TWO-LEVEL OVERLAPPING SCHWARZ ALGORITHMS FOR A STAGGERED DISCONTINUOUS GALERKIN METHOD

ERIC T. CHUNG *, HYEA HYUN KIM †, AND OLOF B. WIDLUND ‡

TR2011-943

Abstract. Two overlapping Schwarz algorithms are developed for a discontinuous Galerkin (DG) finite element approximation of second order scalar elliptic problems in both two and three dimensions. The discontinuous Galerkin formulation is based on a staggered discretization introduced by Chung and Engquist [13] for the acoustic wave equation. Two types of coarse problems are introduced for the two-level Schwarz algorithms. The first is built on a nonoverlapping subdomain partition, which allows quite general subdomain partitions, and the second on introducing an additional coarse triangulation that can also be quite independent of the fine triangulation. Condition number bounds are established and numerical results are presented.

Key words. domain decomposition, elliptic problems, preconditioned conjugate gradients, discontinuous Galerkin methods, staggered grid, overlapping Schwarz algorithms

AMS(MOS) subject classifications. 65F10, 65N30, 65N55

1. Introduction. Two-level overlapping Schwarz algorithms are developed for the fast and stable solution of a staggered discontinuous Galerkin method applied to second order elliptic problems. Discontinuous Galerkin methods allow test functions which are discontinuous across element boundaries and this feature makes them more suitable for modeling problems with discontinuous coefficients, singularities, multiscales and multiphysics. Since the first work, by Reed and Hill [27], for hyperbolic equations, discontinuous Galerkin methods have been applied to various problems and the field has become an active research area, see, e.g., [19, 16, 28, 9, 5]. The design of the flux condition across the inter-element boundary determines the accuracy of the discontinuous Galerkin approximation and the properties of the resulting linear system.

In relatively recent works by Engquist and the first author [12, 13, 15, 14], a staggered discontinuous Galerkin method is developed and analyzed. A second order problem is written as a system of first order with two unknowns $\boldsymbol{U}$ and u. To approximate $\boldsymbol{U}$ and u, each

*Department of Mathematics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong `tschung@math.cuhk.edu.hk`, `http://www.math.cuhk.edu.hk/tschung`, AND The work of this author was supported by Hong Kong RGC General Research Fund Project 401010,

†Department of Applied Mathematics, Kyung Hee University, Korea `hhkim@khu.ac.kr or hyeahyun@gmail.com`, `http://hhkim.khu.ac.kr`. This work was supported by the Korea Science and Engineering Foundation (KOSEF) grant funded by the Korea Korean Government(MOST) (2011-0023354).

‡Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, 251 Mercer Street, New York, N.Y. 10012, USA `widlund@cims.nyu.edu`, `http://www.cs.nyu.edu/cs/faculty/widlund`. This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under contracts DE-FG02-06ER25718 and in part by National Science Foundation Grant DMS-0914954. Part of the work of this author was also supported by the Institute of Mathematical Sciences and the Department of Mathematics of the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

triangle, in a given triangulation, is subdivided and discontinuous functions $\boldsymbol{U}_h$ and u_h are built for the resulting triangulation so that on each interelement boundary one of these functions is continuous and the other discontinuous. In addition, we require these functions to satisfy a certain inf-sup stability. Using them, a conservative inter-element flux condition is then obtained straightforwardly. Such a flux condition preserves symmetry of the model problem and results in an optimal order of approximation. Moreover, the use of this staggered approximation provides locally and globally conservative schemes.

For elliptic problems, the resulting linear system arising from the staggered discontinuous Galerkin formulation is symmetric and positive definite after eliminating one set of variables locally. To the best of our knowledge, no discontinuous Galerkin formulation has previously been developed which is symmetric and positive definite without introducing an additional penalty term. However, one disadvantage of the staggered discontinuous Galerkin method is that the resulting linear system is relatively large and less sparse than those from other discontinuous Galerkin formulation, because the test functions are built after a further subdivision of the given triangulation and are also partially continuous. Therefore, a fast and stable solver for the staggered discontinuous Galerkin formulation is quite desirable to increase its applicability for real world problems.

There have been previous studies that address fast and stable solvers for discontinuous Galerkin methods. In the works by Feng and Karakashian [21, 22], two-level additive Schwarz methods were developed for second order elliptic problems and fourth order problems, and in the work by Lasser and Toselli [26] overlapping Schwarz preconditioners were developed for advection-diffusion problems. A more general framework of Schwarz preconditioners was studied in [1, 2, 3, 4] including multiplicative Schwarz preconditioners and hp-discontinuous Galerkin formulation. In the work by Dryja, Galvis, and Sarkis [20], BDDC methods were applied to discontinuous Galerkin formulations of elliptic problems with discontinuous coefficients, where the finite element functions are continuous inside each subdomain and discontinuous across the subdomain boundaries only. Recently, two-level additive Schwarz preconditioners have also been studied by Barker et al [6]. In their work, algorithms are developed and analyzed for several types of coarse problems and their performance compared for these different choices.

In our work, we will develop a two-level overlapping Schwarz preconditioner for the staggered discontinuous Galerkin formulation [13] applied to elliptic problems. In all the previous works on two-level Schwarz preconditioners for the discontinuous Galerkin formulation, each subdomain is assumed to be an element of a coarse regular partition or the union of a few such elements. Our algorithm, in contrast, allows for a quite general subdomain partition without such an assumption. Two types of coarse problems are introduced. The first one is related only to the subdomain partition where each subdomain is obtained as the union of elements provided in the problem domain. On each face, which is the common part of two subdomain boundaries, we introduce a face-based finite element function; its value is one on the given face and zero on the rest of the subdomain interface. For these interface values, the values in the interior of each subdomain are determined by minimizing a certain discrete energy norm. By using these face-based functions in the construction of the coarse problem, we can prove that the condition number can be bounded by $C(1+H/\delta)(1+H^{2-d}\max_{F_{ij}}|\theta^c_{F_{ij}}|^2_{H^1(\Omega)})$, where d is the dimension, H is the subdomain diameter, δ the overlapping width, C a positive constant independent of any mesh parameters, and $\theta^c_{F_{ij}}(x)$ a continuous, face-based finite element function described in Section 4. We note that our result can be applied to quite general subdomain partitions, where each subdomain satisfies a Poincaré-inequality and a starlike property.

The second type of coarse problem is obtained by introducing an additional coarse triangulation. In this case, the subdomains again need not be a union of coarse triangles. With the less strong assumption that the diameter of each subdomain is comparable to those of the coarse triangles which intersect it, we can prove a condition number bound of $C(1+H/\delta)$.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the staggered discontinuous Galerkin formulation is introduced for a model elliptic problem and in Sections 3 and 4, our first two-level Schwarz algorithm is developed and analyzed. In Section 5, the algorithm with the second type of the coarse problem is introduced and analyzed. In Section 6, numerical experiments are reported for the proposed algorithms. Throughout this paper, C denotes a generic positive constant, which is independent of any mesh parameters.

2. The Staggered Discontinuous Galerkin formulation.

2.1. Variational form. We consider a scalar, elliptic model problem in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $d = 2$ or 3:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{find } u \in H^1_0(\Omega) \text{ such that} \\ &-\nabla\cdot(\rho(x)\nabla u(x)) = f(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\rho(x) \geq \rho_0 > 0$ with ρ_0 a constant. The domain Ω is subdivided into potentially many subdomains Ω_i, which may have quite irregular boundaries. In the following, we will use d to denote the dimension of Ω. In our description of the algorithm, we will primarily discuss the case of $d = 3$. The coefficient function can be discontinuous in Ω, but will be assumed to vary only moderately in each subdomain. An equivalent variational formulation is obtained by integrating by parts:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{find } u \in H^1_0(\Omega) \text{ such that} \\ &(\rho(x)\nabla u, \nabla v)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(\Omega)} = (f, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in H^1_0(\Omega). \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

By introducing an additional unknown, namely $\boldsymbol{U} := \rho\nabla u$, we can recast this problem, and obtain a suitable framework for our DG discretization, also known as a *two-unknown* or a *saddle point* problem:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\text{find } (u,\boldsymbol{U}) \in H_0^1(\Omega)\times \boldsymbol{L}^2(\Omega) \text{ such that}\\
&(\rho(x)^{-1}\boldsymbol{U},\boldsymbol{V})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(\Omega)} - (\nabla u,\boldsymbol{V})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(\Omega)} = 0 \quad \forall\, \boldsymbol{V}\in \boldsymbol{L}^2(\Omega),\\
&(\boldsymbol{U},\nabla v)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(\Omega)} = (f,v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall\, v\in H_0^1(\Omega).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}
$$

2.2. The Staggered Discontinuous Galerkin discretization. Following Chung and Engquist [12, 13], we first define an initial triangulation $\mathcal{T}_u$. Thus, the domain Ω is triangulated using a set of tetrahedra in 3D and triangles in 2D. $\mathcal{F}_u$ will denote the set of all faces in this triangulation and $\mathcal{F}_u^0$ the subset of all interior faces, i.e., the set of faces in $\mathcal{F}_u$ that are not embedded in $\partial\Omega$.

For each tetrahedron, we select an interior point ν and denote this tetrahedron by $\mathcal{S}(\nu)$. We then further subdivide each tetrahedron into 4 sub-tetrahedra by connecting the point ν to the 4 vertices of the tetrahedron. The resulting triangulation is denoted by $\mathcal{T}$. We will denote by $\mathcal{F}_p$ the set of all the new faces obtained by the second subdivision and set $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_u \cup \mathcal{F}_p$ and $\mathcal{F}^0 := \mathcal{F}_u^0 \cup \mathcal{F}_p$.

For each face $\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_u$, we denote by $\mathcal{R}(\kappa)$ the union of the two sub-tetrahedra sharing the face κ. If κ is a boundary face, then $\mathcal{R}(\kappa)$ is just the one tetrahedron having this face. See Figure 1 for an illustration of this concept in two dimensions.



FIG. 1. *Triangulation in 2D.*

We define a unit normal vector $\boldsymbol{n}_\kappa$ for each face $\kappa \in \mathcal{F}$ as follows: If $\kappa \in \mathcal{F}\backslash\mathcal{F}^0$, then $\boldsymbol{n}_\kappa$ is the unit normal vector of κ pointing towards the outside of Ω. If $\kappa \in \mathcal{F}^0$, an interior face, we then fix $\boldsymbol{n}_\kappa$ as one of the two possible unit normal vectors on κ; when it is clear which face is being considered, we will simplify the notation and use $\boldsymbol{n}$ instead of $\boldsymbol{n}_\kappa$.

We are now ready to introduce our finite element spaces. Let $k \geq 0$ be a non-negative integer. Let $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ and let $P^k(\tau)$ be the space of polynomials of degree less than or equal to k on τ.

We first introduce our discrete scalar field space:

Locally $H^1(\Omega)$-conforming finite element space for the scalar field:

$$\mathcal{S}_h := \{v \mid v_{|\tau} \in P^k(\tau),\ \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T};\ v \text{ continuous across } \kappa \in \mathcal{F}_u^0;\ v_{|\partial\Omega} = 0\}. \tag{2.4}$$

We define two norms in the space $\mathcal{S}_h$, the discrete L^2-norm $\|v\|_X$ and the discrete H^1-norm $\|v\|_Z$, by

$$\|v\|_X^2 = \int_\Omega v^2\ dx + \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_u^0} h_\kappa \int_\kappa v^2\ d\sigma, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\|v\|_Z^2 = \int_\Omega |\nabla v|^2\ dx + \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_p} h_\kappa^{-1} \int_\kappa [v]^2\ d\sigma, \tag{2.6}$$

where h_κ is the diameter of κ and the integral of ∇v in (2.6) should be understood as defined elementwise:

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v|^2\ dx = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \int_\tau |\nabla (v_{|\tau})|^2\ dx.$$

Here we recall that, by definition, $v \in \mathcal{S}_h$ is always continuous across each face of $\mathcal{F}_u^0$, but that it can be discontinuous across any face of $\mathcal{F}_p$. In the above definition, the jump $[v]$ across each $\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_p$ is defined as

$$[v] = v_1 - v_2$$

where $v_i = v_{|\tau_i}$ and τ_1 and τ_2 are the two (sub-)tetrahedra sharing κ. We note that by using norm equivalence and a scaling argument (see also [13, Theorem 3.1]), we can show that there exists a constant $C > 0$, independent of h, such that

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \|v\|_X^2 \leq C\, \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{S}_h.$$

We next introduce a discrete space of vector fields:

Locally $H(\mathbf{div};\Omega)$-conforming finite element space for the vector field:

$$\mathcal{V}_h = \{\boldsymbol{V} \mid \boldsymbol{V}_{|\tau} \in P^k(\tau)^d,\ \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T};\ \boldsymbol{V}\cdot\boldsymbol{n} \text{ is continuous across } \kappa \in \mathcal{F}_p\}. \tag{2.7}$$

In the space $\mathcal{V}_h$, we define two norms, the discrete $\boldsymbol{L}^2$-norm and the discrete $H(\text{div};\Omega)$-norm, by

$$\|\boldsymbol{V}\|_{\boldsymbol{X}'}^2 = \int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{V}|^2\ dx + \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_p} h_\kappa \int_\kappa (\boldsymbol{V}\cdot\boldsymbol{n})^2\ d\sigma, \tag{2.8}$$

$$\|\boldsymbol{V}\|_{\boldsymbol{Z}'}^2 = \int_\Omega (\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{V})^2\ dx + \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_u^0} h_\kappa^{-1} \int_\kappa [\boldsymbol{V}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}]^2\ d\sigma \tag{2.9}$$

where the integral of $(\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{V})^2$ in (2.9) is defined elementwise. We also recall that, by definition, $\boldsymbol{V} \in \mathcal{V}_h$ has a continuous normal component across each face $\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_p$.

In the definition above, the jump $[\boldsymbol{V} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}]$ on each $\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_u^0$ is defined as

$$[\boldsymbol{V} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}] = \boldsymbol{V}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{n} - \boldsymbol{V}_2 \cdot \boldsymbol{n},$$

where $\boldsymbol{V}_i = \boldsymbol{V}_{|\tau_i}$ and τ_1 and τ_2 are the two sub-tetrahedra with κ as their common face.

One can prove, by an argument used in the proof of [13, Theorem 3.2], that there exists a constant $C > 0$, independent of h, such that

$$\|\boldsymbol{V}\|^2_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(\Omega)} \le \|\boldsymbol{V}\|^2_{\boldsymbol{X}'} \le C\,\|\boldsymbol{V}\|^2_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall \boldsymbol{V} \in \mathcal{V}_h. \tag{2.10}$$

We next define

$$\begin{aligned} b_h(\boldsymbol{U}, v) = & \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{U} \cdot \nabla v \, dx - \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_p} \int_\kappa \boldsymbol{U} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}\, [v] \, d\sigma \\ & - \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_u \setminus \mathcal{F}_u^0} \int_\kappa v\, \boldsymbol{U} \cdot \boldsymbol{n} \, d\sigma, \quad \boldsymbol{U} \in \mathcal{V}_h, v \in \mathcal{S}_h \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned} b_h^*(u, \boldsymbol{V}) = & -\int_\Omega u\, \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{V} \, dx + \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_u^0} \int_\kappa u\, [\boldsymbol{V} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}] \, d\sigma \\ & + \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_u \setminus \mathcal{F}_u^0} \int_\kappa u \boldsymbol{V} \cdot \boldsymbol{n} \, d\sigma, \quad u \in \mathcal{S}_h, \boldsymbol{V} \in \mathcal{V}_h. \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

We note that when v and u in the above formulae vanish on $\partial\Omega$, the last term in both $b_h(\boldsymbol{U}, v)$ and $b_h^*(u, \boldsymbol{V})$ vanish.

According to Lemma 2.4 of Chung and Engquist [13], we have

$$b_h(\boldsymbol{V}, v) = b_h^*(v, \boldsymbol{V}), \quad \forall (v, \boldsymbol{V}) \in \mathcal{S}_h \times \mathcal{V}_h. \tag{2.13}$$

Moreover, the following holds

$$b_h(\boldsymbol{V}, v) \le \|v\|_Z \, \|\boldsymbol{V}\|_{\boldsymbol{X}'}, \quad \forall (v, \boldsymbol{V}) \in \mathcal{S}_h \times \mathcal{V}_h. \tag{2.14}$$

The Staggered Discontinuous Galerkin method reads:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{find } (u_h, \boldsymbol{U}_h) \in \mathcal{S}_h \times \mathcal{V}_h \text{ such that} \\ & (\boldsymbol{U}_h, \boldsymbol{V})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2_\rho(\Omega)} - b_h^*(u_h, \boldsymbol{V}) = 0, \quad \forall\, \boldsymbol{V} \in \mathcal{V}_h \\ & b_h(\boldsymbol{U}_h, v) = (f, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall\, v \in \mathcal{S}_h. \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

Here

$$(\boldsymbol{U}, \boldsymbol{V})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2_\rho(\Omega)} = \int_\Omega \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \boldsymbol{U} \cdot \boldsymbol{V} \, dx.$$

Let B_h and M_h are matrices obtained from $b_h(\boldsymbol{V}, v)$ and $(\boldsymbol{U}, \boldsymbol{V})_{L^2_\rho(\Omega)}$ for functions in $(\boldsymbol{V}, v) \in \mathcal{V}_h \times \mathcal{S}$ and $(\boldsymbol{U}, \boldsymbol{V}) \in \mathcal{V}_h \times \mathcal{V}_h$, respectively. Using that $b_h(\boldsymbol{V}, v) = b_h^*(v, \boldsymbol{V})$, the matrix B_h^T corresponds to the bilinear form $b_h^*(v,\boldsymbol{U})$ for $(v,\boldsymbol{U}) \in \mathcal{S}_h \times \mathcal{V}_h$. We can then rewrite (2.15) as an algebraic system of equations:

$$M_h \boldsymbol{U}_h - B_h^T u_h = 0, \tag{2.16}$$

$$B_h \boldsymbol{U}_h = f_h. \tag{2.17}$$

Since M_h is symmetric and positive definite and block diagonal with small blocks, we can eliminate $\boldsymbol{U}_h$ from (2.16) to obtain an equation for u_h,

$$B_h M_h^{-1} B_h^T u_h = f_h, \tag{2.18}$$

with a matrix which is symmetric and positive definite. We introduce a bilinear form for $(u,v) \in \mathcal{S}_h \times \mathcal{S}_h$

$$a(u,v) := v^T B_h M_h^{-1} B_h^T u$$

and use the notation A to denote the matrix $B_h M_h^{-1} B_h^T$,

$$A := B_h M_h^{-1} B_h^T. \tag{2.19}$$

We will develop two two-level overlapping Schwarz algorithms for solving the algebraic system (2.18).

In the design of the first preconditioner, we will build coarse basis functions related to a nonoverlapping subdomain partition of Ω similar to that of [17]. Let $\{\Omega_i\}$ be a nonoverlapping partition of Ω. For a given partition, we introduce local finite element spaces,

$$\mathcal{V}_{h,i} := \mathcal{V}_h|_{\Omega_i},\ \mathcal{S}_{h,i} := \mathcal{S}_h|_{\Omega_i},$$

which are the restrictions of $\mathcal{V}_h$ and $\mathcal{S}_h$ to the subdomain Ω_i. Associated with $(\mathcal{V}_{h,i}, \mathcal{S}_{h,i})$, we introduce local bilinear forms $b_{h,i}$ and $b_{h,i}^*$ by

$$b_{h,i}(\boldsymbol{U},v) = \int_{\Omega_i} \boldsymbol{U}\cdot\nabla v\ dx - \sum_{\kappa\in\mathcal{F}_p \bigcap \Omega_i} \int_\kappa \boldsymbol{U}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\,[v]\ d\sigma \tag{2.20}$$

$$\begin{aligned} b_{h,i}^*(u,\boldsymbol{V}) = &-\int_{\Omega_i} u\,\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{V}\ dx + \sum_{\kappa\in\mathcal{F}_u^0 \bigcap \Omega_i} \int_\kappa u\,[\boldsymbol{V}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}]\ d\sigma \\ &+ \sum_{\kappa\in\mathcal{F}_u^0 \bigcap \partial\Omega_i} \int_\kappa u\,\boldsymbol{V}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}_i\ d\sigma, \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

where $\boldsymbol{n}_i$ is the unit normal to $\partial\Omega_i$ on κ. It can be seen easily that

$$b_{h,i}(\boldsymbol{V},v) = b_{h,i}^*(v,\boldsymbol{V}), \tag{2.22}$$

and that

$$b_h(\boldsymbol{V},v) = \sum_i b_{h,i}(\boldsymbol{V}|_{\Omega_i}, v|_{\Omega_i}), \quad b_h^*(v,\boldsymbol{V}) = \sum_i b_{h,i}^*(v|_{\Omega_i}, \boldsymbol{V}|_{\Omega_i}).$$

Let B_i and B_i^* be the matrices associated to the bilinear forms $b_{h,i}$ and $b_{h,i}^*$, respectively, i.e.,

$$\langle B_i \boldsymbol{V}|_{\Omega_i}, v|_{\Omega_i}\rangle = b_{h,i}(\boldsymbol{V}|_{\Omega_i}, v|_{\Omega_i})$$

and

$$\langle B_i^* v|_{\Omega_i}, \boldsymbol{V}|_{\Omega_i}\rangle = b_{h,i}^*(v|_{\Omega_i}, \boldsymbol{V}|_{\Omega_i}).$$

Here $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denotes the l^2-inner product. Using (2.22), we have

$$B_i^* = B_i^T.$$

By introducing M_i, the matrix associated to the bilinear form

$$\langle M_i \boldsymbol{U}|_{\Omega_i}, \boldsymbol{V}|_{\Omega_i}\rangle = (\boldsymbol{U}|_{\Omega_i}, \boldsymbol{V}_{\Omega_i})_{L^2_\rho(\Omega_i)}$$

and R_i, the restriction from $\mathcal{S}_h$ to $\mathcal{S}_{h,i}$, we can rewrite (2.15) as

$$M_i \boldsymbol{U}_i - B_i^T R_i u = 0, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N, \tag{2.23}$$

$$\sum_i R_i^T B_i \boldsymbol{U}_i = \sum_i R_i^T f_i, \tag{2.24}$$

where $\boldsymbol{U}_i$ is the restriction of $\boldsymbol{U}$ to Ω_i and f_i is given by

$$\langle f_i, v|_{\Omega_i}\rangle = (f, v)_{L^2(\Omega_i)}.$$

Since M_i are invertible, by (2.23) and (2.24), we can obtain the algebraic equation (2.18) by assembling of local matrices:

$$\sum_i R_i^T B_i M_i^{-1} B_i^T R_i u = \sum_i R_i^T f_i. \tag{2.25}$$

Here we note that $u \in \mathcal{V}_h$, where functions can be discontinuous across each face $\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_p$. We introduce the notation A_i for

$$A_i = B_i M_i^{-1} B_i^T.$$

and we introduce a bilinear form defined on $\mathcal{S}_{h,i} \times \mathcal{S}_{h,i}$,

$$a_i(u_i, v_i) = \langle A_i u_i, v_i\rangle. \tag{2.26}$$

3. A two-level overlapping Schwarz algorithm. We consider a nonoverlapping partitions of Ω, which is denoted by $\{\Omega_i\}$. The nonoverlapping partition can be obtained from the original triangulation $\mathcal{T}_u$ provided for Ω, e.g., by using a mesh partitioner; the subdomains in the resulting partition may then have quite irregular boundaries. The interface Γ is defined by

$(\cup_{i\neq k}\partial\Omega_i \cap \partial\Omega_k) \setminus \partial\Omega$, and Γ^h is the set of nodes that belong to the boundaries of at least two substructures.

We introduce an overlapping partition $\{\Omega'_j\}$ of Ω and each subregion Ω'_j is associated with finite element spaces $\mathcal{V}_h(\Omega'_j)$ and $\mathcal{S}^0_h(\Omega'_j)$, which are the restrictions of $\mathcal{V}_h$ and $\mathcal{S}_h$ to the subregion Ω'_j. Here the superscript 0 indicates that the functions in $\mathcal{S}^0_h(\Omega'_j)$ vanish on the boundary of Ω'_j.

A bilinear form is introduced for $(u, v) \in \mathcal{S}^0_h(\Omega'_j) \times \mathcal{S}^0_h(\Omega'_j)$, by

$$a_{\Omega'_j}(u, v) := v^T B_{h,\Omega'_j} M^{-1}_{\Omega'_j} B^T_{h,\Omega'_j} u,$$

where B_{h,Ω'_j} is the matrix obtained from $b_h(\boldsymbol{U}, v)$ for $(\boldsymbol{U}, v) \in \mathcal{V}_h(\Omega'_j) \times \mathcal{S}^0_h(\Omega'_j)$ and $M^{-1}_{\Omega'_j}$ is the inverse of the weighted mass matrix obtained from $(\boldsymbol{U}, \boldsymbol{V})_{L^2_\rho(\Omega)}$ where $(\boldsymbol{U}, \boldsymbol{V}) \in \mathcal{V}_h(\Omega'_j) \times \mathcal{V}_h(\Omega'_j)$.

To simplify the presentation, we will use the notation V'_j to denote $\mathcal{S}^0_h(\Omega'_j)$ and introduce the trivial extension by zero

$$R^T_j \,:\, V'_j \to S_h.$$

A projection P_j, related to the subregion Ω'_j, is defined by

$$P_j = R^T_j P'_j,$$

where P'_j is obtained from

$$a_{\Omega'_j}(P'_j u, v) = a(u, R^T_j v), \quad \forall v \in V'_j.$$

We now construct the coarse space V_0 based on the nonoverlapping partition $\{\Omega_i\}$. Let F_{ij} denote the common face (edge) of two subdomains Ω_i and Ω_j in three (two) dimensions. On each F_{ij}, we define a face (edge)-based function $\theta^{(k)}_{F_{ij}}(x)$ as follows. For $x \in \partial\Omega^h_i$ its value is given by

$$\theta^{(k)}_{F_{ij}}(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in \overline{F}^h_{ij} \\ 0, & x \in \Gamma^h \setminus \overline{F}^h_{ij}. \end{cases}$$

We extend these interface values to the interior by a minimal energy extension with respect to the seminorm $a_i(v_i, v_i)^{1/2}$ defined in (2.26). Here we use the superscript k to stress that S_h is defined by piecewise polynomials of order k. For $x \in \overline{\Omega}^h_j$, we define $\theta^{(k)}_{F_{ij}}(x)$ similarly. We then extend it by zero to the rest of Ω as an element of S_h.

We can now obtain the space of coarse basis functions,

$$V_0 = \text{span}\left\{\theta^{(k)}_{F_{ij}}(x),\ \forall F_{ij}\right\}.$$

The projection P_0 is then defined by

$$a(P_0 u, v) = a(u, v), \quad \forall v \in V_0$$

and the two-level overlapping Schwarz operator is given by

$$P_{as} = \sum_{j=0}^{N} P_j.$$

4. Estimate of the condition number. We will now provide a bound of the condition number of our first two-level overlapping Schwarz algorithm. See [29, Chapter 3] for this algorithm and theory in the standard conforming case.

For the upper bound, we obtain

$$a(P_{as}u, u) \leq (1 + N_c)a(u, u),$$

where N_c is the number of colors required to color the overlapping subregions in $\{\Omega'_j\}$ so that no two of them have the same color.

For the lower bound, we will prove that for some decomposition of $u \in \mathcal{S}_h$,

$$u = u_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{N} R_j^T u_j,$$

with $u_0 \in V_0$ and $u_j \in V'_j$, the following inequality holds

$$a(u_0, u_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{\Omega'_j}(u_j, u_j) \leq C_0^2 a(u, u).$$

The condition number of P_{as} is then bounded by

$$\kappa(P_{as}) \leq (1 + N_c)C_0^2.$$

In our theory, we need an assumption on the nonoverlapping subdomain partition $\{\Omega_i\}$. A domain Ω is starlike if there exits a $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega$ and a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0) \cdot \mathbf{n} \geq cH_\Omega, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \partial\Omega, \tag{4.1}$$

where $\mathbf{n}$ is the unit normal to $\partial\Omega$ at $\mathbf{x}$.

ASSUMPTION 4.1. *Each subdomain Ω_i satisfies the Poincaré inequalities and the starlike property, and the number of tetrahedra along each edge of Ω_i is proportional to $(H/h)^{d-2}$.* With the above assumption on each subdomain in the nonoverlapping subdomain partition, we will prove that

$$C_0^2 \leq C\left(1 + \frac{H}{\delta}\right)\left(1 + H^{2-d} \max_{F_{ij}} |\theta^c_{F_{ij}}|^2_{H^1(\Omega)}\right),$$

where $\theta^c_{F_{ij}}$ is a linear conforming face function with the boundary values

$$\theta^c_{F_{ij}}(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in F^h_{ij} \\ 0, & x \in \Gamma^h \setminus F^h_{ij}, \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

and which minimizes the H^1-seminorm on a space V_h. Here V_h is the space of linear conforming finite element functions on the given initial triangulation $\mathcal{T}_u$. We note that $\theta^c_{F_{ij}}$ is needed only for the theory.

We recall the following properties for $b_h(\boldsymbol{V}, v)$ and $b^*_h(v, \boldsymbol{V})$ (see [12, 13]):

$$|b_h(\boldsymbol{V}, v)| \le \|\boldsymbol{V}\|_{Z'} \|v\|_X, \tag{4.3}$$

$$|b_h(\boldsymbol{V}, v)| \le \|\boldsymbol{V}\|_{X'} \|v\|_Z, , \tag{4.4}$$

and

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{V}\in\mathcal{V}_h} \sup_{v\in\mathcal{S}_h} \frac{b^*_h(v, \boldsymbol{V})}{\|v\|_X \|\boldsymbol{V}\|_{Z'}} \ge \beta, \tag{4.5}$$

$$\inf_{v\in\mathcal{S}_h} \sup_{\boldsymbol{V}\in\mathcal{V}_h} \frac{b_h(\boldsymbol{V}, v)}{\|\boldsymbol{V}\|_{X'} \|v\|_Z} \ge \beta, \tag{4.6}$$

where β is a positive constant independent of h and H.

We note that using (4.4) and (4.6), we obtain for $u \in S_h$

$$c(\rho)\beta^2 \|u\|^2_Z \le a(u, u) \le C(\rho)\|u\|^2_Z,$$

where $c(\rho)$ and $C(\rho)$ are positive constants depending on $\rho(x)$. Similarly, we obtain for $u_i \in S_{h,i}$

$$c\beta^2 \rho_i \|u_i\|^2_{Z_i} \le a_i(u_i, u_i) \le C\rho_i \|u_i\|^2_{Z_i}, \tag{4.7}$$

where

$$\|u_i\|^2_{Z_i} := \int_{\Omega_i} |\nabla u_i|^2 \, dx + \sum_{\kappa\in\mathcal{F}_p \bigcap \Omega_i} h_\kappa^{-1} \int_\kappa [u_i]^2 \, ds$$

and c and C are positive constants, which do not depend on $\rho(x)$. Here we assume that $\rho(x) = \rho_i$ for x in Ω_i where ρ_i is a positive constant.

For $u \in H^1_0(\Omega)$, we have

$$\|u\|_Z = |u|_{H^1(\Omega)},$$

and for all $u \in H^1_0(\Omega)$

$$c(\rho)\beta |u|^2_{H^1(\Omega)} \le a(u, u) \le C(\rho)|u|^2_{H^1(\Omega)}. \tag{4.8}$$

We list some auxiliary results which will be useful in our analysis.

- Poincaré(-Friedrichs) inequalities (Brenner [8])

$$\|v\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2 \le C\left(\sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} |v|_{H_1(\tau)}^2 + \sum_{\kappa\in\mathcal{F}} h_\kappa^{-1}\int_\kappa [v]^2\,ds + \left(\int_\Omega v\,ds\right)^2\right). \tag{4.9}$$

$$\|v\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2 \le C\left(\sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} |v|_{H_1(\tau)}^2 + \sum_{\kappa\in\mathcal{F}} h_\kappa^{-1}\int_\kappa [v]^2\,ds + \left(\int_\Gamma v\,ds\right)^2\right). \tag{4.10}$$

- Trace inequality (Feng and Karakashian [22, Lemma 3.6])

(4.11)
$$\|v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2 \le C\left(H_\Omega^{-1}\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + H_\Omega\left(\sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} |v|_{H^1(\tau)}^2 + \sum_{\kappa\in\mathcal{F}} h_\kappa^{-1}\int_\kappa [v]^2\,ds\right)\right).$$

Let Ω_δ be the thin layer of Ω which consists of $\mathbf{x}\in\Omega$ such that $\text{dist}(\mathbf{x},\partial\Omega)\le\delta$.

- Generalized Poincaré inequality (Feng and Karakashian [22, Lemma 3.7])

(4.12)
$$\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega_\delta)} \le C\delta\left(H_\Omega^{-1}\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + H_\Omega\left(\sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} |v|_{H^1(\tau)}^2 + \sum_{\kappa\in\mathcal{F}} h_\kappa^{-1}\int_\kappa [v]^2\,ds\right)\right).$$

We note that these results hold for any piecewise polynomial function u given in terms of a partition $\mathcal{T}$ with $\mathcal{F}$, the set of all interior faces (edges) in $\mathcal{T}$. In our case, $\mathcal{F}$ is the union of $\mathcal{F}_p$ and $\mathcal{F}_u^0$. Γ is a measurable subset of $\partial\Omega$ with a positive $(d-1)$-dimensional measure. H_Ω and h_κ denote the diameter of the domain Ω and κ, respectively.

The inequalities in (4.9) and (4.10) hold for any Ω which satisfy the standard Poincaré(-Friedrichs) inequalities. The inequalities in (4.11) and (4.12) hold for any bounded polyhedral domain which is starlike. The constant C in (4.11) depends on the constant c appearing in (4.1), the definition of the starlike property. We note that Ω need not be convex. The result in (4.12) is a general version of Lemma 3.10 in [29]. In our theory, these results will be applied to each subdomain Ω_i.

For a given function $u\in S_h$, we consider

$$u_0(x) = \sum_{ij} \overline{u}_{F_{ij}}\theta_{F_{ij}}^{(k)}(x), \tag{4.13}$$

where $\overline{u}_{F_{ij}}$ is the average of u over F_{ij}, i.e.,

$$\overline{u}_{F_{ij}} = \frac{\int_{F_{ij}} u(x(s))\,ds}{\int_{F_{ij}} 1\,ds}. \tag{4.14}$$

We note that $\theta_{F_{ij}}^{(k)}(x(s))=1$ on $\overline{F}_{ij}$, while the coarse basis function $\theta_{F_{ij}}^c(x)$ of the standard conforming finite elements vanishes at the boundary of the face, and that $\theta_{F_{ij}}^{(k)}$ satisfies

$$\sum_{F_{ij}\subset\partial\Omega_i} \theta_{F_{ij}}^{(k)}(x) = 1 \text{ for all } x\in\overline{\Omega}_i.$$

Let I^h be an interpolant of $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T})$, which is a space of piecewise H^1-functions in $\mathcal{T}$, to S_h which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\kappa (I^h v - v) q\, ds = 0,\ \forall q \in P^k(\kappa), \quad \forall \kappa \in \mathcal{F}_u^0, \\ &\int_\tau (I^h v - v) q\, dx = 0,\ \forall q \in P^{k-1}(\tau), \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

We note that $I^h v$ satisfies, see [13],

$$|I^h v|_{H^1(\tau)} \le C |v|_{H^1(\tau)},\ \forall v \in H^1(\tau). \tag{4.16}$$

We prove the following lemmas, which will be used in our analysis.

LEMMA 4.2. *For $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T})$, we have*

$$\|I^h v\|_Z \le C \|v\|_Z.$$

Proof. We will show that

$$\|I^h v - v\|_Z \le C \|v\|_Z.$$

By the definition of $\|\cdot\|_Z$-norm and the inequality (4.16), it suffices to prove that

$$\sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_p} h_\kappa^{-1} \int_\kappa [I^h v - v]^2\, ds \le C \|v\|_Z^2.$$

For a given $\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_p$, let τ_1 and τ_2 be the two (sub-)tetrahedra which share κ. Let w_i be the restriction of $I^h v - v$ to τ_i for $i = 1, 2$. By a trace inequality, we obtain

$$\int_\kappa [I^h v - v]^2\, ds \le C \sum_{i=1,2} (h_{\tau_i}^{-1} \|w_i\|_{L^2(\tau_i)}^2 + h_{\tau_i} |w_i|_{H^1(\tau_i)}^2).$$

From (4.15), w_i has a zero average over any face $\kappa_u \in \mathcal{F}_u^0$ of τ_i and by applying a Poincaré(-Friedrichs) inequality

$$\|w_i\|_{L^2(\tau_i)}^2 \le C h_{\tau_i}^2 |w_i|_{H^1(\tau_i)}^2,$$

and the following bound is obtained

$$\int_\kappa [I^h w - v]^2\, ds \le C \sum_{i=1,2} h_{\tau_i} |I^h v - v|_{H^1(\tau_i)}^2.$$

Combining the above inequality with (4.16), we obtain

$$\sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_p} h_\kappa^{-1} \int_\kappa [I^h v - v]^2\, ds \le C \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |v|_{H^1(\tau)}^2.$$

□

LEMMA 4.3. *With the assumption that the number of tetrahedra along each edge of Ω_i is proportional to $(H/h)^{d-2}$, the coarse basis function satisfies,*

$$\|\theta_{F_{ij}}^{(k)}\|_Z^2 \leq C(H^{d-2} + |\theta_{F_{ij}}^c|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2),$$

for all $k \geq 0$, where $\theta_{F_{ij}}^c(x)$ is the standard linear conforming face coarse basis function.

Proof. We assume $k \geq 1$ and later extend the result to the case $k = 0$. Let V_{ij} be the set of all triangles in the initial triangulation $\mathcal{T}_u$ that have a non-empty intersection with ∂F_{ij}. We define $\tilde{\theta}_{F_{ij}}^{(k)}(x)$ by

$$\tilde{\theta}_{F_{ij}}^{(k)}(x)|_\tau = \begin{cases} \theta_{F_{ij}}^{(k)}(x)|_\tau, & \tau \in V_{ij} \\ \theta_{F_{ij}}^c(x)|_\tau, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since the number of triangles in V_{ij} is proportional to H/h and to a constant for $d = 3$ and $d = 2$, respectively,

$$|\tilde{\theta}_{F_{ij}}^{(k)} - \theta_{F_{ij}}^c|_{H^1(\tau)}^2 \leq Ch^{d-2}$$

for a τ on V_{ij} and κ in $\mathcal{F}_p \bigcap \tau$ and

$$\frac{1}{h}\|[\tilde{\theta}_{F_{ij}}^{(k)} - \theta_{F_{ij}}^c]\|_{L^2(\kappa)}^2 \leq Ch^{d-2},$$

we obtain

$$\|\tilde{\theta}_{F_{ij}}^{(k)} - \theta_{F_{ij}}^c\|_Z^2 \leq CH^{d-2}.$$

We note that $\tilde{\theta}_{F_{ij}}^{(k)}(x)$ has the same boundary data as $\theta_{F_{ij}}^{(k)}(x)$. Using that $|\theta_{F_{ij}}^c|_{1,\Omega} = \|\theta_{F_{ij}}^c\|_Z$ and that $\theta_{F_{ij}}^{(k)}|_{\Omega_i}$ minimizes the norm $a_i(\cdot,\cdot)^{1/2}$, which is equivalent to $\rho_i\|\cdot\|_{Z_i}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_{F_{ij}}^{(k)}\|_Z^2 &\leq \|\tilde{\theta}_{F_{ij}}^{(k)}\|_Z^2 \\ &\leq C\left(H^{d-2} + \|\theta_{F_{ij}}^c\|_Z^2\right) \\ &= C\left(H^{d-2} + |\theta_{F_{ij}}^c|_{1,\Omega}^2\right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

For $k = 0$, we consider $I^h\theta_{F_{ij}}^{(1)}$, where I^h is the interpolant from a piecewise H^1-function in $\mathcal{T}$ to S_h with $k = 0$. Using the stability of the interpolant of Lemma 4.2, we obtain

$$\|\theta_{F_{ij}}^{(0)}\|_Z^2 \leq \|I^h\theta_{F_{ij}}^{(1)}\|_Z^2 \leq C\|\theta_{F_{ij}}^{(1)}\|_Z^2.$$

The above inequality combined with the result for $k \geq 1$ shows that the result also holds for the case $k = 0$. □

LEMMA 4.4. *With the assumption that the subdomains Ω_i satisfy the Poincaré inequality and starlike property, the u_0 in* (4.13) *satisfies*

$$a(u_0, u_0) \leq Ca(u,u)\,(1 + H^{2-d}\max_{F_{ij}}\|\theta_{F_{ij}}^c\|_Z^2).$$

Here C depends on the Poincaré and the starlike parameters of the subdomains.

Proof. We consider

$$a(u-u_0, u-u_0) = \sum_i a_i((u-u_0)|_{\Omega_i}, (u-u_0)|_{\Omega_i}).$$

Let R_i be the restriction to Ω_i. Then $R_i(u-u_0) = (u-u_0)|_{\Omega_i}$. Each term above is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} a_i(R_i(u-u_0), R_i(u-u_0)) &\le 2a_i(R_iu, R_iu) + 2a_i(R_iu_0, R_iu_0) \\ &\le C\left(a_i(R_iu, R_iu) + \sum_{F_{ij}\subset\partial\Omega_i} \overline{u}^2_{F_{ij}} a_i(R_i\theta_{F_{ij}}, R_i\theta_{F_{ij}})\right) \\ &\le C\left(a_i(R_iu, R_iu) + \sum_{F_{ij}\subset\partial\Omega_i} \overline{u}^2_{F_{ij}} \rho_i \|\theta_{F_{ij}}\|^2_Z\right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

Here we use the inequalities in (4.7).

For the term, $\overline{u}^2_{F_{ij}}$, we obtain by applying (4.11) to Ω_i

$$\int_{F_{ij}} u^2\,ds \le C\left(H\left(|u|^2_{H^1(\Omega_i)} + \sum_{\kappa\in\Omega_i\bigcap\mathcal{F}_p} h_\kappa^{-1}\|[u]\|^2_{L^2(\kappa)}\right) + \frac{1}{H}\|u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_i)}\right). \tag{4.19}$$

Using the fact that $u-u_0$ is invariant to a shift by a constant and applying the Poincaré-inequality (4.9) to the bound above , we obtain

$$\overline{u}^2_{F_{ij}} \le CH^{2-d}\left(|u|^2_{H^1(\Omega_i)} + \sum_{\kappa\in\Omega_i\bigcap\mathcal{F}_p} h_\kappa^{-1}\|[u]\|^2_{L^2(\kappa)}\right). \tag{4.20}$$

Combining (4.18) with (4.20), we get

$$a_i(R_i(u-u_0), R_i(u-u_0)) \le C\left(a_i(R_iu, R_iu) + \sum_{F_{ij}\subset\partial\Omega_i} \rho_i\|R_iu\|^2_{Z_i} H^{2-d}\max_{F_{ij}}\|\theta_{F_{ij}}\|^2_Z\right)$$

and by the bound $\rho_i\|R_iu\|^2_{Z_i} \le Ca_i(R_iu, R_iu)$, see (4.7), we finally obtain

$$a(u_0, u_0) \le C\left(1 + H^{2-d}\max_{F_{ij}}\|\theta_{F_{ij}}\|^2_Z\right) a(u,u). \tag{4.21}$$

□

We now turn to the bounds for the local components. Let $\{\theta_j\}$ be a partition of unity provided for $\{\Omega'_j\}$ and where $\theta_j \in R_j^TV'_j$ with $|\nabla\theta_j| \le C/\delta$ and let $u_j = I^h(\theta_j(u-u_0)) \in R_j^TV'_j$, where I^h interpolates into S_h as defined in (4.15).

We obtain

THEOREM 4.5. *For $u \in \mathcal{S}_h$, when subdomains Ω_i satisfy Assumption 4.1 there is a partition $u = \sum_{j=0}^N u_j$ which satisfies*

$$a(u_0, u_0) + \sum_{j=1}^N a_{\Omega_j'}(u_j, u_j) \le C \left(1 + \frac{H}{\delta}\right) \left(1 + H^{2-d} \max_{F_{ij}} |\theta^c_{F_{ij}}|^2_{H^1(\Omega)}\right) a(u,u),$$

where C depends on the Poincaré and starlike parameters of the subdomains and the number of colors N_c, and $\theta^c_{F_{ij}}(x)$ is the standard linear conforming coarse basis function defined in (4.2).

Proof. We let $w = u - u_0$ and then let

$$u_j = I^h(\theta_j w) \in S_h.$$

We consider

$$a(u_j, u_j) \le C \sum_i \rho_i \|u_j\|^2_{Z_i} \le C \sum_i \rho_i \|\theta_j w\|^2_{Z_i}$$

$$\le C \sum_i \rho_i \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T} \bigcap \Omega_j' \bigcap \Omega_i} |\theta_j w|^2_{H_1(\tau)} + \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_p \bigcap \Omega_j' \bigcap \Omega_i} h_\kappa^{-1} \int_\kappa [w]^2\, ds \right)$$

$$\le C \sum_i \rho_i \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T} \bigcap \Omega_j' \bigcap \Omega_i} \|\nabla \theta_j w\|^2_{L_2(\tau)} + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T} \bigcap \Omega_j' \bigcap \Omega_i} |w|^2_{H_1(\tau)} + \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_p \bigcap \Omega_j' \bigcap \Omega_i} h_\kappa^{-1} \int_\kappa [w]^2\, ds \right). \tag{4.22}$$

We consider the first term in (4.22):

$$\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T} \bigcap \Omega_j' \bigcap \Omega_i} \|\nabla \theta_j w\|^2_{L_2(\tau)} \le C \frac{1}{\delta^2} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T} \bigcap \Omega_{j,\delta}' \bigcap \Omega_i} \|w\|^2_{L^2(\tau)} = C \frac{1}{\delta^2} \|w\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_{j,\delta}' \bigcap \Omega_i)}$$

(4.23)

$$\le C \frac{1}{\delta^2} \delta \left(H_{\Omega_j'}^{-1} \|w\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_j' \bigcap \Omega_i)} + H_{\Omega_j'} \left(\sum_{\tau \in \Omega_j' \bigcap \Omega_i} |w|_{H^1(\tau)} + \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{F}_p \bigcap \Omega_j' \bigcap \Omega_i} h^{-1} \int_\kappa [w]^2\, ds \right) \right).$$

Here $\Omega_{j,\delta}'$ is the union of $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ where $\nabla \theta_j$ does not vanish, and the bound (4.12) is applied to $\Omega_{j,\delta}' \bigcap \Omega_i$.

For the term $\|w\|^2_{L_2(\Omega_j' \bigcap \Omega_i)}$, we use the Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality (4.10)

$$\|w\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_i)} \le C(\Omega_i) \left(\sum_{\tau \in \Omega_i} |w|^2_{H_1(\tau)} + \sum_{\kappa \in \Omega_i \bigcap \mathcal{F}_p} h_\kappa^{-1} \|[w]\|^2_{L_2(\kappa)} + \left(\int_\Gamma w\, ds \right)^2 \right).$$

By choosing $\Gamma = F_{ij}$, we have $\int_\Gamma w\, ds = 0$, see (4.13) and (4.14), and from a scaling argument, we obtain

$$\|w\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_i)} \le C H^2 \left(\sum_{\tau \in \Omega_i} |w|^2_{H_1(\tau)} + \sum_{\kappa \in \Omega_i \bigcap \mathcal{F}_p} h^{-1} \|[w]\|^2_{L_2(\kappa)} \right).$$

Summing (4.23) over i combined with the above bound and assuming that $H_{\Omega_j'}$ is comparable to the diameter H of the Ω_i, which intersects Ω_j', we obtain

(4.24)

$$\sum_i \rho_i \sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}\bigcap\Omega_j'\bigcap\Omega_i} \|\nabla\theta_j w\|^2_{L_2(\tau)} \le C\frac{H}{\delta} \sum_{i,\Omega_i\bigcap\Omega_j'\neq\emptyset} \rho_i \left(\sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}\bigcap\Omega_i} |w|^2_{H_1(\tau)} + \sum_{\kappa\in\mathcal{F}_p\bigcap\Omega_i} h^{-1}\|[w]\|^2_{L_2(\kappa)} \right).$$

Here we note that the sum on the right hand side runs over only the subdomains Ω_i which intersect the subregion Ω_j'. Summing (4.22) over j combined with (4.24), we finally obtain

$$\sum_j a(u_j,u_j) \le C\left(1+\frac{H}{\delta}\right)\sum_i \rho_i\|R_i w\|^2_{Z_i} \le C\left(1+\frac{H}{\delta}\right)a(w,w), \tag{4.25}$$

where $w = u - u_0$. The bound in Lemma 4.4 then completes the proof. □

REMARK 4.6. *The above result holds for quite general subdomains Ω_i, which satisfy the standard Poincaré(-Friedrichs) inequalities and the starlike property, and has a number of tetrahedra across each edge proportional to $(H/h)^{d-2}$. The resulting bound depends on the energy of the linear conforming coarse basis function, $\theta^c_{F_{ij}}(x)$. In the standard case, when Ω_i is tetrahedral ($d=3$) and rectangular or triangular ($d=2$), we have*

$$|\theta^c_{F_{ij}}|^2_{H^1(\Omega)} \le CH^{d-2}\left(1+\log\frac{H}{h}\right),$$

where C is a positive constant independent of any mesh parameters. We also note that for John domains Ω_i in two dimensions the above bound was proved in [25]. We refer [7, 23, 10] for the definition of John domains. John domains satisfy Poincaré inequalities but they do not in general have the starlike property. Instead of the trace inequality in (4.11)*, we can apply the Sobolev inequality*

$$\overline{u}^2_{F_{ij}} \le \max_{x\in\Omega_i}|u(x)|^2 \le C\left(1+\log\frac{H}{h}\right)\|R_i u\|^2_{Z_i}$$

to get the bound

$$a(u_0,u_0)+\sum_j a_{\Omega_j'}(u_j,u_j) \le \left(1+\log\frac{H}{h}\right)^2\left(1+\frac{H}{\delta}\right)$$

for the two-dimensional case when Ω_i are John domains, see [17]. Here one additional log factor comes from the Sobolev inequality. We refer to some recent works [30, 18] for theory of domain decomposition methods on quite general subdomains.

In the three dimensions, with an assumption that Ω_i are Lipschitz, we obtain the following result:

LEMMA 4.7. *For a Lipschitz Ω_i in three dimensions, there exists a function $\theta^c_F \in \mathcal{V}_{h,i}\bigcap H^1(\Omega_i)$ with the bound*

$$|\theta^c_F(x)|^2_{H^1(\Omega_i)} \le CH\left(1+\log\frac{H}{h}\right).$$

Proof. Let $V = \{x \in \Omega_i \ : \ \text{dist}(x,F) \leq \sin\alpha \text{dist}(x,\partial F)\}$. Since Ω_i is a Lipschitz domain, we may select α so that $F_2 := \partial V \setminus \overline{F}$ does not touch $\partial\Omega_i$.

For $x \in V$, we define

$$d(x) = \frac{d_2(x)}{d_1(x) + d_2(x)},$$

where $d_1(x) = \text{dist}(x,F)$ and $d_2(x) = \text{dist}(x,F_2)$, and where we extend $d(x)$ by zero for $x \in \Omega_i \setminus V$. We note that the construction of such a function $d(x)$ was first given by Dohrmann in [18]. Let $d_{\partial F}(x) = \text{dist}(x,\partial F)$. We will show that for $x \in V$, there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$d_1(x) + d_2(x) \geq c d_{\partial F}(x).$$

For $x \in V$, let x_1 and x_2 be points on F and F_2 such that $d_1(x) = |x - x_1|$ and $d_2(x) = |x - x_2|$. Let a_{x_2} be points on ∂F such that $d_{\partial F}(x_2) = |x_2 - a_{x_2}|$. We then have

$$d_{\partial F}(x) \leq |x - a_{x_2}| \leq |x - x_2| + |x_2 - a_{x_2}|. \tag{4.26}$$

Since $x_2 \in F_2$, we have

$$|x_2 - a_{x_2}| = d_{\partial F}(x_2) = \frac{1}{\sin\alpha} d_1(x_2)$$

and by using $d_1(x_2) \leq |x_2 - x_1|$, we obtain

$$|x_2 - a_{x_2}| \leq \frac{1}{\sin\alpha}\left(|x_2 - x| + |x_1 - x|\right)$$

and from the bound in (4.26) combined with the above, we prove that

$$d_{\partial F}(x) \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sin\alpha}\right)(d_1(x) + d_2(x)). \tag{4.27}$$

We interpolate $d(x)$ to the finite element space $\mathcal{V}_{h,i} \bigcap H^1(\Omega_i)$ and obtain $\theta_F^c(x)$. We note that $\theta_F^c(x)$ vanishes on the boundary of F. The function $\theta_F^c(x)$ satisfies the required boundary condition, i.e., it has value one in the interior of F and zero at the rest of the boundary of Ω_i. We will prove that

$$|\theta_F^c|^2_{H^1(\Omega_i)} \leq CH(1 + \log(H/h)).$$

By the construction, it suffices to consider all tetrahedra covering V. For each tetrahedron τ touching the boundary of F, we have

$$|\theta_F^c|^2_{H^1(\tau)} \leq Ch,$$

and using that the number of such tetrahedra is $O(H/h)$, we obtain

$$\sum_{\overline{\tau} \bigcap \partial F \neq \emptyset} |\theta_F^c|^2_{H^1(\tau)} \leq CH. \tag{4.28}$$

For those tetrahedra not touching the boundary of F, by using (4.27) combined with

$$|\nabla\theta_F^c(x)| \leq C\frac{1}{d_1(x)+d_2(x)},$$

we obtain

$$|\nabla\theta_F^c(x)| \leq C\frac{1}{d_{\partial F}(x)}$$

and by integrating the above over all tetrahedra, which are away from ∂F by more than a mesh width, we obtain

$$\sum_{\tau\bigcap\partial F=\emptyset}|\theta_F^c|^2_{H^1(\tau)} \leq CH\log(H/h). \tag{4.29}$$

We complete the proof by using (4.28) and (4.29). ◻

5. Coarse problem from an additional coarse triangulation. By introducing an additional coarse triangulation and an alternative coarse space, we can obtain an alternative often better bound,

$$a(u_0,u_0) \leq C(\rho(x))a(u,u),$$

which results in

$$a(u_0,u_0)+\sum_{j=1}^{N}a_{\Omega_j'}(u_j,u_j) \leq C(\rho(x))\left(1+\frac{H}{\delta}\right)a(u,u).$$

However, $C(\rho(x))$ may depend on $\rho(x)$.

Let $\mathcal{T}_H$ be the additional coarse triangulation. Here the subdomains need not be a union of triangles in $\mathcal{T}_H$ but we need the assumption that any subdomain diameter is comparable to the diameters of the triangles which intersect it. The union of all the coarse triangles in $\mathcal{T}_H$ need not be Ω. However, the union is required to contain the part of $\partial\Omega$, where Neumann boundary conditions are enforced, and to occupy a significant part of Ω. In addition, no coarse triangle is located entirely outside Ω. We refer to [11] for details.

Let V_H be the linear conforming finite element space on $\mathcal{T}_H$ and $I_h^H u$ be the interpolant into V_H defined by

$$(I_h^H u)(x_l) = \frac{1}{|K_l\bigcap\Omega_i|}\int_{K_l\bigcap\Omega_i} u\,dx,$$

where K_l is the union of coarse triangles with x_l as one of their vertices and Ω_i is the subdomain containing the node x_l, see [29, Section 3.5] and references there in. We then introduce

$$u_0 = \mathcal{J}_H^h(I_h^H u) \in\ S_h,$$

where $\mathcal{J}_H^h$ is the interpolant from V_H into S_h, i.e.,

$$(\mathcal{J}_H^h v)(x_l) = v(x_l).$$

Since $u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a(u_0,u_0) &\le C\sum_i \rho_i \|R_i u_0\|_{Z_i}^2 = C\sum_i \rho_i |R_i u_0|_{H^1(\Omega_i)}^2 \\ &= \sum_i \rho_i |R_i \mathcal{J}_H^h I_h^H u|_{H^1(\Omega_i)}^2 \le C\sum_i \rho_i |I_h^H u|_{H^1(\Omega_i)}^2 \\ &\le C(\rho(x))\sum_i \rho_i \|R_i u\|_{Z_i}^2 \qquad (5.1) \\ &\le C(\rho(x))\sum_i a_i(R_i u, R_i u) = C(\rho(x)) a(u,u) \end{aligned}$$

where R_i is the restriction to the subdomain Ω_i and the inequality (5.1) can be proved in a way similar to that of the proof in [24, Lemma 9] and by using the Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality (4.10). Here the constant $C(\rho(x))$ is determined by

$$C(\rho(x)) \le \max_{x_l \in \mathcal{N}^H} \frac{\max_{\Omega_i \bigcap K_l \neq \emptyset} \ \rho_i}{\min_{\Omega_i \bigcap K_l \neq \emptyset} \ \rho_i},$$

where $\mathcal{N}^H$ is the set of all nodes in the coarse triangulation $\mathcal{T}^H$ and K_l is the union of the coarse triangles with x_l as one of their vertices.

We note that the preconditioner is of the form,

$$\mathcal{J}_H^h A_H^{-1} (\mathcal{J}_H^h)^T + \sum_i R_i^T A_i^{-1} R_i,$$

where

$$A_H = (\mathcal{J}_H^h)^T A \mathcal{J}_H^h, \quad A_i = R_i^T A R_i,$$

where R_i is the restriction to Ω_i' and A is the matrix in (2.19). When the subdomains are unions of triangles in $\mathcal{T}_H$, the preconditioner is the same as the one in [6].

6. Numerical results. In this section, we present numerical tests of our two-level Schwarz algorithms for the model elliptic problem (2.1) with Ω a unit rectangle in two dimensions.

We partition Ω into uniform triangles of mesh size h and then divide each triangles into three subtriangles. The domain Ω is then divided into nonoverlapping subdomains so that each subdomain is a union of triangles before the subdivision. By construction, the test functions in $\mathcal{S}_h$ are continuous across each edge on the subdomain boundary. In our experiments presented in Tables 1-5, we take $k = 0$ in the definition of $\mathcal{S}_h$. The overlapping subdomain partition for the local solver is obtained by extending each subdomain with a given overlapping width δ. For the second type of the coarse problem, we consider both structured and unstructured coarse triangulations. In the structured coarse triangulation, 4^2 means that the square domain Ω is partitioned into 4×4 uniform rectangles and each rectangle is divided into two triangles, and in the unstructured coarse triangulation 4^2 means that the size of each triangle is comparable to diam$(\Omega)/4$ where diam(Ω) is the diameter of Ω. The triangles in

TABLE 1

Performance of the algorithms with the two types of coarse problems (method1 and method2) and an increasing number of subdomains N with a fixed local problem (H/h=4) and with $\delta = h$: the number of iterations is Iter, the condition numbers κ, the minimum eigenvalues λ_{min}, the maximum eigenvalues λ_{max}

	method1				method2			
N	Iter	κ	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{min}$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{max}$	Iter	κ	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{min}$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{max}$
4^2	18	7.12	0.660	4.70	17	6.09	0.698	4.25
8^2	21	8.90	0.533	4.74	18	6.15	0.691	4.25
16^2	23	9.66	0.492	4.75	17	5.94	0.715	4.24
32^2	24	9.85	0.482	4.75	17	5.91	0.718	4.24

TABLE 2

Performance of the algorithms with the first type of coarse problem (method1) and the second type of coarse problem (method2) and an increasing local problem size H/h with a fixed subdomain partition ($N = 4^2$) and with a fixed $H/\delta = 2$: the number of iterations is Iter, the condition numbers κ, the minimum eigenvalues λ_{min}, the maximum eigenvalues λ_{max}

	method1				method2			
H/h	Iter	κ	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{min}$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{max}$	Iter	κ	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{min}$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{max}$
2	14	5.06	0.984	4.98	15	5.38	0.894	4.81
4	16	5.12	0.958	4.90	16	5.19	0.911	4.72
8	17	5.32	0.919	4.89	17	5.26	0.893	4.70
16	18	5.52	0.888	4.90	17	5.29	0.886	4.69

the unstructured coarse triangulation may not be unions of triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ while those in the structured coarse triangulation are unions of triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. In the CG (Conjugate Gradient) iteration, we stop when the relative residual norm has dropped by a factor 10^{-6}.

In Table 1, we present results for the algorithms with the two types of the coarse problems with an increasing number of subdomains, a fixed local problem size, and a fixed overlapping width. We observe stable behavior of the condition numbers and iteration counts for both types.

In Table 2, we present results for the algorithms with the first and second type of coarse problems by increasing the local problem size with a fixed H/δ and a fixed subdomain partition. With an increase in the local problem size, we get an increase in iteration counts and condition numbers for the first type of the coarse problem and the result seems to agree well with our bound, $C(1 + H/\delta)(1 + \log(H/h))$. For the second type of coarse problem, we observe that the behavior does not depend on the local problem size when H/δ is fixed.

In Table 3, we present the performance of our methods with varying overlapping width δ with a fixed local problem size and a fixed number of subdomains. We observe a linear increase in the condition numbers of the preconditioned systems regarding to H/δ for both types of coarse problems. The results agree well with our theoretical bounds.

In Table 4, we present tests to show the performance of our methods with respect to jumps

TABLE 3

Performance of the algorithms with the first type of coarse problem (method1) and the second type of coarse problem (method2) with an increasing overlapping width δ with a fixed subdomain partition ($N = 4^2$) and local problem size ($H/h = 16$): the number of iterations is Iter, the condition numbers κ, the minimum eigenvalues λ_{min}, the maximum eigenvalues λ_{max}

	method1				method2			
H/δ	Iter	κ	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{min}$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{max}$	Iter	κ	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{min}$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{max}$
16	29	18.59	0.241	4.47	24	12.52	0.321	4.02
8	23	12.44	0.370	4.61	20	7.54	0.538	4.05
4	19	8.57	0.554	4.75	18	6.05	0.696	4.21
2	18	5.52	0.888	4.90	17	5.29	0.886	4.69

TABLE 4

Performance of the algorithms with the first type of coarse problem (method1) and the second type of coarse problem (method2) with respect to jumps in the coefficient $\rho(x)$. The overlapping width $\delta = h$, subdomain partition $N = 8^2$ and local problem size $H/h = 4$: the number of iterations is Iter, the condition numbers κ, the minimum eigenvalues λ_{min}, the maximum eigenvalues λ_{max}

	method1				method2			
ρ_i	Iter	κ	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{min}$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{max}$	Iter	κ	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{min}$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{max}$
10^{-6}	21	9.30	0.509	4.74	20	11.55	0.373	4.31
10^{-3}	21	9.29	0.511	4.74	20	11.45	0.376	4.31
1	20	9.51	0.498	4.73	16	6.18	0.693	4.29
10^{3}	20	8.55	0.554	4.74	33	65.64	0.066	4.34
10^{6}	21	8.68	0.546	4.73	38	78.75	0.055	4.34

in the coefficient $\rho(x)$. In our tests, $\rho(x) = \rho_i$ on the subdomains located at the diagonal in a 8×8 uniform partition and $\rho(x) = 1$ at the other subdomains. From the results, we see that the condition number of the preconditioned system arising from the first method, the coarse problem of which is defined by face basis functions, is insensitive to the jumps in $\rho(x)$, while the condition number of the method with the second type of coarse problem increases very slowly with increasing jumps in $\rho(x)$.

In Table 5, we test our methods regarding the choice of coarse triangulations. In the structured one, each coarse triangle is a union of triangles in $\mathcal{T}$ and the coefficient $\rho(x)$ is constant in each coarse triangle. On the other hand, in the unstructured one, the coarse triangles may not resolve jumps in the coefficient $\rho(x)$ and they may not be unions of triangles in $\mathcal{T}$. We observe quite good performance in the unstructured coarse triangulation but the results are a little more sensitive to jumps in the coefficient $\rho(x)$.

In Tables 6-8, we present the performance of the method with the first type of coarse problem for S_h with piece-wise linear polynomials ($k = 1$). For this higher order case, we also observe good performance similar to that for the case $k = 0$.

TABLE 5

Performance of the algorithm with the second type of coarse problem with respect to jumps in the coefficient $\rho(x)$ *in the structured* $\mathcal{T}_H$ *and in the unstructured* $\mathcal{T}_H$. *The overlapping width* $\delta = h$, *subdomain partition* $N = 8^2$ *and local problem size* $H/h = 4$: *the number of iterations is Iter, the condition numbers* κ, *the minimum eigenvalues* λ_{min}, *the maximum eigenvalues* λ_{max}

	structured $\mathcal{T}_H$				unstructured $\mathcal{T}_H$			
ρ_i	Iter	κ	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{min}$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{max}$	Iter	κ	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{min}$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{max}$
10^{-6}	20	11.55	0.373	4.31	19	11.01	0.390	4.30
10^{-3}	20	11.45	0.376	4.31	19	10.91	0.394	4.30
1	16	6.18	0.693	4.29	15	5.52	0.750	4.14
10^{3}	33	65.64	0.066	4.34	38	76.81	0.065	4.95
10^{6}	38	78.75	0.055	4.34	45	99.60	0.050	5.00

TABLE 6

Performance of the algorithms with the first type of coarse problem and $k = 1$ *for increasing number of subdomains* N *with a fixed local problem (H/h=4) and with* $\delta = h$: *the number of iterations is Iter, the condition numbers* κ, *the minimum eigenvalues* λ_{min}, *the maximum eigenvalues* λ_{max}

N	Iter	κ	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{min}$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{max}$
2^2	15	6.52	0.696	4.54
4^2	22	11.07	0.429	4.75
8^2	27	13.02	0.367	4.77
16^2	28	14.47	0.330	4.78

TABLE 7

Performance of the algorithms with the first type of coarse problem and $k = 1$ *for increasing the overlapping width* δ *with a fixed local problem (H/h=16) and with a fixed subdomain partition* $N = 4^2$: *the number of iterations is Iter, the condition numbers* κ, *the minimum eigenvalues* λ_{min}, *the maximum eigenvalues* λ_{max}

H/δ	Iter	κ	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{min}$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{max}$
16	33	21.48	0.213	4.58
8	29	17.56	0.267	4.70
4	25	13.53	0.356	4.81
2	18	8.48	0.581	4.92

TABLE 8

Performance of the algorithms with the first type of coarse problem and $k = 1$ *with respect to jumps in the coefficient* $\rho(x)$. *The overlapping width* $\delta = h$, *subdomain partition* $N = 8^2$ *and local problem size* $H/h = 4$: *the number of iterations is Iter, the condition numbers* κ, *the minimum eigenvalues* λ_{min}, *the maximum eigenvalues* λ_{max}

ρ_i	Iter	κ	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{min}$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{max}$
10^{-6}	24	13.40	0.356	4.77
10^{-3}	24	13.41	0.356	4.77
1	24	13.99	0.341	4.77
10^{3}	24	11.69	0.408	4.77
10^{6}	23	11.68	0.409	4.77

REFERENCES

[1] Paola F. Antonietti and Blanca Ayuso. Schwarz domain decomposition preconditioners for discontinuous Galerkin approximations of elliptic problems: non-overlapping case. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 41(1):21–54, 2007.

[2] Paola F. Antonietti and Blanca Ayuso. Multiplicative Schwarz methods for discontinuous Galerkin approximations of elliptic problems. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 42(3):443–469, 2008.

[3] Paola F. Antonietti and Blanca Ayuso. Two-level Schwarz preconditioners for super penalty discontinuous Galerkin methods. *Commun. Comput. Phys.*, 5(2-4):398–412, 2009.

[4] Paola F. Antonietti and Paul Houston. A class of domain decomposition preconditioners for hp-discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 46(1):124–149, 2011.

[5] Douglas N. Arnold, Franco Brezzi, Bernardo Cockburn, and L. Donatella Marini. Unified analysis of discontinuous Galerkin methods for elliptic problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 39(5):1749–1779, 2001/02.

[6] A.T. Barker, S.C. Brenner, E.-H. Park, and L.-Y. Sung. Two-level additive Schwarz preconditioners for a weakly over-penalized symmetric interior penalty method. *To appear in J. Sci. Comput.*, 2011.

[7] Bogdan Bojarski. Remarks on Sobolev imbedding inequalities. In *Complex analysis, Joensuu 1987*, volume 1351 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 52–68. Springer, Berlin, 1988.

[8] Susanne C. Brenner. Poincaré-Friedrichs inequalities for piecewise H^1 functions. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 41(1):306–324, 2003.

[9] F. Brezzi, G. Manzini, D. Marini, P. Pietra, and A. Russo. Discontinuous Galerkin approximations for elliptic problems. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 16(4):365–378, 2000.

[10] S. Buckley and P. Koskela. Sobolev-Poincaré implies John. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 2(5):577–593, 1995.

[11] Tony F. Chan, Barry F. Smith, and Jun Zou. Overlapping Schwarz methods on unstructured meshes using non-matching coarse grids. *Numer. Math.*, 73(2):149–167, 1996.

[12] Eric T. Chung and Björn Engquist. Optimal discontinuous Galerkin methods for wave propagation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 44(5):2131–2158, 2006.

[13] Eric T. Chung and Björn Engquist. Optimal discontinuous Galerkin methods for the acoustic wave equation in higher dimensions. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 47(5):3820–3848, 2009.

[14] Eric T. Chung and Chak Shing Lee. Staggered discontinuous galerkin methods for the convection-diffusion equation. *Submitted*, 2011.

[15] Eric T. Chung and Chak Shing Lee. A staggered discontinuous galerkin method for the curl curl operator. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, To appear.

[16] Bernardo Cockburn and Chi-Wang Shu. The local discontinuous Galerkin method for time-dependent convection-diffusion systems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 35(6):2440–2463, 1998.

[17] Clark R. Dohrmann, Axel Klawonn, and Olof B. Widlund. Domain decomposition for less regular subdomains: overlapping Schwarz in two dimensions. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 46(4):2153–2168, 2008.

[18] Clark R. Dohrmann and Olof B. Widlund. An iterative substructuring algorithm for two-dimensional problems in H(curl). Technical report, Department of Computer Science, Courant Institute, New York University, 2010.

[19] Jim Douglas, Jr. and Todd Dupont. Interior penalty procedures for elliptic and parabolic Galerkin methods. In *Computing methods in applied sciences (Second Internat. Sympos., Versailles, 1975)*, pages 207–216. Lecture Notes in Phys., Vol. 58. Springer, Berlin, 1976.

[20] Maksymilian Dryja, Juan Galvis, and Marcus Sarkis. BDDC methods for discontinuous Galerkin discretization of elliptic problems. *J. Complexity*, 23(4-6):715–739, 2007.

[21] Xiaobing Feng and Ohannes A. Karakashian. Two-level additive Schwarz methods for a discontinuous Galerkin approximation of second order elliptic problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 39(4):1343–1365, 2001.

[22] Xiaobing Feng and Ohannes A. Karakashian. Two-level non-overlapping Schwarz preconditioners for a dis-

continuous Galerkin approximation of the biharmonic equation. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 22/23:289–314, 2005.

[23] Piotr Hajłasz. Sobolev inequalities, truncation method, and John domains. In *Papers on analysis*, volume 83 of *Rep. Univ. Jyväskylä Dep. Math. Stat.*, pages 109–126. Univ. Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, 2001.

[24] Hyea Hyun Kim and Olof B. Widlund. Two-level Schwarz algorithms with overlapping subregions for mortar finite elements. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 44(4):1514–1534, 2006.

[25] Axel Klawonn, Oliver Rheinbach, and Olof B. Widlund. An analysis of a FETI-DP algorithm on irregular subdomains in the plane. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 46(5):2484–2504, 2008.

[26] Caroline Lasser and Andrea Toselli. An overlapping domain decomposition preconditioner for a class of discontinuous Galerkin approximations of advection-diffusion problems. *Math. Comp.*, 72(243):1215–1238, 2003.

[27] W. H. Reed and T. R. Hill. Triangular mesh methods for the neutron transport equation. *Tech. Report LA-UR-73-479, NM*, 1973.

[28] Béatrice Rivière, Mary F. Wheeler, and Vivette Girault. Improved energy estimates for interior penalty, constrained and discontinuous Galerkin methods for elliptic problems. I. *Comput. Geosci.*, 3(3-4):337–360 (2000), 1999.

[29] Andrea Toselli and Olof Widlund. *Domain decomposition methods—algorithms and theory*, volume 34 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.

[30] Olof B. Widlund. Accomodating irregular subdomains in domain decomposition theory. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Domain Decomposition Methods*, number 70 in Springer-Verlag, Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering, pages 87–98, 2009. Held in Jerusalem, Israel, January 12–17 2008.