C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I 353 (2015) 31–34

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I

www.sciencedirect.com

Partial differential equations/Numerical analysis

Hybrid high-order methods for variable-diffusion problems on general meshes

Méthodes hybrides d'ordre élevé pour des problèmes à diffusion variable sur des maillages généraux

Daniele A. Di Pietro [a], Alexandre Ern [b]

[a] *University Montpellier-2, I3M, 34057 Montpellier cedex 5, France*
[b] *University Paris-Est, CERMICS (ENPC), 77455 Marne-la-Vallée cedex 2, France*

A R T I C L E   I N F O

Article history:
Received 11 July 2014
Accepted 20 October 2014
Available online 3 November 2014

Presented by Olivier Pironneau

A B S T R A C T

We extend the Hybrid High-Order method introduced by the authors for the Poisson problem to problems with heterogeneous/anisotropic diffusion. The cornerstone is a local discrete gradient reconstruction from element- and face-based polynomial degrees of freedom. Optimal error estimates are proved.

R É S U M É

Nous étendons la méthode hybride d'ordre élevé conçue par les auteurs pour le problème de Poisson à des problèmes de diffusion hétérogène/anisotrope. La pierre angulaire est une reconstruction locale du gradient discret à partir des degrés de liberté polynomiaux sur les éléments et les faces. On établit des estimations d'erreur optimales.

1. Introduction

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \{2, 3\}$, denote an open, bounded, polytopic domain. Let $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and, for a subset $X \subset \overline{\Omega}$, denote by $(\cdot,\cdot)_X$ and $\|\cdot\|_X$ the inner product and norm in $L^2(X)$, respectively. We focus on the following variable-diffusion problem: Find $u \in U_0 := H^1_0(\Omega)$ such that

$$(\boldsymbol{\kappa}\nabla u, \nabla v)_\Omega = (f, v)_\Omega \quad \forall v \in U_0, \tag{1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ is a bounded, tensor-valued function in Ω, taking symmetric values with lowest eigenvalue uniformly bounded from below away from zero. Owing to the Lax–Milgram Lemma, problem (1) is well-posed.

The approximation of diffusive problems on general polytopic meshes has received an increasing attention lately. Several low-order methods have been developed; see, e.g., [8,3] and references therein. Recently, high-order methods have

E-mail addresses: daniele.di-pietro@univ-montp2.fr (D.A. Di Pietro), ern@cermics.enpc.fr (A. Ern).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.crma.2014.10.013
1631-073X/

also become available; we mention the high-order Mimetic Finite Difference (MFD) schemes [1,9], the Virtual Element Method [2], and the Mixed High-Order [6] and Hybrid High-Order (HHO) [7,5] methods. For the latter, the degrees of freedom (DOFs) are scalar-valued polynomials at mesh elements and faces up to some degree $k \geq 0$ (as for the MFD schemes in [9]), and element-based DOFs can be eliminated by static condensation. The construction hinges on (i) a local discrete gradient reconstruction of order k and (ii) a least-squares local penalty that weakly enforces the matching between element- and face-based DOFs while preserving the order of the gradient reconstruction. This design leads to optimal energy- and L^2-norm error estimates; cf. [7] for the Poisson problem ($\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ being the identity tensor in (1)) and [5] for (quasi-incompressible) linear elasticity.

The purpose of the present work is to extend the HHO method of [7] to the variable-diffusion problem (1). The key idea is to modify the gradient reconstruction so as to take into account the diffusion tensor $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$. Then, adapting the ideas of [7], we prove stability of the discrete problem and derive optimal error estimates. We make the reasonable assumption that there is a partition P_Ω of Ω so that $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ is piecewise Lipschitz. For simplicity of exposition, we also assume that $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ is a piecewise polynomial; otherwise, an additional quadrature error has to be accounted for. In applications from the geosciences, $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ can often be taken piecewise constant.

2. Discrete setting and local gradient reconstruction

We consider admissible mesh sequences in the sense of [4, Sect. 1.4]. Each mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ in the sequence is a finite collection $\{T\}$ of nonempty, disjoint, open, polytopic elements such that $\overline{\Omega} = \bigcup_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \overline{T}$ and $h = \max_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T$ (with h_T the diameter of T), and there is a matching simplicial submesh of $\mathcal{T}_h$ with locally equivalent mesh size and which is shape-regular in the usual sense. For all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, the faces of T are collected in the set $\mathcal{F}_T$. In an admissible mesh sequence, $\operatorname{card}(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is uniformly bounded, the usual discrete and multiplicative trace inequalities hold on element faces, and the L^2-orthogonal projector onto polynomial spaces enjoys optimal approximation properties on each mesh element [4, Chapter 1]. Let a polynomial degree $k \geq 0$ be fixed. For all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we define the local space of DOFs as $\underline{U}_T^k := \mathbb{P}_d^k(T) \times \{\times_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} \mathbb{P}_{d-1}^k(F)\}$, where $\mathbb{P}_d^k(T)$ (resp., $\mathbb{P}_{d-1}^k(F)$) is spanned by the restrictions to T (resp., F) of d-variate (resp., $(d-1)$-variate) polynomials of total degree $\leq k$. In what follows, local DOFs are underlined. Furthermore, $A \lesssim B$ denotes the inequality $A \leq CB$ with positive constant C independent of the meshsize h and the diffusion tensor $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$. We assume that each mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ in the sequence is compatible with the partition P_Ω associated with the diffusion tensor. We denote by $\kappa_T^\flat$ and $\kappa_T^\sharp$ the lowest and largest eigenvalue of $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ in T, respectively, and we introduce the local heterogeneity/anisotropy ratio $\rho_T := \kappa_T^\sharp/\kappa_T^\flat \geq 1$. In what follows, we explicitly track the dependency of the bounds on the ratio ρ_T. To avoid the profileration of symbols, we assume that for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, the Lipschitz constant of $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ in T, say L_T^κ, satisfies $L_T^\kappa \lesssim \kappa_T^\sharp$.

For all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we define the local gradient reconstruction operator $\boldsymbol{G}_T^k : \underline{U}_T^k \to \nabla\mathbb{P}_d^{k+1}(T)$ such that, for all $\underline{v}_T := (v_T, (v_F)_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T}) \in \underline{U}_T^k$ and all $w \in \mathbb{P}_d^{k+1}(T)$,

$$\left(\boldsymbol{\kappa}\boldsymbol{G}_T^k\underline{v}_T, \nabla w\right)_T = (\boldsymbol{\kappa}\nabla v_T, \nabla w)_T + \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} (v_F - v_T, \nabla w\cdot\boldsymbol{\kappa}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}_{TF})_F, \tag{2}$$

which can be computed by solving a local (well-posed) Neumann problem in $\mathbb{P}_d^{k+1}(T)$. We introduce the potential reconstruction operator $p_T^k : \underline{U}_T^k \to \mathbb{P}_d^{k+1}(T)$ such that, for all $\underline{v}_T \in \underline{U}_T^k$, $\nabla p_T^k\underline{v}_T := \boldsymbol{G}_T^k\underline{v}_T$ and $\int_T p_T^k\underline{v}_T := \int_T v_T$ ($p_T^k\underline{v}_T$ is well-defined since $\boldsymbol{G}_T^k\underline{v}_T \in \nabla\mathbb{P}_d^{k+1}(T)$). Finally, we define the local interpolation operator $\underline{I}_T^k : H^1(T) \to \underline{U}_T^k$ such that, for all $v \in H^1(T)$, $\underline{I}_T^k v := (\pi_T^k v, (\pi_F^k v)_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T})$, where π_T^k and π_F^k are the L^2-orthogonal projectors onto $\mathbb{P}_d^k(T)$ and $\mathbb{P}_{d-1}^k(F)$, respectively.

Lemma 2.1 *(Approximation properties for $p_T^k\underline{I}_T^k$). The following holds for all $v \in H^{k+2}(T)$ with $\alpha = 1/2$ if $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ is piecewise constant and $\alpha = 1$ in the general case:*

$$\|v - p_T^k\underline{I}_T^k v\|_T + h_T^{1/2}\|v - p_T^k\underline{I}_T^k v\|_{\partial T} + h_T\|\nabla(v - p_T^k\underline{I}_T^k v)\|_T + h_T^{3/2}\|\nabla(v - p_T^k\underline{I}_T^k v)\|_{\partial T} \lesssim \rho_T^\alpha h_T^{k+2}\|v\|_{H^{k+2}(T)}. \tag{3}$$

Proof. Let $v \in H^{k+2}(T)$. A direct calculation using (2), the definitions of p_T^k and $\underline{I}_T^k$, and integration by parts shows that, for all $w \in \mathbb{P}_d^{k+1}(T)$,

$$\left(\boldsymbol{\kappa}\nabla(v - p_T^k\underline{I}_T^k v), \nabla w\right)_T = \left((\boldsymbol{\kappa} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\kappa}}_T)\nabla(v - \pi_T^k v), \nabla w\right)_T - \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} \left(\pi_F^k v - \pi_T^k v, \nabla w\cdot(\boldsymbol{\kappa} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\kappa}}_T)\cdot\boldsymbol{n}_{TF}\right)_F,$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{\kappa}}_T$ denotes the mean-value of $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ in T. Note that the right-hand side vanishes if $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ is piecewise constant. In the general case, owing to the assumptions on $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ and using the approximation properties of the L^2-orthogonal projectors along with a discrete trace inequality for $\|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2}\nabla w\|_F$, we infer that

$$\left|\left(\boldsymbol{\kappa}\nabla(v - p_T^k\underline{I}_T^k v), \nabla w\right)_T\right| \lesssim L_T^\kappa h_T h_T^k\|v\|_{H^{k+1}(T)}\|\nabla w\|_T \lesssim \kappa_T^\sharp h_T^{k+1}\|v\|_{H^{k+1}(T)}\|\nabla w\|_T. \tag{4}$$

We now observe that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2}\nabla(v - p_T^k \underline{I}_T^k v)\|_T^2 = (\boldsymbol{\kappa}\nabla(v - p_T^k \underline{I}_T^k v), \nabla(v - \pi_T^{k+1} v))_T + (\boldsymbol{\kappa}\nabla(v - p_T^k \underline{I}_T^k v), \nabla(\pi_T^{k+1} v - p_T^k \underline{I}_T^k v))_T. \tag{5}$$

Denote by $\mathfrak{T}_1$ and $\mathfrak{T}_2$ the addends on the right-hand side of (5). Using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and the approximation properties of π_T^{k+1}, we obtain $|\mathfrak{T}_1| \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2}\nabla(v - p_T^k \underline{I}_T^k v)\|_T (\kappa_T^\sharp)^{1/2} h_T^{k+1} \|v\|_{H^{k+2}(T)}$. When $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ is piecewise constant, $\mathfrak{T}_2$ vanishes, so that using Young's inequality yields $\|\nabla(v - p_T^k \underline{I}_T^k v)\|_T \le (\kappa_T^\flat)^{-1/2} \|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2}\nabla(v - p_T^k \underline{I}_T^k v)\|_T \lesssim \rho_T^{1/2} h_T^{k+1} \|v\|_{H^{k+2}(T)}$. In the general case, using (4) with $w = (\pi_T^{k+1} v - p_T^k \underline{I}_T^k v)$ and since $\|\nabla(\pi_T^{k+1} v - p_T^k \underline{I}_T^k v)\|_T = \|\nabla \pi_T^{k+1}(v - p_T^k \underline{I}_T^k v)\|_T \lesssim \|\nabla(v - p_T^k \underline{I}_T^k v)\|_T$ owing to the H^1-stability of the projector π_T^{k+1}, we infer that $|\mathfrak{T}_2| \lesssim \rho_T^{1/2} (\kappa_T^\sharp)^{1/2} h_T^{k+1} \|v\|_{H^{k+1}(T)} \|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2}\nabla(v - p_T^k \underline{I}_T^k v)\|_T$, which leads to the estimate on $\|\nabla(v - p_T^k \underline{I}_T^k v)\|_T$ in (3). The other terms in (3) are then bounded as in [7, Lemma 3]. □

Remark 1 *($\alpha = 0$).* It is also possible to take $\alpha = 0$ whenever, for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, the eigenvectors of $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{|T}$ are constant and its eigenvalues satisfy, with obvious notation, $|\lambda(x) - \bar{\lambda}_T| \lesssim h_T \lambda(x)$ for all $x \in T$.

3. Discrete problem and stability

For all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we introduce the local bilinear forms a_T and s_T on $\underline{U}_T^k \times \underline{U}_T^k$ such that

$$a_T(\underline{u}_T, \underline{v}_T) := (\boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{G}_T^k \underline{u}_T, \boldsymbol{G}_T^k \underline{v}_T)_T + s_T(\underline{u}_T, \underline{v}_T), \quad s_T(\underline{u}_T, \underline{v}_T) := \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} \frac{\kappa_F}{h_F} (\pi_F^k(u_F - P_T^k \underline{u}_T), \pi_F^k(v_F - P_T^k \underline{v}_T))_F, \tag{6}$$

with $\kappa_F := \|\boldsymbol{n}_{TF} \cdot \boldsymbol{\kappa} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}_{TF}\|_{L^\infty(F)}$ and $P_T^k : \underline{U}_T^k \to \mathbb{P}_d^{k+1}(T)$ is such that $P_T^k \underline{v}_T := v_T + (p_T^k \underline{v}_T - \pi_T^k p_T^k \underline{v}_T)$. We define the global space of DOFs by patching interface values, so that $\underline{U}_h^k := \{\times_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \mathbb{P}_d^k(T)\} \times \{\times_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h} \mathbb{P}_{d-1}^k(F)\}$, and, for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and all $\underline{v}_h \in \underline{U}_h^k$, we denote by $\underline{v}_T$ the local DOFs of $\underline{v}_h$ in $\underline{U}_T^k$. The discrete problem consists in seeking $\underline{u}_h \in \underline{U}_{h,0}^k := \{\underline{v}_h = ((v_T)_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h}, (v_F)_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h}) \in \underline{U}_h^k \mid v_F \equiv 0 \ \forall F \in \mathcal{F}_h^{\mathrm{b}}\}$ such that

$$a_h(\underline{u}_h, \underline{v}_h) := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} a_T(\underline{u}_T, \underline{v}_T) = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} (f, v_T)_T =: l_h(\underline{v}_h) \quad \forall \underline{v}_h \in \underline{U}_{h,0}^k. \tag{7}$$

To analyze the stability of the discrete problem, we introduce the following seminorm on $\underline{U}_T^k$:

$$\|\underline{v}_T\|_{\boldsymbol{\kappa},T}^2 := \|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2}\nabla v_T\|_T^2 + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} \frac{\kappa_F}{h_F} \|v_F - v_T\|_F^2, \tag{8}$$

and we set $\|\underline{v}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{\kappa},h}^2 := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \rho_T^{-1} \|\underline{v}_T\|_{\boldsymbol{\kappa},T}^2$ for all $\underline{v}_h \in \underline{U}_h^k$. Observe that $\|\cdot\|_{\boldsymbol{\kappa},h}$ is a norm on $\underline{U}_{h,0}^k$.

Lemma 3.1 *(Stability). The following inequalities hold for all $\underline{v}_T \in \underline{U}_T^k$:*

$$\rho_T^{-1} \|\underline{v}_T\|_{\boldsymbol{\kappa},T}^2 \lesssim a_T(\underline{v}_T, \underline{v}_T) \lesssim \rho_T \|\underline{v}_T\|_{\boldsymbol{\kappa},T}^2. \tag{9}$$

Consequently, $\|\underline{v}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{\kappa},h}^2 \lesssim a_h(\underline{v}_h, \underline{v}_h)$ for all $\underline{v}_h \in \underline{U}_h^k$ and problem (7) is well-posed.

Proof. We adapt the proof of [7, Lemma 4]. Concerning the face terms, we obtain

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} \frac{\kappa_F}{h_F} \|v_F - v_T\|_F^2 \le s_T(\underline{v}_T, \underline{v}_T) + \rho_T \|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{G}_T^k \underline{v}_T\|_T^2, \quad s_T(\underline{v}_T, \underline{v}_T) \lesssim \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} \frac{\kappa_F}{h_F} \|v_F - v_T\|_F^2 + \rho_T \|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{G}_T^k \underline{v}_T\|_T^2. \tag{10}$$

To compare $\|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{G}_T^k \underline{v}_T\|_T$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2}\nabla v_T\|_T$, we observe that, for all $w \in \mathbb{P}_d^{k+1}(T)$ and all $F \in \mathcal{F}_T$,

$$\|\nabla w \cdot \boldsymbol{\kappa} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}_{TF}\|_F^2 \le (|\boldsymbol{n}_{TF} \cdot \boldsymbol{\kappa} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}_{TF}|, |\nabla w \cdot \boldsymbol{\kappa} \cdot \nabla w|)_F \lesssim \frac{\kappa_F}{h_F} \|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2}\nabla w\|_T^2, \tag{11}$$

where we have used the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality for $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$, the definition of κ_F, and a discrete trace inequality. Taking $w = v_T$ in the definition (2) of $\boldsymbol{G}_T^k \underline{v}_T$ yields $\|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2}\nabla v_T\|_T^2 = (\boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{G}_T^k \underline{v}_T, \nabla v_T)_T - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} (v_F - v_T, \nabla v_T \cdot \boldsymbol{\kappa} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}_{TF})_F$. Hence, using (11), a discrete trace inequality for $\|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2}\nabla v_T\|_F$, the first bound in (10), $\rho_T \ge 1$, and Young's inequality yields

$$\|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2}\nabla v_T\|_T^2 \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{G}_T^k \underline{v}_T\|_T^2 + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} \frac{\kappa_F}{h_F} \|v_F - v_T\|_F^2 \lesssim \rho_T \|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{G}_T^k \underline{v}_T\|_T^2 + s_T(\underline{v}_T, \underline{v}_T).$$

Since $\|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{G}_T^k \underline{v}_T\|_T = \sup_{w \in \mathbb{P}_d^{k+1}(T)} \frac{(\boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{G}_T^k \underline{v}_T, \nabla w)_T}{\|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2}\nabla w\|_T}$ and proceeding similarly leads to $\|\boldsymbol{\kappa}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{G}_T^k \underline{v}_T\|_T \lesssim \|\underline{v}_T\|_{\boldsymbol{\kappa},T}$. Combining the above bounds yields (9), and the rest of the proof is straightforward. □

4. Error analysis

Theorem 4.1 *(Energy-error estimate). Let $u \in U_0$ solve (1) and let $\underline{u}_h \in \underline{U}_{h,0}^k$ solve (7). Assume that $u_{|T} \in H^{k+2}(T)$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Then, letting $\widehat{\underline{u}}_h := ((\pi_T^k u)_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}, (\pi_F^k u)_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h}) \in \underline{U}_{h,0}^k$ and, recalling the definition of α from Lemma 2.1, the following holds with consistency error $\mathcal{E}_h(\underline{v}_h) := a_h(\widehat{\underline{u}}_h, \underline{v}_h) - l_h(\underline{v}_h)$:*

$$\|\widehat{\underline{u}}_h - \underline{u}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{\kappa},h} \lesssim \sup_{\underline{v}_h\in\underline{U}_{h,0}^k,\ \|\underline{v}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{\kappa},h}=1} \mathcal{E}_h(\underline{v}_h) \lesssim \left\{\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \kappa_T^\sharp \rho_T^{1+2\alpha} h_T^{2(k+1)} \|u\|_{H^{k+2}(T)}^2\right\}^{1/2}. \tag{12}$$

Proof. We adapt the proof of [7, Theorem 8]. The first inequality in (12) is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.1. Proceeding as in [7] with $\check{u}_T := p_T^k \widehat{\underline{u}}_T = p_T^k \underline{I}_T^k(u_{|T})$ and $\underline{v}_h \in \underline{U}_{h,0}^k$ with $\|\underline{v}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{\kappa},h} = 1$ leads to

$$\mathcal{E}_h(\underline{v}_h) = \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\boldsymbol{\kappa}\nabla(\check{u}_T - u), \nabla v_T\right)_T + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} \left(v_F - v_T, (\nabla\check{u}_T - \nabla u)\cdot\boldsymbol{\kappa}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}_{TF}\right)_F + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} s_T(\widehat{\underline{u}}_T, \underline{v}_T).$$

Denote by $\mathfrak{T}_1, \mathfrak{T}_2, \mathfrak{T}_3$ the three terms on the right-hand side. Combining the results of Lemmas 2.1 and 3.1, we infer that $|\mathfrak{T}_1 + \mathfrak{T}_2|^2 \lesssim \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \kappa_T^\sharp \rho_T^{1+2\alpha} h_T^{2(k+1)} \|u\|_{H^{k+2}(T)}^2$. Moreover, since $s_T(\widehat{\underline{u}}_T, \underline{v}_T) \le s_T(\widehat{\underline{u}}_T, \widehat{\underline{u}}_T)^{1/2} s_T(\underline{v}_T, \underline{v}_T)^{1/2}$, proceeding as in [7] for the first factor, and using the second bound in (10) for the second factor yields $|\mathfrak{T}_3|^2 \lesssim \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \kappa_T^\sharp \rho_T^{1+2\alpha} h_T^{2(k+1)} \|u\|_{H^{k+2}(T)}^2$. $\square$

Finally, adapting the proof of [7, Theorem 10] and [5, Corollary 12] leads to the following L^2-norm error estimate.

Theorem 4.2 *(L^2-error estimate). Assume elliptic regularity for problem (1) in the form $\|z\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|g\|_\Omega$ for all $g \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $z \in U_0$ solving (1) with data g. Assume $f \in H^{k+\delta}(\Omega)$ with $\delta = 0$ for $k \ge 1$ and $\delta = 1$ for $k = 0$. Then, using the same notation as in Theorem 4.1, the following holds:*

$$\|u - p_h^k \underline{u}_h\|_\Omega \lesssim \left|(\kappa^\sharp)^{1/2} \rho^{1/2+\alpha} h\right|_{\ell^\infty} \left\{\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \kappa_T^\sharp \rho_T^{1+2\alpha} h_T^{2(k+1)} \|u\|_{H^{k+2}(T)}^2\right\}^{1/2} + h^{k+2}\|f\|_{H^{k+\delta}(\Omega)},$$

where $|(\kappa^\sharp)^{1/2}\rho^{1/2+\alpha}h|_{\ell^\infty} := \max_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} (\kappa_T^\sharp)^{1/2} \rho_T^{1/2+\alpha} h_T$ and $p_h^k \underline{u}_{h|T} := p_T^k \underline{u}_T$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$.

References

[1] L. Beirão da Veiga, K. Lipnikov, G. Manzini, Arbitrary-order nodal mimetic discretizations of elliptic problems on polygonal meshes, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 49 (5) (2011) 1737–1760.
[2] L. Beirão da Veiga, F. Brezzi, A. Cangiani, G. Manzini, L.D. Marini, A. Russo, Basic principles of virtual element methods, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. 23 (1) (2013) 199–214.
[3] J. Bonelle, A. Ern, Analysis of compatible discrete operator schemes for elliptic problems on polyhedral meshes, Math. Model. Numer. Anal. 48 (2) (2014) 553–581.
[4] D.A. Di Pietro, A. Ern, Mathematical Aspects of Discontinuous Galerkin Methods, Mathématiques & Applications, vol. 69, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2012.
[5] D.A. Di Pietro, A. Ern, A hybrid high-order locking-free method for linear elasticity on general meshes, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng. 283 (2015) 1–21.
[6] D.A. Di Pietro, A. Ern, A family of arbitrary-order mixed methods for heterogeneous anisotropic diffusion on general meshes, submitted for publication, preprint hal-00918482, https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00918482, 2014.
[7] D.A. Di Pietro, A. Ern, S. Lemaire, An arbitrary-order and compact-stencil discretization of diffusion on general meshes based on local reconstruction operators, Comput. Methods Appl. Math. 14 (4) (2014) 461–472, http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/cmam-2014-0018.
[8] J. Droniou, R. Eymard, T. Gallouët, R. Herbin, A unified approach to mimetic finite difference, hybrid finite volume and mixed finite volume methods, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. 20 (2) (2010) 265–295.
[9] G. Manzini, K. Lipnikov, A high-order mimetic method on unstructured polyhedral meshes for the diffusion equation, J. Comput. Phys. 272 (2014) 360–385.