Weak imposition of the slip boundary condition on curved boundaries for Stokes flow
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\textbf{A B S T R A C T}

We study the finite element approximation of two methods to weakly impose a slip boundary condition for incompressible fluid flows: the Lagrange multiplier method and Nitsche’s method. For each method, we can distinguish several formulations depending on the values of some real parameters. In the case of a spatial domain with a polygonal or polyhedral boundary, we prove convergence results of their finite element approximations, extending previous results of Verfürth\textsuperscript{[33]} and we show numerical results confirming them. In the case of a spatial domain with a smooth curved boundary, numerical results show that approximations computed on polygonal domains approximating the original domain may not converge to the exact solution, depending on the values of the aforementioned parameters and on the finite element discretization. These negative results seem to highlight Babuska’s like paradox, due to the approximation of the boundary by polygonal ones. In particular, they seem to contradict some of Verfürth’s theoretical convergence results.
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1. Introduction

In $\Omega$, an open bounded and connected subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n = 2$ or 3, with Lipschitz continuous boundary $\Gamma = \partial \Omega$, we consider the stationary Stokes equations

\begin{align*}
- \nabla \cdot \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{u}, p) &= \mathbf{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,
\end{align*}

where $\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{u}, p) = -p \mathbf{I} + 2\mu \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{u})$ is the stress tensor, $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{u}) = (\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^\top)/2$ is the deformation rate tensor and $\mu > 0$ is the kinematic viscosity of the fluid. On the boundary we prescribe a slip boundary condition:

\begin{align*}
\mathbf{u} \cdot \nu &= g \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \\
\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{u}, p) \cdot \mathbf{\tau}_i &= f_{2,i}, \quad i = 1, n - 1, \text{ on } \Gamma.
\end{align*}

Here, $\nu$ is the outgoing unit normal vector to $\Gamma$ whereas $\mathbf{\tau}_i$, $i = 1, n - 1$, are orthonormal vectors spanning the plane tangent to $\Gamma$. When $g = 0$ (zero-flux condition) and $f_{2,i} = 0$, $i = 1, n - 1$ (vanishing forces in tangential directions to the boundary), this is also known as the free slip boundary condition.
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In the literature, slip-type boundary conditions are less frequent than, for instance, Dirichlet or Neumann (free) boundary conditions. Nevertheless, they are involved in problems with biological surfaces and interfaces [6,7], polymer melts [13], slide coating [11], turbulence models [24], or special problems with Newtonian fluid flows at solid interfaces [25]. They can be viewed as a mix of a Dirichlet boundary condition in the normal direction to the boundary and a Neumann (i.e. natural) boundary condition in tangential directions.

In the numerical literature, several weak formulations have been devised to form the basis of a finite element approximation of Stokes or Navier–Stokes equations with a slip boundary condition. The theoretical results, that we review in the following, were established for Ω with a smooth curved (non-polygonal) boundary and finite element approximations were considered for polyhedral domains approximating this smooth domain. These theoretical results differ primarily in the treatment of the boundary flux condition (3).

In one of the simplest formulation, the boundary flux condition (3) is imposed strongly: the velocity approximation is sought in an ansatz space where all vectors satisfy (3) at each nodes when Lagrange finite elements are used. The first convergence results were proved by Verfürth [31]. The convergence rates obtained in [31] are not optimal and were improved by Knobloch [22] and Bänsch and Deckelnick [4], from 1/2 to 3/2 in usual norms, in the case of Taylor–Hood ($P_2/P_1$) elements. This rate cannot be improved further in general due to the error in the approximation of Ω by polygonal domains $\Omega_h$ (see for instance Strang and Fix [29, Section 4.4]).

Interestingly, and in direct relation to our present work, in [31] Verfürth argued that the obtained suboptimal rate could be difficult to improve due to Babuska’s like paradox [2,3]. Babuska’s paradox can be stated as follows: the solution of Kirchhoff plate equations with simple support boundary conditions in a disk is not the limit of the solutions to the same equations posed on polygonal domains approaching the disk, as in Fig. 1 (left). One can then easily imagine that some difficulties may appear when performing finite element approximations of these equations in meshed polygonal domains approaching the disk, like in Fig. 1 (right). This paradox holds in fact whenever a smooth curved boundary is involved (see [23]). That Babuska’s like paradox is into play in the case of Stokes equations with slip boundary conditions was pointed out by Verfürth [31] by observing that the stream function formulation of Stokes equations with free slip boundary conditions, obtained by posing $u = \text{curl} \psi$ (which is possible since $\nabla \cdot u = 0$, and then $\psi$ is the so-called stream function), leads to the Kirchoff plate equation $-\mu \Delta^2 \psi = \text{curl} f$ with simple support boundary conditions: $\psi = 0$ and $\Delta \psi = 2\kappa \partial \psi / \partial n$ (where $\kappa$ is the curvature of $\partial \Omega$, see for instance [12] for details).

Motivated by the lack of optimality in his estimates, Verfürth [32] proposed to handle the constraint Eq. (3) in a weak way, by the Lagrange multiplier method. With the introduction of a new variable — the Lagrange multiplier-finite element approximation spaces need to be chosen with care (enriching the velocity approximation space with bubble functions having their support in the vicinity of $\Gamma$, like in [32], for instance) or residual boundary terms may be added in the original variational formulation of the equations, resulting in a so-called stabilized formulation [33]. As Stenberg [28] already observed, formal elimination of the Lagrange multiplier in these stabilized formulations results in problem formulations similar to Nitsche’s method [26] to weakly append Dirichlet type boundary conditions.

The objective of this work is to study the efficiency of these two methods (the Lagrange multiplier method and Nitsche’s method) to impose in a weak way a slip boundary condition (more precisely flux boundary condition (3)) for Stokes (and Navier–Stokes) equations, and to put into evidence some convergence problems which may be related to Babuska’s like paradox, in the case of a domain with a smooth curved boundary. As convergence of finite element approximations are difficult to establish in the case of a smooth curved boundary, and as convergence of these methods depends on the values of some parameters (see Sections 2 and 4) even in the case of a polygonal boundary, we first study these methods theoretically only in the case of a polygonal (or polyhedral) boundary. Then we test them numerically, first with a polygonal boundary (in order to illustrate the theoretical results) and then with a smooth boundary in order to put into evidence the paradox.

In Section 2, after recalling the Lagrange multiplier method, we first describe a set of variants of the stabilized formulation introduced and studied in [33]. In Section 3, we prove the convergence of the resulting approximation method when $\Omega$ has a polygonal or polyhedral boundary. The theoretical convergence results depend on the values of the parameters. In Section 4, we prove the stability of several variants of Nitsche’s method, depending on the values of the parameters, assum-
ing again that the domain is polygonal (or polyhedral). One of these variants has the advantage of being stable, regardless of the (polygonal) domain, hence its interest for series of polygonal approximations of a smooth domain. Finally, in Section 5, the two classes of approximation methods studied here theoretically for polygonal domains are tested numerically for both a polygonal and smooth boundaries. In the case of a 2D polygonal domain, all the tests confirm the theory. But in the case of a domain with a smooth curved boundary (a ring), numerical approximations may not converge towards the exact solution at all, putting into evidence that Babuska’s like paradox may be at play. In particular, our numerical results seem to contradict the theoretical convergence results of Verfürth in [33] for the stabilized Lagrange multiplier method. Moreover, we show that this instability with respect to polyhedral perturbations of the domain also appears when using Nitsche’s methods studied in Section 4. We draw more precise conclusions in Section 6. Finally, details of the theoretical demonstrations are given in Appendix A.

2. The Lagrange multiplier method

In the remaining of this paper, if $\omega$ is a domain of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with boundary $\gamma$ then $H^k(\omega)$ and $H^{k-1/2}(\gamma)$, $k \geq 0$, designate the usual Sobolev spaces. Their usual norms are denoted by $\| \cdot \|_k$ and $\| \cdot \|_{k-1/2, \gamma}$ respectively. Recall that $H^0(\omega) = L^2(\omega)$ and $H^{-1/2}(\gamma)$ is the dual space of $H^{1/2}(\gamma)$. The duality product between $\rho \in H^{-1/2}(\gamma)$ and $\lambda \in H^{1/2}(\gamma)$ is simply denoted by $\langle \rho, \lambda \rangle_{\gamma}$. Since there cannot be any confusion, the same notations are used for the norms and duality products associated to spaces in product form like $(H^k(\omega))^n$ or $(H^{k-1/2}(\gamma))^n$.

We further adopt the simplifying notation:

$$Q := L^2_0(\Omega) := \left\{ v \in L^2(\Omega) : \int_{\Omega} v \, d\Omega = 0 \right\}, \quad \Lambda := H^{-1/2}(\Gamma),$$

and we define the quotient space

$$V := H^1(\Omega)/R,$$

where $R$ is the space of rigid body motions, $R := \{ a + b x : a \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } b \in S_n \}$, and $S_n$ is the space of anti-symmetric $n \times n$ matrices. Note that, assuming that $\Omega$ has a Lipschitz boundary, functions in $V$ satisfy the second Korn inequality (see [1])

$$\| u \|_{1, \Omega} \leq C \| D(u) \|_{0, \Omega}, \quad \forall v \in V,$$

for some $C > 0$.

A solution of (1)–(4) can be sought as the solution of the saddle-point problem: Find $u \in V$, $p \in Q$ and $\rho \in \Lambda$ such that

$$L(u, p, \rho) = \inf_{q \in Q, \lambda \in \Lambda} \sup_{v \in V} L(v, q, \lambda),$$

where $L$ is the Lagrangian functional defined by

$$L(v, q, \lambda) = \mu \int_{\Omega} |D(v)|^2 \, d\Omega - \int_{\Omega} f \cdot v \, d\Omega - \int_{\Gamma} q \nabla \cdot v \, d\Gamma + \int_{\Gamma} (v \cdot \nu - g) \lambda \, d\Gamma - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \int_{\Gamma} f_2 \nu_i \cdot \tau_i \, d\Gamma.$$

The Euler–Lagrange equations associated to this saddle-point problem gives the variational formulation: Find $u \in V$, $p \in Q$ and $\rho \in \Lambda$ such that

$$2 \mu \int_{\Omega} D(u) : D(v) \, d\Omega - \int_{\Omega} p \nabla \cdot v \, d\Omega + \int_{\Gamma} \rho \cdot v \cdot d\Gamma = \int_{\Omega} f \cdot v \, d\Omega + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \int_{\Gamma} f_2 v \nu_i \cdot \tau_i \, d\Gamma, \quad \forall v \in V,$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot u q \, d\Omega = 0, \quad \forall q \in Q,$$

$$\int_{\Gamma} u \cdot \nu \lambda \, d\Gamma = \int_{\Gamma} g \lambda \, d\Gamma, \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda.$$

Verfürth [32] proved that this saddle point problem admits a unique solution $(u, p, \rho) \in V \times Q \times \Lambda$ for sufficiently smooth data $f$, $g$ and $f_2$, under the assumption that $\Gamma$ is $C^3$. His result can nevertheless be extended to domains verifying the elliptic regularity property used in his proof of Lemma 3.1 in [32]:

(H0): $\| \phi \|_{2, \Omega} \leq C (\| \psi \|_{2, \Omega} + \| \rho \|_{1/2, \Gamma})$ for any $\psi \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\rho \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$, where $\phi$ is the weak solution of $-\Delta \phi = \psi$ in $\Omega$, $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} = \rho$ on $\Gamma$. 


Remark 2.1. (H0) is satisfied when, for instance, $\Omega$ is a bounded convex domain or is a plane bounded domain with Lipschitz and piecewise $C^2$ boundary whose angles are convex (see Theorem 3.2.1.3 and Remark 3.2.1.4 in [18]).

Of course, (6)–(8) can be obtained from (1)–(4) by suitable multiplications by test functions and integrations by parts and we easily verify that their respective solutions coincide. Moreover, $\rho$ is the negative of the normal component of the stress tensor:

$$\rho = -\sigma(u, p),$$

where $\sigma(u, p) := v \cdot T(u, p) \cdot v = -p + 2\mu v \cdot D(u) \cdot v$.

Let us consider classes of approximation spaces $V_h, Q_h$ and $A_h$ for $V$, $Q$ and $A$ respectively. Here, $h > 0$ is a discretization parameter which goes to 0. As we allow $\Omega$ to be arbitrarily smooth (and not only a polygon or a polyhedron) we assume that these approximation spaces correspond to polygonal ($n = 2$) or polyhedral ($n = 3$) domains $\Omega_h$ approximating $\Omega$ as $h$ tends to 0. The boundary of $\Omega_h$ is denoted by $\Gamma_h$. If $\Omega$ is not polyhedral then we assume that each vertex of $\Omega_h$ lies in $\Gamma$ and we define $g_h = h Q - \int h_i g d\Gamma / \int h_i d\Gamma$, $f_{2,i,h} = h Q f_{2,i}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n - 1$, where $h_i g$ is the continuous piecewise linear function interpolating $g$ at the vertex of $\Omega_h$. If $\Omega$ is polyhedral then we assume that $\Omega_h = \Omega$ and we set $g_h = g$ and $f_{2,i,h} = f_{2,i}$. We assume that $g$ and $f_{2,i}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n - 1$, are functions sufficiently smooth to define these interpolations.

The approximated problem then writes

$$2\mu \int_{\Omega_h} D(u) : D(v) d\Omega - \int_{\Gamma_h} p \nabla \cdot v d\Gamma + \int_{\Omega_h} \rho v \cdot v d\Omega = \int_{\Gamma_h} f \cdot v d\Gamma + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \int_{\Gamma_h} f_{2,i,h} v \cdot \tau_i d\Gamma, \quad \forall v \in V_h, \tag{9}$$

$$\int_{\Omega_h} \nabla \cdot u q d\Omega = 0, \quad \forall q \in Q_h, \tag{10}$$

$$\int_{\Gamma_h} u \cdot v \lambda d\Gamma = \int_{\Gamma_h} g_h \lambda d\Gamma, \quad \forall \lambda \in A_h. \tag{11}$$

For the solutions to be uniquely defined and to converge as $h \to 0$ to the solutions of the continuous problem (6)–(8), approximation spaces need to satisfy the inf-sup condition [8]

$$\inf_{q \in Q_h} \sup_{\rho \in A_h} \frac{-\int_{\Omega_h} q \nabla \cdot v d\Omega + \int_{\Gamma_h} \rho v \cdot v d\Gamma}{\|q\|_{0,\Omega_h} + \|\rho\|_{-1/2,\Gamma_h}^{1/2} \|v\|_{1,\Omega_h}} \geq \beta > 0. \tag{12}$$

As demonstrated by Verfürth [32], simple choices for $A_h$ combined with classical finite element spaces $V_h \times Q_h$ which satisfy the classical LBB inf-sup condition

$$\inf_{q \in Q_h} \sup_{\rho \in V_h} \frac{\int_{\Omega_h} q \nabla \cdot v d\Omega}{\|q\|_{0,\Omega_h} \|v\|_{1,\Omega_h}} \geq \beta > 0 \tag{13}$$

may fail to satisfy (12).

A way to obtain a stable approximation is to enrich $V_h$ with suitable bubble functions having support in the elements that are along $\Gamma_h$. Before introducing these functions, let us first introduce our notation and our assumptions about the meshes.

For any $h > 0$, let $T_h$ be a triangulation of $\Omega_h$ in $n$-simplices having a diameter smaller than $h$ and such that any intersection of two simplices is either empty, a vertex, an edge or a face. We assume that the partitioning is regular, in the sense that there exists $C > 0$ such that for every element $T \in T_h$, its diameter $h_T$ and the diameter $d_T$ of the largest ball contained in $T$ verify $h_T < C d_T$. The resulting partitioning of $T_h$ into segments or triangles is denoted by $S_h$. The diameter of a given element $S \in S_h$ is denoted by $h_S$.

Let $S \in S_h$ and denote by $T_S$ the element of $T_h$ of which $S$ is a face or an edge. Denote by $\lambda_T, 1, \ldots, \lambda_{T_{i,n,T}}$ the barycentric coordinates of $T_S$, the last one being associated with the vertex of $T_S$ which does not lie on $S$, and define

$$\phi_S := \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{T_S,i} v_{S} & \text{on } T_S, \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

The space of bubble functions is defined by

$$B_h := \bigcup_{S \in \Phi} B_{S,h}, \quad \text{with } B_{S,h} := \{ r \phi_S : r \in \mathcal{P}_m(T_S) \}. \tag{15}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_m(T)$ is the space of polynomials of degree $m$ or less. Let us denote by $N_S$ the dimension of $P_m(T)$. If for instance $m = 0$ then $N_S = 1$. Let $\{b_{S,1}, \ldots, b_{S,N_S}\}$ denote a basis of $B_{S,h}$. We define $\tilde{V}_h = V_h + B_h$. An element $\tilde{u} \in \tilde{V}_h$ can then be written
\[ \dot{u} = u + \sum_{S \in S_h} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N_S} \alpha_{S,i} \dot{b}_{S,i}, \quad \alpha_{S,i} \in \mathbb{R} \]

with \( u \in V \). The bubble-stabilized formulation is then \((9)-(11)\) with \( V_h \) replaced by \( \tilde{V}_h \). Here, \( V_h \) and \( Q_h \) are assumed to be popular finite element spaces for Stokes equations with Dirichlet boundary conditions, in particular satisfying \((13)\), whereas \( A_h \) is the space of piecewise polynomials of degree \( m \) or less on each element of \( S_h \). These spaces will be specified and used later in this work. We also refer to Verfürth \[32\] for more details about the approximation spaces and for convergence results about this method.

### 3. Stabilized formulations

A way to circumvent the inf-sup condition \((12)\) for finite elements already satisfying \((13)\) is to add suitable residual terms in the weak equations \((6)-(8)\), resulting in a stabilized formulation. These stabilization procedures were originally developed in order to circumvent the classical LBB inf-sup condition \((13)\) (see for instance Hughes et al. \[21\]). Here, we assume that \( V_h \) and \( Q_h \) satisfy \((13)\) and the objective is to circumvent \((12)\).

Let us introduce the bilinear and linear forms defined by

\[
\begin{align*}
& a_h(u, v) = 2\mu \int_{\Omega_h} D(u) : D(v) \, d\Omega, \quad \ell_{\Omega_h}(v) = \int_{\Omega_h} f \cdot v \, d\Omega, \\
& b_{\Omega_h}(u, p) = -\int_{\Omega_h} p \nabla \cdot v \, d\Omega, \quad b_{\Gamma_h}(\rho, u) = \int_{\Gamma_h} \rho \, u \cdot v \, d\Gamma, \\
& \ell_{\Gamma_h,1}(\rho) = \int_{\Gamma_h} g_h \rho \, d\Gamma', \quad \ell_{\Gamma_h,2}(v) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \int_{\Gamma_h} f_{2,i,h} \, v \cdot \tau_i \, d\Gamma',
\end{align*}
\]

which we use to define the bilinear form \( B_h \) and the linear form \( L_h \) by

\[
B_h(u, p, \lambda) = a_h(u, v) + b_{\Omega_h}(v, p) + b_{\Gamma_h}(\rho, v) + \gamma b_{\Omega_h}(u, q) + b_{\Gamma_h}(\lambda, u),
\]

\[
L_h(v, q, \lambda) = \ell_{\Omega_h}(v) + \ell_{\Gamma_h,2}(v) + \ell_{\Gamma_h,1}(\lambda),
\]

where \( \gamma \) is a constant parameter with value \( 1 \) or \( -1 \).

The approximation problem \((9)-(11)\) then writes: Find \( u_h \in V_h, \, p_h \in Q_h \) and \( \rho_h \in A_h \) such that

\[
B_h(u_h, p_h, \rho_h) \in L_h(v, q, \lambda), \quad \forall (v, q, \lambda) \in V_h \times Q_h \times A_h.
\]

Note that, although \( B_h \) is symmetric only when \( \gamma = 1 \), the two Eqs. \((16)\) corresponding to the two admissible values for \( \gamma \) are equivalent. One can be deduced from the other by the change of variable \( q \to -q \).

In order to introduce the stabilized formulations let us define the mesh-dependent bilinear form

\[
\langle \rho, \lambda \rangle_{-\frac{1}{2}, h, \Gamma_h} = \sum_{S \in S_h} h_S \int_S \rho \lambda \, d\Gamma', \quad \forall \rho, \lambda \in A_h
\]

as well as the associated discrete norm \( \| \cdot \|_{-\frac{1}{2}, h, \Gamma_h} \) defined by

\[
\| \rho \|_{-\frac{1}{2}, h, \Gamma_h} = \langle \rho, \rho \rangle_{-\frac{1}{2}, h, \Gamma_h}^{1/2}.
\]

Define the bilinear form

\[
B_{\omega,h}(u, p, \rho, v, q, \lambda) = B_h(u, p, \rho, v, q, \lambda) - \alpha \langle \rho + \sigma(u, p), \lambda + \delta \sigma(v, q) \rangle_{-\frac{1}{2}, h, \Gamma_h},
\]

where \( \alpha \) and \( \delta \) are real parameters that are discussed in what follows. The stabilized formulation that we shall study then writes: Find \( u \in V_h, \, p \in Q_h \) and \( \rho \in A_h \) such that

\[
B_{\omega,h}(u, p, \rho, v, q, \lambda) \in L_h(v, q, \lambda), \quad \forall (v, q, \lambda) \in V_h \times Q_h \times A_h.
\]

Note that when \( \Omega \) has a polygonal or polyhedral boundary (and then \( \Omega_h = \Omega \)), if the approximation is conformal (that is if \( V_h \subset V, \, Q_h \subset Q \) and \( A_h \subset A \)) then the approximation method is consistent in the sense that a smooth solution \((u, p, \rho) \in V \times Q \times A \) of the continuous problem also satisfies \((18)\).

Note also that, although not explicit in the notation, \( B_{\omega,h} \) depends on \( \delta \) and \( \gamma \). Moreover, contrarily to Eqs. \((16)\), Eqs. \((18)\) corresponding to different parameter values are not generally equivalent one to another.

In this work, we are going to consider the cases where \( \alpha > 0 \) and \( \delta = -1 \) or \( \delta = 1 \).
Verfürth [33] considered the case $\delta = 0$ (with $\gamma = 1$). This normal stress stabilization procedure is inspired from the original pressure stabilization procedure used in [21]. Note that it automatically breaks the symmetry of the original equations (16). Moreover, Verfürth [33] proved that this stabilized formulation is stable if $\alpha$ is lower than a threshold value which can be difficult to estimate in practice.

If we want the stabilized formulation to remain symmetric we have to set $\delta = 1$ and $\gamma = 1$. With $\delta = 1$, this can be seen as an adaptation of a stabilization procedure originally devised by Hughes and Franca [20] to circumvent the classical LBB inf-sup condition (13). Its main drawback, at least in [20], is again that $\alpha > 0$ has to be small enough.

In the case $\delta = -1$, this is an adaptation of a stabilized procedure originally devised by Douglas and Wang [14] and later simplified by Franca and Stenberg [16], again to circumvent the classical LBB inf-sup condition (13). The resulting system is no longer symmetric but the stabilized formulations in [14,16] were proved to be unconditionally stable, which is to say without restriction on $\alpha$ other than $\alpha > 0$.

In both cases $\delta = 1$ and $\delta = -1$, this stabilization procedure has been applied by Barbosa and Hughes [5] to weakly impose Dirichlet boundary conditions for elliptic equations. They arrived to an analogous conclusion: conditional stability of the method in the case $\delta = 1$ and unconditional stability in the case $\delta = -1$.

Here, for our stabilized formulation (18), we shall only prove the conditional stability of the method for all the aforementioned values of $\delta$ and $\gamma$. The reason for this limitation is given in Remark 3.2.

Following [33], in order to prove these stability results we make classical assumptions (assumptions (H1)–(H4) in Appendix A) which are verified by classical finite element spaces $V_h \times Q_h$ such as MINI $(P_1$-bubble/$P_1$), Taylor–Hood $(P_2/P_1)$ or conformal Crouzeix–Raviart $(P_2$-bubble/discontinuous $P_1$) finite element spaces [33].

Let us also introduce the norm $\| \cdot \|_{\alpha,h}$ defined by

$$\| (u, p, \rho) \|^2_h = \| D(u) \|^2_{0,\Omega_h} + \| p \|^2_{0,\Omega_h} + \| \rho \|^2_{1/2,\Gamma_h} + \| \delta \rho \|^2_{1/2,\Gamma_h},$$

for all $(u, p, \rho) \in V_h \times Q_h \times \Lambda_h$.

**Proposition 1.** With $\delta = \pm 1$, $\gamma = \pm 1$ and under assumptions (H0)–(H4), there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that for every $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{(v, q, \lambda) \in V_h \times Q_h \times \Lambda_h} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\alpha,h}((u, p, \rho), (v, q, \lambda))}{\| (v, q, \lambda) \|_h} \geq C \| (u, p, \rho) \|_h,$$

for all $(u, p, \rho) \in V_h \times Q_h \times \Lambda_h$.

**Proof.** See Appendix A (Section A.1). \(\square\)

**Remark 3.1.** Note that even in the case $\delta = -1$ we were not able to prove that the formulation is unconditionally stable. The reason is that, with $\delta = \pm 1$, the smallness condition on $\alpha$ is partly due to condition (28) which enables one to control the last negative term involving the pressure in (27). When $\delta = 0$ (the case studied in [32]), condition (28) does not rule but then the smallness condition is due to (24).

As done in [32], from the stability result we can deduce a convergence result by assuming that the finite element spaces have approximation properties (H5)–(H10) listed in Section A.1. Again, these properties are satisfied by usual finite element spaces like spaces of piecewise polynomials of a given degree, continuous or not, eventually enriched with suitable bubble functions in order to satisfy (H1).

**Theorem 1.** With $\Omega$ a polygon or a polyhedron, assume (H0)–(H10) and assume that the solution $(u, p, \rho)$ of the continuous problem (6)–(8) is sufficiently smooth. If $\alpha$ is sufficiently small then the approximate problem (18) admits a unique solution $(u_h, p_h, \rho_h)$ which satisfies

$$\| D(u - u_h) \|_{0,\Omega} + \| p - p_h \|_{0,\Omega} + \| \rho - \rho_h \|_{-1/2,\Gamma} + h^{1/2} \| \rho - \rho_h \|_{0,\Gamma} \leq h^2 \left( \| f \|_{0,\Omega} + \| g \|_{3/2,\Gamma} + \| f_2 \|_{1/2,\Gamma} \right).$$

(19)

**Remark 3.2.** Verfürth [32] gives a proof for $\delta = 0$ and when $\Omega$ has a $C^3$ boundary. The result is a direct consequence of the stability property of Proposition 1 and of approximation properties (H5)–(H10). As the approximation method is consistent when $\Omega$ is polygonal or polyhedral, there is no consistency error to estimate and the proof is easier. Although the polygonal or polyhedral case is not a particular case of the $C^3$ case, the proof of Theorem 1 is easier, can be extracted from the proof of Proposition 4.2 in [32] and is not repeated here.

**Remark 3.3.** From Korn inequality (5), it follows that the error estimate on the velocity contained in (19) is equivalent to an error estimate in the space $V = H^1(\Omega) / \mathcal{R}$. 
Example 3.1.
- If we take piecewise constant functions \(P_0\) for \(\Lambda_h\) together with MINI \(P_1\)-bubble/\(P_1\), see [8]) finite element space for \(V_h \times Q_h\), then (19) holds with \(s = 1\).
- For the convergence to be quadratic \((s = 2)\), we can take for instance the \(P_{1,\text{disc}}\) finite element for \(\Lambda_h\), combined with Taylor–Hood \((P_2/P_1)\) finite elements for \(V_h \times Q_h\). If Taylor–Hood finite elements are combined with \(P_0\) instead, we obtain a linear convergence only.

4. Nitsche’s method

Stenberg [28] noticed that, in the case of a scalar elliptic equation, one of the stabilized formulations studied by Barbosa and Hughes [5] to append a Dirichlet boundary condition using the Lagrange multiplier method is connected to Nitsche’s method [26]. Nitsche’s method was originally devised for elliptic equations to append the Dirichlet boundary condition in a weak way but the method does not rely on a Lagrange multiplier. The connection between the two methods was established in [28] by simply eliminating the Lagrange multiplier, resulting in a close variant of Nitsche’s method.

Let us conduct a similar operation for our problem. Let us first assume that \(\Omega\) is polygonal or polyhedral. Now, set \(v = 0\) and \(q = 0\) in (18). We then obtain

\[
\int_{I_h} \lambda \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\Gamma - \alpha (\rho + \sigma (\mathbf{u}, p), \lambda)_{\frac{1}{2}, h, I_h} = \int_{I_h} g_h \lambda \, d\Gamma, \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda_h,
\]

from which it follows that

\[
\int_{S} \rho \lambda \, d\Gamma = \int_{S} \left( -\sigma (\mathbf{u}, p) + \frac{\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} - g_h}{ah_S} \right) \lambda \, d\Gamma, \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda_h.
\]

Observe that \(\rho\) can be identified as the \(L^2(\Gamma_h)\) projection onto \(\Lambda_h\) of the function whose restriction to each \(S \in S_h\) is \(-\sigma (\mathbf{u}, p) + \frac{\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} - g_h}{ah_S}\). Although the following property is obviously not true, let us assume that we exactly have \(\rho_{S} = -\sigma (\mathbf{u}, p) + \frac{\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} - g_h}{ah_S}\) (recall that in the continuous case \(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} = g\) and \(\rho = -\sigma (\mathbf{u}, p)\)). Substituting \(\rho\) and taking \(\lambda = 0\) reduces (18) to

\[
D_{\alpha, h}(\mathbf{u}, p), (\mathbf{v}, q)) = F_{S}(\mathbf{v}, q), \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}, q) \in V_h \times Q_h,
\]

where

\[
D_{\alpha, h}(\mathbf{u}, p), (\mathbf{v}, q)) = a_h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + b_{\Omega_h}(\mathbf{v}, p) + \gamma b_{\Omega_h}(\mathbf{u}, q)
- b_{I_h}(\sigma (\mathbf{u}, p), \mathbf{v}) - \delta b_{I_h}(\sigma (\mathbf{v}, q), \mathbf{u}) + \frac{1}{\alpha} (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v})_{\frac{1}{2}, h, I_h},
\]

and

\[
F_{S,h}(\mathbf{v}, q) = \ell_{\Omega_h}(\mathbf{v}) + \ell_{I_h,2}(\mathbf{v}) - \delta \ell_{I_h,1}(\mathbf{v} \cdot T(\mathbf{v}, q)) + \frac{1}{\alpha} (g_h, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v})_{\frac{1}{2}, h, I_h}.
\]

Here, we have used the discrete scalar product \(\langle \cdot , \cdot \rangle_{\frac{1}{2}, h, I_h}\) defined by

\[
\langle \rho, \lambda \rangle_{\frac{1}{2}, h, I_h} = \sum_{S \in S_h} \frac{1}{h_S} \int_{S} \rho \lambda \, d\Gamma
\]

and with associated norm \(\|\rho\|_{\frac{1}{2}, h, I_h} = \langle \rho, \rho \rangle_{\frac{1}{2}, h, I_h}^{1/2}\).

Formula (20) can be obtained directly from Eqs. (1)–(4). Moreover, in the case where \(\Omega\) is polygonal or polyhedral, the solution \((\mathbf{u}, p)\) of (1)–(4) satisfies \(D_{\alpha, h}(\mathbf{u}, p), (\mathbf{v}, q)) = F_{S}(\mathbf{v}, q)\) for all \((\mathbf{v}, q) \in V \times Q\). Since \(V_h \subset V\) and \(Q_h \subset Q\) in this case, the consistency property of the approximation method (20) follows:

Lemma 1. Assume that \(\Omega\) has a polygonal or polyhedral boundary. Let \((\mathbf{u}, p)\) and \((\mathbf{u}_h, p_h)\) be the solutions of (1)–(4) and (20) respectively. They satisfy

\[
D_{\alpha, h}(\mathbf{u}, p) - (\mathbf{u}_h, p_h), (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) = 0, \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in V_h \times Q_h.
\]
With \( \delta = 0 \), regardless of the choice for \( \gamma \), (20) is the original Nitsche’s method [26] which was applied to elliptic equations with a Dirichlet boundary condition. However, the most commonly used variant consists in taking \( \delta = 1 \) (see for instance Fairweather [15]). In the latter case, when the original system is symmetric, like here Stokes equations with \( \gamma = 1 \), the resulting system remains symmetric. Hansbo and Larson [19] as well as Burman and Hansbo [9] proved the stability of two discontinuous Galerkin formulations of (20) with additional stabilizing terms involving inter-element edge jumps (and with \( \delta = 1 \)).

Here we shall prove the stability of (20) for sufficiently small \( \alpha \), regardless of the choice for \( \delta \) and \( \gamma \), like for stabilized formulations. Moreover, we shall prove that with \( \delta = -1 \) and \( \gamma = -1 \), Nitsche’s method (20) is unconditionally stable, this is to say without any condition on \( \alpha \) besides \( \alpha > 0 \). This result is in contrast with the conditional stability result of the stabilized Lagrange multiplier method obtained in the previous section even with \( \delta = -1 \) and \( \gamma = -1 \). A similar unconditional stability result for this non-symmetric variant of Nitsche’s method was already proved for scalar elliptic equations with a Dirichlet boundary condition in [17].

For the following stability result we need to introduce the norm \( \| \cdot \|_h \) defined by

\[
\| (u, p) \|_h^2 = \| D(u) \|_{0, \Omega}^2 + \| p \|_{0, \Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \| u \cdot v \|_{2, h, \Gamma}^2.
\]

**Proposition 2.** Let us assume that (H1)–(H3) hold.

(i) If \( \delta = \pm 1 \) and \( \gamma = \pm 1 \) then there exists \( \alpha_0 > 0 \) such that: for all \( 0 < \alpha < \alpha_0 \) there exists \( C > 0 \) independent of \( h \) such that

\[
\sup_{(v, q) \in V_h \times Q_h} \frac{\| D_{\alpha h} ((u, p), (v, q)) \|}{\| (v, q) \|_h} \geq C \| (u, p) \|_h, \quad \forall (u, p) \in V_h \times Q_h.
\]  

(ii) If \( \delta = -1 \) and \( \gamma = -1 \) then (22) is valid for all \( \alpha > 0 \).

**Proof.** See Appendix A (Section A.2). \( \square \)

We are now in position to prove the following convergence result when \( \Omega \) is a polygon or a polyhedron.

**Theorem 2.** Assume (H0)–(H2), (H4)–(H7) and assume that \( \Omega \) has a polygonal or polyhedral boundary. We also assume that the conditions on \( \alpha \) provided by Proposition 2 to ensure uniform stability are met. Let \((u, p)\) and \((u_h, p_h)\) be the solutions of (1)–(4) and (20) respectively. If \((u, p)\) is sufficiently smooth then they satisfy

\[
\| (u, p) - (u_h, p_h) \|_h \leq h^s (\| u \|_{s+1, \Omega_h}^2 + \| p \|_{s, \Omega_h}).
\]  

**Proof.** See Appendix A (Section A.3). \( \square \)

**Example 4.1.**

- If we take MINI \((P_1\text{-bubble}/P_1)\) finite element space for \( V_h \times Q_h \), then (23) holds with \( s = 1 \).
- For the convergence to be quadratic \((s = 2)\), we can take for instance Taylor–Hood \((P_2/P_1)\) finite elements.

5. **Numerical examples**

In this section numerical results in dimension \( n = 2 \) are compared to the theoretical convergence results provided in Sections 3 and 4 for the stabilized formulation of the Lagrange multiplier method (18) and for Nitsche’s method (20) respectively. We consider two types of domains. In the first example \( \Omega \) has a polygonal geometry (a square) so that the assumptions of the above mentioned theoretical convergence results are met. In the second example (a ring), \( \Omega \) has a smooth boundary. This enable us to put in evidence convergence difficulties, depending on the formulations, on the values of some of the parameters and on the finite elements used.

To observe these convergence properties we shall use the technique of manufactured solutions. An analytical divergence-free velocity field and a pressure field are substituted in the Stokes equations to yield balancing volumetric forces terms. These terms are used throughout a standard mesh refinement study.

Since our goal is to put in evidence convergence problems principally for the velocity approximation, the manufactured pressure solution is \( p = 0 \) in all the tests presented here.

5.1. **A simple polygonal geometry**

In this example, \( \Omega \) is the square \( \{(x, y), -1 < x < 1, -1 < y < 1\} \). Throughout the analysis, polygonal domains \( \Omega_h \) remain identical to \( \Omega \), while meshes are generated in a structured manner and made of \( 2 \times N \times N \) square triangles of side length \( h = 1/N \).
the simplicity of the exact pressure solution (see Example 3.1). The convergence rates are again confirmed, both using the stabilized Lagrange multiplier method and Nitsche’s method. On the following subsection, this manufactured solution is tested on another domain $\Omega$, which has a smooth curved boundary.

$$p = (2y(1 - x^2), -2x(1 - y^2)), \ p = 0.$$  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$h$</th>
<th>MINI-P0</th>
<th>TH-P1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>6.84 x 10^{-2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>3.8 x 10^{-1}</td>
<td>1.74 x 10^{-2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1.88 x 10^{-1}</td>
<td>4.38 x 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/80</td>
<td>4.0 x 10^{-5}</td>
<td>1.10 x 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Stabilized Lagrange multiplier method (18) in the square. Parameters values are $\mu = 1$, $\alpha = 4$, $\gamma = 1$, $\delta = -1$, and the exact solution is $u = (2y(1 - x^2), -2x(1 - y^2)), \ p = 0$.

Fig. 2. The $2 \times 10 \times 10$ triangles structured mesh and a finite element approximation of velocity field $u = (2y(1 - x^2), -2x(1 - y^2))$ using stabilized Lagrange multiplier method (18).

We first look at the efficiency of the methods in approximating the velocity field $u = (2y(1 - x^2), -2x(1 - y^2))$ and the pressure $p = 0$, the exact solution of (1)-(4) for suitable data. Note that $u$ is divergence-free, $\nabla \cdot u = 0$, and that $u(x) \cdot v(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \Gamma$. Fig. 2 shows the structured mesh corresponding to $h = 1/10$ and the velocity field.

Table 2 shows the approximation errors using the stabilized formulation (18) with MINI-P0 and TH-P1 finite elements. Estimated convergence rates confirm the theoretical values predicted in Theorem 1 (see Example 3.1). The convergence rates for the pressure are slightly better than what is predicted, probably due to the structured configuration of the mesh and to the simplicity of the exact pressure solution ($p = 0$).

The same observations can be made for Nitsche’s method (20), as shown in Table 2. Convergence rates obtained using MINI and TH finite elements confirm the theoretical results of Theorem 2 (see Example 4.1).

We have repeated this study with a non-polynomial velocity field $u = (-y\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}, x\sqrt{x^2 + y^2})$ which again is divergence-free, and with $p = 0$. Note that the boundary flux $u \cdot v$ doesn’t vanish everywhere on $\Gamma$, so that a non-homogeneous boundary flux condition (3) must be imposed. As shown in Tables 3 and 4, theoretical convergence rates are again confirmed, both using the stabilized Lagrange multiplier method and Nitsche’s method. On the following subsection, this manufactured solution is tested on another domain $\Omega$, which has a smooth curved boundary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$h$</th>
<th>MINI-P0</th>
<th>TH-P1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>7.02 x 10^{-2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.76 x 10^{-2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>4.54 x 10^{-1}</td>
<td>4.40 x 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/80</td>
<td>2.08 x 10^{-1}</td>
<td>1.10 x 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Nitsche’s method (20) in the square. Parameters values are $\mu = 1$, $\alpha = 4$, $\gamma = 1$, $\delta = -1$, and the exact solution is $u = (2y(1 - x^2), -2x(1 - y^2)), \ p = 0$.
5.2. A simple non-polygonal geometry

In this example, $\Omega$ is the ring $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 1 < x^2 + y^2 < 4\}$ and we compute finite element approximations of the manufactured solution

$$u = (-y\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}, x\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}), \quad p = 0.$$  

Note that $\nabla \cdot u = 0$ and that $u \cdot v = 0$ on $\Gamma$. A Dirichlet boundary condition is applied on the inner boundary of the ring, while slip boundary condition (3)-(4) with $g = 0$ and a suitable tangential force $f_2$ is applied on the outer boundary. All the results shown in what follows were obtained with $\mu = 1$.

Polygonal domains $\Omega_h$ and corresponding meshes are built in a structured manner without being regular and homogeneous respectively. The starting mesh is refined several times so as to successively divide by 2 the smaller element side length $h$. For elements along the boundary, we have been careful to place each boundary vertex of each refined mesh on the original curved boundary $\Gamma$. Fig. 3 shows the first two meshes of this series.

5.2.1. Stabilized Lagrange multiplier method

In this section we perform the computations with the stabilized Lagrange multiplier method (18) and observe the convergence rates to the analytical solution. We test several choices of finite elements:

- MINI or Taylor–Hood elements for velocity and pressure.
- $P_0$ or $P_1$ (discontinuous) elements for the multiplier.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$h$</th>
<th>MINI- $P_0$</th>
<th>$|\mathbf{u}<em>h - \mathbf{u}|</em>{1,2}$</th>
<th>$|p_h - p|_{0,2}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>4.86 x 10^{-1}</td>
<td>1.36 x 10^{-4}</td>
<td>3.75 x 10^{-2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>2.45 x 10^{-1}</td>
<td>5.34 x 10^{-5}</td>
<td>1.11 x 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1.22 x 10^{-1}</td>
<td>1.94 x 10^{-5}</td>
<td>3.25 x 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/80</td>
<td>6.11 x 10^{-2}</td>
<td>6.90 x 10^{-6}</td>
<td>9.39 x 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$h$</th>
<th>MINI</th>
<th>$|\mathbf{u}<em>h - \mathbf{u}|</em>{1,2}$</th>
<th>$|p_h - p|_{0,2}$</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>$|\mathbf{u}<em>h - \mathbf{u}|</em>{1,2}$</th>
<th>$|p_h - p|_{0,2}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>6.33 x 10^{-1}</td>
<td>3.85 x 10^{-4}</td>
<td>3.33 x 10^{-2}</td>
<td>728 x 10^{-7}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>2.84 x 10^{-1}</td>
<td>1.42 x 10^{-5}</td>
<td>9.45 x 10^{-3}</td>
<td>9.39 x 10^{-8}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1.32 x 10^{-1}</td>
<td>4.99 x 10^{-5}</td>
<td>2.61 x 10^{-3}</td>
<td>1.63 x 10^{-8}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/80</td>
<td>6.37 x 10^{-2}</td>
<td>1.75 x 10^{-5}</td>
<td>7.02 x 10^{-4}</td>
<td>3.54 x 10^{-9}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results are shown for three choices of \((\gamma, \delta)\):

- \(\gamma = -1\) and \(\delta = -1\).
- \(\gamma = 1\) and \(\delta = -1\).
- \(\gamma = -1\) and \(\delta = 0\).

For all these cases, results are shown for several values for \(\alpha\) ranging from 1 to \(10^{-6}\), as this stabilized Lagrange multiplier method is known to be stable only for a sufficiently small value of \(\alpha\). In some cases, especially when this seems to improve the convergence properties (for both velocity and pressure), results with larger values of \(\alpha\) are also shown.

MINI-\(P_0\). Tables 5–7 show the approximation errors using this combination of finite elements. All the results show convergence with an optimal linear rate for sufficiently small values of \(\alpha\). Moreover, with the choice \((\gamma, \delta) = (-1, -1)\), the numerical results also suggest that this formulation is stable whatever the value of the positive parameter \(\alpha\), even if for the largest values of \(\alpha\) the convergence rate for the pressure seems suboptimal.
Taylor–Hood–P₁. Tables 8–10 show that whatever our three choices for \((\gamma, \delta)\), a convergence is very difficult to observe. This is particularly evident for small values of \(\alpha\) as we observe that the velocity approximations do not converge at all. This is in contrast with the previous example with the same analytical solution in a polygonal domain \(\Omega\) (a square), where convergence was observed with optimal (quadratic) rate. Note that when \(\alpha\) is small, velocity approximations corresponding to different values of \((\gamma, \delta)\) seem to converge to the same limit. In Fig. 4 we see that the velocity approximation vanishes at the boundary corners of \(\Omega_h\), which makes us think that in these cases Babuška’s like paradox may be at play. The best convergent behavior seems to happen with \((\gamma, \delta) = (−1, −1)\) and moderate to large values of \(\alpha\) (Table 8), but with a very suboptimal rate (just below 1/2 which is the rate obtained by Verfürth in [33]).

Taylor–Hood–P₀. We now use again Taylor–Hood finite elements for velocity and pressure, but this time combined with discontinuous \(P₀\) instead of \(P₁\) finite elements for the multiplier. We now obtain convergent approximations, for several choices of \(\gamma\) and \(\delta\), and for sufficiently small values of \(\alpha\) (Tables 11–13). Convergence rates are not quadratic (between 1 and 2) but we do not expect them to be so, because of the error due to the approximation of \(\Omega\) by \(\Omega_h\). Moreover, according to Theorem 1 we expect a linear convergence rate using \(P₀\) finite elements for the multiplier. A possible explanation with the success of this combination of finite elements, compared to Taylor–Hood–P₁ elements, is that using \(P₀\) elements instead

#### Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\alpha)</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(|P₀ - P₁|_0)</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>11.124</td>
<td>11.112</td>
<td>11.1077</td>
<td>11.0645</td>
<td>10.6643</td>
<td>8.05445</td>
<td>4.64999</td>
<td>3.90242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h/4</td>
<td>7.35829</td>
<td>7.35819</td>
<td>7.35726</td>
<td>7.34799</td>
<td>7.2633</td>
<td>6.72613</td>
<td>3.81695</td>
<td>0.960595</td>
<td>0.604564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h/8</td>
<td>5.36342</td>
<td>5.3634</td>
<td>5.36327</td>
<td>5.36204</td>
<td>5.35877</td>
<td>5.5787</td>
<td>4.85624</td>
<td>1.38297</td>
<td>0.317426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h/16</td>
<td>3.6321</td>
<td>3.63209</td>
<td>3.63199</td>
<td>3.63114</td>
<td>3.63273</td>
<td>4.03195</td>
<td>5.2358</td>
<td>2.32952</td>
<td>0.342948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 9

| h/16 | 5.31468 | 5.31468 | 5.31468 | 5.31477 | 5.32219 | 5.72739 | 9.01859 | 11.5022 | 11.5022 | 11.5022 |

#### Table 10

|\(\|u₀ - u₁\|_1\)| h | 13.8888 | 12.9557 | 10.4732 | 10.666 | 10.8518 | 10.874 | 10.8762 |
| h/2 | 22.3074 | 20.061 | 11.8272 | 10.8455 | 11.2273 | 11.2772 | 11.2823 |
| h/4 | 34.3053 | 30.8276 | 15.2947 | 10.91088 | 11.3354 | 11.435 | 11.4456 |
| h/8 | 46.9302 | 42.7631 | 21.3936 | 10.13 | 11.3042 | 11.4913 | 11.5142 |
| h/16 | 57.5357 | 53.0803 | 28.5675 | 9.30133 | 11.1528 | 11.5022 | 11.5435 |

\(\gamma = 1, \delta = −1\).
Fig. 4. Velocity field obtained with the stabilized Lagrange multiplier method formulation (18), with $\alpha = 10^{-6}$, and TH-$P_1$ finite elements.

Table 11
Errors with the stabilized Lagrange multiplier method in the ring, using TH-$P_0$ elements, $\gamma = -1$, $\delta = -1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$|p_h - p|_0$</th>
<th>$h$</th>
<th>$10^{-1}$</th>
<th>$10^{-2}$</th>
<th>$10^{-3}$</th>
<th>$10^{-4}$</th>
<th>$10^{-5}$</th>
<th>$10^{-6}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>0.771038</td>
<td>0.767009</td>
<td>0.75627</td>
<td>0.748877</td>
<td>0.747541</td>
<td>0.747393</td>
<td>0.747378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/2$</td>
<td>0.177662</td>
<td>0.176388</td>
<td>0.173228</td>
<td>0.17248</td>
<td>0.172406</td>
<td>0.172397</td>
<td>0.172396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/4$</td>
<td>0.044456</td>
<td>0.0438467</td>
<td>0.0423632</td>
<td>0.041945</td>
<td>0.041925</td>
<td>0.041917</td>
<td>0.041916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/8$</td>
<td>0.0115539</td>
<td>0.0112502</td>
<td>0.0104866</td>
<td>0.0103977</td>
<td>0.0103991</td>
<td>0.010399</td>
<td>0.010399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/16$</td>
<td>0.00315239</td>
<td>0.0030288</td>
<td>0.00262816</td>
<td>0.00257625</td>
<td>0.00257681</td>
<td>0.00257681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12
Errors with the stabilized Lagrange multiplier method in the ring, using TH-$P_0$ elements, $\gamma = 1$, $\delta = -1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$|p_h - p|_0$</th>
<th>$h$</th>
<th>$10^{-1}$</th>
<th>$10^{-2}$</th>
<th>$10^{-3}$</th>
<th>$10^{-4}$</th>
<th>$10^{-5}$</th>
<th>$10^{-6}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>0.65139</td>
<td>0.6441</td>
<td>0.620952</td>
<td>0.609931</td>
<td>0.60887</td>
<td>0.608795</td>
<td>0.608786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/2$</td>
<td>0.176529</td>
<td>0.17443</td>
<td>0.158909</td>
<td>0.152965</td>
<td>0.152948</td>
<td>0.152947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/4$</td>
<td>0.0495436</td>
<td>0.0476224</td>
<td>0.040921</td>
<td>0.0379909</td>
<td>0.0379875</td>
<td>0.0379872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/8$</td>
<td>0.0147419</td>
<td>0.0139217</td>
<td>0.0108801</td>
<td>0.009504</td>
<td>0.00944967</td>
<td>0.00944962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/16$</td>
<td>0.00465002</td>
<td>0.0043255</td>
<td>0.0030329</td>
<td>0.00235601</td>
<td>0.00235564</td>
<td>0.00235563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of $P_1$ elements for the multiplier relaxes the constraint $u_h \cdot v_h = 0$ along each face of the polygonal boundary of $\Omega_h$, allowing the velocity approximations not to vanish at boundary vertices. Note also that, if $(\gamma, \delta) = (-1, -1)$ (Table 11) or $(\gamma, \delta) = (-1, 0)$ (Table 13), convergence is observed whatever the value of $\alpha$ in the range $1$ to $10^{-6}$.

5.2.2. Nitsche’s method
In this section we show the results of our computations with Nitsche’s method (20) using MINI or TH finite elements. We consider two choices for $(\gamma, \delta)$:

- $\gamma = -1$ and $\delta = -1$.
- $\gamma = 1$ and $\delta = -1$.
Table 13
Errors with the stabilized Lagrange multiplier method in the ring, using TH-$P_3$ elements, $y = -1$, $\delta = 0$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$10^{-4}$</th>
<th>$10^{-3}$</th>
<th>$10^{-2}$</th>
<th>$10^{-1}$</th>
<th>$10^{-3}$</th>
<th>$10^{-5}$</th>
<th>$10^{-6}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>p_h - \rho</td>
<td></td>
<td>_h$</td>
<td>77.1056</td>
<td>7.54209</td>
<td>3.011522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/2$</td>
<td>34.8049</td>
<td>3.19138</td>
<td>0.193001</td>
<td>0.142837</td>
<td>0.169375</td>
<td>0.172093</td>
<td>0.172366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/4$</td>
<td>14.3248</td>
<td>1.31877</td>
<td>0.095544</td>
<td>0.0306287</td>
<td>0.0409802</td>
<td>0.042701</td>
<td>0.0421795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/8$</td>
<td>6.34771</td>
<td>0.582998</td>
<td>0.0501522</td>
<td>0.00577674</td>
<td>0.00987454</td>
<td>0.0103462</td>
<td>0.0103937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/16$</td>
<td>2.96311</td>
<td>0.271634</td>
<td>0.0251199</td>
<td>0.001268</td>
<td>0.00233664</td>
<td>0.00255249</td>
<td>0.00257438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $||u_h - u||_1$ | 1.65151 | 0.630616 | 0.069067 | 0.060786 | 0.060786 | 0.060786 | 0.060786 |
| $h/2$ | 0.381181 | 0.156578 | 0.152984 | 0.152947 | 0.152946 | 0.152946 | 0.152946 |
| $h/4$ | 0.081565 | 0.0385956 | 0.0379932 | 0.0379872 | 0.0379872 | 0.0379872 | 0.0379872 |
| $h/8$ | 0.0186169 | 0.00956785 | 0.0095709 | 0.0094963 | 0.00987454 | 0.0094963 | 0.0094962 |
| $h/16$ | 0.0044304 | 0.00238122 | 0.00235588 | 0.00235563 | 0.00235563 | 0.00235563 | 0.00235563 |

Table 14
Errors with Nitsche's method in the ring, using MINI elements, $y = -1$, $\delta = -1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$10^{-4}$</th>
<th>$10^{-3}$</th>
<th>$10^{-2}$</th>
<th>$10^{-1}$</th>
<th>$10^{-3}$</th>
<th>$10^{-5}$</th>
<th>$10^{-6}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>p_h - \rho</td>
<td></td>
<td>_h$</td>
<td>0.0584662</td>
<td>0.0580688</td>
<td>0.0551352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/2$</td>
<td>0.0119289</td>
<td>0.0120681</td>
<td>0.0132305</td>
<td>0.0164314</td>
<td>0.0146694</td>
<td>0.0122845</td>
<td>0.0117607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/4$</td>
<td>0.00311512</td>
<td>0.00321297</td>
<td>0.0020894</td>
<td>0.00933453</td>
<td>0.0111591</td>
<td>0.0088537</td>
<td>0.00785421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/8$</td>
<td>0.000105153</td>
<td>0.000104696</td>
<td>0.00012306</td>
<td>0.000799399</td>
<td>0.000886928</td>
<td>0.00062708</td>
<td>0.00049445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/16$</td>
<td>0.000839321</td>
<td>0.000816416</td>
<td>0.00063876</td>
<td>0.00021596</td>
<td>0.00067542</td>
<td>0.00050546</td>
<td>0.00029064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $||u_h - u||_1$ | 5.22831 | 5.27024 | 6.1161 | 9.74844 | 11.2931 | 11.5119 | 11.5362 |
| $h/2$ | 3.02427 | 3.04363 | 3.74667 | 8.39182 | 11.0882 | 11.5075 | 11.5358 |
| $h/4$ | 1.62553 | 1.83325 | 2.07622 | 6.56669 | 10.689 | 11.468 | 11.562 |
| $h/8$ | 0.834657 | 0.837906 | 1.08467 | 4.56184 | 9.9681 | 11.3738 | 11.5542 |
| $h/16$ | 0.421136 | 0.42261 | 0.552549 | 2.83407 | 8.7875 | 11.1919 | 11.5337 |

Let us recall that, according to Proposition 2, formulation (20) with $(y, \delta) = (-1, -1)$ is unconditionally stable while in the case $(y', \delta) = (1, -1)$ it is known to be stable only if $\alpha$ is sufficiently small. This is why we perform the computations for values of $\alpha$ ranging from 1 to $10^{-4}$. This range has proved to be sufficient to capture the convergence behavior for small values $\alpha$. Additionally, computations are also performed with larger values of $\alpha$, ranging from 1 to $10^4$, for completeness.

According to Tables 14–17, whether with $y = -1$ or $y = 1$, and whether with MINI or TH elements, convergence of $(u_h, p_h)$ does not seem to take place for small values of $\alpha$, particularly for the velocity. As shown in Fig. 5, the velocity field approximations tend to vanish at vertices. On another hand, with large values $\alpha$, the unconditionally stable formulation (that is with $(y', \delta) = (-1, -1)$) combined with MINI or TH elements gives convergent approximations, although the convergence rate seems to decrease with increasing $\alpha$. The best convergence rates (for both the pressure and the velocity) are observed for moderate values of $\alpha$ (in the range 10 to $10^2$). Surprisingly, they are linear for MINI elements but lower with TH elements. For the conditionally stable formulation $(y', \delta) = (-1, -1)$, it is difficult to find a condition on $\alpha$ that may indicate convergent approximations according to these numerical results.
Table 16
Errors with Nitsche's method in the ring, using TH elements, $\gamma = -1$, $\delta = -1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$10^4$</th>
<th>$10^3$</th>
<th>$10^2$</th>
<th>$10^1$</th>
<th>$1$</th>
<th>$10^{-1}$</th>
<th>$10^{-2}$</th>
<th>$10^{-3}$</th>
<th>$10^{-4}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>0.0111135</td>
<td>0.0111204</td>
<td>0.011021</td>
<td>0.00834887</td>
<td>0.0037284</td>
<td>0.00248993</td>
<td>0.00235109</td>
<td>0.00233705</td>
<td>0.00233564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/2$</td>
<td>0.00913491</td>
<td>0.0091267</td>
<td>0.00900611</td>
<td>0.0074964</td>
<td>0.0031456</td>
<td>0.00110007</td>
<td>0.00103517</td>
<td>0.00104314</td>
<td>0.00104433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/4$</td>
<td>0.00735733</td>
<td>0.00734894</td>
<td>0.00728396</td>
<td>0.006879</td>
<td>0.00411366</td>
<td>0.000915148</td>
<td>0.000562492</td>
<td>0.000589486</td>
<td>0.000593725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/8$</td>
<td>0.0053623</td>
<td>0.00535298</td>
<td>0.00530912</td>
<td>0.00557822</td>
<td>0.00501116</td>
<td>0.00146635</td>
<td>0.000295468</td>
<td>0.000320417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/16$</td>
<td>0.0036307</td>
<td>0.00361901</td>
<td>0.00355999</td>
<td>0.00396453</td>
<td>0.0052913</td>
<td>0.00241058</td>
<td>0.000354037</td>
<td>0.000150636</td>
<td>0.000165784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\|p_h - p\|_0$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$h$</th>
<th>0.518906</th>
<th>0.508882</th>
<th>0.428803</th>
<th>0.14772</th>
<th>0.00996081</th>
<th>0.00250668</th>
<th>0.00233809</th>
<th>0.00233553</th>
<th>0.00233549</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h/2$</td>
<td>2.08765</td>
<td>2.05071</td>
<td>1.75942</td>
<td>0.634266</td>
<td>0.0333947</td>
<td>0.00174514</td>
<td>0.00103762</td>
<td>0.0010428</td>
<td>0.00104429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/4$</td>
<td>6.81056</td>
<td>6.69759</td>
<td>5.786999</td>
<td>2.29837</td>
<td>0.121298</td>
<td>0.00412763</td>
<td>0.000508173</td>
<td>0.000589642</td>
<td>0.000593724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/8$</td>
<td>18.958</td>
<td>18.662</td>
<td>16.3198</td>
<td>7.2397</td>
<td>0.444538</td>
<td>0.0112405</td>
<td>0.00683396</td>
<td>0.000311633</td>
<td>0.000320407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/16$</td>
<td>46.6511</td>
<td>45.9591</td>
<td>40.5935</td>
<td>19.9966</td>
<td>1.57753</td>
<td>0.0317202</td>
<td>0.00178028</td>
<td>0.000174324</td>
<td>0.000165643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\|u_h - u\|_1$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$h/8$</td>
<td>47.4119</td>
<td>46.6843</td>
<td>40.9436</td>
<td>19.3149</td>
<td>10.1231</td>
<td>11.1644</td>
<td>11.4936</td>
<td>11.5145</td>
<td>11.5167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h/16$</td>
<td>57.9763</td>
<td>57.1221</td>
<td>50.5059</td>
<td>25.3683</td>
<td>9.22561</td>
<td>11.1644</td>
<td>11.5037</td>
<td>11.5436</td>
<td>11.5478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5. Velocity field approximations using Nitsche’s method and MINI element with $\gamma = -1$ and $\delta = -1$. Left: $\alpha = 10^3$. Right: $\alpha = 10^{-3}$.

6. Conclusion

In this paper we have studied, both theoretically and numerically, two methods to weakly impose the slip boundary condition for a viscous incompressible fluid, a stabilized formulation of the Lagrange multiplier method and Nitsche’s method. For each method, there are several non-equivalent forms, depending on the values of a finite number of parameters. For the theoretical results, which extend previous results established by Verfürth [33] for the Lagrange multiplier method with a particular choice of the aforementioned parameters, we assume that the physical domain $\Omega$ has a polygonal or polyhedral boundary. Numerical results (in dimension 2) confirm the theoretical results for this category of domains.

For a domain having a smooth curved boundary (a ring), finite element approximations are computed in polygonal approximations $\Omega_h$. Our numerical results indicate that, for both methods, convergence to the exact solutions may hold or not, depending on the finite element approximation spaces and on the values of the aforementioned parameters.
With the stabilized Lagrange multiplier method we recommend to use MINI-$P_0$ or TH-$P_0$ elements with small values of $\alpha$ and most of all with $\gamma = -1$ and $\delta = -1$, but not TH-$P_1$ elements. We also note that the case $\delta = 0$ corresponds to the variant analyzed by Verfürth. Our numerical results (Table 10) seem to contradict Verfürth's theoretical results in the case of TH-$P_1$ elements, except maybe with the value $\alpha = 10^{-1}$ although the convergence rate for the pressure is very low and from these results we cannot see how to recover a theoretically conforming convergence rate unless by taking unreasonably very small values of the element size $h$. The remaining results (Tables 7 and 13) are in agreement with his theoretical results.

Regarding Nitsche's method, MINI element worked well with the unconditionally stable formulation ($\gamma = -1$, $\delta = -1$) but only and surprisingly for moderately large values of $\alpha$, and not at all with the conditionally stable one ($\gamma = 1$, $\delta = -1$). Using TH element gave at best very low convergence rates (for the unconditionally stable formulation with moderate to large values of $\alpha$) and was unsuccessful with the conditionally stable formulation and whatever the value of $\alpha$.

In cases where numerical convergence does not hold, a common feature is observed: velocity approximations almost vanish at the boundary vertices of $\Omega_h$. This is not surprising since we tend to impose the velocity field to be parallel to each side of the polygonal boundary, thus to vanish at the common vertex of each pair of consecutive sides.

Let us note that several numerical remedies have been found and tested in order to circumvent Babuska's paradox in the finite element approximation of the plate equation with simple support boundary conditions. Let us mention, among them, the penalty method with reduced integration [10] and modified boundary conditions [27,10]. Similar remedies for Stokes equations with slip boundary conditions are presently under investigation by the authors of the present work. Finally, let us note that a similar study in three space dimension and associated remedies need to be investigated as well.
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Appendix A

A.1. Assumptions and proof of Proposition 1

For the proof of Proposition 1 and also Theorem 1, we make the following assumptions where $I_h$, $J_h$, and $K_h$ are interpolation operators associated to $V_h$, $Q_h$ and $A_h$ respectively.

(H1) Classical LBB condition for Stokes equations (13): There exists $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{\mathbf{q} \in Q_h} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in V_h} \frac{\int_{\Omega_h} \mathbf{q} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\Omega}{\|\mathbf{q}\|_{0,\Omega_h} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{1,\Omega_h}} > \beta.\]

(H2) There exists $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\|D(\mathbf{v})\|_{0, S = \partial T \cap \Gamma_h} \leq c_2 h_S^{1/2} \|D(\mathbf{v})\|_{0, T}, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in V_h.\]

(H3) There exists $c_3 > 0$ such that

$$\|p\|_{0, S = \partial T \cap \Gamma_h} \leq c_3 h_S^{1/2} \|p\|_{0, T}, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in V_h.\]

(H4) There exists $c_4 > 0$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{v} - I_h(\mathbf{v})\|_{0, S = \partial T \cap \Gamma_h} \leq c_4 h_S^{1/2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{1, T}, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in V_h.\]

(H5) $\|\mathbf{v} - I_h(\mathbf{v})\|_{m, T} \leq c_5 h_T^{1-m}, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in H^m(T), \quad 0 \leq m \leq 2, \quad m \leq l \leq s + 1.$

(H6) $\|\mathbf{v} - I_h(\mathbf{v})\|_{0, S = \partial T \cap \Gamma} \leq c_6 h_T^{1/2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{1, T}, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in H^{1/2}(T), \quad 0 \leq l \leq s.$

(H7) $\|p - J_h(p)\|_{m, T} \leq c_7 h_T^{1-m} \|p\|_{1, T}, \quad \forall p \in H^m(T), \quad 0 \leq m \leq 1, \quad m \leq l \leq s.$

(H8) $\|p - J_h(p)\|_{0, S = \partial T \cap \Gamma} \leq c_8 h_T^{1/2} \|p\|_{1, T}, \quad \forall p \in H^1(T), \quad 1 \leq l \leq s.$

(H9) $\|\lambda - K_h(\lambda)\|_{-1/2, S} \leq c_9 h_T^{1/2} \|\lambda\|_{-1/2, S}, \quad \forall \lambda, \quad H^{1/2}(S), \quad 0 \leq l \leq s.$

(H10) $\|\lambda - K_h(\lambda)\|_{0, S} \leq c_{10} h_T^{1/2} \|\lambda\|_{-1/2, S}, \quad \forall \lambda, \quad H^{1/2}(S), \quad 1 \leq l \leq s.$

In the following, unless specified, $C, C_1, C_2, \ldots$ are generic constants which do not depend on $\alpha$, $\delta$ or $h$. Let $(\mathbf{u}, p, \rho) \in V_h \times Q_h \times A_h$. Using Cauchy–Schwarz and triangular inequalities as well as assumptions (H2) and (H3) we obtain

$$B_{\alpha, h}(\mathbf{u}, p, \rho, (\mathbf{u}, -\gamma p, -\rho)) = a_h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}) + \alpha \|\rho\|^2_{\frac{1}{2}, h, I_h} + \alpha \|\sigma(\mathbf{u}, p)\|_{-\frac{1}{2}, h, I_h}
- \alpha \delta (\rho + \sigma(\mathbf{u}, p), \sigma(\mathbf{u}, -\gamma p))_{-\frac{1}{2}, h, I_h}

\geq 2\mu \|D(\mathbf{u})\|_{0, \Omega_h}^2 + \alpha \|\rho\|^2_{\frac{1}{2}, h, I_h} - \alpha \|\rho\|_{-\frac{1}{2}, h, I_h} C_1(\mu) \|D(\mathbf{u})\|_{0, \Omega_h} + \|p\|_{0, \Omega_h}.$$
In order to control the pressure terms, \( \alpha \) needs again to be sufficiently small. Let’s assume for instance that

\[
\alpha < \frac{1}{\mu C_1}
\]

so that \( \Delta_1 := 2\mu - \alpha C_1 > \mu \). We then obtain

\[
B_{\alpha,h}((\mathbf{u}, p, \rho), (\mathbf{u}, -p, -\rho, \gamma)) \geq \Delta_1 \|D(\mathbf{u})\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2 + \alpha C_1 (\mu^2 \|D(\mathbf{u})\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2 + \|p\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2).
\]

Moreover, from assumption (H1) there exists \( \mathbf{w} \in H^1(\Omega_h) \) such that

\[
\langle \rho, \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\Gamma_h} = \|\rho\|_{1/2, \Gamma_h}^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{w}\|_{1, \Omega_h} = \|\rho\|_{-1/2, \Gamma_h}.
\]

Note that we also have \( \langle \rho, \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\Gamma_h} = b_{r_3} \langle \rho, \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{v} \rangle \). Set \( \mathbf{w}_h = I_h(\mathbf{w}) \). From assumptions (H2)–(H4) we obtain

In order to control the pressure terms, \( \alpha \) needs again to be sufficiently small. Let’s assume for instance that

\[
\alpha < \frac{\beta}{4C_3}
\]

so that \( \Delta_3 = \beta/2 - \alpha C_3 > \beta/4 \). This allows us to obtain

\[
B_{\alpha,h}((\mathbf{u}, p, \rho), (\mathbf{v}, 0, 0)) \geq \Delta_3 \|p\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2 - C_3 \alpha^2 \|\rho\|_{-1/2, \Gamma_h}^2 - C_3 (1 + \alpha^2) \mu^2 \|D(\mathbf{u})\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2.
\]
Choosing $a_3$ sufficiently small, namely $a_3 < \min\{\Delta_1/C_3(1 + m^2)\mu^2, 1/2C_3m\}$ and taking $\alpha < a_3\beta/8C_1$ so that it satisfies $\alpha < a_3\Delta_3/2C_1$, this enables us to obtain

$$B_{\alpha,h}(u, p, \rho, (u + a_3v, -\gamma p, -\rho)) \geq C\left(\|D(u)\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2 + \|\rho\|_{2,\Omega_h}^2 + \|p\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2\right).$$

It follows that

$$B_{\alpha,h}(u, p, \rho, (u + a_3v + a_2wh, -\gamma p, -\rho)) \geq C\left(\|D(u)\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2 + \|\rho\|_{2,\Omega_h}^2 + \|p\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2\right) + a_2\frac{1}{2}\|\rho\|_{-2,\Omega_h}^2 - a_2C_2(1 + \alpha^2)(\|\rho\|_{-2,\Omega_h}^2 + \|p\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2)\cdot$$

Choosing $a_2 > 0$ sufficiently small, we obtain a $(u_1, q_1, \lambda_1) \in V_h \times Q_h \times \Lambda_h$ such that

$$B_{\alpha,h}(u, p, \rho, (v_1, q_1, \lambda_1)) \geq C\left(\|u, p, \rho\|_{h}^2\right)\cdot$$

As by construction we have $\|(v_1, q_1, \lambda_1)\|_{h} \leq C\|(u, p, \rho)\|_{h}$, the desired result is proved.

A.2. Proof of Proposition 2

Let $(u, p) \in V_h \times Q_h$. For both choices of $\delta$, we have

$$D_{\alpha,h}(u, p, (u, -\gamma p)) = a(u, u) + \frac{1}{\alpha}(u \cdot v, u \cdot v)_{1,\Omega_h} - b_{\Gamma}(\sigma(u, p), u) - \delta b_{\Gamma}(\sigma(u, -\gamma p), u)\cdot$$

Using (H2), (H4) and suitable triangular inequalities we deduce from the last inequality that

$$D_{\alpha,h}(u, p, (u, -\gamma p)) \geq 2\mu\|D(u)\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha}\|u \cdot v\|_{2,\Omega_h}^2 - c\|D(u)\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2 - \frac{c\epsilon}{\mu}\|\rho\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2 - \frac{1}{\epsilon}\|u \cdot v\|_{2,\Omega_h}^2\cdot$$

On another hand, by (H1) there exists $v \in [v \in V_h: v|_{\Gamma_h} = 0]$ such that $b_{\Omega}(v, p) \geq \beta\|p\|_{0,\Omega_h}$ and $\|D(v)\|_{0,\Omega_h} \leq \|p\|_{0,\Omega}$. Hence, again using (H2), (H3) and suitable triangular inequalities, we obtain

$$D_{\alpha,h}(u, p, (v, 0)) = a(u, v) + \beta\|p\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2 - b_{\Gamma}(\sigma(v, 0), u)\cdot$$

Let $\omega > 0$. Then

$$D_{\alpha,h}(u, p, (u + \omega v, -\gamma p)) \geq \left(2\mu - c\epsilon - 4\omega\frac{\mu^2}{\beta}\right)\|D(u)\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2 + \left(\frac{\omega\beta}{2} - \frac{c\epsilon}{\mu}\right)\|p\|_{0,\Omega_h}^2\cdot$$

Choosing $\omega, \epsilon$ and then $\alpha$ such that

$$\omega = \frac{\beta}{4\mu}, \epsilon = \inf\left\{\frac{\mu}{C}, \omega\frac{\mu\beta}{2C}\right\} \text{ and } \alpha < \frac{\beta\epsilon}{\beta + \epsilon\omega C}$$

respectively, we obtain

$$D_{\alpha,h}(u, p, (u + \omega v, q)) \geq C_1\|u, p\|_{h}^2 \geq C_2\|u, p\|_{h}^2 \cdot$$

for suitable $C_1, C_2 > 0$. Hence (22).
For the particular case where $\delta = -1$ and $\gamma = -1$, we have
\[
\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,h}(u, p) = a(u, u) + \frac{1}{\alpha} (u \cdot v, u \cdot v)_{1/2, h}^h
\]
\[
= 2\mu \|D(u)\|^2_{0, \Omega} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \|u \cdot v\|^2_{1/2, h}^h,
\]
so that the terms involving $\varepsilon$ in (31) disappear. As a result, by simply choosing $\omega$ such that $\omega < \inf\{\frac{\alpha}{2\mu}, \frac{\mu}{2\alpha}\}$ yields (22) without any condition on $\alpha$ other than $\alpha > 0$.

A.3. Proof of Theorem 2

From stability estimate (22) and consistency property (21), we obtain
\[
\| (u_h, p_h) - (v_h, q_h) \|_h \leq C \sup_{(v_h, q_h) \in V_h \times Q_h} \frac{\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,h}(u_h, p_h) - (v_h, q_h), (w_h, r_h)}{\| (w_h, r_h) \|_h}
\]
\[
\leq C \sup_{(v_h, q_h) \in V_h \times Q_h} \frac{\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,h}(u, p) - (v_h, q_h), (w_h, r_h)}{\| (w_h, r_h) \|_h}
\]
(32)

for all $(v_h, q_h) \in V_h \times Q_h$. From the definition of $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,h}$, applying Korn inequality (5) we obtain
\[
\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,h}(u, p) - (v_h, q_h), (w_h, r_h) \leq \left( \| (u, p) - (v_h, q_h) \|_h + c_1 \| v, D(u - v_h) \|_{[1/2, h]} + c_2 \| p - q_h \|_{[1/2, h]} \right)
\]
\[
\times \left( \| (w_h, r_h) \|_h + c_3 \| v, D(w_h) \|_{[1/2, h]} + c_4 \| r_h \|_{[1/2, h]} \right).
\]
(33)

Using (H2) and (H3) we obtain
\[
\| (w_h, r_h) \|_h + \| v, D(w_h) \|_{[1/2, h]} + \| r_h \|_{[1/2, h]} \leq C \| (w_h, r_h) \|_h.
\]
(34)

On the other hand, using the estimate
\[
\| \phi \|^2_{0,\Omega} \leq C (h_T^{-1} \| \phi \|^2_{0,T} + h_T \| \phi \|^2_{1,T})
\]
(35)

which holds for sufficiently smooth $\phi : \Omega_h \to \mathbb{R}$ (see [30]) we get
\[
\| v, D(u - v_h) \|_{[1/2, h]} + \| p - q_h \|_{[1/2, h]} + \| p - q_h \|_{[1, \Omega_h]}
\]
\[
\leq c \left( \| u - v_h \|_{2, \Omega_h} + h \| u - v_h \|_{2, \Omega_h} + \| p - q_h \|_{0, \Omega_h} + h \| p - q_h \|_{1, \Omega_h} \right)
\]
for sufficiently smooth $u$ and $p$. Hence, combining (32), (33), (34) and (35) we obtain
\[
\| (u_h, p_h) - (v_h, q_h) \|_h \leq C \left( \| (u, p) - (v_h, q_h) \|_h + h \| u - v_h \|_{2, \Omega_h} + h \| p - q_h \|_{1, \Omega_h} \right).
\]

As a result of a triangular inequality and of interpolation properties (H5)-(H8), taking $v_h = \mathcal{I}_h u$ and $q_h = \mathcal{J}_h p$ we obtain
\[
\| (u_h, p_h) - (u, p) \|_h \leq \left( \| (u_h, p_h) - (v_h, q_h) \|_h + \| (u, p) - (v_h, q_h) \|_h \right)
\]
\[
\leq (1 + C) \left( \| (u, p) - (v_h, q_h) \|_h + C h \| u - v_h \|_{2, \Omega_h} + \| p - q_h \|_{1, \Omega_h} \right)
\]
\[
\leq Ch \left( \| u \|_{\ell + 1, \Omega_h} + \| p \|_{\ell, \Omega_h} \right),
\]
for all $0 \leq \ell \leq s$.
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