

CHALMERS



GÖTEBORG UNIVERSITY

*PREPRINT 2007:44*

# Weakly imposed Dirichlet boundary conditions for the Brinkman model of porous media flow

P. HANSBO  
M. JUNTUNEN

*Department of Mathematical Sciences  
Division of Mathematics*

CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY  
GÖTEBORG UNIVERSITY  
Göteborg Sweden 2007



Preprint 2007:44

**Weakly imposed Dirichlet boundary conditions  
for the Brinkman model of porous media flow**

P. Hansbo, M. Juntunen

Department of Mathematical Sciences  
Division of Mathematics  
Chalmers University of Technology and Göteborg University  
SE-412 96 Göteborg, Sweden  
Göteborg, December 2007

Preprint 2007:44  
ISSN 1652-9715

---

Matematiska vetenskaper  
Göteborg 2007

# Weakly imposed Dirichlet boundary conditions for the Brinkman model of porous media flow

P. Hansbo<sup>a</sup>, M. Juntunen<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Mathematical Sciences, Chalmers University of Technology and Göteborg University, SE-41296 Göteborg, Sweden*

<sup>b</sup> *Department of Engineering Physics and Mathematics, Institute of Mathematics, Helsinki University of Technology, P.O. Box 1100, 02015 TKK, Finland*

---

## Abstract

We use low order approximations, piecewise linear, continuous velocities and piecewise constant pressures to compute solutions to Brinkman's equation of porous media flow, applying an edge stabilization term to avoid locking. In order to handle the limiting case of Darcy flow, when only the velocity component normal to the boundary can be prescribed, we impose the boundary conditions weakly using Nitsche's method [7]. We show that this leads to a stable method for all choices of material parameters. Finally we present some numerical examples verifying the theoretical predictions and showing the effect of the weak imposition of boundary conditions.

*Key words:* Brinkman model, Stokes–Darcy model, stabilized methods, finite element, interior penalty method, Nitsche's method

---

## 1 Introduction

The Brinkman equations model creeping flow in porous media and can be seen as a mixture of Darcy's equations and Stokes' equations. The behavior of solutions to the Brinkman equations will be controlled by the ratio of permeability (in Darcy) to viscosity (Stokes), and it is desirable from a numerical point of view to develop methods that can handle the whole range of possible ratios, from the pure inviscid Darcy problem to the Stokes problem with full (infinite) permeability. In doing so, we are led to formulate the Darcy equations in mixed form using velocities and pressure as variables, as is done in the Stokes case. One problem that then arises is the fact that a good method

for the Stokes problem may perform badly, or not even work, in the case of a mixed form of the Darcy problem, see Mardal, Tai, and Winther [6]. In [4], this problem was overcome by using a stabilized method that was shown to be convergent for both Darcy and Stokes; the same method will be used in the present study. Another inconvenient fact, from the point of view of numerical implementation, is that the Darcy equations do not admit the same boundary conditions as the Stokes equations: in the Darcy case only the velocity normal to the boundary can be prescribed, whereas no-slip boundary conditions are usually employed for Stokes. In this paper we suggest a remedy to this last inconvenience: the use of weakly prescribed Dirichlet boundary conditions for the velocities using Nitsche's method [7].

Weakly imposed Dirichlet boundary conditions have been shown to be advantageous for convection-diffusion problems with outflow layers, in the work of Burman [3], in that it will lead to discontinuous jumps in the solution at the boundary rather than forcing a continuous numerical solution to mimic discontinuities. It has also been promoted by Bazilevs and Hughes [1] as an alternative to wall function models in turbulent channel flow, allowing for limited slip at the boundary. In these cases, the balance between a first order term (convection) and a second order term (diffusion/viscosity) is the factor that favors weak boundary conditions; in our case it is the balance between a zero order term (in Darcy) and a second order term (in Stokes). The idea is thus more general and its full potential awaits exploitation.

We will consider the following Brinkman model of porous flow

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma \mathbf{u} - \nabla \cdot (\mu \nabla \mathbf{u}) + \nabla p &= \mathbf{f} \text{ in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} &= 0 \text{ in } \Omega,\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

where  $\Omega$  is an open, bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbf{u}$  denotes the average fluid velocity in the porous medium,  $\sigma$  the viscosity divided by the permeability,  $\mu$  the effective viscosity,  $p$  the pressure, and  $\mathbf{f}$  is a given forcing term. We assume that  $\Omega$  has polygonal boundary  $\partial\Omega$  and that the boundary is divided into two non-overlapping sets  $\partial\Omega = \Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_N$ . The respective boundary conditions are

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{u}_0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D, \\ \mu \partial_n \mathbf{u} - p \mathbf{n} &= \mathbf{g} \text{ on } \Gamma_N,\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

where  $\mathbf{g} = g_n \mathbf{n} + \mu \mathbf{g}_t$ , with  $g_n$  a scalar and  $\mathbf{g}_t$  a vector in the plane perpendicular to  $\mathbf{n}$ . In other words we prescribe only the normal component of the Neumann condition in Darcy limit  $\mu = 0$ . Furthermore we assume that the measure of  $\Gamma_D$  is not zero i.e. we always have some Dirichlet boundary.

The side condition  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$  requires that some care is taken in the choice of approximating spaces in order to avoid over-constraining the problem. Here we shall use a stabilized scheme proposed for Stokes by Hughes and Franca [5],

and for Darcy by Burman and Hansbo [4]. In this paper we apply this mixed stabilized method to the Brinkman equations with weakly imposed boundary conditions and prove optimal a priori estimates in the energy norm. We also give an *a posteriori* error estimate and adaptive algorithm for energy norm control of the computational error. Finally, we give some numerical examples showing the performance of the method and the adaptive algorithm.

## 2 Finite element formulation

In order to formulate our finite element method we first introduce the weak formulation of problem (1). We introduce the Hilbert spaces

$$W_{\mathbf{u}_0} = \{\mathbf{v} \in [H^1(\Omega)]^d \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{v}|_{\Gamma_D} = \mathbf{u}_0\},$$

and

$$L_0^2 = \{q \in L^2(\Omega) \text{ s.t. } \int_{\Omega} q \, dx = 0\}.$$

We denote the product space  $W_{\mathbf{u}_0} \times L_0^2$  by  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{u}_0}$  and define the following norm on  $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{u}_0}$ ,

$$\|(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_{\mathcal{W}}^2 = \sigma \|\mathbf{u}\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + \mu \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1,\Omega}^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + \|p\|_{0,\Omega}^2.$$

Consider the bilinear form

$$B[(\mathbf{u}, p), (\mathbf{v}, q)] = (\mu \nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{v})_{0,\Omega} + (\sigma \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_{0,\Omega} - (p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_{0,\Omega} - (q, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u})_{0,\Omega}. \quad (3)$$

The weak formulation of (1) now takes the form, find  $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{u}_0}$  such that

$$B[(\mathbf{u}, p), (\mathbf{v}, q)] = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v})_{0,\Omega} + (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{v})_{0,\Gamma_N} \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}, q) \in \mathcal{W}_0. \quad (4)$$

Let  $\mathcal{T}^h$  be a conforming, shape regular triangulation of  $\Omega$ . With  $K$  we denote an element of the triangulation and with  $E$  an edge/face of the triangulation. By  $h_K$  and  $h_E$  we denote the size of an element or edge/face, respectively, and by  $h$  we denote the size of the largest element in  $\mathcal{T}^h$ . We introduce the two classical finite element spaces of piecewise linears and piecewise constants

$$\begin{aligned} V^h &= \{v \text{ s.t. } v|_K \in P_1(K), v \in C^0(\Omega)\}, \\ Q^h &= \{q \text{ s.t. } q|_K \in P_0(K), \int_{\Omega} q \, dx = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The velocity field will be sought in  $W^h = [V^h]^d$  and the pressure field in  $Q^h$ . In analogy with the notation above we use the notation  $\mathcal{W}^h := W^h \times Q^h$ . We introduce the following bilinear and linear forms on which we will base our

finite element method:

$$\begin{aligned}
B^h[(\mathbf{u}, p), (\mathbf{v}, q)] &= (\mu \nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{v})_{0,\Omega} + (\sigma \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_{0,\Omega} \\
&\quad - (p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_{0,\Omega} - (q, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u})_{0,\Omega} - J^h(p, q) \\
&\quad - (\mu \partial_n \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_{0,\Gamma_D} - (\mu \mathbf{u}, \partial_n \mathbf{v})_{0,\Gamma_D} + (\mu \gamma_\mu h^{-1} \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_{0,\Gamma_D} \\
&\quad + (p, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0,\Gamma_D} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}, q)_{0,\Gamma_D} + (\gamma_\sigma h^{-1} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0,\Gamma_D}
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
L^h[(\mathbf{v}, q)] &:= (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v})_{0,\Omega} + (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{v})_{0,\Gamma_N} - (\mathbf{u}_0, \partial_n \mathbf{v})_{0,\Gamma_D} + (\mathbf{u}_0, \mu \gamma_\mu h^{-1} \mathbf{v})_{0,\Gamma_D} \\
&\quad + (\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n}, q)_{0,\Gamma_D} + (\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n}, \gamma_\sigma h^{-1} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0,\Gamma_D},
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where

$$J^h(p, q) = \delta \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^h) \setminus \partial \Omega} h_E ([p], [q])_{0,E}, \tag{7}$$

with  $[\cdot]$  denoting the jump over the element edge (taken on the interior edges only). Above, and in what follows, in the inner product  $h = h(x)$  i.e.  $h$  correspond to the element under integration, not to the global maximum. We propose the following finite element formulation: find  $(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h) \in \mathcal{W}^h$  such that

$$B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)] = L^h[(\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)] \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}^h, q^h) \in \mathcal{W}^h. \tag{8}$$

This finite element formulation is simply the standard Galerkin formulation with Nitsche boundary conditions and the penalizing term  $J^h(p, q)$  added. In the following we will assume that the pressure is in  $H^1(\Omega)$ : then the penalizing term is consistent and we have the following

**Lemma 2.1** *If  $(\mathbf{u}, p)$  is a weak solution to (1) with  $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in W \times H^1(\Omega) \cap L^2_0$  then*

$$B^h[(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^h, p - p^h), (\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)] = 0 \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}^h, q^h) \in \mathcal{W}^h. \tag{9}$$

**Proof.** Immediate by noting that if  $p \in H^1(\Omega)$  then the trace of  $p$  is well defined and hence  $J^h(p, q^h) = 0$  for all  $q^h \in Q^h$ . □

### 3 Stability

Since it is a well known fact that the above choice of finite element spaces results in an ill posed discrete problem if used in a standard Galerkin method, the crucial point is to show that our stabilization operator  $J^h(p, q)$  introduces



sufficient coupling between the degrees of freedom in the pressure field such that an *inf-sup* condition is satisfied. This was done for Darcy in [4], using the standard way of handling Dirichlet boundary conditions. Here, we extend the analysis of [4] to the Brinkman model with weakly imposed Dirichlet boundary conditions.

In the analysis, we will use the following norms:

$$\|(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_h^2 := \|(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_{\mathcal{W}}^2 + J^h(p, p) + \mu \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1/2, h, \Gamma_D}^2 + \|\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{1/2, h, \Gamma_D}^2, \quad (10)$$

$$\|(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_h^2 := \|(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_h^2 + \mu \|\mathbf{u}\|_{-1/2, h, \Gamma_D}^2, \quad (11)$$

where

$$\|v\|_{1/2, h, \Gamma_D}^2 := (h^{-1}v, v)_{0, \Gamma_D} \quad \text{and} \quad \|v\|_{-1/2, h, \Gamma_D}^2 := (h v, v)_{0, \Gamma_D}.$$

Note that the norms contain the  $L^2$ -norm of  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$ ; this term is superfluous for Stokes since we already control the  $H^1$ -norm of the velocities, but of vital importance for Darcy. In fact, the control of the divergence is what allows us to prove optimal error estimates in the energy norm for sufficiently regular solutions. In what follows we will use the following well known estimates:

$$(\partial_n \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})_{0, \partial\Omega} \leq \|\partial_n \mathbf{v}\|_{-1/2, h, \partial\Omega} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1/2, h, \partial\Omega} \quad \forall \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in V^h, \quad (12)$$

$$\|\partial_n \mathbf{v}\|_{-1/2, h, \partial\Omega}^2 \leq C_I \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_{0, \Omega}^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in V^h, \quad (13)$$

$$\|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}\|_{-1/2, h, \partial\Omega}^2 \leq C_{II} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}\|_{0, \Omega}^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in V^h. \quad (14)$$

Note that due to estimate (13) the norms  $\|\cdot\|_h$  and  $\|(\cdot, \cdot)\|_h$  are equivalent on the finite element subspace.

In the following, we will let  $C$  denote a generic positive constant whose value may change from instance to instance.

The main result of this section is the following theorem, assuring the well-posedness of our discretization.

**Theorem 3.1** *Assume  $\gamma_\mu > C_I$  and  $\gamma_\sigma > 0$ . Then the finite element formulation (8) satisfies the following inf-sup condition*

$$\alpha \|(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h)\|_h \leq \sup_{(\mathbf{v}^h, q^h) \in \mathcal{W}^h} \frac{B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)]}{\|(\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)\|_h}, \quad \forall (\mathbf{u}^h, p^h) \in \mathcal{W}^h.$$

**Proof.** The idea of the proof is to acquire control of the different terms of the energy norm with different choices of test functions and finally combine the choices using the linearity of the bilinear form.

*Step 1.* Taking first  $(\mathbf{v}^h, q^h) = (\mathbf{u}^h, -p^h)$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (\mathbf{u}^h, -p^h)] &= \mu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + \sigma \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + J^h(p^h, p^h) \\ &\quad - 2 \left( \mu \partial_n \mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{u}^h \right)_{0,\Gamma_D} + \gamma_\mu \mu \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2 + \gamma_\sigma \|\mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using Young's inequality and estimates (12) and (13) we get

$$\begin{aligned} B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (\mathbf{u}^h, -p^h)] &\geq \left(1 - \frac{C_I}{\epsilon}\right) \mu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + \sigma \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + J^h(p^h, p^h) \\ &\quad + (\gamma_\mu - \epsilon) \mu \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2 + \gamma_\sigma \|\mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\epsilon > 0$  is a parameter from Young's inequality. Our assumption is that  $\gamma_\mu > C_I$ . Therefore we can choose  $C_I < \epsilon < \gamma_\mu$  and we have

$$\begin{aligned} B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (\mathbf{u}^h, -p^h)] &\geq C_1 \mu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + \sigma \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + J^h(p^h, p^h) \\ &\quad + C_2 \mu \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2 + \gamma_\sigma \|\mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

*Step 2.* We are still missing the control of the pressure and the divergence of the velocity. To gain control over the pressure we note that as a consequence of the surjectivity of the divergence operator there exists a function  $\mathbf{v}_p \in [H_0^1(\Omega)]^d$  such that  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_p = p^h$  and

$$\|\mathbf{v}_p\|_{1,\Omega} \leq C \|p^h\|_{0,\Omega}. \quad (16)$$

Let  $\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p$  denote the Scott–Zhang interpolant (cf. [2]) of  $\mathbf{v}_p$  onto  $[V_0^h]^d$ , where

$$V_0^h := \{v \text{ s.t. } v|_K \in P_1(K), v \in C^0(\Omega), v = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}.$$

By the stability of the interpolant we have

$$\|\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p\|_{1,\Omega} \leq \tilde{c} \|p^h\|_{0,\Omega}. \quad (17)$$

We now choose the test function to be  $(\mathbf{v}^h, q^h) = (-\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p, 0)$ . Adding

$$0 = \|p^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 - (p^h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_p)_{0,\Omega}$$

and recalling that  $\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p$  vanishes on the boundary we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (-\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p, 0)] &= -\mu \left( \nabla \mathbf{u}^h, \nabla \pi^h \mathbf{v}_p \right)_{0,\Omega} - \sigma \left( \mathbf{u}^h, \pi^h \mathbf{v}_p \right)_{0,\Omega} + \|p^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\ &\quad + \left( p^h, \nabla \cdot (\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p - \mathbf{v}_p) \right)_{0,\Omega} + \mu \left( \mathbf{u}^h, \partial_n \pi^h \mathbf{v}_p \right)_{0,\Gamma_D}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating the fourth term by parts on each element  $K$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (-\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p, 0)] &= -\mu \left( \nabla \mathbf{u}^h, \nabla \pi^h \mathbf{v}_p \right)_{0,\Omega} - \sigma \left( \mathbf{u}^h, \pi^h \mathbf{v}_p \right)_{0,\Omega} + \|p^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}^h} \frac{1}{2} \left( [p^h], (\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p - \mathbf{v}_p) \cdot \mathbf{n} \right)_{0,\partial K} + \mu \left( \mathbf{u}^h, \partial_n \pi^h \mathbf{v}_p \right)_{0,\Gamma_D}. \end{aligned}$$

Splitting the inner products using Schwarz inequality, followed by Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p, 0)] \\
& \geq -\frac{1}{2\epsilon} \mu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \mu \|\nabla \pi^h \mathbf{v}_p\|_{0,\Omega}^2 - \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \sigma \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sigma \|\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\
& \quad + \|p^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 - \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \mu \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \mu \|\partial_n \pi^h \mathbf{v}_p\|_{-1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{2\delta\epsilon} J^h(p^h, p^h) - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^h) \setminus \partial\Omega} h_E \|(\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p - \mathbf{v}_p) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,E}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Using estimate (13) and the stability of the interpolate (17) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p, 0)] \\
& \geq -\frac{1}{2\epsilon} \mu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 - \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \sigma \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} (\mu\tilde{c} + \sigma\tilde{c} + \mu\tilde{c}C_I)\right) \|p^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \mu \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2 - \frac{1}{2\delta\epsilon} J^h(p^h, p^h) - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^h) \setminus \partial\Omega} h_E \|(\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p - \mathbf{v}_p) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,E}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

To conclude we need the following trace inequality, cf. [8],

$$\|\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,\partial K}^2 \leq C(h^{-1} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{0,K}^2 + h \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1,K}^2) \quad \forall \mathbf{w} \in [H^1(K)]^d, \quad (18)$$

from which we deduce, using (16),

$$\sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^h) \setminus \partial\Omega} h_E \|(\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p - \mathbf{v}_p) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,E}^2 \leq C \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}^h} \|\mathbf{v}_p\|_{1,\Omega}^2 \leq C \|p^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2.$$

Using the inequality above we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p, 0)] & \geq -\frac{1}{2\epsilon} \mu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 - \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \sigma \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\
& \quad + \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} (\mu\tilde{c} + \sigma\tilde{c} + \mu\tilde{c}C_I + C)\right) \|p^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \mu \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2 - \frac{1}{2\delta\epsilon} J^h(p^h, p^h).
\end{aligned}$$

Setting  $0 < \epsilon < 2/(\mu\tilde{c} + \sigma\tilde{c} + \mu\tilde{c}C_I + C)$  we finally have

$$\begin{aligned}
B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (\pi^h \mathbf{v}_p, 0)] & \geq -C_3 \mu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 - C_3 \sigma \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + C_4 \|p^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\
& \quad - C_3 \mu \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2 - \frac{C_3}{\delta} J^h(p^h, p^h). \quad (19)
\end{aligned}$$

*Step 3.* The divergence of the velocity is already contained in the  $H^1$ -norm of the velocity if  $\mu > 0$  but we want to have the control of the divergence even if  $\mu = 0$ .

The control of  $\|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2$  is obtained choosing  $(\mathbf{v}^h, q^h) = (0, -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h)$ , which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (0, -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h)] \\ &= \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + J^h(p^h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h) - (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0,\Gamma_D} \\ &\geq \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 - \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^h) \setminus \partial\Omega} \frac{\xi}{2} \delta \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h\|_{-1/2,h,E}^2 - \frac{1}{2\xi} J^h(p^h, p^h) \\ &\quad - \frac{\xi}{2} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h\|_{-1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2 - \frac{1}{2\xi} \|\mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using estimate (14) we get

$$\begin{aligned} B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (0, -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h)] &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\xi}{2} C_{II}(1 + \delta)\right) \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\xi} J^h(p^h, p^h) - \frac{1}{2\xi} \|\mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

*Step 4.* Now we have control over all the terms in the energy norm separately. Finally we take  $(\mathbf{v}^h, q^h) = (\beta \mathbf{u}^h - \pi^h \mathbf{v}_p, \beta p^h - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h)$ . Combining the results (15), (19) and (20) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)] \\ &\geq (\beta C_1 - C_3) \mu \|\nabla \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + (\beta - C_3) \sigma \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + C_4 \|p^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \frac{\xi}{2} C_{II}(1 + \delta)\right) \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + \left(\beta - \frac{1}{2\xi} - \frac{C_3}{\delta}\right) J^h(p^h, p^h) \\ &\quad + (\beta C_2 - C_3) \mu \|\mathbf{u}^h\|_{1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2 + \left(\beta \gamma_0 - \frac{1}{2\xi}\right) \|\mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{1/2,h,\Gamma_D}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The fourth term on the right hand side is positive if the parameter from Young's inequality is  $\xi < \frac{2}{C_{II}(1+\delta)}$ . With this the rest of the terms are positive if  $\beta > \frac{C_3}{C_1}$ ,  $\beta > C_3$ ,  $\beta > C_{II}(1 + \delta) + \frac{C_3}{\delta}$ ,  $\beta > \frac{C_3}{C_2}$ , and  $\beta > \frac{C_{II}(1+\delta)}{\gamma_0}$ . Then we have that

$$B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)] \geq |||(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h)|||_h^2$$

and the claim follows since there exists  $C > 0$  such that  $|||(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h)|||_h \geq C |||(\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)|||_h$ .  $\square$

Note that the Nitsche stability parameter  $\gamma_\sigma$  forcing the Darcy problems boundary conditions has no lower bound. This holds even on Darcy limit  $\mu = 0$ .

In the rest of the paper we assume that the stability requirement is satisfied, i.e. we make the following assumption.

**Assumption 3.2** *The real parameter  $\gamma_\mu$  satisfies  $\gamma_\mu > C_I$ .*

## 4 Error analysis

### 4.1 A priori estimates

First of all, we note that applying the trace inequality (18) we easily derive the following approximation property for couples of functions  $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in [H^2(\Omega)]^d \times H^1(\Omega)$ ,

$$|||(u - \pi^h u, p - \pi^h p)|||_h \leq Ch(\|u\|_{2,\Omega} + \|p\|_{1,\Omega}), \quad (21)$$

where  $(\pi^h \mathbf{u}, \pi^h p) \in \mathcal{W}^h$  denotes the interpolates. Without proof we also state the continuity of the bilinear form.

**Lemma 4.1** *For all  $(\mathbf{u}, p), (\mathbf{v}, q) \in \mathcal{W}$  it holds*

$$B^h[(\mathbf{u}, p), (\mathbf{v}, q)] \leq C |||(\mathbf{u}, p)|||_h |||(\mathbf{v}, q)|||_h. \quad (22)$$

The main result in this section is the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.2** *Assume that the solution  $(\mathbf{u}, p)$  to the problem (1) resides in  $[H^2(\Omega)]^d \times H^1(\Omega) \cap L_0^2(\Omega)$ ; then the finite element solution (8) satisfies the error estimate*

$$\|(u - \mathbf{u}^h, p - p^h)\|_h \leq Ch(\|u\|_{2,\Omega} + \|p\|_{1,\Omega}).$$

**Proof.** In view of the approximation property (21) we only need to show the inequality for  $|||(\mathbf{u}^h - \pi^h \mathbf{u}, p^h - \pi^h p)|||$ . By the stability, see Theorem 3.1, there exist a pair  $(\mathbf{v}^h, q^h) \in \mathcal{W}^h$  such that  $|||(\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)|||_h = 1$  and

$$\|(\mathbf{u}^h - \pi^h \mathbf{u}, p^h - \pi^h p)\|_h \leq \alpha^{-1} B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h - \pi^h \mathbf{u}, p^h - \pi^h p), (\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)].$$

Using the Galerkin orthogonality, see Lemma 2.1, we obtain

$$\|(\mathbf{u}^h - \pi^h \mathbf{u}, p^h - \pi^h p)\|_h \leq \alpha^{-1} B^h[(\mathbf{u} - \pi^h \mathbf{u}, p - \pi^h p), (\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)].$$

Furthermore, using the continuity of the bilinear form, equation (22), and recalling that the energy norms are equivalent in the finite element subspace, we have

$$\|(\mathbf{u}^h - \pi^h \mathbf{u}, p^h - \pi^h p)\|_h \leq \alpha^{-1} C |||(\mathbf{u} - \pi^h \mathbf{u}, p - \pi^h p)|||_h.$$

Now the claim follows by the approximation property (21). □

## 4.2 A posteriori estimate

In this section we propose and prove the a posteriori estimate in the energy norm. In what follows we will need two meshes. The original mesh  $\mathcal{T}^h$  and mesh  $\mathcal{T}^{h/2}$  derived from the original mesh by splittig the elements. By pair  $(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h)$  we denote the solution on the mesh  $\mathcal{T}^h$  and by  $(\mathbf{u}^{h/2}, p^{h/2})$  the solution on the mesh  $\mathcal{T}^{h/2}$ . The proof is based on the following saturation assumption.

**Assumption 4.3 (Saturation assumption)** *There exists  $0 < \beta < 1$  such that*

$$\|(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^{h/2}, p - p^{h/2})\|_{h/2} \leq \beta \|(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^h, p - p^h)\|_h. \quad (23)$$

The residual based elementwise estimator is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} E_K[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h)]^2 &:= \frac{h_K^2}{\mu + \sigma h_K^2} \|\nabla \cdot \mu \nabla \mathbf{u}^h - \sigma \mathbf{u}^h - \widehat{\nabla} p^h + \mathbf{f}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,K}^2 \\ &+ \mu h_E \|\partial_n \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\partial K \setminus \partial \Omega}^2 + h_E \|p^h\|_{0,\partial K \setminus \partial \Omega}^2 \\ &+ \mu h_E \|\mathbf{g}_t - \partial_n \mathbf{u}^h + (\partial_n \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}) \mathbf{n}\|_{0,\partial K \cap \Gamma_N}^2 + \mu h_E^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,\partial K \cap \Gamma_D}^2 \\ &+ h_E \|g_n + p^h - \mu \partial_n \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,\partial K \cap \Gamma_N}^2 + h_E^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,\partial K \cap \Gamma_D}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where the approximate gradient of pressure  $\widehat{\nabla} p^h \in W^h$  is defined as the solution to

$$(-\widehat{\nabla} p^h, \mathbf{v})_{0,\Omega} = (p^h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})_{0,\Omega} - (p^h, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0,\partial \Omega} \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in W^h. \quad (25)$$

We then have the following result.

**Theorem 4.4** *Under the Assumptions 3.2 and 4.3 it holds*

$$\|(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^h, p - p^h)\|_h \leq C \left( \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}^h} E_K[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h)]^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (26)$$

**Proof.** *Step 1.* Denote  $H := h/2$ . By the triangle inequality and the saturation assumption 4.3 we have

$$\|(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^h, p - p^h)\|_h \leq \frac{1}{1 - \beta} \|(\mathbf{u}^H - \mathbf{u}^h, p^H - p^h)\|_H. \quad (27)$$

Hence it is sufficient to bound  $\|(\mathbf{u}^H - \mathbf{u}^h, p^H - p^h)\|_H$ . By the stability, Theorem 3.1, we know that there exists  $(\mathbf{v}^H, q^H) \in \mathcal{W}^H$  such that

$$\alpha \|(\mathbf{u}^H - \mathbf{u}^h, p^H - p^h)\|_H \leq B^H[(\mathbf{u}^H - \mathbf{u}^h, p^H - p^h), (\mathbf{v}^H, q^H)] \quad (28)$$

and  $\|(\mathbf{v}^H, q^H)\|_H = 1$ . Let  $(\mathbf{v}^h, q^h) \in \mathcal{W}^h$  be an interpolate to  $(\mathbf{v}^H, q^H) \in \mathcal{W}^H$ . To simplify the notation we denote

$$\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{v}^H - \mathbf{v}^h \quad \text{and} \quad r := q^H - q^h.$$

By scaling arguments one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma + \mu h_K^{-2}) \|\mathbf{w}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{w}\|_{0,K}^2 + \|r\|_{0,K}^2 + \mu h_K \|\partial_n \mathbf{w}\|_{0,\partial K}^2 + h_K \|r\|_{0,\partial K}^2 \\ + \mu h_K^{-1} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{\partial K}^2 + h_K^{-1} \|\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{\partial K}^2 \leq C \|(\mathbf{v}^H, q^H)\|_H^2 \leq C. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Combining equations (27) and (28), and using the interpolate to split the bilinear form into two parts, we get

$$\begin{aligned} C \|(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^h, p - p^h)\|_h &\leq B^H[(\mathbf{u}^H - \mathbf{u}^h, p^H - p^h), (\mathbf{v}^H, q^H)] \\ &= B^H[(\mathbf{u}^H - \mathbf{u}^h, p^H - p^h), (\mathbf{w}, r)] + B^H[(\mathbf{u}^H - \mathbf{u}^h, p^H - p^h), (\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)] \\ &= W_1 + W_2. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

*Step 2.* We bound the terms  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  separately, starting with  $W_1$ . Since  $(\mathbf{u}^H, p^H)$  is the solution to the problem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 &= L^H[(\mathbf{w}, r)] - B^H[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (\mathbf{w}, r)] \\ &= (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{w})_{0,\Omega} + (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{w})_{0,\Gamma_N} + (\mathbf{u}_0, \gamma_\mu \mu H^{-1} \mathbf{w})_{0,\Gamma_D} - (\mathbf{u}_0, \mu \partial_n \mathbf{w})_{0,\Gamma_D} \\ &\quad + (\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n}, \gamma_\sigma H^{-1} \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0,\Gamma_D} + (\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n}, r)_{0,\Gamma_D} \\ &\quad - (\mu \nabla \mathbf{u}^h, \nabla \mathbf{w})_{0,\Omega} - (\sigma \mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{w})_{0,\Omega} + (p^h, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{w})_{0,\Omega} + (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h, r)_{0,\Omega} \\ &\quad + J^H(p^h, r) + (\mu \partial_n \mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{w})_{0,\Gamma_D} + (\mu \mathbf{u}^h, \partial_n \mathbf{w})_{0,\Gamma_D} - (\gamma_\sigma \mu H^{-1} \mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{w})_{0,\Gamma_D} \\ &\quad - (p^h, \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0,\Gamma_D} - (\mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}, r)_{0,\Gamma_D} - (\gamma_\sigma H^{-1} \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0,\Gamma_D}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Integrating the term  $-(\mu \nabla \mathbf{u}^h, \nabla \mathbf{w})_{0,\Omega}$  by parts in each element, and using the definition of approximate gradient of pressure (25) we get

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 &= (\mathbf{f} + \nabla \cdot \mu \nabla \mathbf{u}^h - \sigma \mathbf{u}^h - \widehat{\nabla} p^h, \mathbf{w})_{0,\Omega} + (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h, r)_{0,\Omega} \\ &\quad - \sum_{E \in \partial \Omega} ([\mu \nabla \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}], \mathbf{w})_{0,E} + \sum_{E \in \partial \Omega} ([p^h], \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0,E} + J^H(p^h, r) \\ &\quad + (\mathbf{g} + p^h \mathbf{n} - \mu \partial_n \mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{w})_{0,\Gamma_N} - (\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}^h, \mu \partial_n \mathbf{w})_{0,\Gamma_D} \\ &\quad + (\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}^h, \gamma_\mu \mu H^{-1} \mathbf{w})_{0,\Gamma_D} + (\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}, r)_{0,\Gamma_D} \\ &\quad + (\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \gamma_\sigma H^{-1} \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0,\Gamma_D}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

We split equation (32) into smaller pieces

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_1 &:= (\mathbf{f} + \nabla \cdot \mu \nabla \mathbf{u}^h - \sigma \mathbf{u}^h - \widehat{\nabla} p^h, \mathbf{w})_{0,\Omega} \\
Z_2 &:= (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h, r)_{0,\Omega} + J^H(p^h, r) \\
Z_3 &:= - \sum_{E \in \mathcal{T}^H} ([\mu \nabla \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}], \mathbf{w})_{0,E} + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{T}^H} ([p^h], \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0,E} \\
Z_4 &:= (\mathbf{g} + p^h \mathbf{n} - \mu \partial_n \mathbf{u}^h, \mathbf{w})_{0,\Gamma_N} \\
Z_5 &:= -(\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}^h, \mu \partial_n \mathbf{w})_{0,\Gamma_D} + (\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}^h, \gamma_\mu \mu H^{-1} \mathbf{w})_{0,\Gamma_D} \\
Z_6 &:= (\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}, r)_{0,\Gamma_D} + (\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \gamma_\sigma H^{-1} \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0,\Gamma_D}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we bound the terms  $Z_i$  using the the Schwarz inequality for both inner products and sums.

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_1 \leq & \left( \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}^H} (\sigma + \mu h_K^{-2})^{-1} \|\mathbf{f} + \nabla \cdot \mu \nabla \mathbf{u}^h - \sigma \mathbf{u}^h - \widehat{\nabla} p^h\|_{0,K}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \cdot \left( \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}^H} (\sigma + \mu h_K^{-2}) \|\mathbf{w}\|_{0,K}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (33)
\end{aligned}$$

$$Z_2 \leq \left( \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}^H} \|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,K}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}^H} \|r\|_{0,K}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + J^H(p^h, p^h)^{\frac{1}{2}} J^H(r, r)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_3 \leq & \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \setminus \partial\Omega} \mu h_E \|\partial_n \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \setminus \partial\Omega} \mu h_E^{-1} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& + \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \setminus \partial\Omega} h_E \|[p^h]\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \setminus \partial\Omega} h_E^{-1} \|\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (35)
\end{aligned}$$

The term  $Z_4$  is first split into normal and tangential components.

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_4 = & (\mu \mathbf{g}_t - \mu \partial_n \mathbf{u}^h + \mu (\partial_n \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}) \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{t})_{0,\Gamma_N} \\
& + (g_n + p^h - \mu \partial_n \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0,\Gamma_N} = Z_{4,n} + Z_{4,t}. \quad (36)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{4,n} \leq & \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_N} \mu h_E \|\mathbf{g}_t - \partial_n \mathbf{u}^h + (\partial_n \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}) \mathbf{n}\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \cdot \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_N} \mu h_E^{-1} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (37)
\end{aligned}$$



$$Z_{4,t} \leq \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_N} h_E \|g_n + p^h - \mu \partial_n \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_N} h_E^{-1} \|\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (38)$$

$$Z_5 \leq \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_D} \mu h_E^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_D} \mu h_E \|\partial_n \mathbf{w}\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ + \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_D} \mu h_E^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{u}^h\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_D} \mu h_E^{-1} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (39)$$

$$Z_6 \leq \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_D} h_E^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_D} h_E \|r\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ + \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_D} h_E^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_D} h_E^{-1} \|\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (40)$$

By the interpolation estimate (29) and since  $(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h)$  has same values on both meshes, we find that

$$W_1 \leq C \left( \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}^H} E_K [(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h)]^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C \left( \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}^h} E_K [(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h)]^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (41)$$

*Step 3.* Now we have bounded the term  $W_1$  and next we bound the term  $W_2$ . Since both  $(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h)$  and  $(\mathbf{u}^H, p^H)$  are solutions to the problem on different meshes, we get

$$W_2 = L^H[(\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)] - B^H[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)] \\ - L^h[(\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)] + B^h[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h), (\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)]. \quad (42)$$

Below we will denote with subscripts  $h$  and  $H$  the mesh that we are currently integrating on, e.g.  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{0, \Gamma_{D,h}}$ . Since  $(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h)$  and  $(\mathbf{v}^h, q^h)$  have same values on both meshes, we have

$$W_2 = J^h(p^h, q^h) - J^H(p^h, q^h) \\ + (\mathbf{u}^h - \mathbf{u}_0, \gamma_\mu \mu h^{-1} \mathbf{v}^h)_{0, \Gamma_{D,h}} + (\mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n}, \gamma_\sigma h^{-1} \mathbf{v}^h \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0, \Gamma_{D,h}} \\ - (\mathbf{u}^h - \mathbf{u}_0, \gamma_\mu \mu H^{-1} \mathbf{v}^h)_{0, \Gamma_{D,H}} - (\mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n}, \gamma_\sigma H^{-1} \mathbf{v}^h \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0, \Gamma_{D,H}}. \quad (43)$$

Recall that  $h = 2H$  to get

$$W_2 = J^H(p^h, q^h) - (\mathbf{u}^h - \mathbf{u}_0, \gamma_\mu \mu (2H)^{-1} \mathbf{v}^h)_{0, \Gamma_{D,H}} - (\mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n}, \gamma_\sigma (2H)^{-1} \mathbf{v}^h \cdot \mathbf{n})_{0, \Gamma_{D,H}}. \quad (44)$$

Using the Schwarz inequality we obtain

$$W_2 \leq C \left[ J^H(p^h, p^h)^{\frac{1}{2}} J^H(q^h, q^h)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_D} \mu h^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}^h - \mathbf{u}_0\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_D} \mu h^{-1} \|\mathbf{v}^h\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_D} h^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}^h \cdot \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{u}_0 \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{(E \in \mathcal{T}^H) \cap \Gamma_D} h^{-1} \|\mathbf{v}^h \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,E}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right]. \quad (45)$$

Since  $\|(\mathbf{v}^H, q^H)\|_H = 1$  the stability of the interpolate gives

$$W_2 \leq C \left( \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}^H} E_K[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h)]^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C \left( \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}^h} E_K[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h)]^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (46)$$

*Step 4.* Now all the pieces are ready and we only need to combine equations (30), (41) and (46) to get the desired result.  $\square$

## 5 Numerical Examples

In this section we illustrate the method and analytical results with numerical examples. We concentrate on showing that the results hold with viscosity  $\mu \geq 0$ , including Darcy limit  $\mu = 0$ . Furthermore, we compare the results with the traditional boundary conditions.

Our model problem is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u} - \nabla \cdot \mu \nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla p &= 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} &= 0 \text{ in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

First we compute the convergence rate of the error in the energy norm with different values of viscosity  $\mu$ . Our domain  $\Omega$  is the unit square with Dirichlet

boundary conditions computed from the known exact solution;

$$p = -\sin(x) \sinh(y) - (\cos(1) - 1)(\cosh(1) - 1) \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathbf{u} = -\nabla p = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(x) \sinh(y) \\ \sin(x) \cosh(y) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since the pressure  $p$  is harmonic, the solution is independent of the viscosity. In Figure 1 are the exact pressure and velocity fields of the model problem. In all the subsequent computations Nitsche stability parameters are  $\gamma_\mu = 2$  and  $\gamma_\sigma = 1$ , and the divergence stability parameter is

$$\delta = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } \mu \geq 0.1 \\ 10 & \text{for } 0 \leq \mu < 0.1. \end{cases}$$

In Figure 2 are the convergence rates of the method. We see that the convergence rate is  $O(h)$  with all the values of viscosity, even on Darcy limit, as predicted by Lemma 4.2.

Next we compare the Nitsche method to the traditional boundary conditions. Here our domain is the unit square and we use the following boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{0} && \text{on } \{x \in (0, 1), y = 0\} \text{ and } \{x \in (0, 1), y = 1\}, \\ g_n &= 1, \mathbf{g}_t = \mathbf{0} && \text{on } \{x = 0, y \in (0, 1)\}, \\ g_n &= 0, \mathbf{g}_t = \mathbf{0} && \text{on } \{x = 1, y \in (0, 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The stability parameters are as before. In Figure 3 are the velocities with different values of viscosity. We see that the traditional method cannot produce slip boundary conditions of the Darcy problem unless the viscosity is equal to zero. On the other hand, Nitsche's method moves continuously towards the slip boundary conditions as the viscosity diminishes. In Figure 4 we have the velocity profile in x-direction at line  $x = 0.5$ . We notice that the traditional method has oscillations in the velocity near the boundaries in the case of small viscosity. In Figure 5 we have the velocity in y-direction at same line  $x = 0.5$ . The velocity in y-direction should be zero, but with traditional boundary conditions and with small viscosity there is also oscillation in the velocity in y-direction. These oscillations are due to the fact that the problem is very close to Darcy problem but the traditional way of prescribing the boundary conditions does not allow slip in tangential direction before the viscosity is equal to zero.

We think that the previous example clearly illustrates the shortcoming of the traditional boundary conditions in the Brinkman problem; the whole range of viscosity cannot be used. From the non-physical oscillations it is obvious that the results are not accurate or reliable near the boundaries with the

traditional no-slip boundary conditions if the viscosity is small. Refining the mesh pushes the inaccuracy closer to the boundary but will not remove the problem. Nitsche's method handles these difficulties even on a coarse mesh.

Finally we test the adaptive refinement based on the elementwise a posteriori error estimator. The domain is  $\Omega = (-1, 2) \times (0, 1)$  and the boundary conditions are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{0} && \text{on } \{x \in (-1, 2), y = 0\} \text{ and } \{x \in (-1, 2), y = 1\}, \\ g_n &= 1, \mathbf{g}_t = \mathbf{0} && \text{on } \{x = -1, y \in (0, 1)\}, \\ g_n &= 0, \mathbf{g}_t = \mathbf{0} && \text{on } \{x = 2, y \in (0, 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The idea is to mimic fluid flow in porous medium with a crack in the middle of the domain. Most of the domain is a porous medium, governed by Darcy equation, but on a small crack the viscosity also has an effect. In other words, the viscosity is a function  $\mu = \mu(x, y)$ , see Figure 6. Here the divergence stability parameter is  $\delta = 5$ . In Figure 7 we have the velocity and pressure on a well adapted mesh. In Figure 8 we first have the initial mesh and error distribution, and then the mesh and the error distribution after two rounds of adaptive refinement. We notice that the adaptive scheme detects the step changes in the viscosity and refines there.

In numerical tests not shown here we have noticed that the a posteriori estimator needs a rather smooth pressure field if the viscosity is small, especially near the boundaries. This is because the residual inside the elements in the a posteriori estimator is of the form  $\|\mathbf{u}^h + \widehat{\nabla} p^h\|_{0,K}^2$  if the viscosity and load are zero (or very small). There are no powers of  $h$  in the coefficient; therefore the approximate negative gradient of pressure  $-\widehat{\nabla} p^h$  has to be close to the velocity. To this end we need a smoother pressure which is obtained by using a larger stability parameter  $\delta$ . However, using too large a stability parameter may result in compressible flow. The problem is worse near the boundaries since the approximate gradient is essentially computed from the pressure jumps, and on the boundary we do not have a value for the jump.

## References

- [1] Y. Bazilevs, T.J.R. Hughes, Weak imposition of Dirichlet boundary conditions in fluid mechanics, *Computers & Fluids* 36 (1) (2007) 12–26.
- [2] S. Brenner, R.L Scott, *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, Springer: New York, 1994.
- [3] E. Burman, A unified analysis for conforming and nonconforming stabilized finite element methods using interior penalty, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 43 (5) (2005) 2012–2033.

- [4] E. Burman, P. Hansbo, A unified stabilized method for Stokes' and Darcy's equations, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* 198 (1) (2007) 35–51.
- [5] T.J.R. Hughes, L.P. Franca, A new finite element formulation for cfd: VII. the stokes problem with various well-posed boundary conditions: Symmetric formulations that converge for all velocity/pressure spaces, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 65 (1) (1987) 85–96.
- [6] K. Mardal, X. Tai, R. Winther, A robust finite element method for Darcy-Stokes flow, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 58 (5) (2002) 1605–1631.
- [7] J. Nitsche, Über ein Variationsprinzip zur Lösung von Dirichlet-Problemen bei Verwendung von Teilräumen, die keinen Randbedingungen unterworfen sind, *Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg* 36 (1971) 9–15.
- [8] V. Thomée, *Galerkin Finite Element Methods for Parabolic Problems*, Springer: Berlin, 1997.




Fig. 1. The exact velocity and pressure for the model problem. Recall that the solution is independent of the viscosity since the pressure is harmonic.




Fig. 2. The convergence of the error in the energy norm for various values of viscosity parameter. The convergence rates are given in the legend. Notice that even the Darcy limit case,  $\mu = 0$ , converges with the optimal speed of  $\mathcal{O}(h)$ .




Fig. 3. Velocity fields of the model problem, on the left using the traditional and on the right using Nitsche boundary conditions. From top to bottom viscosity  $\mu$  has values 0.1, 0.001, and 0. The lengths of the vectors are scaled differently on each row. For size of the velocity, see the velocity profile figures below. Notice the difference in the solutions near the boundaries on the middle row.




Fig. 4. The velocity profile to x-direction at line  $x = 0.5$  with different values of viscosity  $\mu$ . The solid line is computed with Nitsche boundary conditions and the dashed line with the traditional boundary conditions. Notice the oscillations with the traditional method near the boundary with small  $\mu$ .






Fig. 5. The velocity profile to  $y$ -direction at line  $x = 0.5$  with different values of viscosity  $\mu$ . The solid line is computed with Nitsche boundary conditions and the dashed line with the traditional boundary conditions. Notice the oscillations with the traditional method near the boundary with small  $\mu$ .




Fig. 6. The viscosity function  $\mu(x, y)$  in the adaptive test with varying viscosity.




Fig. 7. The velocity and pressure in the adaptive test with varying viscosity. The results are computed on a well adapted mesh.




Fig. 8. The first (initial) and third step of the adaptive refinement in the test with varying viscosity. The goal of the adaptivity is  $E_K[(\mathbf{u}^h, p^h)] < 0.01$  for all  $K \in \mathcal{T}^h$ .