAL ENGINEERING AND SCIENCES, THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS  
AT AUSTIN, AUSTIN, TX 78712, USA

*E-mail address:* `leszek@ices.utexas.edu`

PO BOX 751, PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY, PORTLAND, OR 97207-0751, USA

*E-mail address:* `gjay@pdx.edu`