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Abstract. In this paper, we study least-squares finite element methods (LSFEM) for general second-order elliptic equations with nonconforming finite element approximations. For the potential-flux div LSFEM with Crouzeix-Raviart (CR) element approximation, we present two proofs of the discrete solvability under the condition that mesh size is small enough. A counter-example is given to show that div least-squares functional does not have norm equivalence in the sum space of $H^1$ and CR finite element spaces, and thus it cannot be used as an a posteriori error estimator. Several versions of reliable and efficient error estimators are proposed for the method. We also propose a three-filed potential-flux-intensity div-curl least-squares method with general nonconforming finite element approximations. The norm equivalence in the abstract nonconforming piecewise $H^1$-space is established for the three-filed formulation. The three-filed div-curl nonconforming formulation thus has no restriction on the mesh size and the least-squares functional can be used as the built-in a posteriori error estimator. Under some restrictive conditions, we also discuss a potential-flux div-curl least-squares method.

1. Introduction

The least-squares variational principle and the corresponding least-squares finite element methods based on a first-order system reformulation have been widely used in numerical solutions of partial differential equations, see for example [16, 18, 38, 2, 19, 17, 9, 43, 42, 46]. Compared to the standard variational formulation and the related finite element methods, the first-order system least-squares finite element methods have several known advantages such as the discrete problem is stable without the inf-sup condition of the discrete spaces and the least-squares functional itself is a good built-in a posteriori error estimator.

Since the introduction in the classic 1973 paper of Crouzeix and Raviart [25], the nonconforming finite elements, including the Crouzeix-Raviart (CR) element [6], and various elements introduced in [33, 35, 47, 27] are very useful for numerical computation of many physical problems. In [28], least-squares methods with various nonconforming finite element approximations are introduced for the diffusion problem without the lower order terms. In [28], contradicting to least-squares methods with conforming approximations, the coercivity of the discrete problem needs to be proved independently. For the CR element, the discrete problem is coercive. For some other elements, the assumption that the mesh size is sufficiently small is needed to ensure the coercivity in [28]. The a posteriori error estimator is not discussed in [28].

In this paper, we want to extend the least-squares methods with nonconforming finite element approximations to general second-order elliptic equations. We first review the finite element approximation of the general second-order elliptic equation with least-squares and non-least-squares methods. For general second-order elliptic equations, which may be non-self-adjoint, such as equations with convection and reaction terms, or indefinite, such as Helmholtz equations, we can show the standard div least-squares functional has norm equivalence with the $H(\text{div}) \times H^1$ norm under very mild assumptions, see [10, 4, 7, 11]. Thus, the coercivity of the discrete problem with conforming approximations and the reliability and efficiency of the least-squares a posteriori error estimator follows. On the other hand, for the conforming finite element approximation with the standard non-least-squares variational formulation, the case is more subtle. Under some assumption of the coefficients, the bilinear form of the standard non-least-squares variational formulation can be shown coercive. But this case does not include the genuine indefinite case. For the general case, Schatz’s argument
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should be used to ensure the solvability of the discrete problem with an assumption that the mesh size is sufficiently small.

For the least-squares CR finite element methods for general second-order elliptic equations, we first present a two-field potential-flux div least-squares method, which is a direct generalization of the method suggested in [49] to general second-order elliptic equations. For this method, to ensure the solvability of the discrete problem, we discuss two proofs. The first proof is based on an assumption of the coefficients to ensure the coercivity of the standard non-least-squares variational formulation. The second proof is based on Schatz’s argument only assuming very mild regularities of the original and dual of the elliptic equations. We present an $L^2$-error estimate of the potential-flux div least-square CR method based on Cai-Ku’s paper [15]. The proof also corrects a small error in the original [15] when handling mixed boundary conditions. Both proofs require the mesh size is sufficiently small. The restriction of the mesh size in the first proof is local. The restriction of the mesh size in the second proof is global since the regularity assumption is global. For a posteriori error estimator, we first present a negative result on the norm equivalence of the nonconforming div least-squares functional in the sum space of $H^1$ and CR finite element spaces. Thus, the functional itself cannot be used as a posteriori error directly. We suggest several different a posteriori error estimators for the potential-flux div least-square CR method by adding different terms measuring the nonconforming error. Reliability and efficiency results are proved.

The potential-flux div least-squares CR method does not have the two most important properties of a standard least-squares finite element method: automatic discrete stability without assumption of the mesh size and a built-in a posteriori error estimator with the least-squares functional. To overcome this, we suggest three-field formulations, potential-flux-density div-curl least-squares methods. A curl term of the intensity (gradient of the solution) is added to the least-squares formulation. In this new formulation, we prove norm equivalence for the abstract nonconforming piecewise $H^1$-space. Since the nonconforming space is mesh-dependent, to avoid the coercivity constant depending on the mesh, we use the Helmholtz decomposition. The coercivity of potential-flux-density div-curl least-squares methods is then proved in the same mild assumption as the standard least-squares formulation without any requirement on the mesh size. Since the norm equivalence in the abstract nonconforming piecewise $H^1$-space is true, we automatically have the standard built-in least-squares a posteriori error estimator. The only other ingredient needed of the proof is a discrete Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality in the abstract nonconforming piecewise $H^1$-space. Thus the proof is also true for nonconforming elements introduced in [33, 35, 47, 27, 8].

We also discuss the application and restriction of the original potential-flux div-curl least-squares method [18]. When the domain is nice and the coefficient is sufficiently smooth, the original formulation introduced in [18] can be used in the nonconforming case. The norm equivalence can also be established similarly. But the two-field formulation can cause serious problems when the conditions on the domain and coefficients are not satisfied.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present preliminaries about the abstract and discrete spaces. Properties of the CR space, the Helmholtz decomposition, and the discrete Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality are discussed. Sections from 3 to 6 are about the potential-flux div LSFEM with CR approximation. In Section 3, we introduce the formulation. A discrete coercivity is proved with the assumption of the coefficients ensuring the coercivity of the bilinear form of the original variational problem in Section 4. We present another proof based on Schatz’s argument with an assumption of the regularity of the primal and the adjoint problem. In Section 6, we present a counter-example to show that div least-squares functional does
not have norm equivalence in the sum space of $H^1$ and CR finite element spaces and we propose several versions of reliable and efficient error estimators. We propose the potential-flux-intensity div-curl least-squares method with general nonconforming finite element approximations in Section 7. The norm equivalence in the abstract nonconforming piecewise $H^1$-space is established. Under some restrictive conditions, we also discuss the potential-flux div-curl least-squares method in Section 8. Several concluding remarks are made in Section 9.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Notations and the function spaces. Let $\Omega$ be a bounded, open, connected subset of $\mathbb{R}^d (d = 2$ or $3)$ with a Lipschitz continuous boundary $\partial \Omega$. We partition the boundary of the domain $\Omega$ into two open subsets $\Gamma_D$ and $\Gamma_N$ such that $\partial \Omega = \Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_N$ and $\Gamma_D \cap \Gamma_N = \emptyset$. For simplicity, we assume that $\Gamma_D$ is not empty (i.e., $\operatorname{mes}(\Gamma_D) \neq 0$) and is connected.

We use the standard notations and definitions for the Sobolev spaces $H^s(\Omega)^d$ for $s \geq 0$. The standard associated inner product is denoted by $(\cdot, \cdot)_{s, \Omega}$, and their respective norms are denoted by $\| \cdot \|_{s, \Omega}$ and $\| \cdot \|_{s, \partial \Omega}$. The notation $|\cdot|_{s, \partial \Omega}$ is used for semi-norms. (We suppress the superscript $d$ because the dependence on dimension will be clear by context. We also omit the subscript $\Omega$ from the inner product and norm designation when there is no risk of confusion.) For $s = 0$, $H^s(\Omega)^d$ coincides with $L^2(\Omega)^d$. The symbols $\nabla \cdot$ and $\nabla$ stand for the divergence and gradient operators, respectively. Set $H^1_0(\Omega) := \{ v \in H^1(\Omega) : v = 0$ on $\Gamma_D \}$, $H^2_N(\Omega) := \{ v \in H^2(\Omega) : v = 0$ on $\partial \Omega \}$.

In two dimensions, for a vector-valued function $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2)^t$, define the curl operator by $\nabla \times \tau := \frac{\partial \tau_2}{\partial x_1} - \frac{\partial \tau_1}{\partial x_2}$. For a scalar-valued function $v$, define the operator $\nabla^\perp$ by $\nabla^\perp v = \left( -\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_2}, \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_1} \right)$. In three dimensions, $\nabla \times \tau$ is defined standardly for a vector valued function $\tau$. To unify the notation in both dimensions, we define the vector curl as following. Let $k := 1$ if $d = 2$ and $k := 3$ if $d = 3$. The Curl of a function $v \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is defined by

$$\text{Curl} v := \nabla^\perp v \text{ if } d = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Curl} v := \nabla \times v \text{ if } d = 3.$$  

We use a special font for $v$ that it is a scalar function when $d = 2$ and it is a vector function when $d = 3$. Given a unit normal $n$ we define the tangential component of a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with respect to $n$ by

$$\gamma_t(v) := \begin{cases} v \cdot t & \text{if } d = 2, \quad \text{where } t = (-n_2, n_1) \text{ if } n = (n_1, n_2), \\ v \times n & \text{if } d = 3. \end{cases}$$

We use the following Hilbert spaces

$$H(\text{div}; \Omega) = \{ \tau \in L^2(\Omega)^d : \nabla \cdot \tau \in L^2(\Omega) \} \quad \text{and} \quad H(\text{curl}; \Omega) = \{ \tau \in L^2(\Omega)^d : \nabla \times \tau \in L^2(\Omega) \}$$

equipped with the norms

$$\| \tau \|_{H(\text{div}; \Omega)} := \left( \| \tau \|_{0, \Omega}^2 + \| \nabla \cdot \tau \|_{0, \Omega}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \| \tau \|_{H(\text{curl}; \Omega)} := \left( \| \tau \|_{0, \Omega}^2 + \| \nabla \times \tau \|_{0, \Omega}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

respectively. Denote their subspaces by

$$H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) = \{ \tau \in H(\text{div}; \Omega) : \tau \cdot n|_{\Gamma_N} = 0 \} \quad \text{and} \quad H_D(\text{curl}; \Omega) = \{ \tau \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega) : \gamma_t(\tau)|_{\Gamma_D} = 0 \},$$

where $n$ is the unit vectors outward normal to the boundary $\partial \Omega$.

Let $\mathcal{T} = \{K\}$ be a triangulation of $\Omega$ using simplicial elements. The mesh $\mathcal{T}$ is assumed to be regular. Denote the set of all nodes of the triangulation by

$$\mathcal{N} := \mathcal{N}_{\text{int}} \cup \mathcal{N}_D \cup \mathcal{N}_N,$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{\text{int}}$ is the set of all interior nodes and $\mathcal{N}_D$ and $\mathcal{N}_N$ are the sets of all boundary nodes belonging to the respective $\Gamma_D$ and $\Gamma_N$. Denote the set of all faces (3D) edges (2D) of the triangulation by

$$\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}} \cup \mathcal{E}_D \cup \mathcal{E}_N,$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}$ is the set of all interior element faces/edges and $\mathcal{E}_D$ and $\mathcal{E}_N$ are the sets of all boundary faces/edges belonging to the respective $\Gamma_D$ and $\Gamma_N$. For each $F \in \mathcal{E}$, denote by $h_F$ the diameter of the face/edge $F$. 

denote by \( \mathbf{n}_F \) a unit vector normal to \( F \). When \( F \in \mathcal{E}_D \cup \mathcal{E}_N \), assume that \( \mathbf{n}_F \) is the unit outward normal vector. For each interior face/edge \( F \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}} \), let \( K_F^+ \) and \( K_F^- \) be the two elements sharing the common edge \( F \) such that the unit outward normal vector of \( K_F^- \) coincides with \( \mathbf{n}_F \).

Define jumps and averages over faces/edges by

\[
[v]_F := \begin{cases} v|_F - v|_F^+ & F \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}, \\ \{v\}_F & F \in \mathcal{E}_D \\ 0 & F \in \mathcal{E}_N, \end{cases}
\]

for all \( F \in \mathcal{E} \). A simple calculation leads to the following identity:

\[
(2.3) \quad [uv]_F = \{v\}_F [u]_F + \{u\}_F [v]_F \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}.
\]

Let \( P_k(K) \) be the space of polynomials of degree \( k \) on element \( K \). Denote the Crouzeix-Raviart nonconforming piecewise linear finite element space \([25, 6]\) associated with the triangulation \( \mathcal{T} \) by

\[
V^{cr} = \{ v \in L^2(\Omega) : v|_K \in P_1(K) \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and } \int_F \|v\| ds = 0 \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}} \}
\]

and its subspace by

\[
V^{cr}_D = \{ v \in V^{cr} : \int_F v ds = 0 \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{E}_D \}.
\]

Let

\[
(2.4) \quad W^{1+cr}_D := H^1_D(\Omega) + V^{cr}_D = \{ v = v_1 + v_2 : v_1 \in H^1_D(\Omega), v_2 \in V^{cr}_D \},
\]

and

\[
(2.5) \quad W_D(\mathcal{T}) := \{ v \in L^2(\Omega) : v|_K \in H^1(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and } \int_F \|v\| ds = 0 \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}} \cup \mathcal{E}_D \}.
\]

It is easy to see that

\[
W^{1+cr}_D \subset W_D(\mathcal{T}).
\]

Many other classic nonconforming elements \([33, 35, 47, 27, 8]\) belong to \( W_D(\mathcal{T}) \).

Denote the local lowest order Raviart-Thomas \([48]\) on element \( K \in \mathcal{T} \) by \( RT_0(K) = P_0(K)^d + x P_0(K) \). Then the standard lowest-order \( H(\text{div}; \Omega) \) conforming Raviart-Thomas space is defined by

\[
RT_{0,N} = \{ \tau \in H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) : \tau|_K \in RT_0(K) \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T} \}.
\]

Also, let

\[
P_0 = \{ v \in L^2(\Omega) : v|_K \in P_0(K) \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T} \}.
\]

Denote the first type of local lowest order Nédélec space \([15]\) on element \( K \in \mathcal{T} \) by

\[
N_0(K) := \begin{cases} P_0(K)^2 + (x_2, -x_1)P_0(K) & d = 2, \\ P_0(K)^3 + (0, -x_3, x_2)P_0(K) + (x_3, 0, -x_1)P_0(K) + (-x_2, x_1, 0)P_0(K) & d = 3. \end{cases}
\]

Then the lowest order \( H(\text{curl}; \Omega) \) conforming Nédélec spaces are defined by

\[
N_{0,D} = \{ \tau \in H_D(\text{curl}; \Omega) : \tau|_K \in N_0(K) \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T} \}.
\]

We define the discrete gradient operator as \( (\nabla_h v)|_K := \nabla(v|_K) \), for all \( K \in \mathcal{T} \).

For a fixed \( r > 0 \), denote by \( I_r : H(\text{div}; \Omega) \cap [H^r(\Omega)]^d \rightarrow RT_0 \) the standard \( RT \) interpolation operator. We have the following local approximation property: for \( \tau \in H^{\ell_K}(K), 0 < \ell_K \leq 1 \),

\[
(2.6) \quad \|\tau - I_r \tau\|_{0,K} \leq C h_K^{\ell_K} \|\tau\|_{\ell_K,K} \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T},
\]

\[
(2.7) \quad \|\nabla \cdot (\tau - I_r \tau)\|_{0,K} \leq C h_K^{\ell_K} \|\nabla \cdot \tau\|_{\ell_K,K} \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}.
\]

The estimates in (2.6) and (2.7) are standard for \( \ell_K = 1 \) and can be proved by the average Taylor series developed in \([29]\) and the standard reference element technique with Piola transformation for \( 0 < \ell_K < 1 \). The interpolations and approximation properties are completely local.
Similarly, denote by \( I_n : H(\text{curl} ; \Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_0 \) the standard lowest-order Nédelec interpolation operator. We have the following approximation property: for \( \tau \in H^1(\Omega) \) and \( \nabla \times \tau \in H^1(\Omega)^d \),

\[
\| \tau - I_n \tau \|_0 \leq C h |\tau|_1 \tag{2.8}
\]

\[
\| \nabla \times (\tau - I_n \tau) \|_0 \leq C h_K |\nabla \times \tau|_0. \tag{2.9}
\]

Denote by \( \theta_F(x) \) the nodal basis function of \( V^D_{cr} \) associated with the face \( F \in \mathcal{E} \). For \( v \in L^1(F) \), define \( \Pi_0^F v = (v, 1)_F/|F| \), the average value of \( v \) on \( F \). The local Crouzeix-Raviart interpolant is defined by

\[
I_{cr}^K v = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E} \cap \partial K} (\Pi_0^F v) \theta_F(x) \text{ for } v \in W^{1,1}(K). \tag{2.10}
\]

It was shown (see [30, 10]) that for \( v \in H^{1+\ell_K}(K) \) with \( 0 \leq \ell_K \leq 1 \)

\[
\| v - I_{cr}^K v \|_{0,K} \leq C h_{1+\ell_K}^K |\nabla v|_{\ell_K,K} \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}. \tag{2.10}
\]

### 2.2. General second-order elliptic equation.
Consider the general second-order elliptic equation

\[
-\nabla \cdot (A \nabla u) + Xu = f \quad \text{in } \Omega,
\]

\[
u = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_D,
\]

\[
A \nabla u \cdot n = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_N.
\]

where

\[
Xv := b \cdot \nabla v + cv, \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega). \tag{2.11}
\]

The diffusion coefficient matrix \( A \in L^\infty(\Omega)^{d \times d} \) is a given \( d \times d \) tensor-valued function; \( b \in L^\infty(\Omega)^d \) and \( c \in L^\infty(\Omega) \) are given vector- and scalar-valued functions, respectively; and \( f \in L^2(\Omega) \) is a given scalar function. Assume that \( A \) is uniformly symmetric positive definite: there exist positive constants \( 0 < \Lambda_0 \leq \Lambda_1 \) such that

\[
\Lambda_0 y^T y \leq y^T A y \leq \Lambda_1 y^T y
\]

for all \( y \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and almost all \( x \in \Omega \).

The variational problem of (2.11) is: Find \( u \in H^1_D(\Omega) \), such that,

\[
a(u, v) = (f, v) \quad \forall v \in H^1_D(\Omega), \tag{2.14}
\]

where the bilinear form \( a \) is defined as

\[
a(w, v) := (A \nabla w, \nabla v) + (Xw, v) \quad \text{for } w, v \in H^1_D(\Omega). \tag{2.15}
\]

We also consider the adjoint problem of (2.11),

\[
-\nabla \cdot (A \nabla z) - \nabla \cdot (bz) + cz = g \quad \text{in } \Omega,
\]

\[
z = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_D,
\]

\[
(A \nabla z + b z) \cdot n = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_N. \tag{2.16}
\]

With the help of integrations by parts, it is easy to check that the variational problem of (2.16) is: Find \( z \in H^1_D(\Omega) \), such that,

\[
a(v, z) = (g, v) \quad \forall v \in H^1_D(\Omega). \tag{2.17}
\]

Thus (2.16) is the adjoint problem of (2.11).

In this paper, we assume the following assumption.

**Assumption 2.1.** Assume there exists a unique solution \( u \in H^1_D(\Omega) \) for the problem (2.14).
2.3. First-order system of general second-order elliptic equation. Following the notations of [2], we call the solution \( u \) as potential. Let the flux \( \sigma = -A \nabla u \), we have the following potential-flux first-order system:

\[
\begin{align*}
\nabla \cdot \sigma + Xu &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega \\
A \nabla u + \sigma &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,
\end{align*}
\]

with boundary conditions

\[
u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D \text{ and } \mathbf{n} \cdot \sigma = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_N.
\]

We have \( \sigma \in H_N(\text{div } \Omega) \) and \( u \in H^1_D(\Omega) \).

2.4. Some results for Crouzeix-Raviart elements. Let \( S_{2,D} \subset H^1_D(\Omega) \) be the conforming \( P_2 \) Lagrange finite element space associated with the mesh \( \mathcal{T} \). Define the following enriching operator \( E_h : V^c_D \to S_{2,D} \) by averaging:

\[
(E_h)(z) = \frac{1}{|T_z|} \sum_{K \in T_z} v|_K(z) \quad \forall z \in N_{\text{int}} \cup N_N,
\]

where \( T_z \) is the set of the elements in \( T \) that share \( z \) as a common vertex and \( |T_z| \) is the number of the elements in \( T_z \). We have the following estimate (see (2.27), (2.37), and (2.28) of [4]):

\[
\sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} h_K^{-2} \|v_{cr} - E_h v_{cr}\|_{0,K}^2 \leq C \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}} \frac{1}{h_F} \|v_{cr}\|_{0,F}^2 \quad \forall v_{cr} \in V^c_D,
\]

\[
\|\nabla (v_{cr} - E_h v_{cr})\|_{0,0}^2 \leq C \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}} \frac{1}{h_F} \|v_{cr}\|_{0,F}^2 \quad \forall v_{cr} \in V^c_D,
\]

\[
\|\nabla (E_h v_{cr})\|_{0,0} \leq C \|\nabla v_{cr}\|_{0,0} \quad \forall v_{cr} \in V^c_D.
\]

Although the above estimates are proved in [5] for pure Dirichlet boundary condition only, it is not hard to see they are also true for mixed boundary conditions with a non-empty \( \Gamma_D \).

Following the argument in (2.41) of [5], for \( v_{cr} \in V^c_D \) and \( v \in H^1_D(\Omega) \), we also have

\[
\frac{1}{h_F} \|v_{cr}\|_{0,F}^2 = \frac{1}{h_F} \|v_{cr} - v\|_{0,F}^2 - \Pi_0^F [v_{cr} - v] \|_{0,F}^2 \leq C \|\nabla h(v - v_{cr})\|_{0,K_F}^2 \cup K_F^c.
\]

In other words,

\[
\sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}} \frac{1}{h_F} \|v_{cr}\|_{0,F}^2 \leq C \inf_{v \in H^1_D(\Omega)} \|\nabla h(v - v_{cr})\|_{0}^2 \quad \forall v_{cr} \in V^c_D.
\]

Specifically, let \( v = 0 \) in (2.25),

\[
\sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}} \frac{1}{h_F} \|v_{cr}\|_{0,F}^2 \leq C \|\nabla v_{cr}\|_{0}^2 \quad \forall v_{cr} \in V^c_D.
\]

Choosing \( v = u \), the solution of (2.11), in (2.25), we have

\[
\sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}} \frac{1}{h_F} \|v_{cr}\|_{0,F}^2 \leq C \|\nabla (u - v_{cr})\|_{0}^2 \quad \forall v_{cr} \in V^c_D.
\]

We also have the following equivalence between the function jump and tangential jump of the discrete gradient: For \( F \in \mathcal{E} \) and \( v_{cr} \in V^c_D \), we have

\[
Ch_F \|\gamma_t F(\nabla v_{cr})\|_{0,F}^2 \leq \frac{1}{h_F} \|v_{cr}\|_{0,F}^2 \leq Ch_F \|\gamma_t F(\nabla v_{cr})\|_{0,F}^2.
\]

The equivalence in two dimensions is proved by a direct calculation in [12]. The upper bound in three dimension in proved in Lemma 3.3 of [10]. To show that \( Ch_F \|\nabla v_{cr} \times \mathbf{n}_F\|_{0,F}^2 \leq \frac{1}{h_F} \|v_{cr}\|_{0,F}^2 \) in a discrete setting, we let \( \|v_{cr}\|_{0,F} = 0 \), then \( v_{cr} \) is continuous on \( F \), we get \( \|\nabla v_{cr} \times \mathbf{n}_F\|_{0,F} = 0 \). By the
Thus we have the following discrete version of integration by parts, for a vector-valued function \( v \),

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{F \in T} \int_{F} (\nabla_h v, \tau_{rt}) &= -\int_{\partial T} (\nabla v \cdot \tau, v_{cr})_{\partial T} + \int_{\partial T} (v_{cr}, \tau_{rt})_{\partial T} \\
&= -\int_{\partial T} (v_{cr}, \tau_{rt})_{\partial T} + \sum_{F \in E_{int} \cup E_{D}} \int_{F} (\tau_{rt} \cdot n_{F}, v_{cr})_{F} = -(v_{cr}, \nabla \cdot \tau_{rt}).
\end{align*}
\]

Thus we have the following discrete version of integration by parts, for \( v_{cr} \in V_{D}^{cr} \) and \( \tau_{rt} \in RT_{0,N} \), with the property of the CR elements, we can show

\[
\sum_{T} \int_{F} (\nabla_h v_{cr}, \tau_{rt}) = -\int_{\partial T} (\nabla v_{cr} \cdot \tau, v_{cr})_{\partial T} + \int_{\partial T} (v_{cr}, \tau_{rt})_{\partial T} = -(v_{cr}, \nabla \cdot \tau_{rt}).
\]

Thus we have the following discrete version of integration by parts,

\[
(\nabla_h v_{cr}, \tau_{rt}) + (v_{cr}, \nabla \cdot \tau_{rt}) = 0 \quad \forall v_{cr} \in V_{D}^{cr} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_{rt} \in RT_{0,N}
\]

2.5. Helmholtz Decompositions. For simplicity, we assume both \( \Gamma_D \) and \( \Gamma_N \) are not empty.

The two-dimensional version of the Helmholtz decomposition can be found in [34, 22].

**Lemma 2.2.** For a vector-valued function \( \tau \in L^2(\Omega)^2 \), there exists \( \alpha \in H^1_D(\Omega) \) and \( \beta \in H^1_N(\Omega) \) such that

\[
\tau = A\nabla \alpha + \nabla \times \beta.
\]

We have the following Helmholtz decomposition in three dimensions, see Theorem 2.6 [18] and Theorem 2.1 of [23].

**Lemma 2.3.** Assume that \( \Omega \) is a simply connected, bounded, and open domain in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \). The boundary \( \partial \Omega \) is Lipschitz continuous. Then, for a vector-valued function \( \tau \in L^2(\Omega)^3 \), there exists a unique \( \alpha \in H^1_D(\Omega) \) and a unique \( \beta \in H^1(\Omega)^3 \) with \( \nabla \cdot \beta = 0, \beta \cdot n = 0 \) on \( \Gamma_D \), \( (\nabla \times \beta) \cdot n = 0 \) on \( \Gamma_N \) and \( \beta \times n = 0 \) on \( \Gamma_N \), such that

\[
\tau = A\nabla \alpha + \nabla \times \beta
\]

and

\[
\|\beta\|_1 \leq C\|\nabla \times \beta\|_0.
\]

**Remark 2.4.** A discussion of more complicated multiply-connected domain can also be found in [18], we omit it in this paper for simplicity.

Let

\[
(2.30) \quad Q = \begin{cases} 
H^1_N(\Omega) & d = 2, \\
\{ \beta \in H^1(\Omega)^3 : \nabla \cdot \beta = 0, \beta \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D, (\nabla \times \beta) \cdot n = 0 \text{ and } \beta \times n = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_N \} & d = 3.
\end{cases}
\]

We have the following Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality,

\[
(2.31) \quad \|q\|_0 \leq C\|\text{Curl}q\|_0 \quad \forall q \in Q.
\]

Thus \( \|\text{Curl}q\|_0 \) is a norm on \( Q \).

The following integrations by parts formulas also hold:

\[
(2.32) \quad (\nabla p, \text{Curl}q) = 0 \quad \forall (p, q) \in H^1_D(\Omega) \times Q,
\]

\[
(2.33) \quad (\tau, \text{Curl}q) - (\nabla \times \tau, q) = 0 \quad \forall (\tau, q) \in H_D(\text{curl}; \Omega) \times Q.
\]

The identities in (2.32) and the two-dimensional case in (2.33) are easy to prove. We only give proof of the second identity in three dimensions. First, we have the following integration by parts formula for \( H(\text{curl}) \) functions (see Theorem 3.31 of [44]),

\[
(\nabla \times \tau, q) - (\nabla \times q, \tau) = (\gamma_T(\tau), \gamma_T(q))_{\partial \Omega}, \quad \forall (\tau, q) \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega)^{2},
\]

where \( \gamma_T(q) = (q \times n) \times n. \) Thus, for \( (\tau, q) \in H_D(\text{curl}; \Omega) \times Q, \) we have

\[
(\nabla \times \tau, q) - (\nabla \times q, \tau) = (\gamma_T(\tau), \gamma_T(q))_{\partial \Omega} = (\tau \times n, (q \times n) \times n)_{\partial \Omega} = (\tau \times n, (q \times n) \times n)_{\Gamma_D} + (\tau \times n, (q \times n) \times n)_{\Gamma_N} = 0.
\]

In a summary, we have the following Helmholtz decomposition theorem...
Theorem 2.5. Assuming the conditions of Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 hold, we have: For \( \tau \in L^2(\Omega)^d \), there exists \( \alpha \in H^1_D(\Omega) \) and \( \beta \in \mathbb{Q} \) such that
\[
\tau = \nabla \alpha + \text{Curl} \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \|A^{-1/2}\tau\|_0^2 = \|A^{1/2}\nabla \alpha\|_0^2 + \|A^{-1/2}\text{Curl} \beta\|_0^2.
\]
(2.34)

The identity \( \|A^{-1/2}\tau\|_0^2 = \|A^{1/2}\nabla \alpha\|_0^2 + \|A^{-1/2}\text{Curl} \beta\|_0^2 \) is a simple consequence of the orthogonality relation (2.32).

2.6. Discrete Poincaré-Friedrichs Inequality. The proof of the following discrete Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality can be found in papers [3] [50].

Theorem 2.6. There exists a positive constant \( C \) depending on \( \Omega \) such that
\[
\|v\|_0 \leq C\|\nabla_h v\|_0 \quad v \in W^1_D(\Omega).
\]
(2.35)

With the help of the discrete Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality, we can define the following combined norm for the space \( H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) \times W^1_D(\Omega) \):
\[
\| (\tau, v) \|^2 := \|
abla_h v\|_0^2 + \|\tau\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau\|_0^2 \quad (\tau, v) \in H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) \times W^1_D(\Omega).
\]
(2.36)

3. Potential-Flux Div Least-Squares Methods with Crouzeix-Raviart Elements

In this section, we introduce the potential-flux div least-squares methods for general second-order elliptic equations with Crouzeix-Raviart elements.

For \( (\tau, v) \in H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) \times W^1_D(\Omega) \), define the potential-flux div least-squares functional for (2.1.1) as:
\[
J_h^{\text{div}}(\tau, v; f) := \|A^{1/2}\nabla_h v + A^{-1/2}\tau\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau + X_h v - f\|_0^2,
\]
where
\[
X_h v = b \cdot \nabla_h v + cv.
\]

For \((\chi, w) \in H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) \times W^1_D(\Omega)\) and \( (\tau, v) \in H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) \times W^1_D(\Omega)\), define the following bilinear form \( b_h \):
\[
b_h((\chi, w), (\tau, v)) := (A\nabla_h w + \chi, \nabla_h v + A^{-1}\tau) + (\nabla \chi + X_h w, \nabla \cdot \tau + X_h v).
\]
(3.2)

When \( v \in H^1_D(\Omega) \), we can remove the subscript \( h \) in \( \nabla_h \) of the above definitions and they are the standard potential-flux div least-squares functional and bilinear forms. We clearly have:
\[
J_h^{\text{div}}(\tau, v; 0) = b_h((\tau, v), (\tau, v)) \quad (\tau, v) \in H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) \times W^1_D(\Omega).
\]

The solution \((\sigma, u)\) satisfies the least-squares minimization problem: Find \( (\sigma, u) \in H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) \times H^1_D(\Omega) \) such that
\[
J_h^{\text{div}}(\sigma, u; f) = \inf_{(\tau, v) \in H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) \times H^1_D(\Omega)} J_h^{\text{div}}(\tau, v; f).
\]
(3.3)

Or equivalently a weak problem: Find \( (\sigma, u) \in H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) \times H^1_D(\Omega) \) such that
\[
b_h((\sigma, u), (\tau, v)) = (f, \nabla \cdot \tau + X_h v) \quad \forall (\tau, v) \in H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) \times H^1_D(\Omega).
\]
(3.4)

The following norm equivalence is standard. Different proofs can be found in [10] [7] [8] [38] [41].

Theorem 3.1. Assuming Assumption 2.7 is true, then for all \((\tau, v) \in H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) \times H^1_D(\Omega)\), we have
\[
C_1\| (\tau, v) \|^2 \leq J_h^{\text{div}}(\tau, v; 0) = \|A^{1/2}\nabla v + A^{-1/2}\tau\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau + X_h v\|_0^2 \leq C_2\| (\tau, v) \|^2.
\]
(3.5)

Now consider the potential-flux div least-squares methods with CR approximation: Find \((\sigma_{rt}, u_{cr}) \in RT_{0, N} \times V^c_B\) such that
\[
J_h^{\text{div}}(\sigma_{rt}, u_{cr}; f) = \inf_{(\tau_{rt}, v_{cr}) \in RT_{0, N} \times V^c_B} J_h^{\text{div}}(\tau_{rt}, v_{cr}; f).
\]
(3.6)

Or equivalently: Find \((\sigma_{rt}, u_{cr}) \in RT_{0, N} \times V^c_B\) such that
\[
b_h((\sigma_{rt}, u_{cr}), (\tau_{rt}, v_{cr})) = F_h(\tau_{rt}, v_{cr}), \quad \forall (\tau_{rt}, v_{cr}) \in RT_{0, N} \times V^c_B.
\]
(3.7)

Different from the standard CR finite element method [23] [6], as suggested in [28], we have the error equation for the least-squares method.
Lemma 3.2. Assume that \((\sigma, u) \in H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) \times H^1_N(\Omega)\) is the solution of (3.4) and \((\tau_{rt}, v_{cr}) \in RT_{0,N} \times V^\sigma_D\) is the numerical solution of (3.4). The following error equation is true,
\[
(\sigma - \tau_{rt}, u - u_{cr})(\tau_{rt}, v_{cr}) = 0 \quad \forall (\tau_{rt}, v_{cr}) \in RT_{0,N} \times V^\sigma_D.
\]

Proof. Since \(\sigma\) and \(u\) satisfy the first-order system (2.18) in the \(L^2\) sense, then for any \((\tau_{rt}, v_{cr}) \in RT_{0,N} \times V^\sigma_D\), we have
\[
b_h((\sigma, u), (\tau_{rt}, v_{cr})) = (A\nabla u + \nabla h v_{cr} - A^{-1}\tau_{rt}) + (\nabla \cdot \sigma + Xu, \nabla \cdot \tau_{rt} + X_h v_{cr})
\]
\[
= (f, \nabla \cdot \tau_{rt} + X_h v_{cr}) = b_h((\sigma, u_{cr}), (\tau_{rt}, v_{cr})).
\]
Thus the error equation is proved. \(\square\)


We first present a coercivity result of the potential-flux div CR method in the discrete setting with some assumptions of the coefficients.

Assumption 4.1. Suppose \(b \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)^d\) and \(c \in L^\infty(\Omega)\) satisfy the following assumption: \(c - \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot b \geq 0\) in \(\Omega\) and \(n \cdot b \geq 0\) on \(\Gamma_N\).

This assumption ensures the bilinear form \(a\) defined in (2.15) of the elliptic equation is coercive:
\[
a(v, v) \geq \|A^{1/2} \nabla v\|_D^2 \quad v \in H^1_D(\Omega).
\]

Theorem 4.2. Assuming that the assumption (4.1) is true and the mesh size of \(T\) is small enough, there exists constants \(C_1 > 0\) and \(C_2 > 0\) independent of mesh size, such that
\[
C_1 \|(\tau_{rt}, v_{cr})\|^2 \leq J_{h}^{\text{div}}(\tau_{rt}, v_{cr}; 0) \leq C_2 \|(\tau_{rt}, v_{cr})\|^2 \quad \forall (\tau_{rt}, v_{cr}) \in RT_{0,N} \times V^\sigma_D.
\]

Proof. The upper bound is easy to prove by the triangle and the discrete Poincaré inequalities. Our main task is to prove the coercivity.

Using integration by parts, we can easily derive that
\[
(b \cdot \nabla_h v_{cr}, v_{cr}) = -\frac{1}{2}(\nabla \cdot b, v^2_{cr}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{K \in T} (n \cdot b, v^2_{cr})_{\partial K}.
\]
Then due to fact that \(n \cdot b \geq 0\) on \(\Gamma_N\) and the uniform bound of \(c - \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot b \geq 0\) in \(\Omega\),
\[
-(X_h v_{cr}, v_{cr}) = -(c - \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot b, v^2_{cr}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{K \in T} (n \cdot b, v^2_{cr})_{\partial K} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{K \in T} (n \cdot b, v^2_{cr})_{\partial K}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_{int}} (n \cdot b, [v_{cr}^2])_{F} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_D} (n \cdot b, v^2_{cr})_{F}.
\]
For any \(v_{cr} \in V^\sigma\) and any \(F \in \mathcal{E}_{int}\), by the fact that \(\int_F [v_{cr}] ds = 0\), the mean value of \(v_{cr}\) over \(F\) is single-valued constant, \(\tau_{cr,F} = \Pi^\sigma_0 v_{cr}|_{K^+_F} = \Pi^\sigma_0 v_{cr}|_{K^-_F}\), where \(K^+_F\) and \(K^-_F\) are two elements sharing the common \(F\). We also have \(\tau_{cr,F} = 0\) for \(F \in \mathcal{E}_D\). Then for an \(F \in \mathcal{E}_{int}\), we have
\[
\frac{1}{2} (b \cdot n, [v^2_{cr}])_{F} = (b \cdot n[v_{cr}], [v_{cr}])_{F} \leq |b \cdot n|_{\infty,F}||[v_{cr}],[v_{cr}]||_{F} = |b \cdot n|_{\infty,F}||v_{cr}||_{F} + ||v_{cr}|_{K^+_F} - \tau_{cr,F}||_{0,F} + ||v_{cr}|_{K^-_F} - \tau_{cr,F}||_{0,F}/2.
\]
We have (see e.g. p.110 of [3])
\[
||v_{cr}|_{K^+_F} - \tau_{cr,F}||_{0,F} \leq C h^{1/2}_F \|\nabla v_{cr}\|_{0,K^+_F}.
\]
Combing the above estimate and (2.22), we get
\[
(b \cdot n, [v^2_{cr}])_{F} \leq C_F h_F |b \cdot n|_{\infty,F}||\nabla v_{cr}||^2_{0,K^+_F \cup K^-_F} \quad \text{for } F \in \mathcal{E}_{int},
\]
where $C_F$ only depends on the shape of $K \in K_\Omega \cup K_\Gamma$. Similarly, we have
\[(b \cdot n, v_{cr}^2) \leq C_F h_K |b \cdot n|_{\infty,F} \| \nabla v_{cr} \|_{0,K_F}^2 \quad \text{for } F \in \mathcal{E}_D.\]

Thus, we have
\[(4.2) \quad - (X_h v_{cr}, v_{cr}) \leq C \sum_{K \in T} \left( \sup_{F \in \partial K \cap (\mathcal{E}_n \cup \mathcal{E}_D)} |b \cdot n|_{\infty,F} h_F \right) \| \nabla v_{cr} \|_{0,K}^2.\]

By (2.29), the discrete Poincare inequality, and (4.2),
\[\| A^{1/2} \nabla_h v_{cr} \|_0^2 = (A^{1/2} \nabla_h v_{cr} + A^{-1/2} \tau_{rt}, A^{1/2} \nabla_h v_{cr} + (\nabla \cdot \tau_{rt} + X_h v_{cr}, v_{cr}) - (X_h v_{cr}, v_{cr}) \leq C \| A^{1/2} \nabla_h v_{cr} + A^{-1/2} \tau_{rt} \|_0 \| \nabla_h v_{cr} \|_0 + C \| \nabla \cdot \tau_{rt} + X_h v_{cr} \|_0 \| \nabla_h v_{cr} \|_0 + C_0 \sum_{K \in T} \left( \sup_{F \in \partial K \cap (\mathcal{E}_n \cup \mathcal{E}_D)} |b \cdot n|_{\infty,F} h_F \right) \| \nabla v_{cr} \|_{0,K}^2.\]

where $C_0$ only depends on the shape regularity of the mesh $T$. Choosing the mesh size small enough such that on each element $K$,
\[(4.3) \quad C_0 \sup_{F \in \partial K \cap (\mathcal{E}_n \cup \mathcal{E}_D)} |n_F \cdot b|_{\infty,F} h_F < \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_0 |K|,\]

we have the following bound for a $C > 0$ independent of the mesh size,
\[\| \nabla_h v_{cr} \|_0^2 \leq J_h^{\text{div}}(\tau_{rt}, v_{cr}; 0).\]

An application of the triangle inequality shows that
\[(4.4) \quad C \| \nabla \cdot \tau_{rt} \|_0 \leq \| A^{1/2} \nabla_h v_{cr} + A^{-1/2} \tau_{rt} \|_0 + C \| \nabla_h v_{cr} \|_0\]

and
\[(4.5) \quad C \| \nabla \cdot \tau_{rt} \|_0 \leq \| \nabla \cdot \tau_{rt} + X_h v_{cr} \|_0 + \| X_h v_{cr} \|_0 \leq \| \nabla \cdot \tau_{rt} + X_h v_{cr} \|_0 + C \| \nabla_h v_{cr} \|_0.\]

The lemma is then proved. \(\square\)

**Remark 4.3.** From (4.3), we know that the mesh size needs not be extremely small. It depends on the shape of the element, the coefficient $A$ on the element, and $n_F \cdot b$ on its faces/edges. Also, (4.3) is a local result and is suitable for an adaptively refined non-uniform mesh.

With the coercivity result (4.1), the error equation (3.8), local approximation properties (2.6), (2.7), and (2.10), we immediately have the following priori error estimate.

**Theorem 4.4.** For piecewise constant function $s$ on mesh $T$ with $s_K = s|_K$ satisfying $0 < s_K \leq 1$, assume that $u_K \in H^{1+s_K}(K), \sigma|_K \in H^{s_K}(K)$, and $\nabla \cdot \sigma|_K \in H^{s_K}(K)$, for $K \in T$. We also assume that the assumption (4.1) is true and the mesh size of $T$ is small enough, then the following a priori error estimate is true:

\[(4.7) \quad \| (\sigma - \sigma_{rt}, u - u_{cr}) \| \leq C \left( \inf_{(\tau_{rt}, v_{cr}) \in \mathcal{RT}_{D,N} \times \mathcal{V}_{cr}^D} \| (\sigma - \tau_{rt}, u - v_{cr}) \| \right) \]

\[(4.8) \quad \leq C \sum_{K \in T} h_K^{s_K} (|u|_{1+s_K,K} + |\sigma|_{s_K,K} + |\nabla \cdot \sigma|_{s_K,K}).\]

5. **Discrete Existence and Uniqueness of the Div Method: II. Schatz’s Argument**

In this section, we present a discrete existence and uniqueness proof based on the argument of Schatz [49] without assuming Assumption (4.1) to ensure the coercivity of the bilinear form $a$. Thus, the original variational problem (2.11) can be indefinite. Important cases of indefinite but well-posed elliptic problems include the Helmholtz equation.

In this proof, we only assume the regularity of the primal and adjoint elliptic equations. First, we prove the $L^2$-error estimate of the potential-flux div method, then a Garding-like inequality is proved. With these tools, we can get a priori estimate, then the existence and uniqueness of the discrete problem follow.
5.1. An $L^2$ estimate of the potential-flux div method. In this subsection, we present an $L^2$-error estimate of the potential-flux div least-squares method with CR approximation based on the argument of [15]. We also correct a minor mistake in the original proof of [15].

**Assumption 5.1.** Assume there exist unique solutions $u \in H^1_D(\Omega)$ for problem (2.14) and $z \in H^1_D(\Omega)$ for problem (2.17), and the following $H^{1+s}$ regularity estimates are true:

\begin{align}
\|u\|_{1+s} \leq C\|f\|_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|z\|_{1+s} \leq C\|g\|_0, \quad \text{for some } 0 < s \leq 1.
\end{align}

Introduce a first-order system:

\begin{align}
\begin{cases}
A\nabla w + \gamma &= A\nabla z \quad \text{in } \Omega \\
\nabla \cdot \gamma + Xw &= z \quad \text{in } \Omega,
\end{cases}
\end{align}

with boundary conditions

\begin{align}
w = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D \quad \text{and} \quad n \cdot \gamma = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_N.
\end{align}

**Lemma 5.2.** Let $z$ be the solution of (2.14), and $(\gamma, w)$ be the functions defined in (5.2), we have the following estimates under the Assumption 5.1.

\begin{align}
\|w\|_{1+s} + \|\gamma\|_s + \|\nabla \cdot \gamma\|_s \leq C\|g\|_0.
\end{align}

**Proof.** The first-order system (5.2) can be understood in the PDE form as:

\[-\nabla \cdot (A\nabla w) + b \cdot \nabla w + cw = z - \nabla \cdot (A\nabla z) \quad \text{in } \Omega,
\]

with boundary conditions

\[w = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D \quad \text{and} \quad A\nabla w \cdot n = A\nabla z \cdot n = (b \cdot n)z \text{ on } \Gamma_N.
\]

Note that the boundary condition of $w$ on $\Gamma_N$ is not standard, thus the claim in p.1729 (below (5.7)) of the paper [15] is not accurate. The boundary condition shows that $w$ is not a solution of $w \in H^1_D(\Omega)$ with

\[a(w, v) = (z - \nabla \cdot (A\nabla z), v) \quad \forall v \in H^1_D(\Omega).
\]

We can not use the regularity result of (2.14) directly. To fix this, introduce

\[y = w - z \in H^1_D(\Omega).
\]

Then

\begin{align}
\begin{cases}
A\nabla y + \gamma &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \\
\nabla \cdot \gamma + Xy &= z - Xz \quad \text{in } \Omega,
\end{cases}
\end{align}

Then we have $y \in H^1_D(\Omega)$ satisfying

\[-\nabla \cdot (A\nabla y) + Xy = z - Xz \quad \text{in } \Omega,
\]

with boundary conditions

\[y = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D, \quad A\nabla y \cdot n = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_N.
\]

Or, equivalently,

\[a(y, v) = (z - Xz, v) \quad \forall v \in H^1_D(\Omega).
\]

Then by the regularity assumption (5.1) (first for $y$ then for $z$), we have

\[\|y\|_{1+s} \leq C\|z - \nabla z - cz\|_0 \leq C\|z\|_1 \leq C\|g\|_0.
\]

Now, the following estimate for $w$ is true,

\[\|w\|_{1+s} = \|y + z\|_{1+s} \leq \|y\|_{1+s} + \|z\|_{1+s} \leq C\|g\|_0.
\]

We also have

\[\|\gamma\|_s = \|A\nabla y\|_s \leq C\|g\|_{1+s} \leq C\|g\|_0, \quad \|\nabla \cdot \gamma\|_s = \|z - Xw\|_s \leq C(\|z\|_1 + \|w\|_{1+s}) \leq C\|g\|_0.
\]

This completes the proof of Lemma. \(\square\)
Lemma 5.3. Assume \( h \) is the maximum mesh size of the mesh \( T \). Let \( z \) be the solution of \( (2.11) \), \( u \) be the solution of \( (2.17) \), and \( u_{cr} \) be the solution of \( (5.4) \), then the following inequality holds under the Assumption 5.1:

\[
\sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}^{I} \cup \mathcal{E}^{D}} ((A \nabla z + b z) \cdot n, [u_{cr}])_{F} \leq Ch^{s} \| \nabla h (u - u_{cr}) \|_{0} \| g \|_{0}.
\]

Proof. Let \( \xi = A \nabla z + b z \), then \( \nabla \cdot \xi = cz - g \in L^{2}(\Omega) \), thus \( \xi \in H(\text{div}; \Omega) \). By the regularity assumption on \( z \), we have \( \xi \in H^{s}(\Omega) \). Define \( \xi_{rt0} \) to be \( \xi \)'s interpolation in \( RT_{0} \). We have

\[
\| \xi - \xi_{rt0} \|_{0} \leq Ch^{s} \| \xi \|_{s} \quad \text{and} \quad \| \nabla \cdot \xi - \nabla \cdot \xi_{rt0} \|_{0} \leq \| \nabla \cdot \xi \|_{0} = \| g - cz \|_{0} \leq C \| g \|_{0}.
\]

Summing up on all elements, and use the regularity assumption and the fact \( 0 < s \leq 1 \), we get

\[
\sum_{K} (\| \xi - \xi_{rt0} \|_{0,K} + h_{K} \| \nabla \cdot (\xi - \xi_{rt0}) \|_{0,K}) \leq h^{s} \| g \|_{0}.
\]

By the property of \( ([u_{cr}]_{F})_{F} = 0 \) and the fact \( \xi_{rt0} \cdot n \) is a constant, we have

\[
(\xi_{rt0} \cdot n, [u_{cr}])_{F} = 0 \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{E}^{I} \cup \mathcal{E}^{D}.
\]

By the above result, the trace theorem of Lemma 2.4 and Remark 2.5 of [10], (2.27), and (5.6), we have

\[
\sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}^{I} \cup \mathcal{E}^{D}} (\xi \cdot n, [u_{cr}])_{F} = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}^{I} \cup \mathcal{E}^{D}} ((\xi - \xi_{rt0}) \cdot n, [u_{cr}])_{F}
\]

\[
\leq C \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}^{I} \cup \mathcal{E}^{D}} h_{F}^{-1/2} \| u_{cr} \|_{0,F} (\| \xi - \xi_{rt0} \|_{0,K_{F}^{+} \cup K_{F}^{-}} + h_{K} \| \nabla \cdot (\xi - \xi_{rt0}) \|_{0,K_{F}^{+} \cup K_{F}^{-}})
\]

\[
\leq Ch^{s} \| \nabla h (u - u_{cr}) \|_{0} \| g \|_{0}.
\]

We also have the following approximation property by (2.10), (2.0), (2.17), and (5.4),

\[
\inf_{(\gamma_{h},w_{h}) \in RT_{0,N} \times V_{h}^{D}} \| (\gamma - \gamma_{h}, w - w_{h}) \| \leq Ch^{s} (\| \gamma \|_{s} + \| \nabla \cdot \sigma \|_{s} + \| w \|_{1+s}) \leq Ch^{s} \| g \|_{0}.
\]

Theorem 5.4. Assume \( h \) is the maximum mesh size of the mesh \( T \). Let \( (\sigma,u) \) be the solution of \( (2.18) \) and \( (\sigma_{rt},u_{cr}) \) be the solution of \( (5.7) \), then the following \( L^{2} \)-error estimate holds under the Assumption 5.2:

\[
\| u - u_{cr} \|_{0} \leq Ch^{s} \| (\sigma - \sigma_{rt}, u - u_{cr}) \|.
\]

Proof. Let \( e = u - u_{cr} \in W_{1}^{1+cr} \) and \( E = \sigma - \sigma_{rt} \in H_{N}(\text{div}; \Omega) \). Multiplying both sides of \( (2.16) \) by \( e \) and integrating by parts, we have

\[
(e, g) = -(\nabla \cdot (A \nabla z + b z), e) + (ce, z)
\]

\[
= (A \nabla z + b z, \nabla h e) + (cz, e) - \sum_{K \in T} ((A \nabla z + b z) \cdot n_{\partial K}, e)_{\partial K}
\]

\[
= (A \nabla h e, \nabla z) + (X_{h} e, z) + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}^{I} \cup \mathcal{E}^{D}} ((A \nabla z + b z) \cdot n, [u_{cr}])_{F}.
\]

Using the fact that \( (E, \nabla z) + (\nabla \cdot E, z) = 0 \), the error equation \( (5.8) \), and the approximation property \( (5.8) \), the first two terms can be bounded by the following estimate,

\[
(A \nabla h e, \nabla z) + (X_{h} e, z) = (A \nabla h e + E, \nabla z) + (\nabla \cdot E + X_{h} e, z)
\]

\[
= (A \nabla h e + E, \nabla w + \gamma) + (\nabla \cdot E + X_{h} e, \nabla \cdot \gamma + X w)
\]

\[
= b_{h}(E, e; \gamma, w) = b_{h}(E, e; \gamma - \gamma_{h}, w - w_{h})
\]

\[
\leq \| (E, e) \|_{0} (\gamma - \gamma_{h}, w - w_{h}) \| \leq ch^{s} \| g \|_{0} \| (E, e) \|
\]

Combining with the result of Lemma 5.3, we have the result of the theorem. \( \square \)
5.2. Discrete existence and uniqueness based on Schatz’s argument. We first prove the a discrete Garding-like inequality, then derive a priori error estimate, and show the existence and uniqueness of the discrete potential-flux div CR method by using Schatz’s argument [49].

Lemma 5.5. The following inequality is true for \((\tau_{rt},v_{cr}) \in RT_{0,N} \times V^*_D\):
\begin{equation}
C(\|\tau_{rt},v_{cr}\|)^2 \leq J^\text{dis}_h(\tau_{rt},v_{cr};0) + \|v_{cr}\|_0^2 = b_h((\tau_{rt},v_{cr}),(\tau_{rt},v_{cr}))+ \|v_{cr}\|_0^2.
\end{equation}
Proof. By (2.21) and the discrete Poincare inequality,
\begin{align*}
\|A^{1/2}\nabla v_{cr}\|_0^2 &= (A^{1/2}\nabla v_{cr} + A^{-1/2}\tau_{rt}, A^{1/2}\nabla v_{cr}) + (\nabla \cdot \tau_{rt} + X_h v_{cr}, v_{cr}) - (X_h v_{cr}, v_{cr}) \\
&\leq C(\|A^{1/2}\nabla v_{cr} + A^{-1/2}\tau_{rt}\|_0 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau_{rt} + X_h v_{cr}\|_0)\|\nabla v_{cr}\|_0 + C\|\nabla v_{cr}\|_0 \|v_{cr}\|_0 \\
&\leq C(\|A^{1/2}\nabla v_{cr} + A^{-1/2}\tau_{rt}\|_0 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau_{rt} + X_h v_{cr}\|_0 + \|v_{cr}\|_0)\|A^{1/2}\nabla v_{cr}\|_0.
\end{align*}
Thus,
\begin{equation}
\|\nabla v_{cr}\|_0 \leq C(\|A^{1/2}\nabla v_{cr} + A^{-1/2}\tau_{rt}\|_0 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau_{rt} + X_h v_{cr}\|_0 + \|v_{cr}\|_0).
\end{equation}
The lemma is proved by combining the above result, (4.5), and (4.6). □

Theorem 5.6. Assume the Assumption [5.7] is true. There exists a \(h_0 > 0\), such that when the maximum mesh size \(h\) of \(\mathcal{T}\) is smaller than \(h_0\), the discrete problem of the potential-flux div least-squares CR method (3.4) has a unique solution and we have the following a priori error estimate,
\begin{align}
\|\sigma - \sigma_{rt}, u - u_{cr}\| &\leq C \inf_{(\tau_{rt},v_{cr}) \in RT_{0,N} \times V^*_D} \|\sigma - \sigma_{rt}, u - v_{cr}\| \\
&\leq C \sum_{K \in T} h^*_K |\{u\}|_{1+s_K} + |\sigma|_{s_K} + \|\nabla \cdot \sigma\|_{s_K}.
\end{align}
Proof. Let \(v_{cr}\) be an arbitrary function in \(V^*_D\) and \(\tau_{rt}\) be an arbitrary function in \(RT_{0,N}\). Denote \(e_h = u_{cr} - v_{cr}\) and \(E_h = \sigma_{cr} - \tau_{rt}\). By the result of Lemma 5.5, the error equation (3.4), we have
\begin{align}
\|E_h,e_h\|_2^2 &\leq C(b_h(E_h,e_h;E_h,e_h) + \|e_h\|_0^2) \\
&\leq C(b_h(\sigma - \tau_{rt}, u - v_{cr};E_h,e_h) + \|u - v_{cr}\|_0^2 + \|e\|_0^2) \\
&\leq C(\|\sigma - \tau_{rt}, u - v_{cr}\|\|E_h,e_h\| + \|\sigma - \tau_{rt}, u - v_{cr}\|_2^2 + \|e\|_0^2)
\end{align}
An application of Young’s inequality with \(\epsilon\) shows
\begin{equation}
C(\|E_h,e_h\|_2) \leq \|\sigma - \tau_{rt}, u - v_{cr}\|_2 + \|e\|_0.
\end{equation}
Then by the triangle inequality, (5.12), and the \(L^2\)-error estimates (5.9),
\begin{align}
\|E_h,e_h\|_2 \leq &\|E_h,e_h\|_2 + \|\sigma - \tau_{rt}, u - v_{cr}\|_2 \leq C(\|\sigma - \tau_{rt}, u - v_{cr}\|_2 + \|e\|_0) \\
&\leq C(\|\sigma - \tau_{rt}, u - v_{cr}\| + h^*(E_h,e_h)).
\end{align}
Choosing \(h_0\) small enough, we have
\begin{equation}
\|\sigma - \tau_{rt}, u - v_{cr}\| \leq C \inf_{(\tau_{rt},v_{cr}) \in RT_{0,N} \times V^*_D} \|\sigma - \tau_{rt}, u - v_{cr}\|.
\end{equation}
The other part of the a priori error analysis is from the local approximation properties (2.6), (2.7), and (2.10). The existence and uniqueness of the discrete problem is then a simple consequence of the a priori error estimate. □

Remark 5.7. We present two proofs of the existence and uniqueness of the potential-flux div least-squares CR method (3.4). The first proof is based on Assumption [5.7] ensuring the coercivity of the original variational problem. The restriction on the mesh size in the first proof is local and explicit. But the first proof can not be applied to the indefinite problems. On the other hand, the second proof is based on Assumption [5.7] ensuring the existence, uniqueness, and regularity estimate of the original and adjoint PDEs. It can be applied to more general indefinite cases. The restriction of the second proof is that the regularity assumption is global thus we have to assume the global mesh size \(h\) is small enough. □

6.1. A negative result on norm equivalence. First, we present a negative result on the norm equivalence of the least-squares functional \( \mathcal{J}_h^{\text{div}} \) and the \( \|a(v)\| \)-norm for \( v \in W_D^{1, cr} \) and \( \tau \in H(\text{div}; \Omega) \). For simplicity, we only discuss the simple case that \( A = I, b = 0, c = 0 \).

Lemma 6.1. The following inequality is not true.
\[
C \|a(v)\|^2 \leq \|\nabla_h v + \tau\|_{0,0}^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau\|^2_0 \quad \forall (v, \tau) \in H(\text{div}; \Omega) \times W_D^{1, cr}.
\]

Proof. We present a counterexample in the two-dimensional case only. Let \( 0 \neq w_{cr} \in V_D^{cr} \), but \( w_{cr} \notin H_D^{1}(\Omega) \). For example, we can choose \( w_{cr}(m_F) = 1 \), where \( m_F \) is the mid-point of an interior edge of a fine element mesh and let all other degrees of freedom of \( w_{cr} \) be zero. We have the following Helmholtz decomposition,
\[
\nabla_h w_{cr} = \nabla \alpha + \nabla \perp \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla_h w_{cr}\|_{0,0}^2 = \|\nabla \alpha\|_{0}^2 + \|\nabla \perp \beta\|_{0,0}^2,
\]
with \( \alpha \in H_D^{1}(\Omega) \) and \( \beta \in H_D^{1}(\Omega) \). Since \( 0 \neq w_{cr} \in V_D^{cr} \), but \( w_{cr} \notin H_D^{1}(\Omega) \), we get \( \nabla \perp \beta \neq 0 \).

Let \( v = -\alpha + w_{cr} \in W_D^{1, cr} \) and \( \tau = \nabla_h w_{cr} - \nabla \alpha = -\nabla_h v = \nabla \perp \beta \). Then we have \( \nabla \cdot \tau = \nabla \cdot (\nabla \perp \beta) = 0 \).

Thus, we get
\[
\|\nabla_h v + \tau\|_{0,0}^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau\|^2_0 = 0,
\]
but
\[
\|\nabla_h v\|_{0,0}^2 + \|\tau\|_{0,0}^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau\|^2_0 = 2\|\nabla \perp \beta\|_{0,0}^2 > 0.
\]
We get a contradiction. \( \square \)

6.2. A posteriori error estimates. Lemma 6.1 provides a counterexample that \( \mathcal{J}_h^{\text{div}}(\sigma_{rt}, u_{cr}; f) \) itself cannot be used as a reliable a posteriori error estimator. From the proof of Lemma 6.1, we need to design error estimator by adding the missing part.

Let \( E \) be the enriching operator defined in (2.20). Define
\[
u_c = Eu_{cr} \in S_{2, D}.
\]
We introduce the following six a posteriori error estimators:
\[
\begin{align*}
\eta_1^2 & := \|A^{1/2} \nabla_h (u_{cr} - u_c)\|_0^2 + \mathcal{J}_h^{\text{div}}(\sigma_{rt}, u_{cr}; f), \\
\eta_2^2 & := \|A^{1/2} \nabla_h (u_{cr} - u_c)\|_0^2 + \mathcal{J}_h^{\text{div}}(\sigma_{rt}, u_{cr}; f), \\
\eta_3^2 & := \sum_{F \in E} \frac{1}{h_F} \|u_{cr}\|_{0,F}^2 + \mathcal{J}_h^{\text{div}}(\sigma_{rt}, u_{cr}; f), \\
\eta_4^2 & := \sum_{F \in E} \frac{1}{h_F} \|u_{cr}\|_{0,F}^2 + \mathcal{J}_h^{\text{div}}(\sigma_{rt}, u_{cr}; f), \\
\eta_5^2 & := \sum_{F \in E} h_F \|\gamma_F(u_{cr})\|_{0,F}^2 + \mathcal{J}_h^{\text{div}}(\sigma_{rt}, u_{cr}; f), \\
\eta_6^2 & := \sum_{F \in E} h_F \|\gamma_F(u_{cr})\|_{0,F}^2 + \mathcal{J}_h^{\text{div}}(\sigma_{rt}, u_{cr}; f).
\end{align*}
\]

We have the following reliability and efficiency.

Theorem 6.2. Let \( (\sigma_{rt}, u_{cr}) \in RT_{0, N} \times V_D^{cr} \) be the finite element solution to the problem \( (3.7) \). For \( i = 1, \cdots, 6 \), there exists positive constants \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) such that the following inequalities hold:
\[
C_1 \eta_i^2 \leq \|\sigma - \sigma_{rt}, u - u_{cr}\| \leq C_2 \eta_i.
\]

Proof. Due to the norm equivalence \( (3.35) \) on \( H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) \times H_D^{1}(\Omega) \) and the fact that \( u_c = Eu_{cr} \in S_{2, D} \subset H_D^{1}(\Omega) \), we have
\[
C_1 \|(\sigma - \sigma_{rt}, u - u_c)\|^2 \leq \mathcal{J}_h^{\text{div}}(\sigma_h, u_c; f) = \mathcal{J}_h^{\text{div}}(\sigma - \sigma_{rt}, u - u_c; 0) \leq C_2 \|(\sigma - \sigma_{rt}, u - u_c)\|^2.
\]
Then by the simple triangle inequality,
\[
\|(\sigma - \sigma_{rt}, u - u_{cr})\|^2 \leq \|(\sigma - \sigma_{rt}, u - u_c)\|^2 + C\|A^{1/2}\nabla_h (u_{cr} - u_c)\|_0^2 \leq C\eta_i^2.
\]
The reliability result of \( \eta_1 \) is proved. From (2.22) and (2.25), we have
\[
(6.5) \quad C \| \nabla_h (u_{cr} - u_c) \|_0^2 \leq \sum_{F \in E} \frac{1}{h_F} \| \|u_{cr}\| \|_0^2, F \leq C \| \nabla_h (u_{cr} - u_c) \|_0^2,
\]
(6.6) \quad \sum_{F \in E} \frac{1}{h_F} \| \|u_{cr}\| \|_0^2, F \leq C \| \nabla_h (u - u_{cr}) \|_0^2,
\]
With the triangle inequality and (6.5),
\[
\eta_1^2 = \| A^{1/2} \nabla_h (u_{cr} - u_c) \|_0^2 + J_h^{\text{div}} (\sigma_{rt}, u_c; f) \leq C \| A^{1/2} \nabla_h (u_{cr} - u_c) \|_0^2 + J_h^{\text{div}} (\sigma_{rt}, u_c; f) \leq C \| \sigma - \sigma_{rt}, u - u_{cr} \|_0^2
\]
The efficiency of \( \eta_1 \) is also proved. By the triangle inequality, it is easy to see
\[
\eta_1^2 \leq \eta_2^2 + \| A^{1/2} \nabla_h (u_{cr} - u_c) \|_0^2 \leq 2 \eta_1^2.
\]
Similarly, \( \eta_2^2 \leq 2 \eta_1^2 \). So \( \eta_2 \) is both reliable and efficient. From (6.5), we get that \( \eta_3 \) and \( \eta_4 \) are both reliable and efficient. The reliability and efficiency of \( \eta_5 \) and \( \eta_6 \) can be obtained from (2.28).

Remark 6.3. In this remark, we give some explanations on the terms in the error estimators. The error estimator contains three parts. The major part is the residual, that is, \( \| \nabla \cdot \sigma_{rt} + X_h u_{cr} - f \|_0 \) or \( \| \nabla \cdot \sigma_{rt} + X u - f \|_0 \). The other terms represent the fact that the numerical solutions are not in the right space. As discussed in [21, 22, 23], we have
\[
(6.7) \quad \sigma = -A \nabla u \in H(\text{div}; \Omega), \quad u \in H^1(\Omega), \quad \nabla u \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega).
\]
The result \( \nabla u \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega) \) is obtained from \( u \in H^1(\Omega) \). While numerically,
\[
(6.8) \quad -A \nabla_h u_{cr} \notin H(\text{div}; \Omega), \quad -A \nabla u_c \notin H(\text{div}; \Omega), \quad u_{cr} \notin H^1(\Omega), \quad \nabla_h u_{cr} \notin H(\text{curl}; \Omega).
\]
The terms \( \| A^{-1/2} \sigma_{rt} + A^{1/2} \nabla u_{cr} \|_0 \) and \( \| A^{-1/2} \sigma_{rt} + A^{1/2} \nabla u_c \|_0 \) measure the distance of the numerical flux from \( u_{cr} \) \((A \nabla_h u_{cr}) \) or \( u_c \) \((A \nabla u_c) \) to \( H(\text{div}; \Omega) \) space. The term \( \sum_{F \in E} \frac{1}{h_F} \| \|u_{cr}\| \|_0^2, F \) measures the distance of the numerical solution \( u_{cr} \) to \( H^1(\Omega) \) space. The term \( \sum_{F \in E} h_F \| \gamma_{F} (u_{cr}) \|_0^2, F \) measures the distance of the numerical gradient \( \nabla_h u_{cr} \) to \( H(\text{curl}; \Omega) \) space. Due to that fact that \( \nabla u \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega) \) is actually obtained from \( u \in H^1(\Omega) \) and the equivalence (2.28), we can use either \( \sum_{F \in E} h_F \| \|u_{cr}\| \|_0^2, F \) or \( \sum_{F \in E} h_F \| \gamma_{F} (u_{cr}) \|_0^2, F \) to measure this violation.

From the proof of Lemma 6.1, the curl part of the Helmholtz decomposition (6.2) is not controlled by the div least-squares functional. This part is exactly the so-called nonconforming error. The necessity of measuring the violation that \( u_{cr} \notin H^1(\Omega) \) or \( \nabla_h u_{cr} \notin H(\text{curl}; \Omega) \) is discussed in the literature of a posteriori error estimates of nonconforming finite elements, see [23, 21, 22, 12, 10, 13, 14].

This also gives hints on how to design a least-squares functional which has the norm equivalence on \( W^{1+cr}_D \times H(\text{div}; \Omega) \). An equation related to \( \nabla u \in H(\text{curl}) \) should be added. We will discuss it in the next section.

Remark 6.4. Compared to \( \eta_i \), \( i = 3, \cdots, 6 \), the estimators \( \eta_1 \) and \( \eta_2 \) use the matrix \( A \), thus they will be more robust with respect to the coefficient.

7. Potential–Flux–Intensity Div-Curl LSFEM with Nonconforming Approximation for General Elliptic Equations

Due to the lack of the norm equivalence in the abstract nonconforming piecewise \( H^1 \)-space \( W_D(T) \), the potential-flux div least-squares CR method does not have the automatic discrete stability and a built-in a posteriori error estimator with the least-squares functional. Inspired by the a posteriori error analysis
discussed in the previous section, we propose three-field formulations, potential-flux-density div-curl least-squares methods. A intensity field and its curl equation are added to the least-squares formulation. In this new formulation, we can prove norm equivalence for the abstract nonconforming piecewise $H^1$-space and automatically have the standard built-in least-squares a posteriori error estimator.

7.1. Three-field potential–flux–intensity div-curl first-order system. Following the notation of [2], introduce the intensity $\phi = -\nabla u$. Then we have the following potential–flux–intensity $(u, \sigma, \phi)$ div-curl first-order (redundant) system as seen in Chapter 5 of [2]:

$$
\begin{align*}
\nabla \cdot \sigma + Xu &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega \\
\nabla \phi &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\
A \nabla u + \sigma &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\
A \phi - \sigma &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\
\nabla u + \phi &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,
\end{align*}
$$

(7.1)

with boundary conditions

$$
u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D, \quad \gamma_t(\phi) = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D, \quad \text{and } \quad n \cdot \sigma = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_N. $$

We have the flux $\sigma \in H_N(\text{div}; \Omega)$, the intensity $\phi \in H_D(\text{curl}; \Omega)$, and the potential $u \in H^1_D(\Omega)$.

7.2. Potential–flux–intensity div-curl least-squares method. It is easy to see that only two of the last three equations in (7.1) are independent. Thus, we only need two of them to construct a least-squares functional. We will discuss one case first. All the results can be easily generalized to the other two cases, see subsection 7.3.

To simplify the notations, let

$$
\mathbb{Y} := H_N(\text{div}; \Omega) \times H_D(\text{curl}; \Omega) \times W_D(T),

\| (\tau, \psi, v) \|_\mathbb{Y}^2 := \| \tau \|_{H(\text{div})}^2 + \| \psi \|_{H(\text{curl})}^2 + \| \nabla v \|_0^2.
$$

(7.2)

Define the following least-squares functionals: For $(\tau, \psi, v) \in \mathbb{Y}$,

$$
\mathcal{J}_{h,1}^{\text{div-curl}}(\tau, \psi, v; f) := \| A^{-1/2}(\tau + A \nabla h v) \|_0^2 + \| A^{-1/2} \tau - A^{-1/2} \psi \|_0^2 + \| \nabla \psi \|_0^2 + \| \nabla \cdot \tau + X_h v - f \|_0^2.
$$

Then the potential-flux-intensity div-curl least-squares minimization problem in the abstract space is: Find $(\sigma, \phi, u) \in \mathbb{Y}$, such that,

$$
\mathcal{J}_{h,1}^{\text{div-curl}}(\sigma, \phi, u; f) = \inf_{(\tau, \psi, v) \in \mathbb{Y}} \mathcal{J}_{h,1}^{\text{div-curl}}(\tau, \psi, v; f).
$$

(7.3)

For $(\chi, \eta, w) \in \mathbb{Y}$ and $(\tau, \psi, v) \in \mathbb{Y}$, define the following bilinear forms $c_h$:

$$
c_h((\chi, \eta, w), (\tau, \psi, v)) := (A \nabla h w + \chi, \nabla h v + A^{-1} \tau) + (\chi - A^{-1} \eta, A^{-1} \tau - \psi) + (\nabla \cdot \eta, \nabla \cdot \psi) + (\nabla \cdot \chi + X_h w, \nabla \cdot \tau + X_h v).
$$

(7.4)

Then the least-squares variational problems are: Find $(\sigma, \phi, u) \in \mathbb{Y}$,

$$
c_h((\sigma, \phi, u), (\tau, \psi, v)) = (f, \nabla \cdot \tau + X_h v) \quad \forall (\tau, \psi, v) \in \mathbb{Y}.
$$

(7.5)

It is clear the exact solution is $(\sigma, \phi, u)$. The following continuity is also easy to verify:

$$
c_{h,1}((\chi, \eta, w), (\tau, \psi, v)) \leq C \| (\chi, \eta, w) \|_\mathbb{Y} \| (\tau, \psi, v) \|_\mathbb{Y}.
$$

(7.5)
7.3. Coercivity of potential–flux–intensity div-curl least-squares method. For a regular mesh $\mathcal{T}$ with any mesh size, we want to prove the following norm equivalence under the mild assumption\(^{2.4}\)

\[
A \nabla_h v = A \nabla p + \text{Curl} q \quad \text{and} \quad \|A^{-1/2} \nabla_h v\|_0^2 = \|A^{-1/2} \nabla p\|_0^2 + \|A^{-1/2} \text{Curl} q\|_0^2.
\]

To simplify notations, let

\[
A \nabla_h v = A \nabla p + \text{Curl} q \quad \text{and} \quad \|A^{-1/2} \nabla_h v\|_0^2 = \|A^{-1/2} \nabla p\|_0^2 + \|A^{-1/2} \text{Curl} q\|_0^2.
\]

To simplify notations, let

\[
\|A^{-1/2} \nabla_h v\|_0^2 = \|A^{-1/2} \nabla p\|_0^2 + \|A^{-1/2} \text{Curl} q\|_0^2.
\]

For \((\tau, \psi, p, q) \in Z\), define

\[
L(\tau, \psi, p, q) = \|A^{-1/2}(\tau + A \nabla p + \text{Curl} q)\|_0^2 + \|A^{-1/2} \text{Curl} q\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau + X p + b \cdot A^{-1} \text{Curl} q\|_0^2.
\]

**Lemma 7.1.** Assuming Assumption 2.7 is true, we have the following coercivity:

\[
C\|L(\tau, \psi, p, q)\|_0^2 \leq L(\tau, \psi, p, q) \quad \forall (\tau, \psi, p, q) \in Z.
\]

**Proof.** By the standard coercivity\(^{3.3}\) and the triangle inequality, we have

\[
C\|L(\tau, \psi, p, q)\|_0^2 \leq L(\tau, \psi, p, q) \quad \forall (\tau, \psi, p, q) \in Z.
\]

By (2.32), (2.33), the Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality\(^{2.31}\), Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and the property of the coefficient matrix $A$, we have

\[
\|A^{-1/2} \text{Curl} q\|_0^2 = \|A^{-1/2} \text{Curl} q\|_0^2 \leq \|A^{-1/2} \nabla p\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau + X p + b \cdot A^{-1} \text{Curl} q\|_0^2 + C\|\text{Curl} q\|_0^2.
\]

Thus,

\[
\|\text{Curl} q\|_0^2 \leq C\|\text{Curl} q\|_0^2.
\]

The term $\|\text{Curl} q\|_0^2$ can be bounded by the triangle inequality:

\[
\|\text{Curl} q\|_0^2 \leq C\|A^{-1/2} \nabla p\|_0^2 + C\|\tau\|_0^2.
\]

Combined with the above results and using the fact $\|\nabla \times \psi\|_0$ is a part of $L(\tau, \psi, p, q)$, the lemma is proved.

**Theorem 7.2.** Assuming the conditions of Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 are true, we have the following norm equivalence,

\[
C\|L(\tau, \psi, p, q)\|_0^2 \leq L(\tau, \psi, p, q) \quad \forall (\tau, \psi, p, q) \in Z.
\]
Proof. The upper bound is straightforward with the triangle inequality and the discrete the Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality (2.33).

We will focus on proving the coercivity. By the Helmholtz decomposition (7.7), the result of Lemma 7.1 the triangle inequality, and the nonconforming Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality (2.33).

\[
\|A^{1/2}v_A\|_0^2 + \|\tau\|_{H(\text{div})}^2 + \|\psi\|_{H(\text{curl})}^2 = \|A^{1/2}\nabla p\|_0^2 + \|A^{-1/2}\nabla \times q\|_0^2 + \|\tau\|_{H(\text{div})}^2 + \|\psi\|_{H(\text{curl})}^2 \\
\leq CL(\tau, \psi, p, q) \\
= C(\|A^{-1/2}(\tau + A\nabla p + \nabla \times q)\|_0^2 + \|A^{-1/2}\psi\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \times \psi\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau + Xp + b \cdot A^{-1}\nabla \times q\|_0^2) \\
= C(\|A^{-1/2}(\tau + A\nabla h)\|_0^2 + \|A^{-1/2}\psi\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \times \psi\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau + Xh + c(p - v)\|_0^2) \\
\leq C(\mathcal{J}_{h,1}^{\text{div-curl}}(\tau, \psi, v; 0) + \|p - v\|_0^2) \leq C(\mathcal{J}_{h,1}^{\text{div-curl}}(\tau, \psi, v; 0) + \|p - v\|_0^2) \\
\leq C(\mathcal{J}_{h,1}^{\text{div-curl}}(\tau, \psi, v; 0)) = 0)
\]

By (7.10), we also have

\[
A^{-1/2}\nabla \times q\|_0^2 \leq \|A^{-1/2}\nabla p + A^{-1/2}\nabla \psi\|_0^2 + \|A^{-1/2}\psi\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \times \psi\|_0^2 \leq \mathcal{J}_{h,1}^{\text{div-curl}}(\tau, \psi, v; 0).
\]

The theorem is then proved. \qed

7.4. Potential–flux–intensity div-curl nonconforming least-squares finite element method. Let \( Y_h := RT_{0,h} \times N_{0,h} \times V_{cr} \).

We have \( Y_h \subset Y \). The div-curl nonconforming least-squares finite element method is to find \((\sigma_h, \phi_h, u_h) \in Y_h\), such that,

\[
\mathcal{J}_{h,1}^{\text{div-curl}}(\sigma_h, \phi_h, u_h; f) = \inf_{(\tau_h, \psi_h, v_h) \in Y_h} \mathcal{J}_{h,1}^{\text{div-curl}}(\tau_h, \psi_h, v_h; f),
\]

or equivalently in a weak form: Find \((\sigma_h, \phi_h, u_h) \in Y_h\), such that,

\[
c_h((\sigma_h, \phi_h, u_h), (\tau_h, \psi_h, v_h)) = (f, \nabla \cdot \tau_h + X_h v_h) \quad \forall (\tau_h, \psi_h, v_h) \in Y_h.
\]

It is easy to see we have the error equation

\[
c_h((\sigma - \sigma_h, \phi - \phi_h, u - u_h), (\tau_h, \psi_h, v_h)) = 0 \quad \forall (\tau_h, \psi_h, v_h) \in Y_h,
\]

and thus the following a priori error estimate: Assuming \( u \in H^2(\Omega) \) (thus \( \phi \in H^1(\Omega) \) and we always have \( \nabla \cdot \phi = 0 \), \( \sigma|_K \in H^1(K) \), and \( \nabla \cdot \sigma|_K \in H^1(K) \), for \( K \in T \). Then

\[
\|((\sigma - \sigma_h, \phi - \phi_h, u - u_h))\|_Y \leq C \inf_{(\tau_h, \psi_h, v_h) \in Y_h} \|((\sigma - \tau_h, \phi - \psi_h, v - v_h))\|_Y \\
\leq C\hat{h}(\|u\|_2 + \|\sigma\|_{1,h} + \|\nabla \cdot \sigma\|_{1,h} + \|\phi\|_1),
\]

where \( \|v\|_{1,k}^2 = \sum_{K \in T} \|v\|_{1,K}^2 \).

Remark 7.3. Using the more refined analysis of local interpolation or local quasi-interpolation of the Nédélec elements, see [32, 31], we can also show a local optimal error estimate.

Let \((\sigma_h, \phi, u_h) \in Y_h\) be the numerical solution of (7.12). Define the following a posteriori error estimator:

\[
\zeta^2 := \mathcal{J}_{h,1}^{\text{div-curl}}(\sigma_h, \phi_h, u_h; f).
\]

Due to the norm equivalence (7.11), we have the global reliability and efficiency of \( \zeta \):

\[
C_1 \zeta^2 \leq \|((\sigma - \sigma_h, \phi - \phi_h, u - u_h))\|_Y^2 \leq C_2 \zeta^2.
\]

Remark 7.4. Since \( -\phi \) and \( -A^{-1}\sigma \) are both \( \nabla u \), the term \( X_h v \) in the above definitions of the least-squares functionals can also be replaced by

\[
G_{h,r,s,t}(\psi, \tau, v) := b \cdot (r\nabla_h v - s\psi - tA^{-1}\tau) + cv \quad \forall (\tau, \psi, v) \in Y,
\]

where \( (r, s, t) \in [0, 1]^3 \), and \( r + s + t = 1 \). We can get similar results of norm equivalence and a priori and a posteriori error estimates.
7.5. Two variants of potential–flux–intensity div-curl nonconforming least-squares method. We can also use other combinations in the first-order system (7.1) to define least-squares functionals. Define the following least-squares functionals: For \((\tau, \psi, v) \in \mathcal{Y}\),

\[
\begin{align*}
J_{h,2}(\tau, \psi, v; f) &:= \|A^{1/2}(\nabla h v + \psi)\|_0^2 + \|A^{1/2} \tau - A^{1/2} \psi\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \psi\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau + X_h v - f\|_0^2, \\
J_{h,3}(\tau, \psi, v; f) &:= \|A^{-1/2}(\tau + A\nabla h v)\|_0^2 + \|A^{1/2}(\nabla h v + \psi)\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \psi\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau + X_h v - f\|_0^2.
\end{align*}
\]

We then prove the equivalence of different \(J_{h,i}\). We use the notation \(B \approx D\) to denote there exist constants \(C_1\) and \(C_2\), such that \(C_1 D \leq B \leq C_2 D\).

Lemma 7.5. The following equivalences are true:

\[
J_{h,1}^{\text{div-curl}}(\tau, \psi, v; 0) \approx J_{h,2}(\tau, \psi, v; 0) \approx J_{h,3}(\tau, \psi, v; 0) \quad \forall (\tau, \psi, v) \in \mathcal{Y}.
\]

Proof. By the triangle inequality, we have

\[
\|A^{1/2}(\nabla h v + \psi)\|_0 \leq \|A^{-1/2} \tau + A^{1/2} \nabla h v\|_0 + \|A^{-1/2} \tau - A^{1/2} \psi\|_0.
\]

Thus \(J_{h,2}(\tau, \psi, v; 0) \leq C J_{h,1}^{\text{div-curl}}(\tau, \psi, v; 0)\) is true for all \((\tau, \psi, v) \in \mathcal{Y}\). The other results can be proved by similar arguments.

We thus can define potential–flux–intensity div-curl nonconforming least-squares methods based on functionals \(J_{h,2}^{\text{div-curl}}\) and \(J_{h,3}^{\text{div-curl}}\). Due to the equivalence (7.17), all results of properties related to \(J_{h,1}^{\text{div-curl}}\) can be generalized to methods defined by \(J_{h,2}^{\text{div-curl}}\) or \(J_{h,3}^{\text{div-curl}}\).

8. Potential–Flux Div-Curl LSFEM with Nonconforming Approximation

In this section, we discuss the application and restriction of the original potential-flux div-curl least-squares method [18] in a nonconforming setting. When the domain is nice and the coefficient is sufficiently smooth, the original formulation introduced in [18] can be used in the nonconforming case. But this two-field formulation can cause serious problems when the conditions on the domain and coefficients are not satisfied.

8.1. Potential–flux div-curl first-order system. In the original paper [18], the intensity \(\phi = -\nabla u\) is not introduced as an independent variable, instead, the following first-order system is discussed.

\[
\begin{align*}
\nabla \cdot \sigma + Xu &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\
A \nabla u + \sigma &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\
\nabla \times (A^{-1} \sigma) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,
\end{align*}
\]

with boundary conditions

\[
u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D, \quad \gamma_H(A^{-1} \sigma) = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D, \quad \text{and } \ n \cdot \sigma = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_N.
\]

Let

\[
\Sigma := \{ \tau : \tau \in H_N(\text{div}; \Omega), \ A^{-1} \tau \in H_D(\text{curl}; \Omega) \}
\]

with a norm

\[
\|\tau\|_\Sigma^2 := \|\tau\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \times (A^{-1} \tau)\|_0^2.
\]

Then the exact flux \(\sigma \in \Sigma\).

In this section, we assume the following assumption is true. Detailed discussion on this norm equivalence can be found in [18], see also discussion in Section A.3.1 of [2].

Assumption 8.1. We assume that \(A \in C^{1,1}\) and the domain \(\Omega\) is nice enough to guarantee that \(\Sigma\) is algebraically and topologically included in \(H^1(\Omega)^d\), that is, the following norm equivalence holds:

\[
C_1 \|\tau\|_1 \leq \|\tau\|_\Sigma \leq C_2 \|\tau\|_1 \quad \forall \tau \in \Sigma.
\]

Here, the domain is nice enough means one of the following is true (Theorem A.8 of [2]):

- \(\partial \Omega\) is of class \(C^{1,1}\),
- \(\partial \Omega\) is piecewise smooth with no reentrant corners for \(d = 2\),
- \(\Omega\) is a convex polyhedron for \(d = 3\).
Theorem 8.4.\ We then have the following a priori error estimate as the classic div-curl LSFEM problem (Theorem 3.1 of \[8.4\])
\[\|A^{-1/2}\tau + A^{1/2}\nabla_h v\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau + X_h v - f\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \times (A^{-1}\tau)\|_0^2 \quad \forall (\tau, v) \in \Sigma \times W_D(T).\]
Then the potential-flux div-curl least-squares minimization problem in the abstract space is: Find \((\sigma, u) \in \Sigma \times W_D(T),\) such that,
\[\mathcal{G}_h(\sigma, u; f) = \inf_{(\tau, v) \in \Sigma \times W_D(T)} \mathcal{G}_h(\tau, v; f).\]
For \((\chi, w) \in \Sigma \times W_D(T)\) and \((\tau, v) \in \Sigma \times W_D(T),\) define the following bilinear forms \(d_h:\)
\[d_h((\chi, w), (\tau, v)) := (A\nabla_h w + \chi, \nabla_h v + A^{-1}\tau) + (\nabla \times (A^{-1}\chi), \nabla \times (A^{-1}\tau)) + (\nabla \cdot \chi + X_h v, \nabla \cdot \tau + X_h v).\]
Then the potential-flux div-curl least-squares variational problems is: Find \((\sigma, u) \in \Sigma \times W_D(T),\)
\[d_h((\sigma, u), (\tau, v)) = (f, \nabla \cdot \tau + X_h v) \quad \forall (\tau, v) \in \Sigma \times W_D(T).\]
We use almost the same argument of potential-flux-curl least-squares method to prove the coercivity of \(\mathcal{G}_h(\tau, v; 0).\) We assume the same Helmholtz decomposition \((7.7)\) holds. Let \(T := \Sigma \times H_D^1(\Omega) \times \mathbb{Q}\) and \(\|(\tau, p, q)\|_T^2 := \|\tau\|_{L_2}^2 + \|\nabla p\|_0^2 + \|\text{Curl} q\|_0^2.\)
For \((\tau, p, q) \in T,\) define
\[M(\tau, p, q) := \|A^{-1/2}(\tau + A\nabla p + \text{Curl} q)\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \times (A^{-1}\tau)\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \cdot \tau + X_h p + b \cdot \text{Curl} q\|_0^2.\]
Lemma 8.2. Assuming Assumption \(2.7\) is true, we have the following coercivity:
\[C\|(\tau, p, q)\|_T^2 \leq M(\tau, p, q) \quad \forall (\tau, p, q) \in T.\]
Proof. By \((2.32), (2.33),\) the Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality \((2.31),\) the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and the property of the coefficient matrix \(A,\) we have
\[
\|A^{-1/2}\text{Curl} q\|_0^2 = (A^{-1}\text{Curl} q + \nabla p + A^{-1}\tau, \text{Curl} q) - (A^{-1}\tau, \text{Curl} q) \\
= (A^{-1}\text{Curl} q + \nabla p + A^{-1}\tau, \text{Curl} q) + (\nabla \times (A^{-1}\tau), q) \\
\leq C\|A^{-1/2}\text{Curl} q + A^{1/2}\nabla p + A^{-1/2}\tau\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \times (A^{-1}\tau)\|_0^2\|A^{-1/2}\text{Curl} q\|_0.
\]
Then, we get \(C\|\text{Curl} q\|_0^2 \leq \|A^{-1/2}\text{Curl} q + A^{1/2}\nabla p + A^{-1/2}\tau\|_0^2 + \|\nabla \times (A^{-1}\tau)\|_0.\) Thus, \(\|\text{Curl} q\|_0^2 \leq CM(\tau, p, q).\) By \((7.7),\) the lemma is then proved.\(\Box\)

The following theorem can be easily proved by using the same argument as Theorem \(7.2.\)

Theorem 8.3. Assuming the conditions of Lemmas \(2.4\) and \(2.5\) are true, we have the following norm equivalence,
\[C_1(\|\tau\|_{L_2}^2 + \|\nabla_h v\|_0^2) \leq \mathcal{G}_h(\tau, v; 0) \leq C_2(\|\tau\|_{L_2}^2 + \|\nabla_h v\|_0^2) \quad \forall (\tau, v) \in \Sigma \times W_D(T).\]

With Assumption \(8.1,\) we can use standard \(H^1\)-conforming finite element to approximate \(\sigma.\) For simplicity, we use linear finite element space. Define \(\Sigma_h = \{\tau \in C^0(\Omega)^d : \tau|_K \in P_1(K)^d \quad \forall K \in T, \tau \in \Sigma\}.\)
Then the potential-flux div-curl nonconforming finite element approximation of \((8.4)\) or \((8.5)\) is: Find \((\sigma_h, u_h) \in \Sigma_h \times X_D^r,\)
\[d_h((\sigma_h, u_h), (\tau_h, v_h)) = (f, \nabla \cdot \tau + X_h v) \quad \forall (\tau_h, v_h) \in \Sigma_h \times X_D^r.\]
We then have the following a priori error estimate as the classic div-curl LSFEM problem (Theorem 3.1 of \(18)):\n
Theorem 8.4. Assume \(u \in H^{1+\alpha}(\Omega)\) and \(\sigma \in H^{1+\alpha}(\Omega)^d\) and let \((\sigma_h, u_h) \in \Sigma_h \times V_D^r\) be the numerical solution of \((8.8).\) Then
\[\|\sigma - \sigma_h\|_1 + \|\nabla_h (u - u_h)\|_0 \leq Ch^\alpha(\|u\|_{1+\alpha} + \|\sigma\|_{1+\alpha}).\]
Define the following a posteriori error estimator:

\[ \xi^2 := \mathcal{G}_h(\sigma_h, u_h; f), \]

where \((\sigma_h, u_h) \in \Sigma_h \times V_h^\sigma\) is the numerical solution of \(S.8\). Due to the norm equivalence \(S.7\), we immediately have the global reliability and efficiency of \(\xi\):

\[ C_1 \xi \leq \|\sigma - \sigma_h\|_1 + \|\nabla_h(u - u_h)\|_0 \leq C_2 \xi. \]

### 8.3. Restrictions of the potential–flux div-curl least-squares formulation

We discuss the reactions of the potential–flux div-curl least-squares formulation due to the violation of Assumption \(S.1\). The first restriction is about the domain even when \(A = C^{1,1}\), for example, \(A = I\). We have the following famous negative result \([2]\) that when \(d = 3\), \({\tau \in H(\text{div}; \Omega): \tau \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega} \cap H^1(\Omega)^3\) and \({\tau \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega): \tau \times \mathbf{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega} \cap H^1(\Omega)^3\) are closed, infinite-codimensional subspaces of \({\tau \in H(\text{div}; \Omega): \tau \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega} \cap H(\text{curl}; \Omega)\) and \({\tau \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega): \tau \times \mathbf{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega} \cap H(\text{div}; \Omega)\), respectively. For such cases, \(H^1\)-conforming finite elements can not be used to approximate the flux, see detailed discussion in Section B.2.2 of \([2]\).

The second restriction is about the possible discontinuity of coefficient \(A\). As discussed in \([21, 22, 20, 11]\), for exact solution, we have

\[ \sigma = -A\nabla u \in H(\text{div}; \Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla u \in H(\text{curl}; \Omega). \]

But, for a discontinuous \(A\), we also have

\[ \sigma = -A\nabla u \notin H^1(\Omega)^d. \]

Thus for a discontinuous \(A\), \(\Sigma_h\) or any \(H^1\)-conforming finite element space is a wrong approximation space for \(\sigma\). The error estimator \(S.9\) will never be zero even the numerical solution \(u_h = u\) is exact, see examples given at \([11]\).

In conclusion, the potential–flux div-curl least-squares formulation should be used very carefully for both the conforming and nonconforming cases.

### 9. Concluding Remarks

We present two least-squares formulations for the general second-order elliptic equations with nonconforming finite element approximation. One is the two-field potential-flux div formulation and the other is the three-field potential-flux-intensity div-curl formulation. For the two-field div formulation, the CR least-squares method does not have the norm equivalence in the abstract setting, thus does not have automatic discrete coercivity and built-in a posteriori error estimates. The three-field formulation recovers the norm equivalence in the abstract setting and all the good properties of the least-squares method. Furthermore, examining the proof carefully, it is easy to find that the three-field potential-flux-intensity div-curl formulation has the potential to be generalized to other non-traditional nonconforming least-squares approximation, for example, the multiscale finite elements \([37, 36]\) and the immersed finite elements \([40]\).
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