**Authors’ Replies to Reviewers’ Comments and Requests**

The authors would like to thank the reviewers for their comments and time in reviewing the manuscript. Their suggestions have helped us improve the quality of the manuscript.

**Note:** Reference, figure, equation, and page numbers used below are from the **revised** manuscript unless stated otherwise. Changes to the manuscript are denoted by red text, while green text highlights material from the original manuscript used to address reviewers’ comments.

**Comments from reviewers:**

**Reviewer #1:**

The manuscript presents a double hybrid formulation for two- and three-dimensional elasticity problems. The approximation spaces lead to a uniformly convergent scheme that is independent of the Poisson ratio. The resulting global system is symmetric and positive definite when applied to compressible solids and is a saddle-point problem for incompressible cases. A single mean pressure per element acts as a Lagrange multiplier to impose the incompressibility constraint.

The manuscript is well-written and clear. It also provides a thorough review of related works, highlighting the connection between the proposed formulation and the earlier works of the authors. Detailed convergence studies are presented in Section 6, with the one in Section 6.1 demonstrating the clear superiority of the proposed formulation over the popular Taylor-Hood formulation. Acceptance of the manuscript is recommended, and I have only minor clarification questions.

**Reply**:

Thank you for your positive feedback on the manuscript. Below, we address your comments.

1) The number of degrees of freedom in the global system depends on the number of element faces in a mesh. Thus, a mesh composed of hexahedron elements results in fewer degrees of freedom than one with tetrahedron elements, given the same number of nodes. This is demonstrated in the last problem solved in the paper. Local mesh refinement of hexahedron meshes generally leads to hanging nodes. Is the proposed formulation suitable for discretization with hanging nodes?

**Reply**:

Nathan: Acredito que sim, o que acham?

Giovane: Acho que funciona normal, só tenho dúvidas quanto aos espaços definidos sobre as faces restringidas. Phil?

2) Please check the definition of the L2 space given on page 3: Isn't component v\_1required to be in L2?

**Reply**:

Thank you for noticing that. We corrected the definition of the space.

3) Problem (39) is defined across six approximation spaces. Nonetheless, multiple degrees of freedom can be condensed at the element level. While this can be done in parallel, it is necessary to integrate all matrices and vectors listed in (41) before performing the static condensation to ultimately arrive at (47). Please comment on the overhead associated with these operations. How large must a problem be for the solution of the global system of equations to dominate the cost?

**Reply**:

Estão a fim de responder isso a fundo? Eu não tenho essa informação pronta, teríamos que rodar bastante casos pra ver, mas não me lembro um caso em que a montagem da matriz não dominou o custo computacional.

4) Figure 11 and related discussion: Do the number of dofs used for the plots include the internal and external dofs, or only the external ones?

**Reply**:

For all the convergence analyses, the number of DOFs considered is, in fact, the size of the global system to be solved. Thus, only the external ones are considered.

**Reviewer #2:**

This paper deals with an old problem, the calculation of quasi-incompressible elastic structures, which has been the subject of many works, starting with Herrmann's formulation (1965), and which can now be solved efficiently using FE industrial software

In this paper, which is of interest, is the adaptation of a numerical formulation that the authors have already proposed and developed in several papers to such elasticity problems, where, as in all approaches, pressure is considered as an additional unknown.

In the proposed formulation, called semi-hybrid-mixed formulation, only the normal component of the displacement is continuous, while the continuity of the tangent component is satisfied in a mean sense.

In view of the illustrations, the proposed numerical formulation works, but it seems no better than the classical ones.

**Reply**:

Thank you for the feedback on the manuscript and for mentioning the paper by Leonard R. Herrmann (1965). We added the reference to our manuscript in the Introduction section as follows:

“… Examples of these techniques include: using reduced integration with hourglass control [20, 21], average nodal pressure formulations [22, 23], extended variational principles with mean pressure function [24]...”.

Below we address your comments.

1-The title is too technical -it should be simplified

**Reply**:

Thank you for the suggestion. We changed the title to:

A Primal Double-Hybrid FEM for 3D Compressible and Incompressible Elasticity Using H(div)–L² Spaces

2- Formulation and notations

--index mistake in the definition of H1

-(u,v) :not defined

**Reply**:

Thank you for noticing about the definition of the H1 space, it has been corrected. Also, we included the definition of the L2 product of (u,v).

3-Taylor-Hood elements

Such elements are seen in the paper as a reference, which is highly debatable. They approximate the pressure by very regular functions that are not compatible with non-homogeneous structures. Moreover, in solid mechanics, one does not like to have k' > k - 1 where the pressure ( a stress) is approximated by polynomials of degree k' and the displacement by polynomials of degree k. It is worth noting that the authors ' approach is compatible with this remark.

**Reply**:

Thank you for sharing your view on using Taylor-Hood elements as a reference. Although we have the same opinion regarding their capabilities of approximating pressure/stress in non-homogeneous structures, they still remain one of the most used techniques for solving incompressible elasticity/Stokes equations. We believe that making a parallel between the proposed method and the Taylor-Hood elements could help us to increase the community’s attention to this topic.

O que responder sobre a segunda questão??

4-Hybrid-mixed formulation

-(18):. To say that what's unusual is that the stress is not symmetrical

**Reply**:

Não entendi isso. Ele está dizendo que (18) implica que a tensão é simétrica?

5-Semi-hybrid-mixed formulation

-(28) is a particular equilibrium relation, only the resultant. A comment is needed

-It is not clear whether the proposed method is capable of calculating a symmetrical stress per element.

-The interest of the second hybridization of tangential stresses is not clear. A more detailed comment is needed

**Reply**:

- Não entendi a primeira afirmação.

- Acredito que a resposta seja sim, se posprocessarmos a tensão como o gradiente dos deslocamentos, teríamos uma tensão em L2. Quanto a obter uma tensão simétrica em Hdiv, o Phil precisaria dar uma olhada.

- The purpose of the second hybridization is to mitigate some numerical drawbacks associated to the semi-hybrid formulation, i.e. with a single hybridization of the tangential stresses. After performing a static condensation procedure to eliminate the internal variables of the global system, the semi-hybrid formulation gives rise to a saddle point matrix with two constraints variables, namely one average pressure per element and the tangential stresses over the element faces. This specific structure makes the solving step very challenging, as it is hard to find a permutation that completely eliminates the need for pivoting. Also, we observed some instabilities when applying Neumann boundary conditions on the tangential stresses using a variational method such as the penalization method. Performing a second hybridization, the tangential stresses can also be condensed at element level, so the resulting linear system is reduced to a positive semi-definite block matrix related to the displacements, and a single average pressure per element, which is much more stable and easier to solve. This is detailed in the beginning of Section 5.2.

6-Uniform stretch of a non-homogeneous solid

I don't share completely the authors' comments: it's obvious with two elements that the very classical formulations, in particular those implemented in industrial software, give the exact solution (k=1 for the displacement and k=0 for the pressure, per element). This should be true for all formulations.

It's obvious that Taylor-Hood elements don't work because of their abnormal regularity for pressure for non-homogeneous solids.

**Reply**:

Nathan: Podemos motivar que o outro revisor gostou

Giovane: Não sei o que falar sobre isso, pois pra mim também é muito óbvio esse exemplo haha

7-Extension

Is it easy to extend the proposed formulation to large-displacement elastic problems?

**Reply**:

We appreciate the reviewer’s question. Indeed, extending the proposed formulation to large-displacement problems is part of our future plans. The current framework has been developed with this possibility in mind, and we plan to investigate the necessary modifications—particularly in the kinematic and constitutive modeling—to handle large deformations in upcoming work. Citar trabalho do Joachim e adicionar nas conclusões como future works? Mencionar que, como não aproximamos as tensões, é pra mudar muito pouco?