SUPERCONVERGENCE BY $M$-DECOMPOSITIONS. PART II: CONSTRUCTION OF TWO-DIMENSIONAL FINITE ELEMENTS
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Abstract. We apply the concept of an $M$-decomposition introduced in Part I to systematically construct local spaces defining superconvergent hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin methods, and their companion sandwiching mixed methods. This is done in the framework of steady-state diffusion problems for the $h$- and $p$-versions of the methods for general polygonal meshes in two-space dimensions.
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1. Introduction

This is the second of a series of papers in which we develop the concept of an $M$-decomposition as an effective tool for devising hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin (HDG) methods, and their companion sandwiching mixed methods, which superconverge on unstructured meshes of shape-regular polyhedral elements. In the first part of this series, [20], the general theory of $M$-decompositions was developed in the frame of steady-state diffusion problems:

\[ c q + \nabla u = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \]
\[ \nabla \cdot q = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \]
\[ u = g \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega, \]

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a bounded polygonal domain, $c$ is a uniformly bounded, uniformly positive definite symmetric matrix-valued function, $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $g \in H^{1/2}(\partial \Omega)$. Here we apply it systematically to explicitly construct ready-for-implementation local spaces admitting $M$-decompositions for a variety of finite elements defined on general polygonal elements in two-space dimensions. The corresponding construction in three-space dimensions, which is fundamentally different than the two-dimensional case due to the difference in the characterization of divergence-free polynomials in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and $\mathbb{R}^3$, is carried out in Part III, [14], of this series.

To better describe our results, let us recall the definition of the HDG (and mixed) methods under consideration; we use the notation used in Part I, [20]. The HDG methods seek an approximation to $(u, q, u|_{E_h})$.
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(\(u_h, q_h, \hat{u}_h\)), in the finite element space \(W_h \times V_h \times M_h\), of the form

\[
V_h := \{v \in L^2(\mathcal{T}_h) : v|_K \in V(K), \ K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}, \\
W_h := \{w \in L^2(\mathcal{T}_h) : w|_K \in W(K), \ K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}, \\
M_h := \{\mu \in L^2(\mathcal{E}_h) : \mu|_F \in M(F), \ F \in \mathcal{E}_h\},
\]

which is determined as the only solution of the following weak formulation:

\[
(c q_h, v)_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (u_h, \nabla \cdot v)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\hat{u}_h, v \cdot n)_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = 0, \tag{1.1a}
\]

\[
-(q_h, \nabla w)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\hat{q}_h \cdot n, w)_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h} = (f, w)_{\mathcal{T}_h}, \tag{1.1b}
\]

\[
(\hat{q}_h \cdot n, \mu)_{\partial \mathcal{T}_h \setminus \partial \Omega} = 0, \tag{1.1c}
\]

\[
(\hat{u}_h, \mu)_{\partial \Omega} = (g, \mu)_{\partial \Omega}, \tag{1.1d}
\]

for all \((w, v, \mu) \in W_h \times V_h \times M_h\), where

\[
\hat{q}_h \cdot n = q_h \cdot n + \alpha(u_h - \hat{u}_h) \quad \text{on} \quad \partial \mathcal{T}_h.
\]

In Part I, \cite{20}, it was shown that these methods are superconvergent on unstructured meshes if, for all elements \(K \in \mathcal{T}_h\), the local space \(V(K) \times W(K)\) admits an \(M(\partial K)\)-decomposition, where

\[
M(\partial K) := \{\mu \in L^2(\partial K) : \mu|_e \in M(e) \text{ for all edges } e \text{ of } K\}.
\]

Moreover, it was also shown how to construct \(M\)-decompositions for any given space \(M(\partial K)\).

We can summarize the construction as follows. (From now on, if there is no confusion, we drop the dependence of the local spaces on the element \(K\).) Given the trace space \(M\) that contains constants on \(\partial K\), we pick any \textit{given} space \(V_g \times W_g\) satisfying the inclusion properties:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1.1) & \quad \gamma V_g + \gamma W_g \subset M, \\
(1.2) & \quad \nabla W_g \times \nabla \cdot V_g \subset V_g \times W_g,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\gamma V_g := \{v \cdot n|_{\partial K} : v \in V_g\}\) and \(\gamma W_g := \{w|_{\partial K} : w \in W_g\}\). We then construct the three spaces \(V \times W\) described in Tables 1 and 2; each of them admits an \(M\)-decomposition. In Table 1, the space \(V^\text{hdg} \times W^\text{hdg}\) is associated to an HDG method (note that we have \(\nabla \cdot V^\text{hdg} \subseteq W^\text{hdg}\)), while the \textit{upper} sandwiching space \(V^\text{mix} \times W^\text{mix}\) and the \textit{lower} space \(V \times W\) are associated to mixed methods (note that we have \(\nabla \cdot V^\text{mix} = W^\text{mix}\) and \(\nabla \cdot V^\text{mix} = W^\text{mix}\)). In Table 2, the space \(V_g := \{v \in V_g : \nabla \cdot v = 0\}\) (\(s\) stands for solenoidal) is the divergence-free subspace of \(V_g\).

Let us recall that the two integers in the last column of Table 2 are the \(M\)- and the \(S\)-indexes. They are defined as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
I_M(V_g \times W_g) & := \dim M - \dim \{v \cdot n|_{\partial K} : v \in V_g, \nabla \cdot v = 0\} - \dim \{w|_{\partial K} : w \in W_g, \nabla w = 0\}, \\
I_S(V_g \times W_g) & := \dim W_g - \dim \nabla \cdot V_g.
\end{align*}
\]
Table 2. The properties of the spaces $\delta V$. Here $V_{\delta} := \{v \in V_{g} : \nabla \cdot v = 0\}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\delta V$</th>
<th>$\nabla \cdot \delta V$</th>
<th>$\gamma \delta V$</th>
<th>$\dim \delta V$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\delta V_{RIIM}$</td>
<td>${0}$</td>
<td>$\subset M, \cap \gamma V_{\delta} = {0}$</td>
<td>$I_M(V_{g} \times W_{g})$ ($= \dim \gamma \delta V$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta V_{RIW}$</td>
<td>$\subset W_{g}, \cap \nabla \cdot V_{\delta} = {0}$</td>
<td>$\subset M$</td>
<td>$I_S(V_{g} \times W_{g})$ ($= \dim \nabla \cdot \delta V$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The indexes for $M := \mathcal{P}_k(\partial K)$ for different elements $K$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>$I_M(V_{g} \times W_{g})$</th>
<th>$I_S(V_{g} \times W_{g})$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rectangle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{g} \times W_{g} := \mathcal{P}_k \times \mathcal{Q}_k$ ($k \geq 0$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle</td>
<td>$\begin{array}{c} 1 \ (k=0) \ 2 \ (k=1) \end{array}$</td>
<td>$k+1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrilateral</td>
<td>$\begin{array}{c} 2 \ (k=0) \ 4 \ (k=1) \ 5 \ (k=2) \end{array}$</td>
<td>$k+1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentagon</td>
<td>$\begin{array}{c} 3 \ (k=0) \ 6 \ (k=1) \ 8 \ (k=2) \ 9 \ (k=3) \end{array}$</td>
<td>$k+1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygon</td>
<td>$(ne - 3)(\theta + 1) - \frac{1}{2}\theta(\theta - 1)$</td>
<td>$k+1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of $ne$ edges</td>
<td>$\theta := \min{k, ne - 3}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once we find spaces $V \times W$ admitting $M$-decompositions, we need to check the conditions

(J.1) $\mathcal{P}_0(K) \subset \nabla \cdot V$,
(J.2) $\mathcal{P}_1(K) \subset W$,

to guarantee that the spaces actually define a superconvergent method. Here by superconvergence, we mean that there exists a projection of the scalar function $u$ onto the finite element space $W_h$, denoted as $\Pi u$, such that the projection error $\Pi u - u_h$ converges to zero faster than the error $u - u_h$. It is then possible to define a scalar postprocessing $u^*_h$ converging to $u$ as fast as $\Pi u - u_h$.

Although the construction just sketched is independent of the space dimension, in this paper, we restrict ourselves to the two-dimensional case. We mainly focus on the construction of the spaces $\delta V_{RIIM}$ and $\delta V_{RIW}$ on a general polygonal element $K$ in two dimensions, which are ready for implementation, for the trace space $M := \mathcal{P}_k(\partial K) = \{\mu \in L^2(\partial K) : \mu|_e \in \mathcal{P}_k(e) \text{ for all edges } e \text{ of } K\}$,

and the given space $V_{g} \times W_{g} := \mathcal{P}_k(K) \times \mathcal{P}_k(K)$. Here $\mathcal{P}_k(D)$ denotes the space of polynomials of degree at most $k$ defined on a domain $D$. When the element $K$ is a unit square, we also consider the tensor-product given space $V_{g} \times W_{g} := \mathcal{Q}_k(K) \times \mathcal{Q}_k(K)$. As mentioned above, the construction of the corresponding spaces on polyhedral elements is carried out in Part III, [14]. The reason we need to do this elsewhere is that the construction of the space $\delta V_{RIIM}$, which is the most difficult part of the construction, relies on a characterization of the divergence-free space $\{v \in V_{g} : \nabla \cdot v = 0\}$ and that of the space of its normal traces. Such characterizations are significantly more involved in the three-dimensional case.

A glance at Table 2 is enough to make us realize that the spaces $\delta V_{RIIM}$ and $\delta V_{RIW}$ are not unique on a given polygonal element $K$ for given spaces $V_{g} \times W_{g}$ and $M$; see also ([20], Props. 5.1 and 5.3). On the other hand, the dimensions of the spaces $\delta V_{RIIM}$ and $\delta V_{RIW}$, that is, $I_M(V_{g} \times W_{g})$ and $I_S(V_{g} \times W_{g})$, respectively, are actually unique, as we see in Table 3. Indeed, recall that $I_M(V_{g} \times W_{g})$ is the smallest dimension of a space $\delta V_{RIIM}$ such
that \( \mathbf{V} \times W := V_g \oplus \delta V_{\text{fillM}} \times W_g \) admits an \( M \)-decomposition, see remark after ([20], Prop. 5.1), and that
\( I_S(V_g \times W_g) \) is the smallest dimension of a space \( \delta V_{\text{fillW}} \) such that \( \mathbf{V} \times W := V_g \oplus \delta V_{\text{fillM}} \oplus \delta V_{\text{fillW}} \times W_g \) admits an \( M \)-decomposition with \( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{V} = W \), see remark after ([20], Prop. 5.3). Moreover, from Table 3 for the case \( V_g \times W_g := \mathcal{P}_k \times \mathcal{P}_k \), we notice that the \( S \)-index, \( I_S(V_g \times W_g) \), only depends on the polynomial degree \( k \), not on the geometry of the element. In contrast, the \( M \)-index, \( I_M(V_g \times W_g) \), does depend on both the polynomial degree \( k \) and on the number of edges, \( ne \), of the polygonal element. In particular, \( k \mapsto I_M(V_g \times W_g) \) is an increasing function on \( k \) for \( k \leq ne - 3 \), and is equal to \( \frac{1}{2} ne (ne - 3) \) for any \( k \geq ne - 3 \).

Let us briefly discuss how do we actually carry out the construction of the spaces \( \mathbf{V} \times W \) admitting \( M \)-decompositions. The main idea is to find a basis for a complement in the space of (non-constant) traces in \( M(\partial K) \) of the normal traces of \( V_g \). Once this basis is found, the space \( \delta V_{\text{fillM}} \) is obtained as the span of a lifting of each of the traces into the element \( K \). To find a basis of the above-mentioned complement, we proceed by induction on the edges of the polygonal element \( K \). This allows us to consider spaces of traces defined on a single edge at a time and results in a systematic way to dealing with any polygonal element. The price we must pay is that the resulting space \( \delta V_{\text{fillM}} \) will depend on the numbering of the edges of the elements. However, as shown in [20], this does not affect the superconvergence properties of the associated method. Moreover, when symmetries are needed, it is not difficult to modify our results to get the symmetry-satisfying spaces.

Note that the HDG methods we obtain by our construction are strongly related to mixed methods, as the sandwiching methods displayed the first and last rows of Table 1 are associated to (hybridized versions of) mixed methods. Because of this, we can consider that our approach is the first systematic, constructive way of obtaining mixed methods for polynomial elements of arbitrary shape. Indeed, although the theory of mixed methods has been well-explored since the seminal paper of Raviart and Thomas back in 1977 [31], most mixed methods for diffusion problems in two dimensions are available for meshes made of triangular or square elements only, see [6]. In fact, to the knowledge of the authors, the only element for which high-order mixed elements were defined is a convex quadrilateral, see [2]; the spaces provided by our construction are smaller and provide similar convergence properties. Mixed methods of lowest order (\( k = 0 \)) on polygonal/polyhedral meshes have been proposed in [26, 27], where the authors use composite piecewise linear functions to define the \( H(\text{div}) \)-conforming space; see also in [32] where a different lowest order composite mixed method on general hexahedral meshes was introduced. High-order mixed methods on polygonal meshes has been considered in ([33], Sect. 7). However, this method is actually a reformulation of a standard mixed method on a matching simplicial submesh of the original polygonal mesh, see ([33], Thm. 7.2). It is unclear whether this kind of reformulation would be more efficient to implement than the original mixed method on the matching simplicial submesh.

Let us now briefly contrast our mixed methods with the mixed virtual element methods on two-dimensional polygonal meshes in [9]; for the three-dimensional case, see [5]. The spaces used by these methods, on each element, use solutions to certain PDEs as basis functions. As for the original conforming virtual element methods, [4], since the basis functions themselves are not computable, a set of degrees of freedom that can be used to exactly compute volume integrals related to the polynomial parts of the basis functions has to be identified. Then some integrals must be replaced by a suitably chosen “stabilization” term so that the method keeps its original high-order accuracy. In contrast, our high-order \( H(\text{div}) \)-conforming spaces are obtained by adding to \( V_g \) a small number of explicitly computable basis functions. Indeed, as pointed out above, for \( V_g \times W_g := \mathcal{P}_k \times \mathcal{P}_k \), the dimension of \( \delta V_{\text{fillM}} \) is at most \( \frac{1}{2} ne (ne - 3) \) and that of \( \delta V_{\text{fillW}} \) is \( k + 1 \).

Let us now compare of our methods against other HDG methods that achieve superconvergence without using \( M \)-decompositions. Currently, there are two ways of devising superconvergent HDG methods without relying on \( M \)-decompositions. One uses a new stabilization operator suggested back in 2010 in ([28], Rem. 1.2.4) by Lehrenfeld–Schöberl projection. A complete error analysis of these superconvergent HDG methods (defined on general polygonal of polyhedral elements) was performed by Oikawa recently in [30]. Another way consists in defining a sophisticated numerical trace for the approximate flux. This definition is the distinctive feature of the so-called hybrid high-order (HHO) methods introduced in [22, 23] which superconverge also for polygonal or polyhedral elements of arbitrary shape. It can be easily incorporated into the family of HDG methods since HHO methods can be rewritten as HDG methods, as shown in [21]; see [13] for the different ways of rewriting.
HDG methods. One advantage of these methods over the spaces we provide is that they display smaller local spaces. On the other hand, for the same space $M(\partial K)$, both these methods and ours have a global matrix equation of identical size and sparsity structure. Thus, it is reasonable to expect that, if the computation of the local problems is done in parallel, the main computational effort of all of these methods should be essentially the same. Our numerical results in Section 5 shows that, on a polygonal mesh, all these methods produce similar results in terms of numerical error and computational cost.

Let us end by pointing out that, by using our results for the sandwiching mixed methods, we can locally compute an $H(\text{div})$-conforming flux postprocessing, see (20), Sect. 6.3, for the HDG approximation. This also applies to the other methods like the HDG with the LS stabilization function or the HHO methods. This postprocessing can be thought of as a generalization of the postprocessing obtained back in 2003 by Bastian and Rivièrè [3] (see the variations proposed, for simplicial meshes, in 2005 [16], in 2007 [24] and in 2010 in [18]). As was argued therein, see also (1, Sect. 2.2), $H(\text{div})$-conforming fluxes obtained by postprocessing an DG-like approximate flux are preferable to the original DG-like approximation, even if both approximations are of the same accuracy, when used on other convection-diffusion problems in which these fluxes drive the convection.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe and discuss our constructions of $M$-decompositions. In Section 3, we provide the proofs of all the results of Section 2. In Section 4, we extend our results to elements with hanging nodes (which may be useful in $h$-adaptivity), and to the variable-degree case in which $M(\partial K) := \{ \mu \in L^2(\partial K) : \mu|_e \in \mathcal{P}_{k_e}(e) \text{ for all edges } e \text{ of } K \}$, and $k_e \geq 0$ can vary from edge to edge (which may be useful in $p$-adaptivity). Then, in Section 5, we provide numerical results to compare with some other HDG methods, and illustrate the superconvergence properties of the new (uniform-degree) HDG methods and their sandwiching mixed methods on polygonal meshes. We end in Section 6 with some concluding remarks.

2. THE MAIN RESULTS

This section contains our main results, that is, the spaces $\delta V_{\text{fill}}^M$ and $\delta V_{\text{fill}}^W$ satisfying the properties in Table 2. We consider the two above-mentioned choices of the initial guess spaces $V_g \times W_g$ and general polygonal elements. Here, we use the following notation:

$$\text{curl}p := (-p_y, p_x).$$

2.1. The case $V_g \times W_g := \Omega_k \times \Omega_k, k \geq 1$

In this case, we obtain mostly already known methods which we can see under a different light.

Theorem 2.1. Let $K$ be the unit square with edges parallel to the axes. Then, for $M = \mathcal{P}_k(\partial K)$ and $V_g \times W_g = \Omega_k(K) \times \Omega_k(K)$, where $k \geq 1$, we have that

$$I_M(V_g \times W_g) = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad I_S(V_g \times W_g) = 1.$$ 

Moreover, the space

$$\delta V_{\text{fill}}^M := \text{curl} \text{span}\{x^{k+1}y, y^{k+1}\},$$

$$\delta V_{\text{fill}}^W := \text{span}\{(x^{k+1}y^{k}, x^{k}y^{k+1})\},$$

satisfy the properties in Table 2.

The proof of this result is quite simple, hence omitted.

In addition to properties in Table 2, the spaces in Theorem 2.1 consists of polynomials that are invariant under the coordinate permutation $(x, y) \rightarrow (y, x)$, hence they are easy to implement and preserve the symmetry
of the square element $K$. The local spaces $V \times W$ resulting from this result (see Tab. 1) are displayed in Table 4, where we abuse the notation and write $Q_k \{ x^k y^k \}$ instead of $\nabla \cdot Q_k = P_{k-1} + P_{k,k-1}$. These three spaces satisfy the conditions (J) in the introduction for superconvergence. As a consequence, the approximations $q_h, u_h$ converge with the optimal order of $k + 1$ and the postprocessing $u_h^*$ with order $k + 2$. This is also the case for the well-known Raviart–Thomas space $V := P_{k+1} \times P_{k,k+1}$ and $W := Q_k$, even though its approximate flux space strictly contains the corresponding space of $\text{TNT}_{[k]}$, whose dimension is bigger by $2k + 1$. Here $P_{m,n} := P_m(x) \otimes P_n(y)$ is the tensor product space of variable degree.

2.2. The case $V_g \times W_g := P_k \times P_k, k \geq 0$

For this case, we present two different approaches depending on what type of function is used to construct the spaces we seek. In the first approach, we use polynomials. Unfortunately, this approach only works for triangles and parallelograms. This prompts the second approach, which is based on special lifting functions from the boundary of the element into its interior.

a. First approach: Polynomial functions

Triangles

Let us begin by considering triangular elements. We recover a very well-known result.

Theorem 2.2. Let $K$ be a triangle. Then, for $M := P_k(\partial K)$ and $V_g \times W_g = P_k(K) \times P_k(K)$, we have that

$$I_M(V_g \times W_g) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad I_S(V_g \times W_g) = k + 1.$$ 

Moreover, the spaces

$$\delta V_{\text{fill}} := \{0\},$$

$$\delta V_{\text{fill}} := x \tilde{P}_k,$$

satisfy the properties in Table 2.

The proof of this result is very simple, hence omitted.

The local spaces $V \times W$ resulting from this result are displayed in Table 5. The first two spaces are well-defined for $k \geq 0$ while the last for $k \geq 1$. The first two spaces satisfy the conditions (J) for superconvergence when $k \geq 1$, and the last when $k \geq 2$. For these cases, the postprocessing $u_h^*$ converges with order $k + 2$ for these three choices of local spaces.
Table 5. A construction for $K$ a triangle, $M = \mathcal{P}_k(\partial K)$ and $V_g \times W_g = \mathcal{P}_k \times \mathcal{P}_k$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$V(K)$</th>
<th>$W(K)$</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$k \geq 0$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_k \oplus x \mathcal{P}_k$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_k$ RT$_k$ [31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k \geq 0$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_k$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_k$ HDG$_k$ [19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k \geq 1$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_k$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_{k-1}$ BDM$_k$ [7]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. The case $M = \mathcal{P}_k(\partial K)$, $V_g \times W_g = \mathcal{P}_k \times \mathcal{P}_k$, and $K$ is the unit square.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$V(K)$</th>
<th>$W(K)$</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$k \geq 0$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_k \oplus \text{curl span}{x^{k+1}y, xy^{k+1}} \oplus x \mathcal{P}_k(K)$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_k$ (new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k \geq 0$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_k \oplus \text{curl span}{x^{k+1}y, xy^{k+1}}$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_k$ (new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k \geq 1$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_k \oplus \text{curl span}{x^{k+1}y, xy^{k+1}}$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_{k-1}$ BDM$_k$ [7]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parallelograms**

Here we consider the case in which the element is a parallelogram. We only need to take the element $K$ to be the unit square as the general case is readily obtained by a linear transformation.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let $K$ be the unit square. Then, for $M := \mathcal{P}_k(\partial K)$ and $V_g \times W_g = \mathcal{P}_k(K) \times \mathcal{P}_k(K)$, we have

$$I_M(V_g \times W_g) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0, \\ 2 & \text{if } k \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad I_S(V_g \times W_g) = k + 1.$$

Moreover, the space

$$\delta V_{fill} := \text{curl span}\{x^{k+1}y, xy^{k+1}\},$$

satisfy the properties in Table 2.

Again, the proof of this result is very simple, hence omitted. Note that for $k = 0$, $\delta V_{fill} = \text{span}\{(-y, x)\}$ has dimension 1.

The local spaces $V \times W$ resulting from this result are displayed in Table 6. Note that the local space $V_{\text{hdg}} \times W_{\text{hdg}}$ is strictly included in the space called $\text{HDG}^P_{\kappa}[k]$ in [19], namely,

$$\mathcal{P}_k \oplus \text{curl } (xy \mathcal{P}_k(K)) \times \mathcal{P}_k.$$

This space admits an $M$-decomposition and its dimension is bigger than that of the space $V_{\text{hdg}} \times W_{\text{hdg}}$ by $k - 1$. Also, note that the space $\text{BDFM}_{[k]}$ [8], namely,

$$V \times W := (\mathcal{P}_{k+1} \setminus \{y^{k+1}\}) \times \mathcal{P}_{k+1} \setminus \{x^{k+1}\} \times \mathcal{P}_k,$$

admits an $M$-decomposition and that its dimension is bigger than that of the corresponding space in the first row of Table 6 by $k - 1$. These five spaces satisfy the conditions (J) for superconvergence when $k \geq 1$, except for the space $\text{BDM}_{[k]}$ which satisfies them when $k \geq 2$. In these circumstances, the approximations $q_h, u_h$ converge with the optimal order of $k + 1$ and the postprocessing $u_h^*$ with order $k + 2$. 
Polygonal elements

Unfortunately, it turns out that it is not possible to carry out the construction of the spaces under consideration by using only polynomials for more general elements $K$, as we see in the next result, whose proof will be given in Section 3.

**Theorem 2.4.** Let $K$ be a polygon which is not a triangle or parallelogram. If $V \times W$ admits an $M$-decomposition with $M := \mathcal{P}_k(\partial K)$ for some $k \geq 0$, and $\mathcal{P}_0 \subset W$, then $V$ can not be solely polynomials.

This result immediately shows that it is not possible to construct $\delta V_{fill}$ satisfying the properties in Table 2 by solely using polynomials for a polygon that is not a triangle or a parallelogram. This impossibility prompts the need to take a different approach.

b. Second approach: Non-polynomial liftings

To state our result, we need to introduce some notation. Let $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^{ne}$ be the set of vertices of the polygonal element $K$ which we take to be counter-clockwise ordered. Let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^{ne}$ be the set of edges of $K$ where the edge $e_i$ connects the vertices $v_i$ and $v_{i+1}$. Here the subindexes are integers module $ne$, for example, $v_{ne+1} = v_1$. An illustration for a quadrilateral element $K$ is presented in Figure 1. We also define, for $1 \leq i \leq ne$, $\lambda_i$ to be the linear function that vanishes on edge $e_i$ and equals to 1 at the node $v_{i+1}$.

Now, we introduce functions which we are going to use as tools for lifting traces on $\partial K$ inside the element $K$. To each vertex $v_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, ne$, we associate a function $\xi_i \in H^1(K)$ satisfying the following conditions:

(L.1) $\xi_i|_{e_i} \in P_1(\mathcal{E}_j)$, $j = 1, \ldots, ne$,
(L.2) $\xi_i(v_j) = \delta_{i,j}$, $j = 1, \ldots, ne$,

where $\delta_{i,j}$ is the Kronecker delta. Note that conditions (L.2) and (L.3) together ensure that the trace of $\xi_i$ on the edges is only non-zero at $e_{i-1}$ and $e_i$, where they are linear. Next, we give examples of these functions.

1. **Polynomial liftings.** For a triangle, the polynomial lifting $\xi_i^p := \lambda_{i+1}$ satisfies the conditions (L). For a parallelogram, the polynomials $\xi_i^p := \lambda_{i+1} \lambda_{i+2}$ satisfy the conditions (L). However, for general quadrilaterals, and for arbitrary polygons, there are no such polynomial liftings.

2. **Composite liftings.** Here, we present the first non-polynomial lifting with a composite function. Given a polygonal element $K$, we subdivide it into a set of triangles $K = \bigcup_{i=1}^{nt} T_i$ with $nt$ being the total number of triangles. We denote the collection of vertices of these triangles by $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^{nv}$, where $nv$ is the number of total vertices of the subdivision $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^{nt}$ and $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^{ne}$ is the collection of vertices of the polygon $K$. Then, we take $\xi_i^c$ to be the piecewise linear function such that $\xi_i^c|_{T_i} \in P_1(T_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, nt$, and $\xi_i^c(v_j) = \delta_{i,j}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, nv$. It is trivial to verify that $\xi_i^c$ satisfy the conditions (L).

If the element $K$ is a convex polygon with $ne$ edges, we can subdivide it into $ne - 2$ triangles with $T_i$ having vertices $v_1, v_i$, and $v_{i+1}$ for $2 \leq i \leq ne - 1$. Then, the number of vertices of the subdivision $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^{nt}$ is $ne$.  

![Figure 1. A quadrilateral element $K$.](image-url)
If the element \( K \) is a start-shaped (not necessarily convex) polygon with respect to an interior node denoted as \( v_{ne+1} \), we can subdivide it into \( ne \) triangles with \( \mathcal{T}_i \) having vertices \( v_i, v_{i+1} \), and \( v_{ne+1} \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq ne - 1 \), and \( \mathcal{T}_{ne} \) having vertices \( v_{ne}, v_1, v_{ne+1} \). Then, the number of vertices of the subdivision \( \{\mathcal{T}_i\}_{i=1}^{ne} \) is \( ne + 1 \). In our numerical examples in Section 5, we use the second choice of the subdivision with the node \( v_{ne+1} \) being the center of the polygon \( K \). Numerical integration on \( K \) of these lifting functions can be easily performed by using standard quadrature rules for polynomials on each of the triangles \( \mathcal{T}_i \).

(3) **Generalized barycentric coordinates liftings.** A set of generalized barycentric coordinates (GBC) see \([25,29,34]\) for the element \( K \) also satisfy conditions (L). In addition, they need to satisfy the partition of unity property \( \sum_{i=1}^{ne} \xi_i = 1 \), and the linear precision property \( \sum_{i=1}^{ne} v_i \xi_i(x) = x \). Although we do not require these two additional constrains, we can use any set of GBC to define our liftings.

We are now ready to state our construction. The proof of this result is quite complicated, and is postponed to Section 3.

**Theorem 2.5.** Let \( K \) be a polygonal of \( ne \) edges such that no edges lie on the same line. Then, for \( M := \mathcal{P}_k(\partial K) \) and \( V_g \times W_g = \mathcal{P}_k(K) \times \mathcal{P}_k(\bar{K}) \), we have that

\[
I_M(V_g \times W_g) = (ne - 3)(\theta + 1) - \frac{1}{2} \theta(\theta - 1), \quad \text{and} \quad I_S(V_g \times W_g) = k + 1,
\]

here \( \theta := \min\{k, ne - 3\} \). Moreover, the spaces

\[
\delta V_{\text{fill}} := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{ne} \text{curl} \psi_i,
\]

\[
\delta V_{\text{fill1}} := \{ x \bar{\mathcal{P}}_k \}
\]

satisfy the properties in Table 2. Here

\[
\psi_i = \begin{cases} 
\{0\} & \text{if } i = 1, 2, \\
\text{span}\{\xi_{i+1}\lambda_{i+1}^b; \max\{k + 3 - i, 0\} \leq b \leq k\} & \text{if } 3 \leq i \leq ne - 1, \\
\text{span}\{\xi_{i+1}\lambda_{i+1}^b; \max\{k + 4 - i, 1\} \leq b \leq k\} & \text{if } i = ne.
\end{cases}
\]

Here, the functions \( \{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^{ne} \) are liftings functions that satisfy conditions (L).

The local spaces \( V \times W \) resulting from this result are displayed in Table 7. The first two spaces are well-defined for \( k \geq 0 \), while the last for \( k \geq 1 \). The first two spaces satisfy the conditions (J) for superconvergence when \( k \geq 1 \), and the last when \( k \geq 2 \). For these cases, the postprocessing \( u_h \) converges with order \( k + 2 \) for these three choices of local spaces.

**Table 7.** A construction for \( K \) a polygon without hanging nodes, \( M = \mathcal{P}_k(\partial K) \) and \( V_g \times W_g = \mathcal{P}_k \times \mathcal{P}_k \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( V(K) )</th>
<th>( W(K) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( (k \geq 0) )</td>
<td>( \mathcal{P}_k )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (k \geq 0) )</td>
<td>( \mathcal{P}_k )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (k \geq 1) )</td>
<td>( \mathcal{P}_k )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we pointed out in the Introduction, the space \( \delta V_{\text{fill}} \) in Theorem 2.5, defined on a general polygonal element \( K \), depends on a particular edge numbering (and the choice of lifting functions). So, we do get a different space with a different edge numbering and/or a different choice of lifting functions. The dependence
on edge numbering is a direct consequence of our edge-by-edge construction of $\delta V_{hIM}$ as shown in Section 3 which is the only one applicable to an arbitrary polygonal element. Moreover, the superconvergence properties of the associated methods are not compromised at all. However, if the polygon $K$ is a regular convex polygon (isogonal and isotoxal), we might be more interested in finding a space $\delta V_{hIM}$ which does not depend on the edge numbering. We do not concern ourselves with this problem open since it requires case-by-case study of the regular polygon $K$. However, we our edge-by-edge construction in Section 3 can be used as a starting point to achieve this goal.

Note that even for an element $K$ with hanging nodes, or more generally, when its two edges lie the same line, we can still use the space provided in Theorem 2.5 to define HDG methods even though the spaces do not admit $M$-decompositions. We expect the superconvergence properties of the resulting method not to be affected for the same reasons that a similar result holds for superconvergent HDG methods on triangular mesh with hanging nodes [11, 12].

When $K$ is a triangle, this construction provides the same spaces than that obtained in Theorem 2.2; when $K$ is a square, it provide the same spaces (with a polynomial lifting function) than those obtained in Theorem 2.3.

Before ending this section, let us compare our space $V^{\text{mix}}$ with the space proposed in [2], which defines the first (rigorously proven) high-order mixed methods on a convex quadrilateral mesh. Such a space is first defined on a unit square $\hat{K}$ with

$$V(\hat{K}) := \mathcal{P}_{k+2,2}(\hat{K}) \times \mathcal{P}_{k,k+2}(\hat{K}), \quad W(\hat{K}) := \nabla \cdot \mathcal{V}(\hat{K}),$$

and then constructed on a general convex quadrilateral $K$ using pullback of the bilinear mapping from the reference element $\hat{K}$ to the physical element $K$. The resulting space has the property that it contains $\mathcal{P}_k(K) \times \mathcal{P}_k(K)$. Our space does have this property without the need of the pullback mapping as we work directly on the physical element $K$. The resulting mixed method shares the same convergence rates as that in [2]. However, our space has significantly smaller dimension than that in [2] since

$$\dim \mathcal{P}_{k+2,2}(\hat{K}) \times \mathcal{P}_{k,k+2}(\hat{K}) - \dim V^{\text{mix}} = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } k = 0, \\ k^2 + 4k + 1 & \text{if } k \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

$$\dim \nabla \cdot \mathcal{V}(\hat{K}) - \dim W^{\text{mix}} = \frac{1}{2}(k^2 + 5k + 4).$$

3. Proofs of Theorems 2.4 and 2.5

In this section, we first prove the negative result of Theorem 2.4, then prove the main result of Theorem 2.5 by carrying out a systematic construction of the spaces $\delta V_{hIM}$ for $M = \mathcal{P}_k(\partial K)$.

3.1. Proof of Theorem 2.4

We prove Theorem 2.4 by contradiction. Suppose that $V$ is a space of polynomials, $\mathcal{P}_0 \subset W$, and $V \times W$ admits an $M$-decompositon with $M = \mathcal{P}_k(\partial K)$. By the kernels' trace decomposition in ([20], Thm. 2.8), we have

$$\mathcal{P}_k(\partial K) = \{v \cdot n|_{\partial K} : v \in V, \nabla \cdot v = 0\} \oplus \{w|_{\partial K} : w \in W, \nabla w = 0\},$$

where the direct sum is $L^2(\partial K)$-orthogonal. We have $\{w|_{\partial K} : w \in W, \nabla w = 0\} = \gamma(\mathcal{P}_0(K))$. So for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_0(\partial K) \subset M(\partial K)$ that is a non-zero constant on two edges of $K$ and zero on the other edges, and satisfies $\langle \mu, 1 \rangle_{\partial K} = \int_{\partial K} \mu \, ds = 0$, there exists a divergence-free function in $V$ with normal trace $\mu$. Now, if the element $K$ has two edges that lie on the same line, we can take such $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_0(\partial K)$ to be non-zero on these two edges (with opposite sign) and $\langle \mu, 1 \rangle_{\partial K} = 0$. But there is no vector polynomial function such that its normal trace on a line is piecewise constant. This implies that $K$ does not have two edges lie on the same line. Since, in addition, $K$ is not a triangle nor a parallelogram, there exists three edges of $K$ such that their extensions form a triangle. We denote such edges $e_a, e_b$, and $e_c$, with their extended triangle to be $T$. Let $e_d$ to be another edge of $K$. 
3.2. Proof of Theorem 2.5

We omit the proofs related to the S-index and the space \( \delta V_{\text{fillW}} \) for their simplicity, and focus on the proofs for the \( M \)-index and the space \( \delta V_{\text{fillM}} \).

Here, we begin by developing an algorithm that, given a counter-clockwise ordering of the \( ne \) edges of \( K \), \( \{e_i\}_{i=1}^{ne} \), and an initial space \( V_0 \times W_0 \) satisfying the inclusion properties (I) with \( P_0(K) \subset W_0 \), provides a space \( \delta V_{\text{fillM}} \) satisfying the properties in Table 2. We then apply it to prove the results.

3.2.1. An algorithm to construct the space \( \delta V_{\text{fillM}} \)

We use the notation introduced in the previous section. For \( i = 1, \ldots, ne + 1 \), we define \( V_{gs,i} \) to be the divergence-free subspace of \( V_g \) with vanishing normal traces on the first \( i-1 \) edges. In other words,

\[
V_{gs,i} := \{ v \in V_g : \nabla \cdot v = 0, v \cdot n|_{e_j} = 0, 1 \leq j \leq i-1 \}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq ne + 1.
\]

The gradient-free subspace of \( W_g \), \( W_{g,\text{ext}} := \{ w \in W_g : \nabla \cdot w = 0 \} \), also plays an important role in the theory of \( M \)-decompositions; see the kernels' trace decomposition in ([20], Thm. 2.8). By the inclusion property \( P_0(K) \subset W_0 \), we have that \( W_{g,\text{ext}} = P_0(K) \) is just the space of constants on \( K \). Nevertheless, we prefer to use the special name since in other settings such space might be different.

For \( i = 1, \ldots, ne \), we define \( \gamma_i(V) := \{ v \cdot n|_{e_i} : v \in V \} \) to be the normal trace of \( V \) on \( e_i \), and \( \gamma_i(W) := \{ w|_{e_i} : w \in W \} \) to be the trace of \( W \) on \( e_i \). Note that \( \gamma_i(W_{g,\text{ext}}) = P_0(e_i) \) is the space of constants on \( e_i \).

Now, we define the \( M \)-index for each edge.

Definition 3.1 (The \( M \)-index for each edge). The \( M \)-index of the space \( V_g \times W_g \) for the \( i \)th edge \( e_i \) is the number

\[
I_{M,i}(V_g \times W_g) := \dim M(e_i) - \dim \gamma_i(V_{gs,i}) - \delta_{i,ne} \dim \gamma_{ne}(W_{g,ext}),
\]

where \( \delta_{i,ne} \) is the Kronecker delta.

Since \( V_g \times W_g \) satisfies the inclusion properties (I), we have

\[
\gamma_i(V_{gs,i}) \subset M(e_i), \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq ne - 1,
\]

\[
\gamma_{ne}(V_{gs,ne}) + \gamma_{ne}(W_{g,ext}) \subset M(e_{ne}).
\]

Actually, the sum in the last inclusion is an \( (L^2(e_{ne})\text{-orthogonal}) \) direct sum: given any \( (v, w) \in V_{gs,ne} \times W_{g,\text{ext}}, \) we have

\[
\langle \gamma_{ne} v, \gamma_{ne} w \rangle_{e_{ne}} = \langle v \cdot n, w \rangle_{e_{ne}} = \langle v \cdot n, w \rangle_{\partial K} = (v, \nabla w)_K + (\nabla \cdot v, w)_K = 0.
\]

Using these facts, we immediately get that \( I_{M,i}(V_g \times W_g) \) is a natural number for any \( 1 \leq i \leq ne \).

We are now ready to state our result.

Theorem 3.2. Set \( \delta V_{\text{fillM}} := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{ne} \delta V_{\text{fillM}}^i \) where

\[(a) \quad \gamma_i(\delta V_{\text{fillM}}^i) \subset M,
(b) \quad \nabla \cdot \delta V_{\text{fillM}}^i = \{0\},
(c) \quad \gamma_j(\delta V_{\text{fillM}}^i) = \{0\}, \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq i - 1,
(d) \quad \gamma_i(V_{gs,i}) \cap \gamma_i(\delta V_{\text{fillM}}^i) = \{0\},
(e) \quad \dim \delta V_{\text{fillM}}^i = \dim \gamma_i(\delta V_{\text{fillM}}^i) = I_{M,i}(V_g \times W_g).\]
Then $\delta V_{\text{fillM}}$ satisfies the properties in Table 2, that is,

(a) $\gamma \delta V_{\text{fillM}} \subset M$,
(b) $\nabla \cdot \delta V_{\text{fillM}} = \{0\}$,
(c) $\gamma V_{g,1} \cap \gamma \delta V_{\text{fillM}} = \{0\}$,
(d) $\dim \delta V_{\text{fillM}} = \dim \gamma \delta V_{\text{fillM}} = I_M(V_g \times W_g)$.

This result implies that $V_g \oplus \delta V_{\text{fillM}} \times W_g$ admits an $M$-decomposition, see ([20], Prop. 5.1).

Proof. Properties (a), (b) and (c) follow directly from properties (\(\alpha\)), (\(\beta\)) and (\(\gamma\)), respectively. It remains to prove property (d). But, we have

$$\dim \delta V_{\text{fillM}} = \sum_{i=1}^{ne} \dim \delta V_{\text{fillM}}^i = \sum_{i=1}^{ne} I_{M,i}(V_g \times W_g) = \sum_{i=1}^{ne} \dim \gamma_i \delta V_{\text{fillM}}^i = \dim \gamma \delta V_{\text{fillM}},$$

and, by the definition of $I_{M,i}(V_g \times W_g)$, we get

$$\dim \delta V_{\text{fillM}} = \dim M - \sum_{i=1}^{ne} \dim \gamma_i(V_{g,i}) - \dim \gamma_{ne}(W_{g,\text{cst}})$$
$$= \dim M - \sum_{i=1}^{ne} (\dim V_{g,i} - \dim V_{g,i+1}) - \dim \gamma_{ne}(W_{g,\text{cst}})$$
$$= \dim M - (\dim V_{g,1} - \dim V_{g,ne+1}) - \dim \gamma_{ne}(W_{g,\text{cst}}).$$

Finally, by the definition of the spaces $V_{g,1}$ and $V_{g,ne+1}$, we get

$$\dim \delta V_{\text{fillM}} = \dim M - (\dim \{v \in V_g : \nabla \cdot v = 0\}$$
$$- \dim \{v \in V_g : \nabla \cdot v = 0, v \cdot n|_{\partial K} = 0\}) - \dim \gamma_{ne}(W_{g,\text{cst}}).$$
$$= \dim M - \dim \{v \cdot n|_{\partial K} : v \in V_g, \nabla \cdot v = 0\}$$
$$- \dim \{w|_{\partial K} : w \in W_g, \nabla w = 0\}$$
$$= I_M(V_g \times W_g).$$

This completes the proof. \(\square\)

Based on this result, we have that the following algorithm provides a practical construction of the filling space $\delta V_{\text{fillM}}$.

3.2.2. Application of Algorithm PC

Now, we apply Algorithm PC to the setting in Theorem 2.5, that is, $K$ is a star-shaped polygon $K$ of $ne$ edges without edges lie on the same line, $M = P_k(\partial K)$ and $V_g \times W_g = P_k \times P_k$. We proceed to find the space $\delta V_{\text{fillM}}$ in three steps.

1. Finding the spaces $V_{g,i}$. The spaces $V_{g,i}$ are characterized in the following result.

Proposition 3.3. We have that

$$V_{g,i} = \text{curl } \Phi_i,$$

where $\Phi_i := \{b_{i-1}\phi_i : \phi_i \in P_{k+2-i}(K)\}$. Here $b_0 = 1$, and $b_i := \prod_{j=1}^{i} \lambda_j$. 
Algorithm PC. A practical construction of $\delta V_{\text{fill}}$:

Input: A counter-clockwise ordering of the $ne$ edges of the polygon $K$, $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$.
Input: The space of traces $M$.
Input: A space $V_g \times W_g$ satisfying the inclusion properties (I).
Output: The space $\delta V_{\text{fill}}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each $i = 1, \ldots, ne$,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Find the auxiliary spaces $V_{gs,i}$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Find an $I_{M,i}(V_g \times W_g)$-dimensional complement space $C_{M,i}$ on edge $e_i$:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_i(V_{gs,i}) \oplus C_{M,i} = \tilde{M}(e_i)$,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here $\tilde{M}(e_i) = M(e_i)$ if $i &lt; ne$, and $\tilde{M}(e_{ne}) = \gamma_{ne}(W_{gsat})^\perp$ is the subspace of $M(e_{ne})$ that is $L^2(e_{ne})$-orthogonal to $\gamma_{ne}(W_{gsat}) = P_0(e_{ne})$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Find an $I_{M,i}(V_g \times W_g)$-dimensional, divergence-free filling space $\delta V_{\text{fill}}^i$ on $K$:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_j(\delta V_{\text{fill}}^i) = 0$, for $1 \leq j \leq i - 1$,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_i(\delta V_{\text{fill}}^i) = C_{M,i}$,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_j(\delta V_{\text{fill}}^i) \subset M(e_j)$, for $i + 1 \leq j \leq ne$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The space $\delta V_{\text{fill}}^i$ satisfies properties (a)–(delta) of Thm. 3.2.)

return $\delta V_{\text{fill}} := \oplus_{i=1}^{ne} \delta V_{\text{fill}}^i$.

Proof. Since $V_g = P_k$, it is easy to show

$$\text{curl } \Phi_i \subset V_{gs,i} \subset \text{curl } P_{k+1}.$$ 

Since $\Phi_1 = P_{k+1}$, the reverse inclusion, $V_{gs,i} \subset \text{curl } \Phi_i$, is true for $i = 1$.

Now, let us prove the reverse inclusions for $i \geq 2$. We use the following simple fact:

$$\gamma_i(\text{curl } \phi) = 0 \iff \gamma_i \phi \in P_0(e_i) \text{ for any } \phi \in H^1(K) \text{ and any edge } e_i \text{ of } K.$$ 

Let $v = \text{curl } \phi \in V_{gs,i}$ with $\phi \in P_{k+1}$. We have $\gamma_j(\text{curl } \phi) = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq i - 1$. Hence, $\gamma_j \phi \in P_0(e_j)$ for $1 \leq j \leq i - 1$. Since $\phi$ is defined up to a constant, we can assume $\phi(v_1) = 0$. This immediately implies $\gamma_j \phi = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq i - 1$, hence $\phi = b_{i-1} \tilde{\phi}$ for some $\tilde{\phi} \in P_{k+2-i}(K)$. This completes the proof. 

2. Finding the complement spaces $C_{M,i}$. We know that the space $C_{M,i}$ is any subspace of $\tilde{M}(e_i)$ such that $\gamma_i(V_{gs,i}) \oplus C_{M,i} = \tilde{M}(e_i)$; see the definition of $\tilde{M}(e_i)$ in Algorithm PC. Since $M(e_i) = P_k(e_i)$, we need first to characterize $\gamma_i(V_{gs,i})$ then to find a choice of $C_{M,i}$, which is not necessarily unique. The characterization of $\gamma_i(V_{gs,i})$ is contained in the following corollary of the previous proposition.

Corollary 3.4. We have, for $1 \leq i \leq ne$,

$$\gamma_i(V_{gs,i}) = \text{span}\{\text{curl } b_{i-1} \lambda_{i+1}^a\}_{a=\delta_{1,i}}^{k+2-i},$$ 

$$\dim \gamma_i(V_{gs,i}) = \dim P_{k+2-i}(e_i) - \delta_{1,i},$$ 

$$I_{M,i}(V_g \times W_g) = \min(k + 1, i - 2) + \delta_{1,i} - \delta_{ne,i}.$$ 

Here, we use the convention that $\dim P_m = 0$ for any negative integer $m$. 
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Proof. The first identity follows from the definition of the auxiliary space $V_{g_{i},i}$, and the third follows from the second identity and the definition of the $M$-index on edge $e_{i}$, $I_{M,i}(V_{g} \times W_{g})$. Let us prove the second. By construction,

$$\dim \gamma_i(V_{g_{i},i}) = \dim V_{g_{i},i} - \dim V_{g_{i},i+1}$$

$$= \dim V_{g_{i},i} - \dim V_{g_{i},i+1}$$

$$= (\dim P_{k+2-i}(K) - \delta_{1,i}) - (\dim P_{k+1-i}(K) - \delta_{1,i+1})$$

$$= \dim P_{k+2-i}(e_{i}) - \delta_{1,i},$$

since $\dim V_{g_{i},i} = \dim P_{k+2-i}(K) - \delta_{1,i}$. This completes the proof.

Now, we give a particular choice of the trace space $C_{M,i}$ in the following result.

**Theorem 3.5.** The following $I_{M,i}(V_{g} \times W_{g})$-dimensional spaces $C_{M,i}$ of functions defined on the edge $e_{i}$, satisfy $\gamma_i(V_{g_{i},i}) \oplus C_{M,i} = \tilde{M}(e_{i})$ where

$$C_{M,i} = \begin{cases} 
\{0\} & \text{if } i \leq 2, \\
\text{span}\{\gamma_i(\text{curl } \lambda_{i-1}^{a_{i+1}}) : \max\{k+3-i, 0\} + \delta_{ne,i} \leq b \leq k\} & \text{if } i \geq 3.
\end{cases}$$

Proof. It is easy to check that $\dim C_{M,i} = I_{M,i}(V_{g} \times W_{g})$ and $C_{M,i} \subset \tilde{M}(e_{i})$. We are left to show that $\gamma_i(V_{g_{i},i}) \cap C_{M,i} = \{0\}$. We prove this result for the case that $3 \leq i \leq ne - 1$ and $k \geq i - 3$. The other cases are similar and simpler.

To show $\gamma_i(V_{g_{i},i}) \cap C_{M,i} = \{0\}$, we only need to prove the linear independence of the following two sets

$$\{\gamma_i(\text{curl } b_{i-1}^{a_{i+1}})\}_{a=0}^{k+2-i} \text{ and } \{\gamma_i(\text{curl } \lambda_{i-1}^{b_{i+1}})\}_{b=k+3-i}^{k}$$

here the left is a set of bases for $\gamma_i(V_{g_{i},i})$ and the right is a set of bases for $C_{M,i}$. Let us assume that there exist constants $\{C_{a}\}_{a=0}^{k+2-i}$ and $\{D_{b}\}_{b=k+3-i}^{k}$ such that

$$\gamma_i\left(\sum_{a=0}^{k+2-i} C_{a} \text{curl } b_{i-1}^{a_{i+1}} + \sum_{b=k+3-i}^{k} D_{b} \text{curl } \lambda_{i-1}^{b_{i+1}}\right) = 0.$$ 

That is,

$$\left(\sum_{a=0}^{k+2-i} C_{a} b_{i-1}^{a_{i+1}} + \sum_{b=k+3-i}^{k} D_{b} \lambda_{i-1}^{b_{i+1}}\right)\big|_{e_{i}} \in P_{0}(e_{i}).$$

Hence,

$$\lambda_{i-1}\left(\sum_{a=0}^{k+2-i} C_{a} b_{i-2}^{a_{i+1}} + \sum_{b=k+3-i}^{k} D_{b} \lambda_{i+1}^{b_{i+1}}\right)\big|_{e_{i}} \in P_{0}(e_{i}).$$

This implies

$$\left(\sum_{a=0}^{k+2-i} C_{a} b_{i-2}^{a_{i+1}} + \sum_{b=k+3-i}^{k} D_{b} \lambda_{i+1}^{b_{i+1}}\right)\big|_{e_{i}} = 0.$$ 

Now, evaluating the expression at the node $v_{i+1} = e_{i} \cap e_{i+1}$, we get $C_{0} = 0$ since $b_{i-2}(v_{i+1}) \neq 0$ and $\lambda_{i+1}(v_{i+1}) = 0$. Then, dividing the expression by $\lambda_{i+1}$ and evaluating the resulting expression again at $v_{i+1} = e_{i} \cap e_{i+1}$, we get $C_{1} = 0$. Similarly, we get $C_{a} = 0$ for $a = 2, \ldots, k + 2 - i$, and $D_{b} = 0$ for $b = k + 3 - i, \ldots, k$. This completes the proof. \qed
3. Finding the filling spaces $\delta V_i^{\text{fillM}}$. Now, it is easy to show that the divergence-free space $\delta V_i^{\text{fillM}} := \text{curl} \Psi_i$ satisfies the trace properties (3.1-3.3) in Algorithm PC and has dimension $I_{M,i}(V_g \times W_g)$, where $\Psi_i$ is defined in Theorem 2.5. Indeed, using conditions (L) of $\xi_{i+1}$, the equality (3.1) is true since $\gamma_j(\xi_{i+1}) = 0$ for $j \leq i - 1$, the equality (3.2) is true since $\gamma_i(\xi_{i+1}) = \frac{\gamma_i(\lambda_{i-1})}{\lambda_{i-1}(\xi_{i+1})}$, and the equality (3.3) is true since $\gamma_j(\xi_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{P}_1(e_j)$ for $j \geq i + 1$. Hence, $\delta V_i^{\text{fillM}}$ of Theorem 2.5 satisfies properties in Table 2.

The computation of the dimension of $\delta V_i^{\text{fillM}}$. We end this subsection by computing the dimension of $\delta V_i^{\text{fillM}}$. We have

$$\dim \delta V_i^{\text{fillM}} = \sum_{i=1}^{ne} \dim \delta V_i^{\text{fillM}}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{ne} I_{M,i}(V_g \times W_g) = \sum_{i=1}^{ne} (\min\{k + 1, i - 2\} + \delta_{1,i} - \delta_{ne,i})$$

$$= \sum_{i=3}^{ne} (\min\{k, i - 3\} + 1 - \delta_{ne,i}) = \sum_{j=0}^{ne-3} (\min\{k, j\} + 1) - 1$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{ne-3} \min\{k, j\} + (ne - 3).$$

If we set $\theta := \min\{k, ne - 3\}$, we can write

$$\dim \delta V_i^{\text{fillM}} = \sum_{j=1}^{\theta} \min\{k, j\} + \sum_{j=\theta+1}^{ne-3} \min\{k, j\} + (ne - 3)$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{\theta} j + \sum_{j=\theta+1}^{ne-3} \theta + (ne - 3)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \theta(\theta + 1) + \theta(ne - 3 - \theta) + (ne - 3)$$

$$= (\theta + 1)(ne - 3) - \frac{1}{2} \theta(\theta - 1).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.5. \hfill \Box

4. Extensions

In this section, we present some extensions of our constructions in Section 2. First, we take a closer look at the case with quadrilateral elements. Then, we consider the case of the space $M$ for which the polynomials have different degrees in different edges.

4.1. Convex quadrilaterals without hanging nodes

For $k \geq 1$, Theorem 2.5 gives the following two-dimensional filling space:

$$\delta V_i^{\text{fillM}} = \text{curl span}\{\xi_4^k, \xi_1^k, \xi_2^k, \xi_3^k\}.$$

In order to be able to use only one lifting function and save computational effort, we can slightly modify this space to be

$$\delta V_i^{\text{fillM}} = \text{curl span}\{\xi_4^k, \xi_2^k, \xi_3^k\}.$$
Thus, instead of using two lifting functions $\xi_4$ and $\xi_1$, we only use one, $\xi_4$. Moreover, we can subdivide the quadrilateral into two triangles and define the composite lifting function $\xi_4$ based on this subdivision to save computational cost in numerical integration.

### 4.2. Triangles with one hanging node

When a quadrilateral collapses into a triangle with a hanging node, see Figure 2, the results in Corollary 3.4 do not apply anymore, and the spaces provided in Theorem 2.5 do not admit $M$-decompositions. Let us obtain an $M$-decomposition for this case with $V_g \times W_g = P_k \times P_k$ and $M = P_k(\partial K)$.

To do that, let the element nodes ordered as in Fig 2. Using Proposition 3.3, we can easily get that $I_{M,i} = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 4$, that $I_{M,3} = k + 1$, and that the $(k + 1)$-dimensional filling space can be taken as

$$\delta V_{\text{fill}} = \text{curl} \text{span} \{\xi_4 \lambda_b^i; 0 \leq b \leq k\}.$$ 

Here $\xi_4$ can be chosen as a composite lifting.

Note that instead of two (one for the $k = 0$ case) additional basis functions, we have $k + 1$. When $k = 0$, this filling space has dimension one and is the same as the one provided by Theorem 2.5. When $k = 1$, this filling space has the same dimension as the one in Theorem 2.5, namely, two, but has different basis functions.

### 4.3. Variable-degree trace space $M(\partial K)$

Now, we consider the local space

$$M(\partial K) := \{\mu \in L^2(\partial K) : \mu|_e \in P_{k_e}(e), \text{ for all edges } e \text{ of } K\},$$

where $k_e \geq 0$ can vary from edge to edge. Note that this choice of $M(\partial K)$ comes naturally in the context of $p$-adaptivity.

Next we show that the construction of an $M$-decomposition is just a simple modification of that of the uniform degree case. For the sake of simplicity, let us take $K$ to be a triangle; the construction for a general polygon is similar. We take as initial guess the space $V_g \times W_g = P_k(K) \times P_k(K)$ where $k := \min\{k_e : \text{ for all edges } e \text{ of } K\}$. This space admits an $M$-decomposition with $M(\partial K) = P_k(\partial K)$. Then, the $M$-indexes for the variable trace space for each edge are $I_{M,i} = k_e - k$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Since the complement spaces $C_{M,i}$ can be chosen as

$$C_{M,i} = \text{span} \{\gamma_i(\lambda_{i-1}\lambda_{i+1}) : k + 1 \leq b \leq k_e\},$$

the filling space can be taken as

$$\delta V_{\text{fill}} := \bigoplus_{i=1}^3 \text{curl} \text{span} \{\lambda_{i-1}\lambda_{i+1}; k + 1 \leq b \leq k_e\}.$$ 

Note that its dimension is $\sum_{i=1}^3 (k_e - k)$.
5. Numerical Results

In this section, we present numerical results for the model problem

\[-\Delta u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega,\]
\[u = g \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega,\]

where \(\Omega\) is a unit square, and the exact solution is \(u(x, y) = \sin(2\pi x) \sin(2\pi y)\).

We present numerical results for four HDG methods along with two hybridized mixed methods fitting the formulation (1.1) whose corresponding spaces and stabilization operator, and the expected convergence rates are listed in Table 8. The first method is denoted by LDG-H [17]. We denote the second method as LS since it is originally from Lehrenfeld’s diploma thesis [28] (with a primal formulation) under the direction of Schöberl. The third method is denoted as HHO since the key idea stems from the Hybrid-High Order (HHO) methods [22]. Here the linear operator \(r_{\partial K}\) is defined as follows: \(r_{\partial K}(u_h - \hat{u}_h) := P_M(p_{h}^{k+1}(u_h, \hat{u}_h)) - \hat{u}_h\), where \(p_{h}^{k+1}(u_h, \hat{u}_h) \in \mathcal{P}_{k+1}(K)\) satisfies

\[(p_{h}^{k+1}(u_h, \hat{u}_h), w)_K = (u_h, w)_K \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{P}_k(K),\]

\[(\nabla p_{h}^{k+1}(u_h, \hat{u}_h), \nabla z)_K = -(u_h, \Delta z)_K + (\hat{u}_h, \nabla z \cdot n)_{\partial K} \quad \forall z \in \{ w \in \mathcal{P}_{k+1}(K) : w \perp \mathcal{P}_k(K) \}.\]

This is a slight variation of the original HHO flux introduced in [22], see also [21], there the method is devised for the primal formulation, but can be identified as a mixed formulation with the approximate flux space \(V\) taken to be the gradients \(\nabla \mathcal{P}_{k+1}(K)\) and the approximate flux satisfies \(q_h = -\nabla p_{h}^{k+1}(u_h, \hat{u}_h)\). We denote the fourth method as HDG-M since it is the HDG method that use spaces admitting \(M\)-decompositions. Here we use the composite lifting functions for star-shaped polygons in Section 2 to define the lifting functions in \(\delta V_{\text{film}}\).

The fifth and sixth methods are the two (hybridized) mixed methods that sandwich HDG-M; we denote them as L-MIX (lower mixed method) and U-MIX (upper mixed method) respectively. We refer to [20], Thm. 6.3 for a close relation among the last three methods, HDG-M, L-MIX, and U-MIX. Note that on a triangular mesh, HDG-M is nothing but LDG-H since \(\delta V_{\text{film}} = 0\), L-MIX is nothing but the (hybridized) BDM method [7], and U-MIX is nothing but the (hybridized) RT method [31].

For all the methods, the postprocessing \(u_h^* \in \mathcal{P}_{k+1}(K)\) is chosen to be the function that satisfy

\[(u_h^*, w)_K = (u_h, w)_K \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{P}_0(K),\]

\[(\nabla u_h^*, \nabla z)_K = -(q_h, \nabla z)_K \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{P}_{k+1}(K).\]

Since the choice of the trace space \(M(F)\) is the same for all the methods, their global linear system (for \(\hat{u}_h\)) have exactly the same size and sparsity pattern on the same mesh; we observe similar condition numbers

| Method          | \(V\)   | \(W\)   | \(\alpha(u_h - \hat{u}_h)\) | \(|q - q_h|_\Omega\) | \(||u - u_h^*||_\Omega\) |
|-----------------|---------|---------|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| LDG-H [17]      | \(\mathcal{P}_k\) | \(\mathcal{P}_k\) | \(u_h - \hat{u}_h\)         | \(k + 1/2\)         | \(k + 1\)           |
| LS [28, 30]     | \(\mathcal{P}_k\) | \(\mathcal{P}_{k+1}\) | \(1/2(P_Mu_h - \hat{u}_h)\) | \(k + 1\)           | \(k + 2\)           |
| HHO [21, 22]    | \(\mathcal{P}_k\) | \(\delta V_{\text{film}}\) | \(r_{\partial K}(u_h - \hat{u}_h)\) | \(k + 1\)           | \(k + 2\)           |
| HDG-M           | \(\mathcal{P}_k \oplus \delta V_{\text{film}}\) | \(\mathcal{P}_k\) | \(u_h - \hat{u}_h\)         | \(k + 1\)           | \(k + 2\)           |
| L-MIX           | \(\mathcal{P}_k \oplus \delta V_{\text{film}}\) | \(\mathcal{P}_{k-1}\) | 0                           | \(k + 1\)           | \(k + 1\) if \(k = 1\) \(k + 2\) if \(k \geq 2\) |
| U-MIX           | \(\mathcal{P}_k \oplus \delta V_{\text{film}} \oplus \delta V_{\text{film}}\) | \(\mathcal{P}_k\) | 0                           | \(k + 1\)           | \(k + 2\)           |
for all the methods. Hence, solving the global linear system for all the methods, which is the bottleneck of the computation, is expected to take similar time.

While all of these six methods are well-defined on a polygonal meshes, the LDG-H method can be shown to provide suboptimal convergence rate of $k + 1/2$ for the $L^2$-error in the flux variable $q_h$, and suboptimal convergence rate of $k + 1$ for the $L^2$-error in the postprocessed scalar variable $u^*_h$, while the other five methods provide optimal convergence rate of $k + 1$ for $q_h$ and $k + 2$ for $u^*_h$ (when $k = 1$, L-MIX only provide suboptimal convergence rate of $k + 1$ for $u^*_h$). See [10] for an analysis of the LDG-H method, [30] for an analysis of the LS method and [22] HHO (where the space for the flux is replaced by a much smaller space), and [20] for an analysis of the last three methods.

For all the methods, we solve the problem on triangular, square, and polygonal meshes with the coarsest meshes depicted in Figure 3. Here numerical integration on a polygon $K$ is done by first subdiving the polygon into a set of triangles, and sum up the integral on each triangle using standard quadrature rules for polynomials on triangles. Since we use composite lifting functions on the subdivision of the polygon in the definition of $\delta V_{\text{HIM}}$, the restriction on each subtriangle of these functions are polynomials. Hence the functions in $\delta V_{\text{HIM}}$ are easy to implement. If the element $K$ is a triangle or a parallelogram, we use the standard mapping technique to compute the integrals. The history of convergence for the $L^2$-error in the flux variable $q_h$ and the postprocessed scalar variable $u^*_h$ is given in Table 9 to 11 for these three types of meshes.

Table 9 presents the history of convergence for the six methods on triangular meshes for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$. We observe expected convergence rates. When $k = 1$, we have second-order convergence rate in $q_h$ for all the methods, and third-order convergence rate in $u^*_h$ for all the methods except L-MIX, for which the convergence rate is second order. When $k = 2$, we have third-order convergence rate in $q_h$ and fourth-order convergence rate in $u^*_h$ for all the methods. The errors in $q_h$ for LDG-H(=HDG-M), LS, and HHO are about the same, those for L-MIX are slightly bigger and those for U-MIX slightly smaller. The errors in $u^*_h$ for LDG-H(=HDG-M), LS, HHO, and U-MIX are about the same, and those for L-MIX are significantly bigger (even for $k = 2$) for the same convergence rates.

Table 10 presents the history of convergence for the six methods on square meshes for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$. We observe slightly better convergence rates than predicted by the theory for LDG-H, and expected convergence rates for the other five methods. When $k = 1$, we have about 1.7 convergence rate in $q_h$ for LDG-H and second-order convergence rate for the other five methods, and about 2.7 convergence rate in $u^*_h$ for LDG-H, second-order convergence rate for L-MIX, and third-order convergence for the other four methods. When $k = 2$, we have about 2.7 convergence rate in $q_h$ for LDG-H and third-order convergence rate for the other five methods, and about 3.8 convergence rate in $u^*_h$ for LDG-H and fourth-order convergence for the other five the methods. The method LDG-H produces the biggest errors in $q_h$. For the other five methods, the errors in $q_h$ for HDG-M, LS, and HHO are about the same, those for L-MIX are slightly bigger, and those for U-MIX slightly smaller.

Figure 3. Three types of initial meshes. Left: a triangular mesh. Middle: a square mesh. Right: a polygonal mesh.
### Table 9. History of convergence on triangular meshes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$| u - u_h |_{\sigma_h}$</th>
<th>$| u - u_h^* |_{\sigma_h}$</th>
<th>$| q - q_h |_{\tau_h}$</th>
<th>$| q - q_h^* |_{\tau_h}$</th>
<th>$| u - u_h |_{\sigma_h}$</th>
<th>$| u - u_h^* |_{\sigma_h}$</th>
<th>$| q - q_h |_{\tau_h}$</th>
<th>$| q - q_h^* |_{\tau_h}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LDG-H</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>HHO</td>
<td>LDG-H</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>HHO</td>
<td>LDG-H</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.26E-1</td>
<td>1.53E-3</td>
<td>1.17E-1</td>
<td>1.26E-3</td>
<td>1.16E-1</td>
<td>1.30E-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.18E-2</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.84E-4</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.96E-2</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.58E-4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.92E-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>79.5E-3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.25E-5</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>7.43E-3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.97E-5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.31E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.99E-3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.78E-6</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.86E-3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.46E-6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.83E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.12E-2</td>
<td>1.07E-4</td>
<td>1.05E-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.47E-5</td>
<td>1.02E-2</td>
<td>9.59E-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.41E-3</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>6.65E-5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.32E-3</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>6.02E-6</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.29E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.76E-4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.15E-7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.66E-4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.78E-7</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.61E-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.20E-5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.59E-8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.08E-5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.36E-8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.02E-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10. History of convergence on square meshes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$| u - u_h |_{\sigma_h}$</th>
<th>$| u - u_h^* |_{\sigma_h}$</th>
<th>$| q - q_h |_{\tau_h}$</th>
<th>$| q - q_h^* |_{\tau_h}$</th>
<th>$| u - u_h |_{\sigma_h}$</th>
<th>$| u - u_h^* |_{\sigma_h}$</th>
<th>$| q - q_h |_{\tau_h}$</th>
<th>$| q - q_h^* |_{\tau_h}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LDG-H</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>HHO</td>
<td>LDG-H</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>HHO</td>
<td>LDG-H</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.56E-1</td>
<td>8.32E-3</td>
<td>1.83E-1</td>
<td>2.81E-3</td>
<td>1.85E-1</td>
<td>2.65E-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.26E-1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.63E-3</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>4.42E-2</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.98E-4</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>4.42E-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.21E-2</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.38E-4</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.09E-2</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>3.41E-5</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.09E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.29E-2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>4.14E-5</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.71E-5</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>4.15E-6</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.71E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.62E-2</td>
<td>2.63E-4</td>
<td>1.84E-2</td>
<td>1.86E-4</td>
<td>1.86E-2</td>
<td>1.88E-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.42E-3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.02E-5</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.23E-3</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.16E-5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.23E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.06E-3</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.53E-6</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>2.75E-4</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>7.25E-7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.75E-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.60E-4</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.11E-7</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.42E-5</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>4.53E-8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.42E-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPERCONVERGENCE BY M-DECOMPOSITIONS**

**History of convergence on square meshes.**
Table 11. History of convergence on polygonal meshes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mesh</th>
<th>(k)</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(|q - q_h|_{T_h}) error</th>
<th>order</th>
<th>(|u - u_h^*|_{T_h}) error</th>
<th>order</th>
<th>(|q - q_h|_{T_h}) error</th>
<th>order</th>
<th>(|u - u_h^*|_{T_h}) error</th>
<th>order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDG-H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.55E-1</td>
<td>5.22E-3</td>
<td>1.16E-1</td>
<td>1.49E-3</td>
<td>1.16E-1</td>
<td>1.49E-3</td>
<td>1.16E-1</td>
<td>1.49E-3</td>
<td>1.16E-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.97E-2</td>
<td>1.96E-3</td>
<td>2.34E-3</td>
<td>2.93E-2</td>
<td>1.98E-2</td>
<td>2.34E-3</td>
<td>2.93E-2</td>
<td>1.98E-2</td>
<td>2.34E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.06E-2</td>
<td>1.91E-3</td>
<td>2.43E-2</td>
<td>2.71E-3</td>
<td>1.96E-2</td>
<td>2.43E-2</td>
<td>2.71E-3</td>
<td>1.96E-2</td>
<td>2.43E-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.85E-3</td>
<td>1.89E-3</td>
<td>3.47E-3</td>
<td>1.91E-2</td>
<td>2.96E-2</td>
<td>3.47E-3</td>
<td>1.91E-2</td>
<td>2.96E-2</td>
<td>3.47E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.23E-2</td>
<td>1.68E-3</td>
<td>9.62E-3</td>
<td>1.03E-2</td>
<td>9.60E-3</td>
<td>1.03E-2</td>
<td>9.60E-3</td>
<td>1.03E-2</td>
<td>9.60E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.46E-3</td>
<td>3.08E-3</td>
<td>4.07E-2</td>
<td>3.02E-2</td>
<td>3.08E-2</td>
<td>4.07E-2</td>
<td>3.02E-2</td>
<td>3.08E-2</td>
<td>4.07E-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.87E-4</td>
<td>2.97E-3</td>
<td>8.02E-3</td>
<td>2.95E-2</td>
<td>3.13E-2</td>
<td>8.02E-3</td>
<td>2.95E-2</td>
<td>3.13E-2</td>
<td>8.02E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.44E-5</td>
<td>2.94E-3</td>
<td>7.47E-3</td>
<td>2.93E-2</td>
<td>3.12E-2</td>
<td>7.47E-3</td>
<td>2.93E-2</td>
<td>3.12E-2</td>
<td>7.47E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.25E-3</td>
<td>1.04E-3</td>
<td>2.53E-1</td>
<td>2.31E-2</td>
<td>7.10E-2</td>
<td>2.31E-2</td>
<td>7.10E-2</td>
<td>2.31E-2</td>
<td>7.10E-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.14E-3</td>
<td>3.01E-3</td>
<td>6.54E-2</td>
<td>1.95E-2</td>
<td>6.28E-2</td>
<td>1.95E-2</td>
<td>6.28E-2</td>
<td>1.95E-2</td>
<td>6.28E-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.50E-4</td>
<td>2.93E-3</td>
<td>2.70E-5</td>
<td>2.92E-3</td>
<td>4.63E-3</td>
<td>2.92E-3</td>
<td>4.63E-3</td>
<td>2.92E-3</td>
<td>4.63E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.96E-5</td>
<td>2.93E-3</td>
<td>7.47E-5</td>
<td>2.93E-3</td>
<td>2.60E-3</td>
<td>7.47E-5</td>
<td>2.93E-3</td>
<td>2.60E-3</td>
<td>7.47E-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, the errors in \(u_h^*\) for HDG-M, LS, HHO, and U-MIX are about the same, those for LDG-H slightly bigger, and those for L-MIX even bigger than those for LDG-H.

Table 11 presents the history of convergence for the six methods on polygonal meshes for \(k = 1\) and \(k = 2\). Again, we observe slightly better convergence rates than predicted by the theory for LDG-H, and expected convergence rates for the other five methods. When \(k = 1\), we have about second-order convergence rate in \(q_h\) for all the methods, and about 2.5 convergence rate in \(u_h^*\) for LDG-H, second-order convergence rate for L-MIX, and third-order convergence for the other four methods. When \(k = 2\), we have about third-order convergence rate in \(q_h\) for all the methods, and about 3.4 convergence rate in \(u_h^*\) for LDG-H and fourth-order convergence for the other five methods. This time, L-MIX produces the biggest errors in \(q_h\). For the other five methods, the errors in \(q_h\) for HDG-M, LS, and HHO are about the same, those for LDG-H are slightly bigger, and those for U-MIX slightly smaller. On the other hand, the errors in \(u_h^*\) for HDG-M, LS, HHO, and U-MIX are about the same, those for LDG-H slightly bigger, and those for L-MIX are even bigger than those of LDG-H. However, when we refine the mesh once more, the the errors in \(u_h^*\) for L-MIX with \(k = 2\) are smaller than those for LDG-H.

6. Concluding remarks

We have applied the theory of \(M\)-decomposition to systematically construct HDG and their sandwiching mixed methods on polygonal meshes. We have also numerically compared our superconvergent HDG and their sandwiching mixed methods with other superconvergent LS-like and HHO-like HDG methods and have verified, in a very simple model problem, that the expected orders of convergence are achieved and that all these methods produce similar errors with similar computational effort for solving the global problem. The corresponding construction in three-space dimensions is carried out in Part III, [14], of this series. A more thorough numerical
comparison between the several methods considered here, as well as the automatic computation of the spaces $\delta V_{RIM}$ and $\delta V_{RIW}$ are the subject of ongoing work.
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