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#### Abstract

We propose an adaptive finite element method for the elliptic interface problem with piecewise constant coefficients, based on a robust variant of the original NXFEM of Hansbo and Hansbo [5]. This method takes into account discontinuities that are not necessarily aligned with the mesh. Our robust variant [2], introducing pondaration coefficients, provides constants in the error estimates which are independent both of the geometry of the cut cells and of the coefficients. Suitable error estimators have been derived in [1]. In this paper, we extend the method to quadrilateral meshes and describe numerical implementation.
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## §1. Introduction

We propose an adaptive finite element method for the interface problem in a two-dimensional domain

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\operatorname{div}(\sigma)=f \quad \text { in } \Omega, \quad \sigma=-k \nabla u \\
u=0 \quad \text { on } \partial \Omega \tag{1.1}
\end{array}
$$

Let $\Omega$ be a polygonal domain, with convex polygonal boundary $\partial \Omega$ and an internal smooth boundary $\Gamma$ dividing $\Omega$ into two open sets $\Omega_{\mathrm{in}}$ and $\Omega_{\mathrm{ex}}$ (see Figure 1).

For simplicity, we suppose $k$ to be a piecewise constant discontinuous coefficient taking values $k_{\mathrm{in}}$ and $k_{\mathrm{ex}}$ on the two disjoint subdomains $\Omega_{\mathrm{in}}$ and $\Omega_{\mathrm{ex}}$ and $f \in L^{2}(\Omega)$.

The discretization of (1.1) is based on the Nitsche extended finite element method (NXFEM). For the interface problem developed in [5], the method uses standard finite element spaces on either side of the discontinuity and weak conditions along $\Gamma$. The finite element space is obtained by 'doubling' of the local functions space on all cut cells by the interface $\Gamma$, which is here assumed to be polygonal.

The discontinuity of the discrete functions is handled by a variant of Nitsche's method [6], making use of the interface conditions

$$
[u]=0 \quad \text { and } \quad[\sigma \cdot n]=0 \quad \text { on } \Gamma,
$$

where $n$ is the unit outer normal field of $\Omega_{\mathrm{in}}$. We refer to [5] where the stability of the method and optimal order error estimates have been obtained, supposing only that the solution is piecewise in $H^{2}$.

In [2] we have proposed a robust variant of the original method on triangular meshes, introducing a weighting taking into account not only the geometry of the cut cells, but also the


Figure 1: Notations.
coefficients. The resulting method coincides on matching meshes with the weighted discontinuous Galerkin method of Ern and Stephanson [4]. In [1] we have proposed an a posteriori error estimator based on the evaluation of cell- and edge-wise residuals for triangular meshes, resulting in an adaptive algorithm of the classical form

$$
\text { Solve } \longrightarrow \text { Estimate } \longrightarrow \text { Mark } \longrightarrow \text { Refine. }
$$

Throughout, we use the symbol $\lesssim$ to indicate that an inequality holds with constants independent of any geometrical parameter and the values of the coefficient $k$.

Here we explain the method and the implementation on quadrilateral meshes.

## §2. Knowledges on triangular meshes

We denote by $\mathcal{H}$ a family of uniformly shape-regular meshes $h$ consisting of triangles $\mathcal{K}_{h}$. We define the set of cut cells by

$$
\mathcal{K}_{h}^{\text {in }}:=\left\{K \cap \Omega_{\text {in }}: K \in \mathcal{K}_{h} \text { such that } K \cap \Omega_{\text {in }} \neq \emptyset\right\},
$$

and similarly for $\mathcal{K}_{h}^{\text {ex }}$. Let $\mathcal{K}_{h}^{\text {cut }}:=\mathcal{K}_{h}^{\text {in }} \cup \mathcal{K}_{h}^{\text {ex }}$. In addition we denote by $\mathcal{K}_{h}^{*}$ the set of all uncut cells augmented by $\mathcal{K}^{\text {cut }}$. We then define the finite element spaces

$$
V:=\left\{v \in L^{2}(\Omega): v \in C(\Omega),\left.v\right|_{K} \in P^{1}(K) \forall K \in \mathcal{K}_{h}\right\},
$$

and

$$
\mathbb{V}_{h}:=\left\{v_{h} \in L^{2}(\Omega):\left.v_{h}\right|_{\Omega_{\mathrm{in}}} \in C\left(\Omega_{\mathrm{in}}\right),\left.v_{h}\right|_{\Omega_{\mathrm{ex}}} \in C\left(\Omega_{\mathrm{ex}}\right),\left.v_{h}\right|_{M} \in P^{1}(M) \forall M \in \mathcal{K}_{h}^{\mathrm{cut}}\right\} .
$$

The functions of $\mathbb{V}_{h}$ are discontinuous across the interface (see Figure 2) which is divided into the set of segments

$$
\mathcal{S}_{h}^{\Gamma}:=\left\{K \cap \Gamma: K \in \mathcal{K}_{h} \text { such that } K \cap \Gamma \neq \emptyset\right\} .
$$

Let $v_{h} \in \mathbb{V}_{h}$. For a given interior side $S \in \mathcal{S}_{h}^{\Gamma}$ we fix a unit normal $n_{S}$ once for all and define for $x \in S$

$$
v_{h S}^{\mathrm{in}}(x):=\lim _{\varepsilon \searrow 0} v_{h}\left(x-\varepsilon n_{S}\right), \quad v_{h S}^{\mathrm{ex}}(x):=\lim _{\varepsilon \searrow 0} v_{h}\left(x+\varepsilon n_{S}\right) .
$$

Next we define the jump and weighted mean for a weight $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ by

$$
[u](x):=u_{S}^{\mathrm{in}}(x)-u_{S}^{\mathrm{ex}}(x), \quad\{u\}_{\alpha}(x):=\alpha u_{S}^{\mathrm{in}}(x)+(1-\alpha) u_{S}^{\mathrm{ex}}(x) .
$$



Figure 2: A cut triangle.

The following formula readily follows from these definitions:

$$
[u v]=[u]\{v\}_{\alpha}+\{u\}_{1-\alpha}[v],
$$

We define the linear functional

$$
\begin{equation*}
l\left(v_{h}\right)=\int_{\Omega} f v_{h}+\int_{\mathcal{S}_{h}^{\Gamma}} g_{N}\left\{v_{h}\right\}_{1-\alpha} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the symmetric bilinear form

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{h}\left(u_{h}, v_{h}\right)=\sum_{M \in \mathcal{K}_{h}^{\mathrm{in}} \cup \mathcal{K}_{h}^{\text {ex }}} \int_{M} k \nabla u_{h} \cdot \nabla v_{h}-\sum_{S \in S_{h}^{\Gamma}} \int_{S}\left(\left[u_{h}\right] \partial_{n, k}^{*} v_{h}+\partial_{n, k}^{*} u_{h}\left[v_{h}\right]\right), \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have used the discrete fluxes

$$
\partial_{n, k}^{*} v_{h} \mid S:=\left\{\partial_{n, k} v_{h}\right\}_{\alpha_{S}}-\gamma_{S}\left[v_{h}\right] \quad\left(\partial_{n, k} v_{h}:=n_{S}^{T} k \nabla v_{h}\right),
$$

which depend on the two parameters $\alpha_{S}$ and $\gamma_{S}$, defined as

$$
\alpha_{S}:=\frac{k_{\mathrm{ex}}\left|K^{\mathrm{in}}\right|}{k_{\mathrm{ex}}\left|K^{\mathrm{in}}\right|+k_{\mathrm{in}}\left|K^{\mathrm{ex}}\right|}, \quad \gamma_{S}:=\gamma_{0} \frac{k_{\mathrm{in}} k_{\mathrm{ex}}|S|}{k_{\mathrm{ex}}\left|K_{\mathrm{in}}^{\mathrm{in}}\right|+k_{\mathrm{in}}\left|K^{\mathrm{ex}}\right|},
$$

with $\gamma_{0}>0$ depending on the polynomial degree but neither on the diffusion coefficients nor the mesh geometry [2].

We define the energy-type norm

$$
\left\|v_{h}\right\|_{h}^{2}:=\left\|k^{1 / 2} \nabla v_{h}\right\|^{2}+\left\|v_{h}\right\|_{h, \Gamma}^{2}, \quad\left\|v_{h}\right\|_{h, \Gamma}^{2}:=\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{h}^{\Gamma}} \gamma_{S}\left\|\left[v_{h}\right]\right\|^{2}
$$

We are interested in reducing the error

$$
\begin{equation*}
e_{h}:=\left(\left\|k^{1 / 2} \nabla\left(u-u_{h}\right)\right\|^{2}+\left\|u_{h}\right\|_{h, \Gamma}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The main difficulty induced by NXFEM with respect to continuous FEM is the nonconformity caused by the doubling of the unknowns on the interface cells. As usual in non-conforming methods, we therefore introduce the projection on the continuous space.


Figure 3: Classical quadrilateral mapping.


Figure 4: Partial quadrilateral mapping.

We define the cell contribution of the estimator [1]

$$
\begin{align*}
& \eta_{h}(K):=\left(\frac{|K|^{2}}{k}\left\|\pi_{K} f+\operatorname{div}\left(k \nabla u_{h}\right)\right\|_{K}^{2}\right. \\
&\left.+\sum_{S \subset \partial K^{*}} \frac{|S|}{k}\left\|\left[\partial_{n, k} u_{h}\right]\right\|_{S}^{2}+\sum_{S \in S_{h}^{\Gamma}}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_{S}}\left\|\left[\partial_{n, k} u_{h}\right]\right\|_{S}^{2}+\gamma_{S}\left\|\left[u_{h}\right]\right\|_{S}^{2}\right)\right)^{1 / 2}, \tag{2.4}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\pi_{K}$ is the $L^{2}(K)$-projection on the constants and $\partial K^{*}:=\partial K \backslash \partial \Omega$. Next, we introduce a data-approximation estimator

$$
\mu_{h}(K):=|K|^{1 / 2}\left\|f-\pi_{K} f\right\|_{K}, \quad \mu_{h}(\mathcal{M}):=\left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{M}} \mu_{h}(K)^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

Combination of Lemma in [1] yields
Theorem 1. We have the following upper bound

$$
e_{h}^{2} \lesssim \eta_{h}^{2}\left(\mathcal{K}_{h}^{*}\right)+\mu_{h}^{2}\left(\mathcal{K}_{h}^{*}\right),
$$

with contents independent of the mesh geometry and $k$.

## §3. On quadrilateral meshes

### 3.1. Definition of the method

Now we consider a regular family of quadrilateral meshes $\mathcal{H}$. As for triangular meshes, we assume that the interface intersects each element boundary $\partial K$ exactly twice, and each (open) edge at most once. Notation employed here are described in Section 2. Moreover, the classical notations for continuous quadrilateral FE of degree 1 will be used.

We note (cf. Figure 3):

- $K$ current element,
- $\hat{K}=[-1,1]^{2}$ the reference element,
- $\mathcal{F}_{K}$ a $Q^{1}$-mapping ${ }^{1}$ from $\hat{K}$ to $K$.

In addition, for all $M \subset K$, we note $\hat{M}=\mathcal{F}_{K}^{-1}(M)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{M}=\left.\mathcal{F}_{K}\right|_{\hat{M}}$ (cf. Figure 4).
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Figure 5: Split by $\Gamma$ into two polygons.


Figure 6: The interface was copied on $\hat{K}$.

The finite element space is now defined as the isoparametric space

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{V}_{h}:=\left\{v_{h} \in L^{2}(\Omega):\left.v_{h}\right|_{\Omega_{\mathrm{in}}} \in C\left(\Omega_{\mathrm{in}}\right),\left.v_{h}\right|_{\mathrm{exx}^{\mathrm{ex}}} \in C\left(\Omega_{\mathrm{ex}}\right),\left.v_{h}\right|_{M} \circ \mathcal{F}_{M} \in Q^{1}(\hat{M}) \forall M \in \mathcal{K}_{h}^{\text {cut }}\right\} . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

A FE basis for $\mathbb{V}_{h}$ is obtained from a standard FE basis on the mesh by replacing each standard basis function living on a cut element by two new basis functions, namely its restrictions to $\Omega_{\mathrm{in}}$ and $\Omega_{\mathrm{ex}}$ respectively. Both these new basis functions are represented in the implementation using the same nodes ${ }^{2}$ from the original quadrangulation.

In order to implement the discontinuous approximation, we first determined the set of quadrilaterals intersected by $\Gamma$. We assumed that a cut cell $K$ was split by $\Gamma$ into two polygons (see Figure 5).

We determine the approximation $\Gamma_{h}$ of $\Gamma$ on the cut cell $K$ by the following steps (cf. Figure 6):

1. $\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}\right\}=\Gamma \cap \partial K$,
2. $a_{i}=\mathcal{F}_{K}\left(\hat{a}_{i}\right)$, for $i=1,2$,
3. $\hat{\Gamma}_{h}=\left[\hat{a}_{1}, \hat{a}_{2}\right]$,
4. $\Gamma_{h}=\mathcal{F}_{K}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_{h}\right)$.

The main difficulty of this approach deals with the numerical evaluation of the integral terms (see (2.2) and (2.1)) on the cut elements as well as on the discontinuity. We have got around this problem by building numerical integration formulas on each polygon and on the interface. This process enable us to use the standard assemble techniques of the finite element method.

For any $v_{h} \in \mathbb{V}_{h},\left.v_{h}\right|_{\Omega_{\mathrm{in}}}$ is decomposed using the FE basis functions of cells covering $\Omega_{\mathrm{in}}$, and $\left.v_{h}\right|_{\Omega_{\mathrm{ex}}}$ is decomposed using those of cells covering $\Omega_{\mathrm{ex}}$ respectively. In a cut element, $v_{h}$ can be expressed using the restriction of basis functions on $K^{\text {in }}$ and $K^{\text {ex }}$ as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.v_{h}\right|_{K^{\mathrm{in}}}=\left.\sum_{i=0}^{3} \alpha_{i} \varphi_{i}\right|_{K^{\mathrm{in}}},\left.\quad v_{h}\right|_{K^{\mathrm{ex}}}=\left.\sum_{i=0}^{3} \alpha_{i}^{\prime} \varphi_{i}\right|_{K^{\mathrm{ex}}} . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

So, we need eight degrees of freedom $\alpha_{i}$ and $\alpha_{i}^{\prime}$ with $i=0, \ldots, 3$ in order to define $v_{h}$ on a cut cell (Figure 7).

The continuity between cut and uncut elements is guaranteed by the definitions (3.1) and (3.2). Each polygon on $\hat{K}$ was split into triangles in order to obtain interpolation formula on it.

In addition, we proceed as follows. The quadrilaterals that were not crossed by $\Gamma$ (ie $K \in \mathcal{K}_{h}^{*}$ ) were handled in the usual way (see Figure 3). On the elements crossed by the
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Figure 7: Dof distribution.


Figure 8: Independent meshes on each subdomain.


Figure 9: Cut quadrilaterals with hanging node.
interface, we have two polygons, each split into triangles. We used quadrature to evaluate all terms on the reference-reference triangle $\hat{T}$ (see Figure 8). On the interface, we used Gaussian quadrature.

### 3.2. Adaptive algorithm and hanging nodes

Now we consider the family of locally refined quadrilateral meshes $\mathcal{H}$ with hanging nodes. We impose on the refinement algorithm the condition that at most one hanging node is present on each edge. It can be achieved by additional bisection of cells, without destroying the overall linear complexity of the refinement algorithm, see [3].

The definition of $\mathbb{V}_{h}$ (3.1) implies some care on the implementation in the case of cut cells neighboring a hanging node (see Figure 9).

In the first case the interface crosses a refined quadrilateral, in the second case a coarse neighbor of a refined quadrilateral and a refined quadrilateral with its coarse neighbor in the last case (Figure 9). In order to guarantee the continuity of each function $v_{h}$ in $\mathbb{V}_{h}$ on $\Omega_{\text {in }}$ and $\Omega_{\mathrm{ex}}$, we use linear interpolation for the hanging node.

To determine the nodal value corresponding to the hanging node, according its location in $\Omega$, we only use the degree of freedom of $v_{h}$ associated to the same subdomain.

The resulting method is uniformly stable with respect to the geometry of the cut cells and diffusion parameter.

The a posteriori error estimator is identical to the case of triangular meshes and it can be verified that Theorem 1 holds true.

## §4. Implementation

Several numerical tests have been performed. First, the new formula's robustness and the estimator's efficiency were tested in [2] and we obtained satisfactory simulations on uniformly


Figure 10: Configuration.
refined triangular and quadrilateral meshes [1]. We considered a two-dimensional example (from [5]). The exact solution is given by:

$$
u(x, y)= \begin{cases}\frac{r^{2}}{k_{\text {in }}}, & \text { if } r \leq r_{0}  \tag{4.1}\\ \frac{r^{2}-r_{0}^{2}}{k_{\mathrm{ex}}}+\frac{r_{0}^{2}}{k_{\mathrm{in}}}, & \text { else }\end{cases}
$$

with

- $r:=\sqrt{x^{2}+y^{2}}$, with $r_{0}=0.75$,
- $\Omega=]-1,1[\times]-1,1[$,
- $k_{\text {in }}=1, k_{\text {ex }}=1000$,
- $f=-4$,
- Dirichlet boundary condition.


### 4.1. Uniform refinement

We use continuous quadrilateral FE of degree 1 . Recall that the residual error estimator $\eta_{h}$ is defined in (2.4) and the error in energy norm $e_{h}$ in (2.3). We refer to [1] for the convergence's table and curves of a uniform refinement on cartesian quadrilateral mesh. We concluded that the estimator and the error have the same behavior as for uniform refinement on triangular mesh.

He propose here to confirm these findings, by testing the interface problem (4.1) on deformed quadrilateral meshes.

Note that the standard refinement procedure - which consists of refining by joining the sides middle - creates successive meshes in which all elements tend to parallelograms. The transformation $\mathcal{F}_{K}$ becomes also affine. In order to maintain deformed quadrilateral meshes on each level of refinement, we have geared down the same pattern.

Figure 11 shows these various patterns that have been used, and the convergence curves of the REstimator $\eta_{h}$ and the ENorm $e_{h}$ that we obtained on these meshes are presented in Figure 12. These reassure our previous findings.


Figure 11: Deformed quadrilateral meshes.


Figure 12: Convergence curves of uniform refinement on deformed quadrilateral meshes.


Figure 13: Adaptive refinement with classical FEM.


Figure 14: Adaptive refinement with NXFEM.

### 4.2. Adaptive refinement

The model problem (4.1) that we took has no singularity. Therefore, the estimator should mark the cells on which the solution has as many variations.

The pictures in Figure 13 show an adaptive refinement on cartesian quadrilateral mesh, using classical FEM. While when using this method, the adaptive procedure concentrates the refinement around the discontinuity (see Figure 13(a)) because the fluxes are not correctly approximated on the cut cells. The convergence curves in Figure 13(b) confirm this analysis.

When we use NXFEM and the estimator (2.4) to adapt the mesh, the normal derivatives are well approximated on the cut cells. Therefore the mesh is uniformly refined on $\Omega_{\text {in }}$ (as shown in Figure 14(a)). We find the same convergence order (see Figure 14(b)) for the uniform refinement on triangular and quadrilateral meshes, and for adaptive refinement on triangular meshes [1].


Figure 15: Configuration example in porous media problems.

## §5. Evolution

To date, many opportunities are available, some of which are underway.
The procedure described in Section 3.1 can be extended significantly. In a first time, we are currently completing its generalization to finite elements of degree $k$ on triangular, quadrilateral and hexahedral meshes.

We would essentially guide our work towards industrial applications. We would so test the method on:

- convection problems,
- time-dependant problems,
- varying the discontinuity's width (thickness),
- varying the discontinuity's number...

These configurations are commonly encountered in porous media problems (Black oil model, reservoir meshes for example, see Figure 15), but also at the microscopic level, in order to take into account, for example, the mobility and flexibility of the cells. We stand at the microscopic level in order to take into account the mobility and/or flexibility of the cells -such as red blood cells or bacteria- under the action of a liquid flow such as plasma or biofilm.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ We remark that a $Q^{1}$-mapping is bilinear, while a $P^{1}$-mapping is affine.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Recall that the $Q^{1}$ degrees of freedom (dof) and the $Q^{1}$ basis functions are associated with the geometrical nodes

