REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Technical NOte BN-1185	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE *(and Subtitle)* The Partition of Unity Finite Element Method		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Life of Contract
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) I. Babuska[1] and J. M. Melenk[2]		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) [1]ONR/N00014-90-J-1030
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Institute for Physical Science and Technology University of Maryland College Park, MD 207042-2431		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Department of the Navy Office of Naval Research Arlington, VA 22217		12. REPORT DATE April/June 1995
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 34
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS *(if different from Controlling Office)*		15. SECURITY CLASS. *(of this report)*
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT *(of this Report)*

Approved for public release: distribution unlimited

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT *(of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)*

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS *(Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)*

Finite element method, meshless finite element method, finite element methods for highly oscillatory solutions

20. ABSTRACT   A new finite element method is presented that features the ability to include in the finite element space knowledge about the partial differential equation being solved. This new method can therefore be more efficient than the usual finite element methods. An additional feature of the partition-of-unity finite element method is that finite element spaces of any desired regularity can be constructed very easily. Moreover, the method is of "meshless" type. This paper includes a convergence proof of this method and illustrates its efficiency by an application to the Helmholtz equation for high wave numbers. The basic estimates for a-posteriori error estimation for this new method are also proved.

DD FORM 1473   EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
1 JAN 73

S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

THE PARTITION OF UNITY FINITE ELEMENT METHOD

by

I. Babuška

and

J. M. Melenk

April 1995

Institute for
Physical Science and Technology

The Partition of Unity Finite Element Method

I. Babuška*   J. M. Melenk[†]

June 21, 1995

Abstract

A new finite element method is presented that features the ability to include in the finite element space knowledge about the partial differential equation being solved. This new method can therefore be more efficient than the usual finite element methods. An additional feature of the partition-of-unity finite element method is that finite element spaces of any desired regularity can be constructed very easily. Moreover, the method is of "meshless" type. This paper includes a convergence proof of this method and illustrates its efficiency by an application to the Helmholtz equation for high wave numbers. The basic estimates for a-posteriori error estimation for this new method are also proved.

Key words: Finite element method, meshless finite element method, finite element methods for highly oscillatory solutions

1 Introduction

In this paper, we present a new method, the "partition of unity finite element method" (PUFEM) to construct conforming finite element spaces (FE spaces) with local properties determined by the user. The features of the PUFEM are:

1. The ability to include *a-priori* knowledge about the partial differential equation in the FE space,

2. the construction of FE spaces of any given regularity (which is a desirable feature for the approximation of higher order equations),

3. the method is "mesh–free",

4. the method can be understood as a generalization of the classical finite element methods; in particular the h, p, and hp versions of the finite element method can be understood as special cases of the PUFEM,

5. the PUFEM permits *a-posteriori* error estimation and adaptive approaches.

Let us elaborate these five features in more detail. The first feature touches the question of approximation properties of the FE spaces. The classical FE spaces, known as h and p version of the finite element method, are spaces which have good local approximation properties and are conforming; typically they consist of piecewise polynomials (or mapped polynomials) and satisfy some continuity requirement across inter-element boundaries. In the h version, the polynomial degree is fixed (typically $p \leq 2$) and approximation is achieved by decreasing the meshsize h. An appropriate interpolant (e.g., for $p = 1$ on triangles, nodal interpolation can be taken) produces a good approximation which satisfies the necessary continuity conditions. In the p version, local approximation is realized by polynomials of increasingly higher degree. The approximation properties of conforming p extensions are due to two facts. Unconstrained, i.e., without any inter-element continuity constraints, polynomials have good approximation properties on each patch. The resulting jumps across inter-element boundaries can be resolved by polynomial corrections because polynomial spaces are large enough to permit continuous extensions from the element boundaries into the elements (see [18],[20]).

For many problems, the particular structure of the equation can be exploited to construct local spaces with better approximation properties than the usual h or p version based spaces. For example, solutions to Laplace's equation ($\Delta u = 0$) in the plane can be approximated by harmonic polynomials only; it is not necessary to use all polynomials for an approximation in a p version fashion. However, as opposed to full polynomial spaces, there are not enough harmonic polynomials to construct conforming spaces which consist of piecewise harmonic polynomials. The PUFEM however, allows us to construct conforming spaces from harmonic polynomials and thus exploit their good approximation properties.

Let us mention a few examples, for which the special structure of the underlying partial differential equation can be exploited. "Generalized harmonic polynomials" can be constructed for elliptic equation with analytic coefficients. These "generalized harmonic polynomials" have approximation properties very similar to those of harmonic polynomials (see [23, 3, 7, 8, 11]). For Laplace's equation or the elasticity equations, corners or sudden changes of boundary conditions produce certain types of singularities that are resolved very poorly by the classical methods unless a properly refined mesh is used. [14, 15] show that the use of special shape functions for these problems can be very efficient.

For problems of 3-d elasticity on polyhedral domains, the creation of a properly refined mesh can be complicated in the vertices, where vertex and several edge singularities interact. The PUFEM circumvents this difficulty because it enables the user to incorporate the singularities directly in the FE space.

The classical methods work well if the solution to be approximated is smooth. However, for many problems of practical interest, the solution is not smooth. It can be highly oscillatory as in the case of Helmholtz's equation with high wave numbers, or it can be rough, as in the case of the analysis of composites, laminated materials or stiffeners. The usual finite element methods can be prohibitively expense for this kind of problems. However, as shown in [17], the use of shape functions reflecting this rough behavior can lead to optimal convergence rates. A similar observation can be made for highly oscillatory problems such as Helmholtz's equation. It was demonstrated in [11] that the approximation with plane waves displaying the same oscillatory behavior as the solution is very efficient.

Another example, where non–polynomial approximation spaces are of physical interest, are problems on unbounded domains. For problems such as Laplace's equation or Helmholtz's equation, expansions of the solution around the point at infinity are known and can be used.

Let us comment on the second feature of the method, the ability to construct FE spaces of any given regularity. The PUFEM creates FE spaces as follows (a more detailed description follows below). Let patches $\{\Omega_i\}$ comprise a covering of the domain Ω, and let $\{\varphi_i\}$ be a partition of unity subordinate to the covering. On each patch, let function spaces V_i reflect the local approximability. Then the global finite element space V is given by $V = \sum_i \varphi_i V_i$. Local approximation in the spaces V_i can either be achieved by the smallness of the patch (an h version) or by good properties of V_i (a p version). Theorem 1 states that the global space V inherits the approximation properties of the local spaces V_i. Addionally, it inherits the smoothness of the partition of unity (and the spaces V_i). Therefore, the construction of smoother FE spaces for the approximation of higher order equations as they appear, for example, in various plate and shell models is easily possible by using a partition of unity which is sufficiently smooth.

Let us turn to the third feature. The method is mesh-free in the sense that no mesh has to be generated explicitly; rather, a "mesh" is determined implicitly through the overlapping patches of the covering. Let us observe that the creation of a partition

of unity can be easy (if w_i are functions living on the patches Ω_i, the functions $\varphi_i = w_i / \sum_j w_j$ form a partition of unity) and fully automated. Hence, changing the FE space adaptively is easy. Moreover, changes as they are very common for problems like crack propagation or the optimal placement of a fastener can be done easily. In the latter example, for instance, the user would like to calculate several possible locations of the fastener. In the usual finite element method, he has to remesh (at least locally) for each case, which could be costly. In the PUFEM, the effect of the fastener could be modeled by a special function and hence, for each run, only a few spaces V_i (in which these special function are contained) have to be changed. "Mesh-free" methods have been proposed recently in [9, 13]. For an appropriate choice of parameter values, the method of [9] reduces to a particular type of PUFEM, and the computational analysis of [13] shows that the method of [9] is most efficient in that case.

Commenting on the fourth point of the above list, we observe that the if we approximate locally on patches by polynomials of degree p, we get a FE space with approximation properties similar to the usual finite element methods. If the approximation in the spaces V_i is achieved through the smallness of the patches, we get a method very similar to the h version; if approximability is realized by an increase of the polynomial degree, the method behaves like the p version. If both are varied, we get an hp version. In this sense, the method presented here is a generalization of the usual finite element method. It has the feature to include in the FE space knowledge about the structure of the particular problem at hand; however, one can achieve local approximation by polynomials and then the method produces essentially the usual FE spaces.

Concerning the fifth point of the list, we mention that the PUFEM permits *a-posteriori* error estimation. The basic ideas for *a-posteriori* error estimation were developed in [1], [2] and in our development of *a-posteriori* error estimation, we will follow closely [1].

For a successful implementation of the PUFEM, three issues have to be addressed:

1. The integration of the shape functions constructed by the PUFEM.

2. Finding a basis of the PUFEM space and controlling the condition number of the stiffness matrix created by the PUFEM.

3. The implementation of essential boundary conditions.

Let us just briefly outline why these three issues arise. A more detailed analysis of these issues will be done in subsequent work. On the integration issue, we observe that typically the shape functions are defined on the patches. Integrating two shape functions against each other requires an integration over the intersection of two patches. Hence the integrator has to be able to integrate efficiently over intersections of patches. The issue of finding bases of the PUFEM spaces and the problem of controlling the conditioning numbers of the stiffness matrices is illustrated in section 3.3.

3

Finally, let us state that essential boundary conditions can be implemented in different ways. Either the local approximation spaces on patches close to the boundary are chosen large enough to permit an extension of the boundary data from boundary into the domain, or Lagrange multiplier or penalty methods are used.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we develop the PUFEM and give a proof of its approximation properties. In sections 3.1–3.4, we illustrate some of the features of the PUFEM in a one dimensional setting. In section 3.1, we demonstrate how the PUFEM produces robust finite element spaces for a problem with a boundary layer. The performance of the PUFEM for this particular problem is comparable to the usual finite element methods for problems with smooth solutions because the PUFEM allows us to create finite element spaces which capture precisely the behavior of the boundary layer. Section 3.2 proposes several types of partitions of unity which satisfy the necessary conditions for the PUFEM to work. Section 3.3 analyzes in more detail the case of polynomial local approximation spaces. In particular, the problem of potential linear dependencies and the issue of the condition number of the stiffness matrix is addressed. In section 3.4 finally, a PUFEM is exhibited, in which all the degrees of freedom have the meaning of the value of the approximating function in appropriate points. Sections 4.1 and 4.2 discuss briefly methods how to choose good local approximation spaces and the issue of the optimality of local spaces. Two numerical examples are presented. In section 6.1, the PUFEM is compared with the usual p versions for the approximation of harmonic functions. In section 6.2 the PUFEM is used for the approximation of solutions to Helmholtz's equation with large wave number. The PUFEM is shown to be superior (both in terms of error per degree of freedom and error per floating point operation) to several h version type finite element methods. The paper concludes with a proof of an *a posteriori* error estimator for the PUFEM, which is based on exact solutions of appropriate local problems.

2 The Method

In this section, we present our method of constructing conforming subspaces of $H^1(\Omega)$. We construct FE spaces which are subspaces of $H^1(\Omega)$ as an example because of their importance in applications. We would like to stress again that the method leads to the construction of smoother spaces in a straight forward manner. Crucial to the construction of the PUFEM spaces is the notion of a (M, C_∞, C_G) partition of unity.

Definition 1 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set, $\{\Omega_i\}$ be an open cover of Ω satisfying a pointwise overlap condition*

$$\exists M \in \mathbb{N} \qquad \forall x \in \Omega \qquad \text{card}\{i \,|\, x \in \Omega_i\} \le M.$$

4

Let $\{\varphi_i\}$ be a Lipschitz partition of unity subordinate to the cover $\{\Omega_i\}$ satisfying

$$\text{supp } \varphi_i \quad \subset \quad \text{closure}(\Omega_i) \qquad \forall i, \tag{1}$$

$$\sum_i \varphi_i \quad \equiv \quad 1 \text{ on } \Omega, \tag{2}$$

$$\|\varphi_i\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \leq \quad C_\infty, \tag{3}$$

$$\|\nabla\varphi_i\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \leq \quad \frac{C_G}{\text{diam }\Omega_i}, \tag{4}$$

where C_∞, C_G are two constants. Then $\{\varphi_i\}$ is called a (M, C_∞, C_G) partition of unity subordinate to the cover $\{\Omega_i\}$. The partition of unity $\{\varphi_i\}$ is said to be of degree $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ if $\{\varphi_i\} \subset C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The covering sets $\{\Omega_i\}$ are called patches.

Definition 2 *Let $\{\Omega_i\}$ be an open cover of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $\{\varphi_i\}$ be a (M, C_∞, C_G) partition of unity subordinate to $\{\Omega_i\}$. Let $V_i \subset H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)$ be given. Then the space*

$$V := \sum_i \varphi_i V_i = \{\sum_i \varphi_i v_i \,|\, v_i \in V_i\} \subset H^1(\Omega)$$

is called the PUFEM *space. The PUFEM space V is said to be of degree $m \in \mathbb{N}$ if $V \subset C^m(\Omega)$. The spaces V_i are referred to as the* local approximation *spaces.*

Theorem 1 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be given. Let $\{\Omega_i\}$, $\{\varphi_i\}$, and $\{V_i\}$ be as in definitions 1, 2. Let $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ be the function to be approximated. Assume that the local approximation spaces V_i have the following approximation properties: On each patch $\Omega_i \cap \Omega$, u can be approximated by a function $v_i \in V_i$ such that*

$$\|u - v_i\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} \quad \leq \quad \epsilon_1(i),$$
$$\|\nabla(u - v_i)\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} \quad \leq \quad \epsilon_2(i).$$

Then the function

$$u_{ap} = \sum_i \varphi_i v_i \in V \subset H^1(\Omega)$$

satisfies

$$\|u - u_{ap}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \leq \quad \sqrt{M} C_\infty \left(\sum_i \epsilon_1^2(i)\right)^{1/2},$$

$$\|\nabla(u - u_{ap})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \leq \quad \sqrt{2M} \left(\sum_i \left(\frac{C_G}{\text{diam }\Omega_i}\right)^2 \epsilon_1^2(i) + C_\infty^2 \epsilon_2^2(i)\right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof: Using the fact that $\sum_i \varphi_i \equiv 1$ on Ω, we can write $u - u_{ap} = \sum_i \varphi_i(u - v_i)$. The theorem follows after an application of the second estimate of lemma 2 with $u_i = \varphi_i(u - v_i)$. $\qquad \square$

Example 1: The PUFEM as h version. Let $u \in H^k(\Omega)$, $k \geq 1$. Let each patch Ω_i have diameter $h_i \leq h$, and let each V_i have approximation properties

$$
\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_1(i) &\leq C h_i^{\mu+1} \|u\|_{H^k(\Omega \cap \Omega_i)}, \\
\epsilon_2(i) &\leq C h_i^{\mu} \|u\|_{H^k(\Omega \cap \Omega_i)}
\end{aligned}
\tag{5}
$$

for some appropriate $\mu > 0$. Then the error estimates of theorem 1 take the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|u - u_{ap}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq M C_\infty C h^{\mu+1} \|u\|_{H^k(\Omega)} \\
\|\nabla(u - u_{ap})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq M C \sqrt{2(C_G + C_\infty)} h^{\mu} \|u\|_{H^k(\Omega)}
\end{aligned}
\tag{6}
$$

where we used the first estimate of lemma 2 in the estimate of the sums $\sum_i \epsilon_1(i)^2$, $\sum_i \epsilon_2(i)^2$. Note that estimate (6) holds for any system of local approximation spaces V_i satisfying (5). For example, if the spaces V_i consist of polynomials of degree p, then (5) holds with $\mu = \min(k-1, p)$. If the spaces V_i consist of harmonic polynomials of degree p, (5) holds also with $\mu = \min(k-1, p)$ if we know a priori that the function u is harmonic. In this example, local approximability of the spaces V_i (and thus global approximability by theorem 1) is achieved by the smallness of the patches $\Omega_i \cap \Omega$.

Example 2: The PUFEM as a p version. Let $u \in H^k(\Omega)$, $k \geq 1$, and let $\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be N fixed patches covering Ω. Denote $\text{diam}(\Omega_i)$ by h_i. Assume that the spaces V_i (depending on a parameter p) have the approximation properties

$$
\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_1(i) &\leq C h_i p^{-\mu} \|u\|_{H^k(\Omega \cap \Omega_i)}, \\
\epsilon_2(i) &\leq C p^{-\mu} \|u\|_{H^k(\Omega \cap \Omega_i)}
\end{aligned}
\tag{7}
$$

for some appropriate $\mu > 0$. Then the error estimates of theorem 1 take the form

$$
\|u - u_{ap}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq M C_\infty C \max_i h_i p^{-\mu} \|u\|_{H^k(\Omega)},
$$

$$
\|\nabla(u - u_{ap})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq M C \sqrt{2(C_G^2 + C_\infty^2)} p^{-\mu} \|u\|_{H^k(\Omega)}.
$$

Note that this estimate holds for any system V_i satisfying (7)—they do not have to polynomials of degree p. If the spaces V_i consist of polynomials of degree p then (7) holds with $\mu = k - 1$. Estimate (7) also holds for spaces V_i consisting of harmonic polynomials of degree p if the function u is known to be harmonic (see theorems 2, 3). In this example, the approximation properties of the global PUFEM space are achieved through increased approximability of the local spaces while keeping the patches fixed. If we allow the size of the patches to vary as well, then this method behaves like an hp version.

We would like to stress at this point that the requirements on the partition of unity are very weak: It only needs to be Lipschitzian in order to produce H^1 subspaces. Also, we do not need positivity of the partition of unity–the elements of the partition of unity are allowed to change sign. However, if the partition of unity is of degree m (and the local approximation spaces are sufficiently smooth), then the finite element

space V as constructed in definition 2 is also of degree m. Theorem 1 is formulated in terms of H^1, appropriate for a large class of second order problems. *Mutatis mutandis* however, the estimates can be formulated in terms of H^k, $k \geq 1$ to produce finite element spaces for higher order equations. Similar estimates can be achieved in Sobolev spaces $W^{k,p}$.

Remark 1: This idea of using a partition of unity to construct finite element spaces tailored to the differential equation has been used in [17], [10], and [11]. As mentioned in the introduction, for a judicious choice of parameters, the method of [9] reduces to a special type of PUFEM, and the convergence analysis of [13] for this special case is based on theorem 1.

3 The PUFEM in One Dimension

3.1 A One Dimensional Example

Let us demonstrate for a one dimensional model problem how FE spaces with good approximation properties are constructed with the PUFEM. To this end, consider

$$
\begin{aligned}
-u'' + k^2 u &= f \in C^2[0,1] \qquad \text{on } (0,1) \\
u(0) &= 0 \\
u'(1) &= g \in \mathbb{R}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{8}
$$

We assume that the parameter $k > 1$ is large. Associated with this problem is an "energy" norm, given by

$$
\|v\|_E := \left\{ \|v'\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + k^2 \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right\}^{1/2}.
$$

Let us note that for large k, the solution to problem (8) typically exhibits a boundary layer in the neighborhood of $x = 0$, and thus the usual FEM perform poorly unless h is sufficiently small (relative to k^{-1}) or a very strongly refined mesh is used. The PUFEM allows us to use local spaces reflecting this behavior, and therefore leads us to a robust FEM, i.e., a method which is good uniformly in k.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h = \frac{1}{n}$ and define $x_j = jh$, $j = 0, \ldots, n$. Define also $x_{-1} = -h$, $x_{n+1} = 1 + h$ and let the patch $\Omega_j = (x_{j-1}, x_{j+1})$, $j = 0, \ldots, n$. On each patch Ω_j, we have to define a local space which can approximate the solution u of problem (8) well. We consider

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_j^I &= \operatorname{span}\{1, \sinh kx, \cosh kx\} \text{ on } \Omega_j \cap \Omega, \qquad j = 1, \ldots, n, \\
V_0^I &= \operatorname{span}\{\sinh kx, 1 - \cosh kx\} \text{ on } \Omega_0 \cap \Omega.
\end{aligned}
$$

We note that the space V_0 is constructed such that it satisfies the essential boundary condition at $x = 0$. The approximation properties of these spaces, which are tailored to this particular problem (8), are given by the following

Lemma 1 *Let u be the solution to problem (7) and let Ω_j, V_j^I be as defined above. Then there are $v_j \in V_j^I$ such that*

$$\|(u - v_i)'\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} \leq Ch^{1/2} \left[h^2 \min\left(1, (kh)^{-2}\right) \|f'\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \frac{h^2}{k} \|f''\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right]$$

$$\|(u - v_i)\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} \leq Ch^{1/2} \left[h^3 \min\left(1, (kh)^{-2}\right) \|f'\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \right.$$

$$\left. + \frac{h^2}{k} \min(h, k^{-1}) \|f''\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right]$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of h, k, and f.

Proof: Because the spaces V_j^I contain the fundamental system $\{\sinh kx, \cosh kx\}$, it is enough to approximate a particular solution to

$$-u'' + k^2 u = f \qquad \text{on } \Omega_j \cap \Omega.$$

By Taylor's theorem, on $\Omega_j \cap \Omega$, $f(x) = l(x) + r(x)$ where $l(x)$ is linear and $|r(x)| \leq (2h)^2 \|f''\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ (note that $\operatorname{diam} \Omega_j \leq 2h$). A particular solution to the problem with right hand side $r(x)$ is given by the solution u_r to

$$\begin{aligned} -u_r'' + k^2 u_r &= r &&\text{on } \Omega_j \cap \Omega, \\ u &= 0 &&\text{on } \partial(\Omega_j \cap \Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\|u_r'\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_j \cap \Omega)} + k^2 \|u_r\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_j \cap \Omega)} \leq \frac{2h}{k^2} \|r\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega_j \cap \Omega)},$$

from whence

$$\|u_r'\|_{L^2(\Omega_j \cap \Omega)} \leq Ch^{1/2} \frac{h^2}{k} \|f''\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},$$

$$\|u_r\|_{L^2(\Omega_j \cap \Omega)} \leq Ch^{1/2} \frac{h^2}{k} \min(h, k^{-1}) \|f''\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$$

with $C > 0$ independent of h, k, and f. Finally, a particular solution to the problem with right hand side $l(x)$ is given by $u_l(x) = k^{-2} l(x)$ which can be approximated in V_j^I such that

$$\|u_l - v_j\|_{L^2(\Omega_j \cap \Omega)} + h\|(u_l - v_j)'\|_{L^2(\Omega_j \cap \Omega)} \leq Ch^3 h^{1/2} \min(1, (kh)^{-2}) \|f'\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of h, k, and f. The assertion of the lemma follows. $\square$

Remark 2: The spaces V_j^I were chosen as local approximation spaces because they contain the fundamental system $\{\sinh kx, \cosh kx\}$ and the particular solution

that corresponds to a constant right hand side. It is easy to check that the functions $\{1, x, \ldots, x^P\}$ actually span a space of particular solutions for polynomial right hand sides of degree p. Hence, lemma 1 can be adapted to produce the following approximation result. The spaces

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_j^I &= \operatorname{span}\{\sinh kx, \cosh kx, 1, x, \ldots, x^P\} \text{ on } \Omega_j \cap \Omega, \qquad j = 1, \ldots, n, \\
V_0^I &= \operatorname{span}\{\sinh kx, 1 - \cosh kx, x, \ldots, x^P\} \text{ on } \Omega_0 \cap \Omega.
\end{aligned}
$$

contain $v_j \in V_j^I$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|(u - v_i)'\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} &\leq C_p h^{1/2} \left[h^{p+2} \min\left(1, (kh)^{-2}\right) \|f^{(p+1)}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \right. \\
&\qquad \left. + \frac{h^{p+2}}{k} \|f^{(p+2)}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right] \\
\|(u - v_i)\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} &\leq C_p h^{1/2} \left[h^{p+3} \min\left(1, (kh)^{-2}\right) \|f^{(p+1)}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \right. \\
&\qquad \left. + \frac{h^{p+2}}{k} \min(h, \tfrac{1}{k}) \|f^{(p+2)}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right]
\end{aligned}
$$

for some C_p independent of h, k, p, and f.

For any partition of unity $\{\varphi_j\}$ subordinate to the covering $\{\Omega_j\}$, the finite element space V^I as constructed in definition 2 is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
V^I = \operatorname{span}\{ &\varphi_j(x), \varphi_j(x) \sinh kx, \varphi_j(x) \cosh kx, \\
&\varphi_0(x) \sinh kx, \varphi_0(x)(1 - \cosh kx) \mid j = 1, \ldots, n\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since the assumptions on the partition of unity stipulate that the functions φ_j be Lipschitz continuous, we see that $V^I \subset H^1(\Omega)$. Because each function φ_j is assumed to vanish outside the patch Ω_j, and because the elements of V_0^I vanish at $x = 0$, we see that all elements of V^I vanish at $x = 0$. Hence, a conforming finite element method can be based on V^I, and the finite element solution is the best approximant in the energy norm:

$$
\|u - u_{FE}\|_E \leq \inf_{v \in V^I} \|u - v\|_E.
$$

Therefore, with the aid of theorem 1, the local approximation properties of the spaces V_j^I in lemma 1 lead to

Proposition 1 *Let the patches $\{\Omega_j\}$ and the local approximation spaces $\{V_j^I\}$ be given as above. Let $\{\varphi_j\}$ be a (M, C_∞, C_G) partition of unity subordinate to the patches $\{\Omega_j\}$. Then the finite element solution u_{FE} of the PUFEM satisfies*

$$
\|u - u_{FE}\|_E \leq C h^2 \left\{ \min\left(1, (kh)^{-1}\right) \|f'\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + k^{-1} \|f''\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right\} \tag{8}
$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of h, k, and f.

This shows that the PUFEM enables us to construct robust finite element methods which are efficient uniformly in k, i.e., the finite element method behaves as well for rough case of large k as it does for the smooth case $k = 1$. The PUFEM gives these good uniform estimates because the local spaces V_j^I capture the local behavior of the exact solution very well. Note that the number of degrees of freedom is comparable to the number of degrees of freedom of the usual, piecewise quadratic finite element method which is – with the exception of (piecewise) quadratic solutions – of order h^2 and not better. Thus, the PUFEM is as good as the usual piecewise quadratic finite element method for the smooth case $k = 1$.

A simple adaptation of this idea is to choose the local spaces selectively. For example, since the right hand side f is smooth, we expect a boundary layer close to $x = 0$ but expect smooth behavior away from $x = 0$. Hence, it suffices to use the spaces V_j^I on patches close to $x = 0$, and we can use polynomials spaces $V_j = \text{span}\{1, x, \dots, x^p\}$ on patches away from $x = 0$. The idea of choosing the local approximation spaces selectively can also be employed in adaptive versions of the PUFEM. Keeping the patches and changing the degree p of the polynomials lets the PUFEM act like an adaptive p version; changing the size of the patches adaptively makes the PUFEM behave like an adaptive h version.

3.2   Examples of Partitions of Unity

In this section we propose several (M, C_∞, C_G) partitions of unity for the one dimensional example of the preceding section. Thus, the underlying cover of the domain $(0, 1)$ is the one given in the previous section.

1. The usual piecewise linear hat-functions form a partition of unity. Let

$$\varphi^1(x) = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{x}{h} & \text{for } x \in (-h, 0] \\ 1 - \frac{x}{h} & \text{for } x \in (0, h) \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere,} \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

and define the partition of unity by $\varphi_j^1(x) = \varphi(x - x_j)$, $j = 0, \dots, n$.

2. Functions which are identically 1 on a subset of their support can also form a partition of unity.

$$\varphi^2(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{3}{2} + 2\frac{x}{h} & \text{for } x \in \left(-\frac{3}{4}h, -\frac{h}{4}\right] \\ 1 & \text{for } x \in \left(-\frac{h}{4}, \frac{h}{4}\right) \\ \frac{3}{2} - 2\frac{x}{h} & \text{for } x \in \left(\frac{h}{4}, \frac{3}{4}h\right) \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere,} \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

and define the partition of unity by $\varphi_j^2(x) = \varphi(x - x_j)$, $j = 0, \dots, n$.

10

3. A combination of the above two examples is to choose the functions φ_j^1 for patches in the interior but to modify the functions on patches close to the boundary. Define

$$\varphi^3(x) = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{x}{h} & \text{for } x \in (-h, 0] \\ 1 & \text{for } x \in (0, h) \\ 2 - \frac{x}{h} & \text{for } x \in (h, 2h) \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

We observe that the patches $\Omega_0 \cup \Omega_1$, $\Omega_{n-1} \cup \Omega_n$ and Ω_j, $j = 2, \ldots, n-2$, cover Ω. On the patches Ω_j, $j = 2, \ldots, n-2$, we define $\varphi_j^3(x) = \varphi_j^1(x)$. On the patch $\Omega_0 \cup \Omega_1$ we choose $\varphi_1^3(x) = \varphi^3(x)$ and on the patch $\Omega_{n-1} \cup \Omega_n$ we choose $\varphi_{n-1}^3(x) = \varphi^3(x - x_{n-1})$. Note that $\varphi_1^3 = \varphi_0^1 + \varphi_1^1$ and $\varphi_{n-1}^3 = \varphi_{n-1}^1 + \varphi_n^1$.

4. In all three examples above, the partition of unity is merely Lipschitz continuous. However, partitions of unity of any desired regularity can be constructed. Here is a piecewise polynomial C^1 example. The resulting global finite element space V^{II} is then a subspace of $C^1[0, 1]$. Define

$$\varphi^4(x) = \frac{1}{h^3} \begin{cases} (x + h)^2(h - 2x) & \text{for } x \in (-h, 0] \\ (h - x)^2(h + 2x) & \text{for } x \in (0, h) \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere,} \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

and define the individual members of the partition of unity by $\varphi_j^4(x) = \varphi^4(x - x_j)$ on the patches Ω_j.

5. In this example, let Ω_j be any cover of Ω satisfying an overlap condition (i.e., not more than M patches overlap in any given point $x \in \Omega$). Let ψ_j be Lipschitz continuous functions supported by the patches Ω_j. If $|\psi_j'| \leq C$ and $\sum_i \psi_i \geq \tilde{C} \operatorname{diam} \Omega_j$ on each $\Omega_j \cap \Omega$, for some C, $\tilde{C} > 0$ independent of j, then the functions

$$\varphi_j(x) = \frac{\psi_j(x)}{\sum_i \psi_i(x)}$$

form a $(M, C\tilde{C}^{-1}, C\tilde{C}^{-1}(1 + MC^2\tilde{C}^{-2}))$ partition of unity subordinate to the cover $\{\Omega_j\}$. Note that the functions ψ_j scale with their supports in the sense that $|\psi_j| \leq C \operatorname{diam} \Omega_j$. The functions φ_j inherit the smoothness of the functions ψ_j, i.e., with this "normalizing" technique, one can easily construct partitions of unity of any desired regularity. Another feature of the construction is that it allows us to build (M, C_∞, C_G) partitions of unity for very general covering situations. In particular, it enables us to produce the necessary partitions of unity whenever patches are added, removed or otherwise changed in an adaptive computational environment.

3.3 Polynomial Local Approximation Spaces and Linear Dependencies

In this section we want to analyze in more detail the PUFEM spaces based on *polynomial* local approximation spaces. We will see below that for polynomial local approximation spaces, the choice of the partition of unity has an influence on the approximation properties of the PUFEM space and has implementational ramifications in the following sense. In any implementation, a basis of the PUFEM space has to be constructed and it would convenient if that basis were determined directly by the basis functions of the local approximation spaces. In general however, this is not true. For example, for piecewise linear partitions of unity and polynomial local approximation spaces, the local basis functions (multiplied by appropriate partition of unity function) are linearly dependent and thus do not form a basis of the PUFEM space (see below). Although this example is artificial, it suggests that even if the local basis functions lead to a basis of the PUFEM space, the resulting functions might be "nearly" linearly dependent, and the resulting finite element stiffness matrix will be badly conditioned.

Define

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_0^{II} &= \text{span}\{x, \dots, x^p\} \text{ on } \Omega_0 \cap \Omega, \\
V_j^{II} &= \text{span}\{1, x, \dots, x^p\} = \text{span}\{1, x - x_j, \dots, (x - x_j)^p\} \text{ on } \Omega_j \cap \Omega
\end{aligned}
$$

for $j = 1, \dots, n$ and set $V_0^{II} = \{0\}$ if $p = 0$. For any partition of unity $\{\varphi_j\}$, the PUFEM space is given by

$$
V^{II} = \text{span}\{\varphi_j(x)x^m, \varphi_0(x)x^q \mid j = 1, \dots, n, \quad m = 0, \dots, p, \quad q = 1, \dots, p\}.
$$

The fact that the functions $\{\varphi_j\}$ form a partition of unity, i.e., $\sum_j \varphi_j(x) \equiv 1$ on Ω, implies that the space V^{II} satisfies a consistency condition in the sense that all polynomials of degree $\leq p$ which vanish in $x = 0$ are contained in V^{II}.

Let us now consider the spaces V^{II} based on the various partitions of unity of the previous section more closely. Denote by $V^{II,1}$, $V^{II,2}$, and $V^{II,3}$ the spaces V^{II} constructed using the partitions of unity $\{\varphi_j^1\}$, $\{\varphi_j^2\}$, and $\{\varphi_j^3\}$ respectively. Let us concentrate on $V^{II,1}$ first. Owing to the fact that the functions φ_j^1 are piecewise polynomials, the space $V^{II,1}$ is precisely the space of piecewise polynomials of degree $p + 1$ constrained to vanish in $x = 0$. This is an example where the global finite element space has even better approximation properties than guaranteed by theorem 1: Locally, approximation is done by polynomials of degree p and theorem 1 states that the local approximation properties are inherited by the global space, i.e., the H^1 approximability is $O(h^p)$. However, the space of piecewise polynomials of degree $p + 1$ has better approximation properties: it is $O(h^{p+1})$ for H^1 estimates. Let us note that $\dim V^{II,1} = n(p + 1)$.

As mentioned above, it would be convenient for implementational purposes to take as a basis of the finite element space $V^{II,1}$ functions which are determined by the basis functions of the local spaces V_j^{II}, i.e., we would like to take the functions

$$\varphi_j^1(x)(x - x_j)^m, \qquad j = 1, \ldots, n, \qquad m = 0, \ldots, p, \qquad (13)$$

$$\varphi_0^1(x)x^m, \qquad m = 1, \ldots, p. \qquad (14)$$

However, these functions are not linearly independent for $p \geq 1$ as a simple counting argument reveals: there are $n(p+1)+p$ functions but $\dim V^{II,1} = n(p+1) < n(p+1)+p$ for $p \geq 1$. Of course, one can still use these functions. For problem (7) they will lead to a positive semi-definite matrix (as opposed to a positive definite matrix, which is obtained if a basis is used), which has many algebraic solutions. However, all these algebraic solutions are merely different representations of the same function on Ω. One way to solve this linear system is to use a penalty method to deal with the linear dependencies (see [10] for a computational analysis).

One can avoid these linear dependencies if one uses a different partition of unity. For example, whenever the partition of unity is such that each member φ_j is identically 1 on an open set $\mathcal{O}_j \subset \Omega_j \cap \Omega$ (and all the other ones vanish there), linear dependencies as above cannot occur. Hence, the functions

$$\varphi_j^2(x)(x - x_j)^m, \qquad j = 1, \ldots, n, \qquad m = 0, \ldots, p, \qquad (15)$$

$$\varphi_0^2(x)x^m, \qquad m = 1, \ldots, p. \qquad (16)$$

form indeed a basis of the space $V^{II,2}$.

A more careful analysis of the linear dependencies occurring for the case of $V^{II,1}$ reveals that the local approximation space at either the left or the right endpoint of Ω contains too many functions. Thus, a modification of the partition of unity at one (or both) endpoints allows us to exclude linear dependencies: The functions $\varphi_j^3(x)(x - x_j)^m$, $j = 2, \ldots, n-1$, $m = 0, \ldots, p$, $\varphi_1^3(x)x^m$, $m = 1, \ldots, p$, form a basis of $V^{II,3}$. Let us point out that the space $V^{II,3}$ does no longer contain all piecewise polynomials of degree $p + 1$. Let us note here that this space is very closely related to $V^{II,1}$. In fact for problem (7) the stiffness matrix of the finite element method based on $V^{II,3}$ can be easily extracted from the positive semi-definite stiffness matrix constructed using $V^{II,1}$.

The example $V^{II,1}$ shows that "unfortunate" combinations of local approximation spaces and partitions of unity exist, where the basis elements of the local spaces multiplied by the appropriate partition of unity function are linearly dependent. This indicates that even if the chosen functions derived from the local bases are linearly independent and form a basis of the finite element space, the resulting stiffness matrix may still be badly conditioned.

13

3.4 Polynomial Local Approximation Spaces; Lagrange Type Elements

If we choose the functions $\varphi_j(x)(x - x_j)^m$ as basis functions of the space V^{II}, the degrees of freedom cannot be identified directly as function values in certain points. Rather, the degrees of freedom are related to higher derivatives of the elements of V^{II} in the points x_j. In this sense, the functions $\varphi_j(x)(x - x_j)^m$ produce a Hermite type space. However, it is also possible to construct Lagrange type spaces, where the degrees of freedom represent the function values in particular "Lagrange interpolation points". Let us illustrate this for the case where we want to approximate locally with polynomials of degree p. Let $\{\Omega_j\}$ be a cover of $\Omega = (0,1)$ and let $\{\varphi_j\}$ be a (M, C_∞, C_G) partition of unity subordinate to the cover. Let y_i, $i = 1, \ldots, N$, be the "Lagrange interpolation points", and assume that there are $p + 1$ points y_i in each patch Ω_j. In order to be able to enforce the essential boundary condition at $x = 0$, we will stipulate $y_1 = 0$. On each patch Ω_j, let L_{j,y_i} be the usual polynomial Lagrange interpolation function of degree p which is 1 in the point y_i and vanishes in all the other p "Lagrange interpolation points" which are in the patch Ω_j. As before, we define the global finite element space by

$$V^{III} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j} \varphi_j(x) L_{j,y_i}(x) a_{j,y_i} \mid a_{j,y_i} \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

This is exactly the same space as is obtained if the local spaces V_j are chosen to be $\text{span}\{1, x, \ldots, x^p\}$. Now, if we identify unknowns associated with the same interpolation point, i.e., if we set $a_{m,y_i} = a_{n,y_i}$ for all n, m for each point y_i, and denote these common values by a_{y_i}, we arrive at the space

$$V^{IV} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[\sum_{j:y_i \in \Omega_j} \varphi_j(x) L_{j,y_i}(x) \right] a_{y_i} \mid a_{y_i} \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

Because the functions φ_j form a partition of unity and because the functions L_{j,y_i} take only the values 0 and 1 in the "Lagrange interpolation points" y_m, the values a_{y_i} are precisely the function values of the elements of V^{IV}. Hence, we can take as a basis of V^{IV} the functions

$$\Phi_i(x) = \sum_{j:y_i \in \Omega_j} \varphi_j(x) L_{j,y_i}(x), \qquad i = 1, \ldots, N.$$

The essential boundary condition at $x = 0$ is also easily enforced by simply setting $a_{y_i} = 0$, which gives the space

$$V^V = \left\{ \sum_{i=2}^{N} a_{y_i} \Phi_i(x) \mid a_{y_i} \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

14

Let us make a few remarks on the approximation properties of the space V^V. The approximation properties of the spaces V^{II} are given by the approximation properties of the local spaces V_j^{II}, i.e., by the approximation properties of polynomials of degree p. For fixed degree p and appropriate conditions on the distributions of the interpolation points on each patch, it can be shown that approximation with V^V is – up to a constant – as good as with V^{II}. Finally, let us mention that these spaces V^{IV}, V^V are closely related to the method proposed in [9].

Above we noted that the close relation between the spaces $V^{II,1}$ and $V^{II,3}$ enables us to construct the stiffness matrix based on $V^{II,3}$ easily from the one based on $V^{II,1}$. Similarly, the stiffness matrix based on the functions Φ_i can be extracted from the stiffness matrix based on the functions $\varphi_j L_{j,y_i}$.

4 Comments on Choosing Local Approximation Spaces

4.1 Change of Variables Techniques

In section 3.1, we chose the local approximation spaces for problem (7) to consist of a fundamental system for the differential equation and particular solutions for polynomial right hand sides. A different method to construct local approximation spaces is based on changes of variables. If the change of variables $x \mapsto \tilde{x}$ maps the problem onto a problem which can be approximated well (in some appropriate norm) by polynomials (in $\tilde{x}$), say, then the "mapped polynomials", i.e., $P\big(\tilde{x}(x)\big)$, where P is a polynomial, also have good approximation properties. For example, [17] considered the problem

$$-\partial_x \left(a(x,y)\partial_x u\right) - \partial_y \left(a(x,y)\partial_y u\right) = f \qquad \text{on } \Omega,$$
$$u = 0 \qquad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

where the coefficient $a(x,y)$ is assumed to satisfy

$$0 < \alpha \le a(x,y) \le \beta < \infty$$

and is uni-directionally rough, i.e., the coefficient $a(x,y)$ is smooth in the y direction while it is rough in the x direction. The roughness of the coefficient $a(x,y)$ results in poor regularity properties of the solution u, and thus the usual finite element method leads to mesh sizes h which are prohibitively expensive. For the simplified model, $a(x,y) = a(x)$, the change of variables

$$\tilde{x} = \int_0^x \frac{dt}{a(t)},$$
$$\tilde{y} = y$$

transforms the problem into one for which a better regularity theorem holds: if $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, then the transformed function $\tilde{u}$ is in $H^2(\tilde{\Omega})$ ($\tilde{\Omega}$ denotes the image of Ω under

15

the above transformation; cf. [17] for a proof). Thus, $\tilde{u}$ can be approximated by linear functions in $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}$. Formulating in the original coordinates gives that u can be approximated on the patch Ω_j by

$$v_j \in \text{span}\{1, \int_0^x \frac{dt}{a(t)}, y\}$$

such that

$$\|u - v_j\|_{H^1(\Omega_j)} \leq C \left(\text{diam}\, \Omega_j\right) \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_j)}.$$

The constant $C > 0$ depends only on α, β and is independent of the roughness of the coefficient $a(x)$ and thus these local spaces have good approximation properties on patches independent of the bad behavior the coefficient $a(x)$ might display.

Let us finally point out for this example that the change of variables can be done locally: if $(x_j, y_j) \in \Omega_j$, then the approximating functions can be chosen to be in $\text{span}\{1, \int_{x_j}^x \frac{1}{a(t)}, y\}$.

Another instance where the idea of using a change of variables is successfully used can be found in [14, 15]. For elliptic problems in 2-d with corners or interfaces, the use of a conformal map is proposed which maps the rough solution to a smoother function. This smoother function on the mapped domain can be approximated by polynomials. Hence, the images of polynomials under the inverse of this conformal map are used for the approximation of the original problem.

4.2 Optimality of Local Approximation Spaces and n–Width

An interesting issue in the context of finding good local approximation spaces is the question of optimality of the local spaces. We measure optimality in terms of n-width, i.e., in terms error per degree of freedom for a whole class of functions:

$$d(n, \|\cdot\|, S) = \inf_{E_n} \sup_{f \in S} \inf_{g \in E_n} \|f - g\|$$

where E_n denotes an n-dimensional space, and S is the class of functions that we wish to approximate; typically, S is chosen as the unit ball of some appropriate Banach space. A minimizing space E_n is called an optimal space. We see that this notion of optimality depends on the dimension n, the norm $\|\cdot\|$, in which we measure the approximation error, and the choice of the class S. In particular, different classes S lead to different optimal spaces. In practice, of course, we want robust optimal (or near optimal) approximation spaces because we might not know with respect to which class of functions we should optimize (this uncertainty issue is elaborated in [16]). For example, if we choose $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$, and if we are interested in approximating functions which are analytic on $\tilde{\Omega} \supset\supset \Omega$, the class S could be taken as the unit ball of any $H^k(\Omega)$, $k > 1$. Thus, due to this uncertainty, we want the approximation spaces to be optimal for as large a class of functions as possible.

Proposition 2 below exhibits an example of approximation spaces which are optimal for large classes of harmonic functions. In the framework of the PUFEM, proposition 2 yields the following result: For the approximation of harmonic functions on patches Ω_i which are *discs* $\subset \mathbb{R}^2$, the choice of spaces of harmonic polynomials as local approximation spaces V_i is the optimal one. The notion of optimality here is tied to the assumptions of proposition 2, namely, the restriction to functions defined on discs and to rotationally invariant classes of harmonic functions.

For ease of exposition, we deal with complex-valued, holomorphic (analytic) functions and observe that the case of harmonic functions follows by taking real parts.
We introduce the spaces

$$\mathcal{H}^k = \{f \in H^k(B_R(0)) \,|\, f \text{ is holomorphic on } B_R(0)\}, \qquad k \geq 0$$

and a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ of holomorphic functions with inner product $< \cdot, \cdot >_{\mathcal{H}}$ and norm $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is called *rotationally invariant* if

$$\|f(az)\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \|f(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \qquad \forall a \in \mathbb{C}, |a| = 1.$$

The space $\mathcal{H}^0$ ($\mathcal{H}^1$) is a Hilbert space with the L^2 (H^1) inner product and thus a closed subspaces of $L^2(B_R(0))$ ($H^1(B_R(0))$). Therefore, the space $L^2(B_R(0))$ ($H^1(B_R(0))$) can be written as the direct sum of $\mathcal{H}^0$ ($\mathcal{H}^1$) and its orthogonal complement. This reduces the search for optimal spaces for the approximation of holomorphic functions in the L^2 (H^1) norm to the problem of finding optimal subspaces of $\mathcal{H}^0$ ($\mathcal{H}^1$).
The polynomials $(z^n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ form an orthogonal basis of $\mathcal{H}^k$, $k \geq 0$, and it is easy to see that they actually form an orthogonal basis for any rotationally invariant Hilbert space of holomorphic functions. Therefore, setting $\psi_{\mathcal{H}}(n) = < z^n, z^n >_{\mathcal{H}}$, gives the representation

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |f_n|^2 \psi_{\mathcal{H}}(n)$$

where the f_n are the Taylor coefficients of the holomorphic function f, i.e.,

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f_n z^n \qquad \text{on } B_R(0).$$

For example, we have

$$\psi_{\mathcal{H}^0}(n) = \pi \frac{1}{n+1} R^{2n+2},$$
$$\psi_{\mathcal{H}^1}(n) = \pi R^{2n} \left(\frac{R^2}{n+1} + n \right).$$

17

Proposition 2 *Let $\mathcal{H}_1$, $\mathcal{H}_2$ be two rotationally invariant Hilbert spaces of holomorphic functions on $B_R(0)$. Assume that the quotient*

$$\frac{\psi_{\mathcal{H}_1}(n)}{\psi_{\mathcal{H}_2}(n)}$$

is monotonically decreasing in n. Then the spaces

$$T_p = \mathrm{span}\{z^n \mid n = 0, \dots, p\}$$

are optimal spaces for the approximation of functions in $\mathcal{H}_2$ in the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}$ norm, i.e., the space T_p minimizes the expression

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{H}_2} \inf_{g \in E_p} \frac{\|f - g\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}}{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}} \tag{17}$$

over all p dimensional subspaces E_p of $\mathcal{H}_1$.

Proof: The proof proceeds in two steps. First, we will see that (17) is bigger than or equal to

$$\left(\frac{\psi_{\mathcal{H}_1}(p+1)}{\psi_{\mathcal{H}_2}(p+1)}\right)^{1/2}$$

for any p dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{H}_1$. In the second step, we see that this infimum is attained for the choice of T_p as p dimensional approximation space. Let a p dimensional subspace E_p of $\mathcal{H}_1$ be given. Choose $f \in T_{p+1}$ orthogonal (with respect to $<\cdot,\cdot>_{\mathcal{H}_1}$) to E_p. Then, the square of (17) can be bounded from below by

$$\frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2}{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2} \geq \inf_{f \in T_{p+1}} \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2}{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2} = \frac{\psi_{\mathcal{H}_1}(p+1)}{\psi_{\mathcal{H}_2}(p+1)}$$

where we made use of the monotonicity assumption. On the other hand, the choice $E_p = T_p$ implies

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{H}_2} \inf_{g \in T_p} \frac{\|f - g\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2}{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2} \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{H}_2} \frac{\sum_{n=p+1}^{\infty} |f_n|^2 \psi_{\mathcal{H}_1}(n)}{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |f_n|^2 \psi_{\mathcal{H}_2}(n)} \leq \frac{\psi_{\mathcal{H}_1}(p+1)}{\psi_{\mathcal{H}_2}(p+1)}$$

where we made again use of the monotonicity assumption. $\qquad\square$

Choosing $\mathcal{H}_1$ in proposition 2 to be $\mathcal{H}^0$ or $\mathcal{H}^1$ shows that the spaces T_p are optimal if we measure approximability in the L^2 or H^1 norm and if we approximate rotationally invariant classes which satisfy a certain monotonicity of the numbers $\psi_{\mathcal{H}_2}(n)$. All spaces $\mathcal{H}^k$ fall into this latter category and many spaces of holomorphic functions which are in some weighted H^k spaces where the weight is rotationally symmetric. Let us further note that in the context of the PUFEM, theorem 1 suggests that we optimize with respect to the norm $\left(\mathrm{diam}^2(\Omega_i)|\cdot|_{H^1(\Omega_i)}^2 + \|\cdot\|_{L^2(\Omega_i)}^2\right)^{1/2}$. The proof of

18

proposition 2 shows that this choice of norm also leads to the spaces T_p as optimal approximation spaces.

Remark 3: As stated earlier, proposition 2 can be formulated for harmonic functions as well. Then, the $2p + 1$ dimensional spaces of harmonic polynomials are optimal under similar conditions. For example, the $2p + 1$ dimensional spaces of harmonic polynomials are optimal for the approximation of harmonic function on the discs $B_R(0)$ which are in the spaces $H^k(B_R(0))$, $k \geq 1$.

Remark 4: Proposition 2 and the preceding remark state (loosely speaking) that harmonic polynomials are universally optimal for the approximation of harmonic functions on discs. This is partly a justification for the approximation with harmonic polynomials in section 6.1: As long as the patches differ not too much from discs, we expect spaces of harmonic polynomials to be nearly optimal for the approximation of harmonic functions.

Let us stress here that harmonic polynomials are no longer optimal if one of the assumptions of proposition 2 is changed. For example, consider approximation on a sector W with angle ω and size R (for notational convenience, we identify $\mathbb{R}^2$ with the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$):

$$W = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \,|\, |z| < R \text{ and } 0 < \arg z < \omega\}.$$

Assume that we are interested in approximating (in H^1, say) harmonic functions satisfying homogeneous Dirichlet conditions on the two straight sides of the sector, i.e., functions of the form

$$u = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \operatorname{Im} z^{\pi n/\omega}$$

with coefficients $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the functions $\operatorname{Im} z^{\pi n/\omega}$, $n = 1, \dots, p$ form optimal spaces of dimension p for the whole scale of spaces

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^k = \left\{ u = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \operatorname{Im} z^{\pi n/\omega} \,\middle|\, a_n \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_n|^2 (1+n)^{2k-1} R^{2n\pi/\omega} < \infty \right\}, \quad k > 1.$$

The proof of this statement is very similar to the proof of proposition 2. A different way of defining the spaces $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^k$ is to say that harmonic functions in $H^k(B_{R^{\pi/\omega}}(0))$ which are antisymmetric with respect to the real axis are mapped onto the elements of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^k$ under the conformal change of variables $z \mapsto z^{\omega/\pi}$.

5 The PUFEM in Two Dimensions

In the two dimensional case – just as in the one dimensional one – we have to address the creation of a partition of unity and the choice of local approximation spaces. Let

us first outline two different types of partitions of unity. If a domain $\bar{\Omega} \supset \Omega$ is given by a mesh (i.e., triangles, quadrilaterals, or mapped triangles or quadrilaterals), then the usual pyramid functions associated with the nodes of the mesh form a piecewise smooth partition of unity. Since in all the numerical examples below, we use this kind of partition of unity, let us exemplify this idea with one example. Let Ω be the unit square $(0,1) \times (0,1)$ and let it be subdivided into n^2, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ squares of side length $h = \frac{1}{n}$ with nodes (x_j, y_j), $j = 1, \ldots, (n+1)^2$. Define

$$
\varphi(x) = \begin{cases}
(1-x)(1-y) & \text{for } (x,y) \in [0,1] \times [0,1] \\
(1+x)(1-y) & \text{for } (x,y) \in [-1,0] \times [0,1] \\
(1+x)(1+y) & \text{for } (x,y) \in [-1,0] \times [-1,0] \\
(1-x)(1+y) & \text{for } (x,y) \in [0,1] \times [-1,0] \\
0 & \text{elsewhere.}
\end{cases}
\tag{18}
$$

Then the functions $\varphi_j(x) = \varphi((x - x_j)/h, (y - y_j)/h)$ associated with the $(n+1)^2$ patches $\Omega_j = \{(x,y) \,|\, |x - x_j| < h, |y - y_j| < h\}$ form a partition of unity. This is the analogous construction to the first construction of section 3.2.

The second type of partition of unity is given by the construction described in the fifth method of section 3.2. For example, if Ω is covered by circles, ellipses, or quadrilaterals, it is easy to construct a partition of unity of any desired regularity by the "normalizing" technique outlined in the fifth method of section 3.2.

Let us stress at this point that the partition of unity does not have to be related to the geometry of the domain of interest.

Many of the observations of section 3.3 about the one dimensional case are true in the two dimensional setting as well. For example, it can be shown that the piecewise bilinear partition of unity described above in conjunction with polynomial local approximation spaces V_j displays the same difficulties with linear dependencies as the space $V^{II,1}$ of section 3.3 (cf. [10]). However, the same idea of modifying the partition of unity on patches close to the boundary as is proposed in the third method of section 3.2 leads to a basis of the finite element space which is directly related to the bases of the local spaces. As observed in the one dimensional case, the stiffness matrix resulting from the modified partition of unity can actually be constructed from the original one.

Related to the choice of the partition of unity (and of the local approximation spaces) is the question of integrating the shape functions against each other, because the partition of unity is typically only piecewise smooth (and hence the shape functions). This issue will be explored in more details in a forthcoming paper. For all the numerical examples below, we use the partition of unity for the unit square described above, and therefore the usual integration schemes on each of the n^2 square can be applied.

Another important question is the implementation of essential boundary conditions. For some problems, it is easy to construct local approximation spaces V_j on patches close to the boundary which have both good approximation properties and satisfy the

essential boundary conditions. This is the case in the one dimensional problem (7) with the choice V_0^I. For an example in two dimension, consider the implementation of homogeneous Dirichlet conditions on a straight part of the boundary for the problem $-\Delta u = 0$. Here, harmonic polynomials which are antisymmetric with respect to that straight line have good approximation properties and satisfy the homogeneous boundary conditions. A similar approach works in a corner.

One way to imitate the way essential boundary conditions are implemented in the classical finite element methods is to use spaces of (piecewise) full polynomials on patches close to the boundary. In that case, all the techniques of the usual finite element methods can be applied. Another approach to the implementation of essential boundary conditions is the use of Lagrange multipliers or a penalty method. In the numerical examples below, we chose the boundary conditions to be natural in order to be able to concentrate on the approximation properties of the spaces constructed with the PUFEM.

6 Numerical Examples

In this section, we will present two numerical examples, namely, the approximation of solutions to Laplace's equation and Helmholtz's equation on the unit square with the PUFEM.

6.1 Laplace's Equation

Let us consider first approximations to the solution of

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\Delta u &= 0 && \text{on } \Omega = (0,1) \times (0,1) \\
\partial_n u &= \partial_n \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{1}{a^2 - z^2} + \frac{1}{a^2 + z^2}\right) && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \qquad a = 1.05,
\end{aligned}
$$

and we fix u in $(0,0)$ in order to make the solution of this problem unique. Since we want to present a p version of the PUFEM where the local approximation spaces are chosen as spaces of harmonic polynomials of degree p, we need to clarify the approximation properties of harmonic polynomials. This is done in the following two theorems. Note that there are only $2p + 1$ harmonic polynomials of degree p.

Theorem 2 (Szegö) *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a simply connected, bounded Lipschitz domain. Let $\tilde{\Omega} \supset\supset \Omega$ and assume that $u \in L^2(\tilde{\Omega})$ is harmonic on $\tilde{\Omega}$. Then there is a sequence $(u_p)_{p=0}^\infty$ of harmonic polynomials of degree p such that*

$$
\|u - u_p\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C e^{-\gamma p} \|u\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})},
$$
$$
\|\nabla(u - u_p)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C e^{-\gamma p} \|u\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}
$$

where γ, $C > 0$ depend only on Ω, $\tilde{\Omega}$.

Proof: See [21], [24]. □

Theorem 3 *Let Ω be a simply connected bounded Lipschitz domain, star-shaped with respect to a ball. Let the exterior angle of Ω be bounded from below by $\lambda\pi$, $0 < \lambda < 2$. Assume that $u \in H^k(\Omega)$, $k > 1$, is harmonic. Then there is a sequence $(u_p)_{p=2}^{\infty}$ of harmonic polynomials of degree p such that*

$$\|u - u_p\|_{H^j(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\frac{\ln p}{p}\right)^{\lambda(k-j)} \|u\|_{H^k(\Omega)}, \qquad j = 0, \ldots, [k]$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on Ω and k.

See [11] for a proof of theorem 3. Note that typically $\lambda \leq 1$ and that for domains with re-entrant corners, λ can be significantly less than 1.

Remark 5: The restriction in theorem 3 that Ω be star-shaped with respect to a ball is not a big constraint for our purposes because we are interested in local estimates on patches and the patches are typically chosen to be star-shaped.

Figure 1: PUFEM, classical p version for Laplace's equation; $a = 1.05, 8 \times 8$ elements

For the PUFEM the domain Ω is covered by square patches and the partition of unity is chosen to be piecewise bilinear as described in section 5. The specific choice $n = 8$ was made, and the local approximation spaces V_j consist of harmonic polynomials of degree p (p ranging from 0 to 8). In figure 1 we plot the relative error in energy

norm (i.e., the relative error in the H^1 semi norm) versus the number of unknowns for three methods. The PUFEM is compared with two classical p versions, namely, the tensor product spaces Q_p and the serendipity spaces Q'_p based on an 8×8 mesh. We see clearly that the use of harmonic polynomials made possible by the PUFEM is advantageous: in order to achieve 1% error in H^1, the PUFEM based on harmonic polynomials needs only half as many DOF as the usual p version spaces Q_p, Q'_p. This is in accordance with our earlier observation that the number of harmonic polynomials grows linearly with the degree p whereas the size of full polynomial spaces grows quadratically. Note that the disparity between the PUFEM and the spaces of full polynomials becomes bigger for higher accuracy. See [10] for a more detailed study of the performance of the PUFEM as the parameters n and a are varied.

Remark 6: For the elasticity equations in 2-d, the situation is completely analogous to Laplace's equation. In the absence of body forces, the displacement field (u, v) under the plane strain assumption can be expressed by two holomorphic functions φ, ψ (see [12]):

$$2\mu(u + iv) = \kappa\varphi(z) - z\overline{\varphi'(z)} - \overline{\psi}(z) \tag{19}$$

where $\kappa = (\lambda + 3\mu)/(\lambda + \mu)$ and λ, μ are the Lamé constants. Choosing $\kappa = (\lambda^* + 3\mu)/(\lambda^* + \mu)$ with $\lambda^* = 2\lambda\mu/(\lambda + 2\mu)$ gives the representation for the case of plane stress. The holomorphic functions φ, ψ can be approximated by complex polynomials φ_p, ψ_p of degree p, and thus the functions

$$\kappa\varphi_p(z) - z\overline{\varphi}_p(z) - \overline{\psi}_p(z)$$

take the role of "harmonic" polynomials for the elasticity equations. It can be shown that theorems 2, 3 hold verbatim for the approximation of the solutions to the elasticity equations with these "harmonic" polynomials (see [11]).

6.2 Helmholtz's Equation

The next numerical example deals with the approximations to Helmholtz's equation. On the unit square, we consider

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u - k^2 u &= 0 &\quad \text{on } \Omega = (0,1) \times (0,1) \\ \partial_n u + iku &= g &\quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where g is chosen such that the exact solution is a plane wave of the form

$$u(x,y) = \exp\{ik(x\cos\theta + y\sin\theta)\}, \qquad \theta = \frac{\pi}{16}.$$

The following two types of local approximation spaces were analyzed in [11]. The first type are "generalized harmonic polynomials" as alluded to in the introduction. Written in polar coordinates, they take the form

$$V^V(p) = \text{span}\{e^{\pm in\theta} J_n(kr) \,|\, n = 0, \ldots, p\}, \tag{21}$$

where the functions J_n are the Bessel functions of the first kind (see, e.g., [6]). The second type are systems of plane waves given by

$$W(p) = \text{span}\{\exp\left(ik(x\cos\theta_j + y\sin\theta_j)\right) \mid \theta_j = \tfrac{2\pi}{p}j, j = 0, \ldots, p-1\}.$$
(22)

Remark 7: The spaces $V^V(p)$, the spaces of "generalized harmonic polynomials", share the optimality properties of the harmonic polynomials for the approximation of harmonic functions on discs (see section 4.2); the spaces $V^V(p)$ are optimal in the sense of n-width for large classes of rotationally invariant spaces of solutions of Helmholtz's equation on discs.

Remark 8: The numerical examples below are based on the spaces $W(p)$. In all computations we chose p to be of the form $2 + 4m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, so that the exact solution of problem (20) is not an element of the PUFEM space.

The approximation properties of these two types of spaces are very similar to the usual harmonic polynomials. In fact, we have

Theorem 4 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a simply connected, bounded Lipschitz domain. Let $\tilde{\Omega} \supset\supset \Omega$ and assume that $u \in L^2(\tilde{\Omega})$ solves the homogeneous Helmholtz equation on $\tilde{\Omega}$. Then*

$$\inf_{u_p \in V^V(p)} \|u - u_p\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C e^{-\gamma p} \|u\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}$$

$$\inf_{w_p \in W(p)} \|u - w_p\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{C} e^{-\tilde{\gamma} p / \ln p} \|u\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})}$$

where C, $\tilde{C}$, γ, and $\tilde{\gamma}$ depend only on Ω, $\tilde{\Omega}$.

Remark 9: For the solution of the model problem (20), theorem 4 can be strengthened:

$$\inf_{u_p \in V^V(p)} \|u - u_p\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C(\gamma, \Omega) e^{-\gamma p},$$

$$\inf_{w_p \in W(p)} \|u - w_p\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C(\gamma, \Omega) e^{-\gamma p}$$

holds for any fixed $\gamma > 0$.

Theorem 5 *Let Ω be a simply connected bounded Lipschitz domain, star-shaped with respect to a ball. Let the exterior angle of Ω be bounded from below by $\lambda\pi$, $0 < \lambda < 2$. Assume that $u \in H^k(\Omega)$, $k > 1$, satisfies the homogeneous Helmholtz equation. Then*

$$\inf_{u_p \in V^V(p)} \|u - u_p\|_{H^j(\Omega)} \leq C_j \left(\frac{\ln p}{p}\right)^{\lambda(k-j)} \|u\|_{H^k(\Omega)}, \qquad j = 0, \ldots, [k],$$

$$\inf_{u_p \in V^V(p)} \|u - u_p\|_{H^j(\Omega)} \leq C_j \left(\frac{\ln^2 p}{p}\right)^{\lambda(k-j)} \|u\|_{H^k(\Omega)}, \qquad j = 0, \ldots, [k].$$

24

Table 1: DOF necessary to obtain accuracy ϵ in L^2 norm; $k = 100$

ϵ	best approximant	QSFEM	GLSFEM	FEM
30%	2.045D+3	3.969D+3	2.016D+4	7.784D+4
10%	5.041D+3	1.000D+4	6.150D+4	2.352D+5
5%	8.464D+3	1.960D+4	1.274D+5	4.692D+5

Table 2: DOF necessary to achieve various accuracies in L^2 for PUFEM with $n = 4$ and various other methods; $k = 100$

p	L^2 error	PUFEM	best approx.	QSFEM	FEM
26	10.8%	6.50D+2	3.80D+3	7.95D+3	2.08D+5
30	0.69%	7.50D+2	5.89D+4	1.23D+5	3.23D+6
34	0.11%	8.50D+2	3.45D+5	7.23D+5	1.90D+7

The PUFEM can be based on either approximation space. In the numerical results below, we concentrate on the PUFEM based on the spaces $W(p)$ of plane waves (for a comparison with the "generalized harmonic polynomials" $V^V(p)$, see [11]). The domain Ω is covered by square patches and the partition of unity consists again of piecewise bilinear functions as described in section 5. The local approximation spaces V_j are taken as the spaces $W(p)$.

Remark 10: The theorems above merely address the issue of approximability; we do not deal with the delicate question of stability of the finite element methods based on these spaces. Suffice it to say that the spaces created by the PUFEM are stable under the assumption that the mesh size h is sufficiently small with respect to the wave number k (see [11]). However, as can be seen in the numerical results, the PUFEM performs very well as a p version for very coarse meshes.

In tables 1–6 the PUFEM is compared with the usual Galerkin finite element method (FEM), the generalized least squares finite element method (GLSFEM) of [22], and the quasi-stabilized finite element method (QSFEM) of [19]. Since all three methods are based on piecewise linear functions on uniform grids, tables 1 and 2 include the piecewise linear best approximant for reference. The FEM, GLSFEM, and QSFEM differ in their choice of the bilinear form. In particular, the bilinear form of the QSFEM is constructed such that "pollution" (see [19]) is minimized, and thus the

Table 3: number of operations using band elimination – the p version of the PUFEM; $n = 4$; $k = 100$; error in L^2

p	L^2 error	PUFEM	QSFEM	FEM
26	10.8%	1.76D+7	6.3D+7	4.3D+11
30	0.69%	2.71D+7	1.5D+10	1.01D+13
34	0.11%	3.94D+7	5.2D+11	3.6D+14

Table 4: number of operations for *hp* version of PUFEM; $k = 100$; L^2 error

p	n	L^2 error	NOP PUFEM
26	4	10.8%	1.76D+7
18	8	10.6%	5.23D+7
14	16	9.5%	2.75D+8

Table 5: operation count for solving linear system; error in H^1 norm; $k = 32$

	Galerkin			QSFEM		
$\sqrt{DOF}$	H^1 error	No. iter	NOP	H^1 error	No. iter	NOP
hline 32	65%	232	4.51D+6	30.5%	272	5.29D+6
64	21.7%	434	3.37D+7	14.3%	492	3.82D+7
128	8.16%	831	2.68D+8	7.02%	953	2.96D+8
256	3.64%	1665	2.07D+9	3.48%	1863	2.31D+9
512	1.72%	3263	1.62D+10	1.69%	3752	1.86D+10

Table 6: operation count for band elimination for PUFEM; $k = 32$, error in H^1; $n = 1$

p	H^1 error	NOP PUFEM
18	46%	1.3D+5
22	6.7%	2.3D+5
26	0.38%	3.8D+5
30	0.00025%	5.9D+5

QSFEM is virtually the best method available which is based on piecewise linear functions. We will see that the PUFEM compares very favorably with the QSFEM. We discuss the cases $k = 100$ with the L^2 norm as the error measure and $k = 32$ with the H^1 as the error measure. Tables 1–4 show the performance of the PUFEM in comparison with the other methods for $k = 100$ and the L^2 norm as error measure. Table 1 shows the number of DOF needed to achieve a certain L^2 accuracy for the various piecewise linear methods. We see that the QSFEM needs 2 times as many DOF as the best approximant, while the GLSFEM needs 10–15 and the FEM 40–50 as many. Table 2 shows that the p version of the PUFEM can achieve the same accuracy as the other methods with markedly fewer DOF. This can be attributed to the exponential approximability of the PUFEM: According to remark 6.2 the approximation properties of the PUFEM space based on plane waves $W(p)$ are exponential in p whereas the h versions of the piecewise linear methods can only have algebraic rates of convergence. This explains why the discrepancy between the PUFEM and the other methods becomes more pronounced for high accuracy: in order to achieve 10% accuracy in L^2, the best approximant needs 6 times as many DOF as the PUFEM, whereas it needs 400 times as many as the PUFEM to achieve 0.11% accuracy. Table 3 shows how this reduction of DOF translates into a reduction in the operation count if a direct solver (band elimination) is used. Again, the PUFEM outperforms the QSFEM and the FEM for the case of 10.8% accuracy and is greatly superior for high accuracy.

In tables 1–3 we saw the performance of the PUFEM as a p version. Table 4 shows the performance of the PUFEM as an hp version by listing the number of operations for the band elimination for various combinations of p and $h = \frac{1}{n}$ which result in an accuracy of ca. 10% in L^2. We see that the operation count increases with n (and thus with decreasing p). This can again be explained by the fact that the PUFEM spaces feature exponential approximability as p versions but only algebraic approximability as h versions.

Tables 5–6 illustrate the case $k = 32$ with the H^1 semi norm as the error measure. The linear system of the usual FEM and the QSFEM is solved using the iterative scheme proposed in [4]. We compare the cost of these iterative schemes (table 5) with the cost of the band elimination for the PUFEM (table 6) as a p version ($n = 1$). We see that the PUFEM is cheaper than the QSFEM, which is virtually the optimal method for piecewise linear ansatz functions. The PUFEM is cheaper in the whole range of accuracies (50%–0%). As in the case of DOF versus L^2 accuracy above, the disparity between the PUFEM and the other methods becomes bigger for high accuracy: for 50% error, the PUFEM is 30 times cheaper than the FEM, and for 1% the PUFEM is 10^5 times cheaper!

Remark 11: In the operation count for the PUFEM (tables 4, 6) only the contributions of the band elimination are reported. This is justified by the particular structure of the problem under consideration. The mesh is uniform, the partition of unity consists of piecewise bilinear functions and the local approximation spaces are spaces of plane waves. All of this can be exploited in the construction of the stiffness

27

matrix, and the resulting cost of the generation the stiffness matrix is of lower order compared with the cost of the linear solver.

The numerical examples show that the PUFEM performs much better than the usual h versions both in terms of error versus DOF and error versus operation count. This is due to the fact that the PUFEM allows us to use local approximation spaces that capture the local behavior of the solution very well, even if the solution is rough. In this example, the approximation with plane waves is very efficient although the wave number k is large ($k = 32$, $k = 100$). We saw that the PUFEM outperforms the h version for accuracies of practical interest (50%–1% in H^1, say) and that the PUFEM is immensely superior for high accuracy.

7   A-posteriori Error Estimation

A-posteriori error estimation for finite element solutions obtained by the PUFEM is possible if local problems on the patches $\Omega_i \cap \Omega$ can be solved (or suitably approximated). In order to demonstrate this, let us consider the model problem

$$
\begin{aligned}
Lu = -\operatorname{div} a(x)\operatorname{grad} u + c(x)u &= f \in L^2(\Omega) & &\text{on } \Omega \\
u &= 0 & &\text{on } \Gamma_D \subset \partial\Omega, \Gamma_D \neq \emptyset \\
\sigma_n u = a(x)\partial_n u &= g \in H^{-1/2}(\Gamma_N) & &\text{on } \Gamma_N = \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_D \quad (23)
\end{aligned}
$$

where a, c are bounded functions and satisfy the inequality

$$
0 < \alpha \leq \min\big(a(x), c(x)\big) \leq \max\big(a(x), c(x)\big) \leq \beta < \infty.
$$

The weak form of this problem is to find $u \in H_D^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$
B(u, v) = F(v) \quad \forall v \in H_D^1(\Omega) = \{v \in H^1(\Omega) \,|\, v = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D\} \quad (24)
$$

where the bilinear form B and the linear functional F are defined in the standard way. The conditions on the coefficients a, c imply that

$$
\alpha\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq B(u, u),
$$
$$
|B(u, v)| \leq \beta\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|v\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.
$$

Let V_{FE} be a conforming PUFEM space, i.e., $V_{FE} \subset H_D^1(\Omega)$. Then, the finite element solution $u_{FE} \in V_{FE}$ is defined by

$$
B(u_{FE}, v) = F(v) \qquad \forall v \in V_{FE} \subset H_D^1(\Omega). \quad (25)
$$

On each patch $\Omega_i \cap \Omega$, we introduce the local problem

$$
\text{find } \eta_i \in W_i \qquad B(\eta_i, v) = B(u - u_{FE}, v) \qquad \forall v \in W_i \quad (26)
$$

28

where

$$W_i = \{v \in H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega) \mid v = 0 \text{ on } \partial(\Omega_i \cap \Omega) \setminus \Gamma_N\}. \tag{27}$$

Remark 12: If we require the PUFEM space to be of degree 2, i.e., if $V_{FE} \subset H^1_D(\Omega) \cap C^2(\Omega)$, integration by parts allows us to express the right hand side of (26) explicitly in terms of the given data L, f, and g:

$$B(\eta_i, v) = B(u - u_{FE}, v) = \int_{\Omega_i \cap \Omega} (f - Lu_{FE})v dx + \int_{\Gamma_N} (g - \sigma_n u_{FE})v ds. \tag{28}$$

In this last integration by parts argument, we made use of the assumption $V_{FE} \subset C^2(\Omega)$. This is an important simplification in practice because in that way, the evaluation of the right hand side of (26) requires only knowledge about u_{FE} and its derivatives on the patch $\Omega_i \cap \Omega$. If the space V_{FE} is less regular (e.g., $V_{FE} \subset C(\Omega)$ and piecewise C^2) the integration by parts argument introduces additional terms related to the jumps of derivatives; restricting ourselves to the case $V_{FE} \subset C^2(\Omega)$ removes the necessity to determine the points where these jumps may occur.

Before we proceed to prove theorem 6, which relates the error of the finite element solution to the local functions η_i, we need to impose some approximation properties on the local approximation spaces V_i.

Definition 3 *A collection V_i of local approximation spaces has the* uniform Poincaré *property if there is $C_p > 0$ independent of i such that*

1. *for i such that $\Omega_i \cap \Gamma_D = \emptyset$, V_i contains the constant functions and*
   $\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \|v - \lambda\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} \leq C_P \operatorname{diam}(\Omega_i) \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} \qquad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)$

2. *for i such that $\Omega_i \cap \Gamma_D \neq \emptyset$*
   $\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} \leq C_P \operatorname{diam}(\Omega_i) \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} \qquad \forall v \in \{v \in H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega) \mid v = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D\}$

Theorem 6 *Let $\{\Omega_i\}$ be a cover of Ω and $\{\varphi_i\}$ a (M, C_∞, C_G) partition of unity subordinate to the cover $\{\Omega_i\}$. Let the local approximation spaces $\{V_i\}$ have the uniform Poincaré property and assume that $v_i = 0$ on Γ_D for $v_i \in V_i$ with $\Omega_i \cap \Gamma_D \neq \emptyset$. Then there is $C = C(\alpha, \beta, M, C_\infty, C_G, C_P) > 0$ (which is explicitly available from the proof below) such that*

$$C^{-1} \left(\sum_i \|\eta_i\|^2_{H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} \right)^{1/2} \leq \|u - u_{FE}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\sum_i \|\eta_i\|^2_{H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} \right)^{1/2} \tag{29}$$

where u_{FE} and η_i are defined in equations (25), (26).

Proof: The proof follows very closely [1]. First we observe that the finite element space V_{FE} constructed by the PUFEM is conforming, i.e., $V_{FE} \subset H^1_D(\Omega)$. Furthermore, we have $W_i \subset H^1_D(\Omega)$ by continuing the elements of W_i by zero on $\Omega \setminus (\Omega_i \cap \Omega)$.

By the coercivity of B, the orthogonality relation satisfied by u_{FE}, and the fact that $\sum_i \varphi_i \equiv 1$ on Ω, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha \|u - u_{FE}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 &\leq B(u - u_{FE}, u - u_{FE}) \\
&= B(u - u_{FE}, u - u_{FE} - v_{FE}) \qquad \forall v_{FE} \in V_{FE} \\
&= B\Big(u - u_{FE}, \sum_i \varphi_i(u - u_{FE} - v_i)\Big) \qquad v_{FE} = \sum_i \varphi_i v_i, \quad v_i \in V_i \\
&= \sum_i B\big(\eta_i, \varphi_i(u - u_{FE} - v_i)\big) \\
&\leq \beta \left(\sum_i \|\eta_i\|_{H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)}^2\right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_i \|\varphi_i(u - u_{FE} - v_i)\|_{H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)}^2\right)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where we made use of the fact that $\varphi_i(u - u_{FE} - v_i) \in W_i \subset H_D^1(\Omega)$. The uniform Poincaré property gives the existence of $v_i \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\|u - u_{FE} - v_i\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} \leq \min(1, C_P \operatorname{diam}(\Omega_i)) \|u - u_{FE}\|_{H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)},
$$

and thus we can estimate

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_i \|\varphi_i(u - u_{FE} - v_i)\|_{H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)}^2 &\leq \sum_i C_\infty^2 \|u - u_{FE} - v_i\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)}^2 + \\
&\quad + 2C_\infty^2 \|\nabla(u - u_{FE} - v_i)\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)}^2 + \\
&\quad + 2\frac{C_G^2}{\operatorname{diam}(\Omega_i)^2} \|u - u_{FE} - v_i\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq \sum_i \left(3C_\infty^2 + 2C_G^2 C_P^2\right) \|u - u_{FE}\|_{H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq M\left(3C_\infty^2 + 2C_G^2 C_P^2\right) \|u - u_{FE}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used lemma 2 below. This gives the upper estimate of (29). For the lower estimate, we use the fact that each $\eta_i \in W_i \subset H_D^1(\Omega)$ and thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_i \|\eta_i\|_{H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)}^2 &\leq \alpha^{-1} \sum_i B(\eta_i, \eta_i) \\
&\leq \alpha^{-1} \sum_i B(u - u_{FE}, \eta_i) = \alpha^{-1} B\Big(u - u_{FE}, \sum_i \eta_i\Big) \\
&\leq \beta \alpha^{-1} \|u - u_{FE}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \left\|\sum_i \eta_i\right\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \beta \alpha^{-1} \|u - u_{FE}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \sqrt{M} \left(\sum_i \|\eta_i\|_{H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)}^2\right)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where we made again use of lemma 2 below. This concludes the proof of theorem 6.
$\square$

Lemma 2 *Let Ω be an open set, $\{\Omega_i\}$ be an open cover of Ω satisfying the pointwise overlap condition*

$$\operatorname{card}\{i \,|\, x \in \Omega_i\} \le M \qquad\qquad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

Let u, $u_i \in H^1(\Omega)$ be such that

$$\operatorname{supp} u_i \subset \operatorname{closure}(\Omega_i \cap \Omega).$$

Then

$$\sum_i \|u\|_{H^k(\Omega_i)}^2 \le M \|u\|_{H^k(\Omega)}^2 \qquad k = 0, 1,$$

$$\|\sum_i u_i\|_{H^k(\Omega)}^2 \le M \sum_i \|u_i\|_{H^k(\Omega \cap \Omega_i)}^2 \qquad k = 0, 1.$$

Proof: We will show the case $k = 0$, the case $k = 1$ being handled similarly. Let χ_i be the characteristic function of the domain $\Omega_i \cap \Omega$. Then

$$\sum_i \int_{\Omega_i \cap \Omega} |u|^2 = \sum_i \int_\Omega \chi_i |u|^2 = \int_\Omega \sum_i \chi_i |u|^2 \le M \int_\Omega |u|^2.$$

This proves the first estimate. For the second estimate, we use the overlap condition and the condition on the supports of the functions u_i to see that for each $x \in \Omega$, the sum on the left hand side extends over not more than M terms. Therefore,

$$\int_\Omega \left(\sum_i u_i\right)^2 \le \int_\Omega M \sum_i |u_i|^2 \le M \sum_i \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)}^2.$$

$\square$

Remark 13: The proof of theorem 6 shows that the uniform Poincaré property could be weakened. It is enough that the L^2 projections $\Pi_i : H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega) \to V_i$ satisfy

$$\|\Pi_i u\|_{H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} \le C_P \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)},$$
$$\|u - \Pi_i u\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} \le C_P \operatorname{diam}(\Omega_i) \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)}.$$

Remark 14: The existence of the uniform Poincaré constant is related to a certain uniformity of shapes of the patches. More precisely, for any bounded domain D, the constant λ, defined by

$$\lambda^{-1/2} = \sup_{u \in H^1(D)} \inf_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{\|u - \mu\|_{L^2(D)}}{\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(D)}}$$

is the second (i.e., the first non-zero) eigenvalue of the Neumann problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u &= \lambda u & \text{on } D, \\ \partial_n u &= 0 & \text{on } \partial D. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 15: Let us note that a simple scaling argument shows that the uniform Poincaré constant of definition 3 depends only on the shape of the patches and not the diameters. Thus, one simple way to enforce a uniform Poincaré property is to restrict the number of possible shapes of the patches $\Omega_i \cap \Omega$.

Let us outline sufficient conditions on the patches $\Omega_i \cap \Omega$ that guarantee the uniform Poincaré property of the local approximation spaces V_i based on the following lemma.

Lemma 3 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a convex domain, $u \in H^1(\Omega)$. Then*

$$\|u - \underline{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \left(\frac{\omega_n}{|\Omega|}\right)^{1-1/n} (\mathrm{diam}(\Omega))^n \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \tag{30}$$

where $\underline{u}$ is the average of u over Ω

$$\underline{u} = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega u, \tag{31}$$

$|\Omega|$ stands for the volume of Ω, and ω_n is the surface of the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof: Section 7.8 of [5]. □

For patches $\Omega_i \cap \Omega$ such that $\Omega_i \cap \Gamma_D = \emptyset$, lemma 3 gives the uniform Poincaré property if $\Omega_i \cap \Omega$ is convex and if there is $\rho > 0$ such that each patch contains a ball of radius $\rho \, \mathrm{diam}(\Omega_i)$ (and is trivially contained in a ball of radius $\mathrm{diam}(\Omega_i)$). Note that this is reasonable restriction on the patches in view of condition (4).

Let us now turn to the patches close to the boundary where the Dirichlet conditions are prescribed. For simplicity, consider a two dimensional setting, assume that the patches Ω_i are discs, and that $\Omega_i \cap \Gamma_D \neq \emptyset$, $\Omega_i \cap \Gamma_N = \emptyset$. Moreover, let $\Omega_i \cap \Gamma_D$ be a straight line segment. If $\Omega_i \cap \Omega$ is less than a half-disc (but $\Omega_i \cap \Omega$ still contains a ball with diameter $\rho \, \mathrm{diam}(\Omega_i)$), the reflection across Γ_D yields a convex domain $\tilde{\Omega} \subset \Omega_i$. For $u \in H^1(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)$ such that $u|_{\Gamma_D} = 0$, the antisymmetric extension across Γ_D gives an $H^1(\tilde{\Omega})$ function with zero average, and thus lemma 3 gives

$$2\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)} = \|u\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\rho} \, \mathrm{diam}(\Omega_i) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap \Omega)}.$$

The case that $\Omega_i \cap \Omega$ is bigger than a half-disc can be reduced to the above one by an appropriate mapping. The necessary condition for the Poincaré constant not to degenerate is that the length of the line segment $\Omega_i \cap \Gamma_D \geq \rho \, \mathrm{diam}(\Omega_i)$.

The case $\Omega_i \cap \Gamma_D \neq \emptyset$, $\Omega_i \cap \Gamma_N \neq \emptyset$ can be dealt with using similar ideas. Again, the necessary condition is that the length of the line segment $\Omega_i \cap \Gamma_D \geq \rho \, \mathrm{diam}(\Omega_i)$.

References

[1] I. Babuška and A. Miller. A feedback finite element method with a-posteriori error estimation: Part 1: The finite element method and some basic properties of the a posteriori error estimator. *Comput. Meths. Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 61:1–40, 1987.

[2] I. Babuška and W. C. Rheinboldt. A posteriori error estimates for finite element computations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 15:736–755, 1978.

[3] S. Bergman. *Integral operators in the theory of linear partial differential equations.* Springer Verlag, 1961.

[4] Freund. A transpose-free quasi-minimal residual algorithm for non-hermitian linear systems. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 14(2):470–482, 1993.

[5] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order.* Grundlagen der mathematischen Wissenschaften 224. Springer, 1977.

[6] I.S. Gradshtein. *Table of Integrals, Series and Products.* Academic Press, New York, 1980.

[7] P. Henrici. A survey of I.N. Vekua's theory of elliptic partial differential equations with analytic coefficients. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, 1957.

[8] I. Herrera. *Boundary Methods: An Algebraic Theory.* Pitman, Boston, 1984.

[9] T. Belytschko Y.Y. Lu and L. Gu. Element-free Galerkin methods. *Internat. J. Numer. Meths. Engrg.*, 37:229–256, 1994.

[10] J. M. Melenk. Finite element methods with harmonic shape functions for solving Laplace's equation. Master's thesis, University of Maryland, 1992.

[11] J. M. Melenk. *On Generalized Finite Element Methods.* PhD thesis, University of Maryland, 1995.

[12] N. I. Muskhelishvili. *Some Basic Problems of the Mathematical Theory of Elasticity.* P. Noordhoff, Groningen, 1963.

[13] J. T. Oden and A. Duarte. *hp* clouds – a meshless method to solve boundary value problems. Technical Report TICAM Report 95-05, TICAM, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, 1995.

[14] Hae-Soo Oh and I. Babuška. The *p*-version of the finite element method for the elliptic boundary value problems with interfaces. *Comput. Meths. Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 97:211–231, 1992.

[15] Hae-Soo Oh and I. Babuška. The method of auxiliary mapping for the finite element solutions of elasticity problems containing singularities. Technical Report BN-1178, Inst. for Phys. Sci. and Tech., College Park, MD 20742, 1994.

[16] I. Babuška. Information-based numerical practice. *Journal of Complexity*, 3:331–346, 1987.

[17] I. Babuška, G. Caloz, and J. Osborn. Special finite element methods for a class of second order elliptic problems with rough coefficients. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 31:945–981, 1994.

[18] I. Babuška and B. Guo. The *hp* version of the finite element method with various elements. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 25:837–861, 1988.

[19] I. Babuška, F. Ihlenburg, E. Paik, and S. Sauter. A generalized finite element method for solving the Helmholtz equation in two dimensions with minimal pollution. Technical Report BN 1179, University of Maryland, Inst. for Phys. Sc. and Tech., 1994.

[20] I. Babuška and M. Suri. The optimal convergence rate of the *p*-version of the finite element method. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 24:750–776, 1987.

[21] G. Szegö. Über Polynome, die zu einer gegebenen Kurve der komplexen Ebene gehören. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 9:218–270, 1921.

[22] L.L. Thomson and P.M. Pinsky. A Galerkin least squares finite element method for the two-dimensional Helmholtz equation. *Internat. J. Numer. Meths. Engrg.*, 38:371–397, 1995.

[23] I. N. Vekua. *New Methods for Solving Elliptic Equations*. North Holland, 1967.

[24] J.L. Walsh. *Interpolation and approximation by rational functions in the complex domain*, volume 20 of *colloquium publications*. American Mathematical Society, 1960.

The Laboratory for Numerical Analysis is an integral part of the Institute for Physical Science and Technology of the University of Maryland, under the general administration of the Director, Institute for Physical Science and Technology. It has the following goals:

To conduct research in the mathematical theory and computational implementation of numerical analysis and related topics, with emphasis on the numerical treatment of linear and nonlinear differential equations and problems in linear and nonlinear algebra.

To help bridge gaps between computational directions in engineering, physics, etc., and those in the mathematical community.

To provide a limited consulting service in all areas of numerical mathematics to the University as a whole, and also to government agencies and industries in the State of Maryland and the Washington Metropolitan area.

To assist with the education of numerical analysts, especially at the postdoctoral level, in conjunction with the Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematics Program and the programs of the Mathematics and Computer Science Departments. This includes active collaboration with government agencies such as the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

To be an international center of study and research for foreign students in numerical mathematics who are supported by foreign governments or exchange agencies (Fulbright, etc.).

Further information may be obtained from **Professor I. Babuška**, Chairman, Laboratory for Numerical Analysis, Institute for Physical Science and Technology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742-2431.