

Results in Applied Mathematics

A bilinear partially penalized immersed finite element method for elliptic interface problems with multi-domains and triple-junction points

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	RINAM-D-19-00194R2
Full Title:	A bilinear partially penalized immersed finite element method for elliptic interface problems with multi-domains and triple-junction points
Article Type:	SI: CCMA2019
Keywords:	interface problems, multi-domain, triple junction, partially penalized, immersed finite element method
Corresponding Author:	Xu Zhang UNITED STATES
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Yuan Chen
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Yuan Chen Songming Hou Xu Zhang
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Abstract:	In this article, we introduce a new partially penalized immersed finite element method (IFEM) for solving elliptic interface problems with multi-domains and triple junction points. We construct new IFE functions on elements intersected with multiple interfaces or with triple-junction points to accommodate interface jump conditions. For non-homogeneous flux jump, we enrich the local approximating spaces by adding up to three local flux basis functions. Numerical experiments are carried out to show that both the Lagrange interpolations and the partial penalized IFEM solutions converge optimally in L^2 and H^1 norms.
Suggested Reviewers:	Ruchi Guo Ohio State University guo.1778@osu.edu Xiaoming He Missouri University of Science and Technology hex@mst.edu Qiao Zhuang Virginia Tech qzhuang@math.vt.edu
Opposed Reviewers:	
Additional Information:	
Question	Response
Please enter the Word Count of your manuscript	2000

A Bilinear Partially Penalized Immersed Finite Element Method for Elliptic Interface Problems with Multi-Domains and Triple-Junction Points

Yuan Chen¹, Songming Hou², Xu Zhang³

Abstract

In this article, we introduce a new partially penalized immersed finite element method (IFEM) for solving elliptic interface problems with multi-domains and triple-junction points. We construct new IFE functions on elements intersected with multiple interfaces or with triple-junction points to accommodate interface jump conditions. For non-homogeneous flux jump, we enrich the local approximating spaces by adding up to three local flux basis functions. Numerical experiments are carried out to show that both the Lagrange interpolations and the partial penalized IFEM solutions converge optimally in L^2 and H^1 norms.

Keywords: interface problems, multi-domain, triple junction, partially penalized, immersed finite element method

1. Introduction

Elliptic interface problems have received wide attention in the past decades. Numerous numerical methods have been developed to generate accurate and effective approximations for interface problems. Conventional numerical methods, such as the finite element method [1], require the mesh to be aligned with the interface. Another class of numerical methods uses unfitted meshes for solving interface problems. In the finite difference framework, since the pioneering working of immersed boundary method [2], the immersed interface method [3], matched interface and boundary method [4], cut-cell method [7] have been developed. In the finite element framework, there have been penalty finite element method [9], generalized finite element method [10], extended finite element

¹Department of Statistics, The George Washington University, Washington, DC 20052, USA (yuan.chen@gwu.edu).

²Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, LA 71272, USA (shou@latech.edu). This author is partially supported by the Walter Koss Professorship fund made available through Louisiana Board of Regents.

³Department of Mathematics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078, USA (xzhang@okstate.edu). This author is partially supported by National Science Foundation Grant DMS-1720425

method [11], cut finite element method [5], and immersed finite element method [8], to name only a few.

The immersed finite element method (IFEM) [8, 12, 13, 14, 16, 29] is a class of finite element methods that modify the approximation functions, instead of solution meshes, locally around the interface in order to resolve the interface with unfitted mesh. An IFEM adopts standard finite element basis functions on elements away from interfaces but constructs new piecewise-polynomial basis functions on elements cut through by interfaces. In [17], a partially penalized immersed finite element method (PPIFEM) was developed by adding consistency terms and penalty terms to the classical Galerkin formulation on the interface edges. The method is proved to converge optimally in the energy norm [17] and L^2 norm [18]. Moreover, the PPIFEM was extended to handle non-homogenous flux jump conditions in [19]. Gradient recovery for PPIFEM was reported in [20].

Most numerical methods aim at interface problems with two sub-domains. There are a few literatures concerning multi-domain interface problems with possibly a triple-junction point. In [21], the matched interface and boundary method has been developed on multi-domain. In [22], the authors employed a Petrov-Galerkin type method [23] to solve multi-domain interface problems. Related research papers include [24, 25]. As for IFEM for multi-domain interface problems with triple junction, we developed a piecewise linear IFEM on triangular meshes [26]. One of the challenges is the construction of IFEM basis functions due to the complicated geometrical configuration of a multi-domain. We showed that the stiffness matrix is symmetric positive definite and the numerical solutions are reasonably accurate. As indicated in [17] for two-domain interface problems, we also observed that the convergence rates in L^2 and H^1 norms deteriorate as the mesh size becomes small.

In this paper, we develop a new IFEM for solving multi-domain interface problems with non-homogeneous flux jump. We use interface-unfitted rectangular Cartesian meshes, and construct the piecewise bilinear shape functions on multi-interface elements. The PPIFEM is used for enhanced accuracy and stability. Non-homogeneous flux jump conditions are handled by enriching the local approximation spaces, inspired by [15] and [19]. It is worthwhile to note that in our new construction on multi-interface elements, the number of restrictions (from nodal-value conditions and interface jump conditions) and degrees of freedom match for all types of interface elements. Therefore, the least-squares approximation is unnecessary for obtaining IFE basis functions as the piecewise-linear IFE spaces in [26]. Our numerical results indicate that the bilinear PPIFEM for multi-domain interface problems converge optimally in H^1 , L^2 and L^∞ norms without deterioration even for fine meshes. Besides, the new method outperforms the classical linear IFEM [26] in the accuracy around interfaces.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the multi-domain interface problems and recall some preliminary results. In Section 3, bilinear IFE basis functions and flux jump basis functions are constructed on different types of interface elements. Local and global IFE spaces are defined

accordingly. In Section 4, we present the PPIFEM for multi-domain interface problems with the non-homogeneous flux jump. In Section 5, numerical examples are provided to show the features of our new method. A brief conclusion is presented in Section 6.

2. Interface Problems

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be an open bounded domain. Assume that Ω is subdivided by several interfaces into multiple domains. Without loss of generality, we assume Ω is divided by three interfaces $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3$ into three sub-domains $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3$. We also assume that the boundaries $\partial\Omega_1, \partial\Omega_2, \partial\Omega_3$ are Lipschitz continuous. See Figure 1 for an illustration of the geometric setting of the domain and interfaces.




Figure 1: A typical triple-domain domain

Consider the following elliptic interface problem:

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla \cdot (\beta \nabla u) &= f, \quad \text{in } \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup \Omega_3, \\ u &= g, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

The coefficient function $\beta(\mathbf{x})$ is assumed to be discontinuous across each interface Γ_i where $\mathbf{x} = (x, y)$. For simplicity, we assume that $\beta(\mathbf{x})$ is a piecewise constant function such that

$$\beta(\mathbf{x}) = \beta_i, \quad \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega_i, \tag{2.2}$$

where $\beta_i > 0$. Across each interface Γ_i , the solution u is assumed to be continuous, i.e.,

$$[u]_{\Gamma_i} = 0, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, 3. \tag{2.3}$$

The normal flux jumps are prescribed as follows:

$$\begin{cases} [\beta \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}]_{\Gamma_1} \triangleq (\beta_3 \nabla u_3 - \beta_2 \nabla u_2) \cdot \mathbf{n}_1 = b_1(x, y) & \text{on } \Gamma_1, \\ [\beta \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}]_{\Gamma_2} \triangleq (\beta_1 \nabla u_1 - \beta_3 \nabla u_3) \cdot \mathbf{n}_2 = b_2(x, y) & \text{on } \Gamma_2, \\ [\beta \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}]_{\Gamma_3} \triangleq (\beta_2 \nabla u_2 - \beta_1 \nabla u_1) \cdot \mathbf{n}_3 = b_3(x, y) & \text{on } \Gamma_3. \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

Here, $u_i = u|_{\Omega_i}$, and b_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, are given functions defined on Γ_i . Unit normal vectors of Γ_1 , Γ_2 , Γ_3 are denoted by \mathbf{n}_1 , \mathbf{n}_2 , \mathbf{n}_3 , respectively. For simplicity, we also use $g_i = g|_{\partial\Omega_i \cap \partial\Omega}$ from now on.

We use the standard notations for the Sobolev spaces. Define the broken Sobolev space

$$\tilde{H}^2(\Omega) = \left\{ v \in H^1(\Omega) : v|_{\Omega_i} \in H^2(\Omega_i), \quad [\beta \nabla v \cdot \mathbf{n}]_{\Gamma_i} = b_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \right\},$$

equipped with the semi-norm and norm:

$$|u|_{\tilde{H}^2(\Omega)} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 |u|_{H^2(\Omega_i)}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad \|u\|_{\tilde{H}^2(\Omega)} = \left(\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + |u|_{\tilde{H}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

The variational form of (2.1)-(2.4) is to find $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ such that $u = g$ on $\partial\Omega$ and

$$a(u, v) := (\beta \nabla u, \nabla v) = (f, v) - \sum_{i=1}^3 (b_i, v)_{\Gamma_i}, \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega) \quad (2.5)$$

where $(\cdot, \cdot)_\omega$ is the L^2 inner product on $\omega \subseteq \Omega$. The subscript ω is omitted when $\omega = \Omega$.

For elliptic interface problems, the following regularity result holds [6]:

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, $g \in H^{3/2}(\partial\Omega_i \cap \partial\Omega)$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then the problem (2.1) - (2.4) has a unique solution $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ such that for some constant $C > 0$,*

$$\|u\|_{\tilde{H}^2(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \|b_i\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma_i)} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \|g_i\|_{H^{3/2}(\partial\Omega_i \cap \partial\Omega)} \right). \quad (2.6)$$

3. Construction of Triple-Junction Bilinear IFE Spaces

In this section, we construct the bilinear IFE space on interface elements with multiple interfaces. The construction of classical bilinear IFE functions with one interface is reported in [27, 28].

3.1. Element Classification

Let \mathcal{T}_h be an interface-independent Cartesian mesh of Ω where h denotes the mesh size. We classify all rectangular elements according to the number of interfaces intersecting the interior of an element. If the interior of an element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ is not intersected with any interface Γ_i , then the element T is called a non-interface (or a regular) element. The collection of all regular elements are denoted by \mathcal{T}_h^n . If the interior of an element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ is cut through by at least one interface Γ_i , then the element T is called an interface element. The collection of these elements is denoted by \mathcal{T}_h^i . For multi-interface problems, we assume that the interface elements satisfy the following hypotheses:




Figure 2: Left: a typical triple-domain domain and Cartesian mesh. Right: a zoom-in of the region around triple point.

- (H1) Multiple interfaces can only intersect with an element at no more than three edges.
- (H2) Each edge of an interface element can only intersect with interfaces at no more than two points unless the edge is part of the interface.

These hypotheses rule out the case that interfaces intersect an element at three points but on the same edge. Furthermore, we distinguish the collection of interface elements \mathcal{T}_h^i by three sub-categories based on the number of interfaces inside an element. For a triple-domain interface problem stated above, there are at most three interfaces inside an element. The set $\mathcal{T}_{h,1}^i$ contains elements intersected with only one interface. The set $\mathcal{T}_{h,2}^i$ includes all elements intersecting two interfaces (see Figure 3 for an illustration). The set $\mathcal{T}_{h,3}^i$ contain the elements intersecting with all three interfaces and hence the triple-junction points must be inside these elements (see Figure 4 for an illustration).




Figure 3: Two typical elements in $\mathcal{T}_{h,2}^i$




Figure 4: Two typical elements in $\mathcal{T}_{h,3}^i$

Now all elements in a Cartesian mesh must be in one of the following classes.

$$\mathcal{T}_h = \mathcal{T}_h^n \cup \mathcal{T}_h^i = \mathcal{T}_h^n \cup \mathcal{T}_{h,1}^i \cup \mathcal{T}_{h,2}^i \cup \mathcal{T}_{h,3}^i. \quad (3.1)$$

Figure 2 illustrates the above classification of elements by color. Elements in white denote regular elements. Elements in green denote an interface touches one of the nodes of the element or overlaps with an edge of the element. Elements in both of these two colors represent elements in \mathcal{T}_h^n . Elements marked in red, orange, and blue represent elements in $\mathcal{T}_{h,1}^i$, $\mathcal{T}_{h,2}^i$, and $\mathcal{T}_{h,3}^i$, respectively.

Remark 3.1. *If the triple-junction point is on an edge of some element (see the right plot of Figure 3), we count this element in $\mathcal{T}_{h,2}^i$.*

3.2. Local IFE spaces on $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^n$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h,1}^i$

On a non-interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^n$, we adopt the standard bilinear (\mathbb{Q}_1) nodal basis functions. The local finite element space on T is

$$S_h(T) = \text{span}\{1, x, y, xy\}.$$

If an element $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h,1}^i$, then T intersects with only one interface at two different points at two edges. We refer the readers to the construction of the classical bilinear IFE basis functions in [27, 28]. For the non-homogeneous flux jump, the local space is enlarged by adding one more basis function that vanishes at all nodes, continuous over the element, but with a unit flux jump. For more details, we refer readers to [15]. Our main focus is to construct the local approximating spaces on elements in $\mathcal{T}_{h,2}^i$ and $\mathcal{T}_{h,3}^i$.

3.3. Local IFE spaces on $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h,2}^i$

In this case, there are two interfaces inside an element $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h,2}^i$. As shown in Figure 3, the triple-junction point is disjoint of the interior of the element (left plot of Figure 3) or lie on the edge of the element (right plot of Figure 3). Let the curved interfaces be approximated by the line segments Γ_s , Γ_t , and they split the element T into three polygons, denoted by T_a , T_b , T_c . The

intersection points are denoted by Γ_s^1 , Γ_s^2 , Γ_t^1 , and Γ_t^2 . See Figure 3 for the geometrical configuration.

We define four piecewise bilinear basis functions on an element as follows

$$\phi_{i,T}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \phi_{i,T}^a(\mathbf{x}) = a_1 + b_1x + c_1y + d_1xy, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_a, \\ \phi_{i,T}^b(\mathbf{x}) = a_2 + b_2x + c_2y + d_2xy, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_b, \\ \phi_{i,T}^c(\mathbf{x}) = a_3 + b_3x + c_3y + d_3xy, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_c. \end{cases} \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4. \quad (3.2)$$

The following nodal-value conditions and the interface jump conditions are used to determine the coefficients a_j , b_j , c_j , and d_j , ($j = 1, 2, 3$):

- four nodal-value conditions

$$\phi_{i,T}(A_j) = \delta_{ij}, \quad \forall i, j = 1, 2, 3, 4. \quad (3.3)$$

- six continuity conditions of the basis functions

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{i,T}^a(\Gamma_s^1) &= \phi_{i,T}^b(\Gamma_s^1), \quad \phi_{i,T}^a(\Gamma_s^2) = \phi_{i,T}^b(\Gamma_s^2), \quad d_1 = d_2, \\ \phi_{i,T}^b(\Gamma_t^1) &= \phi_{i,T}^c(\Gamma_t^1), \quad \phi_{i,T}^b(\Gamma_t^2) = \phi_{i,T}^c(\Gamma_t^2), \quad d_2 = d_3. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

- two conditions of normal flux continuity

$$\int_{\Gamma_s \cap T} [\beta \nabla \phi_{i,T} \cdot \mathbf{n}]_{\Gamma_s} ds = 0, \quad \int_{\Gamma_t \cap T} [\beta \nabla \phi_{i,T} \cdot \mathbf{n}]_{\Gamma_t} ds = 0. \quad (3.5)$$

The twelve conditions in (3.3) - (3.5) are used to determine the twelve coefficients a_i , b_i , c_i , and d_i , with $i = 1, 2, 3$ in a bilinear IFE local basis function $\phi_{i,T}$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. The left plot of Figure 5 exemplifies a typical bilinear IFE basis function on $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h,2}^i$. The local bilinear IFE space is defined as $S_h(T) = \text{span}\{\phi_{i,T} : i = 1, 2, 3, 4\}$.




Figure 5: Basis function(left) and flux jump function(right) of elements in $\mathcal{T}_{h,2}^i$

To accommodate the non-homogeneous jump of flux (2.4), we enrich the local IFE space by adding two local functions $\phi_{T,J}^k$, $k = 1, 2$. These flux basis

functions are also defined as piecewise bilinear polynomials

$$\phi_{T,J}^k(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \phi_{T,J}^{k,a}(\mathbf{x}) = a_1 + b_1x + c_1y + d_1xy, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_a, \\ \phi_{T,J}^{k,b}(\mathbf{x}) = a_2 + b_2x + c_2y + d_2xy, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_b, \\ \phi_{T,J}^{k,c}(\mathbf{x}) = a_3 + b_3x + c_3y + d_3xy, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_c. \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

The flux jump basis functions $\phi_{T,J}^s$ and $\phi_{T,J}^t$ satisfy the following conditions

- They vanish at four nodes A_j of the element T :

$$\phi_{T,J}^k(A_j) = 0, \quad \forall j = 1, 2, 3, 4, \quad k = s, t. \quad (3.7)$$

- They are continuous across the endpoints of interfaces $\Gamma_i \cap T$:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{T,J}^{k,a}(\Gamma_s^1) &= \phi_{T,J}^{k,b}(\Gamma_s^1), \quad \phi_{T,J}^{k,a}(\Gamma_s^2) = \phi_{T,J}^{k,b}(\Gamma_s^2), \quad d_1 = d_2, \\ \phi_{T,J}^{k,a}(\Gamma_t^1) &= \phi_{T,J}^{k,b}(\Gamma_t^1), \quad \phi_{T,J}^{k,a}(\Gamma_t^2) = \phi_{T,J}^{k,b}(\Gamma_t^2), \quad d_2 = d_3. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

- They have a unit flux jump on the corresponding interfaces.

$$\int_{\Gamma_{k'} \cap T} [\beta \nabla \phi_{T,J}^k \cdot \mathbf{n}]_{\Gamma_{k'}} ds = \delta_{kk'}, \quad \forall k' = s, t. \quad (3.9)$$

A flux basis function of this type is shown in the right plot of Figure 5. The local flux IFE space $S_h^J(T) = \text{span}\{\phi_{T,J}^s, \phi_{T,J}^t\}$ and the enriched local IFE space on T is $\tilde{S}_h(T) = S_h(T) \cup S_h^J(T)$. The Lagrange type interpolation $\mathcal{I}_{h,T} : \tilde{H}^2(T) \rightarrow \tilde{S}_h(T)$ is as follows

$$\mathcal{I}_{h,T} u(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^3 u(A_i) \phi_{i,T}(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{k=s,t} q_T^k \phi_{T,J}^k(\mathbf{x}), \quad (3.10)$$

where

$$q_T^k = \int_{\Gamma_k \cap T} [\beta \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}]_{\Gamma_k} ds. \quad (3.11)$$

3.4. Local IFE spaces on $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h,3}^i$

In this case, an element $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h,3}^i$ intersects all three interfaces at three points. In general, the triple-junction point, denoted by P , is inside this element. See Figure 4 for an illustration.

We use the line approximations of the curved interfaces by Γ_1 , Γ_2 , Γ_3 , which split the whole rectangle into three polygons, denoted by T_a , T_b , T_c (see figure 4). The intersection points with each interface Γ_1 , Γ_2 , Γ_3 are denoted by Γ_1^0 , Γ_2^0 , and Γ_3^0 , respectively.

Piecewise bilinear IFE basis functions are constructed on the element T as follows

$$\phi_{i,T}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \phi_{i,T}^a(\mathbf{x}) = a_1 + b_1x + c_1y + d_1xy, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_a, \\ \phi_{i,T}^b(\mathbf{x}) = a_2 + b_2x + c_2y + d_2xy, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_b, \\ \phi_{i,T}^c(\mathbf{x}) = a_3 + b_3x + c_3y + d_3xy, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_c. \end{cases} \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4. \quad (3.12)$$

As before, the twelve coefficients are determined by

- four-nodal value conditions

$$\phi_{i,T}(A_j) = \delta_{ij}, \quad \forall i, j = 1, 2, 3, 4. \quad (3.13)$$

- five continuity conditions of the basis functions

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{i,T}^b(\Gamma_1^0) &= \phi_{i,T}^c(\Gamma_1^0), \quad \phi_{i,T}^a(\Gamma_2^0) = \phi_{i,T}^b(\Gamma_2^0), \quad \phi_{i,T}^a(\Gamma_3^0) = \phi_{i,T}^c(\Gamma_3^0), \\ \phi_{i,T}^a(P) &= \phi_{i,T}^b(P), \quad \phi_{i,T}^b(P) = \phi_{i,T}^c(P). \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

- three conditions of normal flux continuity

$$\int_{\Gamma_k \cap T} [\beta \nabla \phi_{i,T} \cdot \mathbf{n}]_{\Gamma_k} ds = 0, \quad k = 1, 2, 3. \quad (3.15)$$

A typical bilinear IFE basis function is plotted in the left plot of Figure 6. The local bilinear IFE space is defined as $S_h(T) = \text{span}\{\phi_{i,T} : i = 1, 2, 3, 4\}$.




Figure 6: A bilinear IFE local basis function(left) and a flux basis function (right) of elements in $\mathcal{T}_{h,3}^i$

For non-homogeneous jump of flux (2.4), we enrich the local IFE space by adding three local functions $\phi_{T,J}^k$, $k = 1, 2, 3$ as follows

$$\phi_{T,J}^k(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \phi_{T,J}^{k,a}(\mathbf{x}) = a_1 + b_1x + c_1y + d_1xy, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_a, \\ \phi_{T,J}^{k,b}(\mathbf{x}) = a_2 + b_2x + c_2y + d_2xy, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_b, \\ \phi_{T,J}^{k,c}(\mathbf{x}) = a_3 + b_3x + c_3y + d_3xy, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_c. \end{cases} \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \quad (3.16)$$

such that for $k = 1, 2, 3$ the following conditions hold

- vanishing at four nodes A_j of the element T :

$$\phi_{T,J}^k(A_j) = 0, \quad \forall j = 1, 2, 3, 4. \quad (3.17)$$

- continuous across the endpoints of interfaces $\Gamma_i \cap T$:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{T,J}^{k,b}(\Gamma_1^0) &= \phi_{T,J}^{k,c}(\Gamma_1^0), \quad \phi_{T,J}^{k,a}(\Gamma_2^0) = \phi_{T,J}^{k,b}(\Gamma_2^0), \quad \phi_{T,J}^{k,a}(\Gamma_3^0) = \phi_{T,J}^{k,c}(\Gamma_3^0), \\ \phi_{T,J}^{k,a}(P) &= \phi_{T,J}^{k,b}(P), \quad \phi_{T,J}^{k,b}(P) = \phi_{T,J}^{k,c}(P). \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

- unit flux jump condition:

$$\int_{\Gamma_j \cap T} [\beta \nabla \phi_{T,J}^k \cdot \mathbf{n}]_{\Gamma_j} ds = \delta_{kj}, \quad \forall j = 1, 2, 3. \quad (3.19)$$

A flux basis function of this type is shown in the right plot of Figure 6. The local flux space is defined by $S_h^J(T) = \text{span}\{\phi_{T,J}^1, \phi_{T,J}^2, \phi_{T,J}^3\}$. As before, the enriched local IFE space on T is $\tilde{S}_h(T) = S_h(T) \cup S_h^J(T)$. The Lagrange type interpolation $\mathcal{I}_{h,T} : \tilde{H}^2(T) \rightarrow \tilde{S}_h(T)$ is as follows

$$\mathcal{I}_{h,T} u(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^4 u(A_i) \phi_{i,T}(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{k=1}^3 q_T^k \phi_{T,J}^k(\mathbf{x}), \quad (3.20)$$

where arguments q_T^k , $k = 1, 2, 3$, are integrations of flux jump along the interface, i.e.,

$$q_T^k = \int_{\Gamma_k \cap T} [\beta \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}]_{\Gamma_k} ds. \quad (3.21)$$

Remark 3.2. On an element $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h,2}^i$, the bilinear IFE basis functions degenerate to standard bilinear IFE basis functions in [28] when an interface moves out of the element. This can be proved following the same idea in [29].

Remark 3.3. Compared with the linear IFE basis functions of the triple-junction element in [26], the bilinear IFE basis functions and flux basis functions on rectangular element ensure the nodal value conditions precisely. Inside the triple-junction element, the continuity is guaranteed at the intersection points and triple junction point.

3.5. Global bilinear IFE space

Now we define the global bilinear IFE space and flux IFE space. Let \mathcal{N}_h be the collection of all interior nodes of the mesh \mathcal{T}_h . Associated with each node $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{N}_h$, we define a global bilinear IFE function Φ_i such that

- (i) $\Phi_i(x_j) = \delta_{ij}$, $\forall i, j \in \mathcal{N}_h$.
- (ii) $\Phi_i|_T \in S_h(T)$, $\forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

where $S_h(T)$ is the local IFE space defined in previous subsections. Correspondingly, the global bilinear IFE space is defined as

$$S_h(\Omega) = \text{span}\{\Phi_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{N}_h|\}.$$

For each local flux basis $\phi_{T,J}^k$, a zero-extension to the whole domain will yield the corresponding global flux basis function $\Phi_{T,J}^k$:

$$\Phi_{T,J}^k(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \phi_{T,J}^k(\mathbf{x}), & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T, \\ 0, & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \notin T. \end{cases} \quad (3.22)$$

Here, the value k depends on the type of interface element. In particular, $k = 1$ if $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h,1}^i$, $k = 1, 2$ if $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h,2}^i$, and $k = 1, 2, 3$ if $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h,3}^i$. The flux jump IFE space is defined as

$$S_h^J(\Omega) = \text{span}\{\Phi_{T,J}^k : \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i\},$$

and the enriched global bilinear IFE space is $\tilde{S}_h(\Omega) = S_h(\Omega) \cup S_h^J(\Omega)$.

The Lagrange interpolation operator $\mathcal{I}_h : \tilde{H}^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \tilde{S}_h$ is

$$\mathcal{I}_h u(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_h} u(\mathbf{x}_j) \Phi_j(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i} \sum_{k=1}^{d_k} q_T^k \Phi_{T,J}^k(\mathbf{x}), \quad (3.23)$$

where $d_k = 1$ for $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h,2}^i$, $d_k = 2$ for $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h,2}^i$, and $d_k = 3$ for $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h,3}^i$. The value of q_T^k is given in (3.11) and (3.21).

4. PPIFEM for Triple-Junction Interface Problems

Let \mathcal{E}_h be the collection of edges on the mesh \mathcal{T}_h . Let $\mathring{\mathcal{E}}_h$ and \mathcal{E}_h^b be the set interior edges and boundary edges, respectively. If an edge $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$ intersects with the interface, we call it an interface edge, otherwise, it is called a non-interface edge. Denote by \mathcal{E}_h^i and \mathcal{E}_h^n the set of interface edges and non-interface edges, respectively.

For any interior edge $e \in \mathring{\mathcal{E}}_h$, we denote the two elements sharing the edge e by $T_{e,1}$ and $T_{e,2}$. For a function u defined on $T_{e,1} \cup T_{e,2}$, we define the average and jump of u across the edge e respectively by

$$\{\!\{u\}\!\}_e = \frac{1}{2}((u|_{T_{e,1}})|_e + (u|_{T_{e,2}})_e), \quad [\![u]\!]_e = (u|_{T_{e,1}})|_e - (u|_{T_{e,2}})_e.$$

For $e \in \mathcal{E}_h^b$, we define $\{\!\{u\}\!\}_e = [\![u]\!]_e = u|_e$.

The bilinear IFE approximation is to find $\tilde{u}_h \in \tilde{S}_h(\Omega)$ in the following form

$$\tilde{u}_h = u_h + u_h^J \triangleq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_h} u_j \Phi_j + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i} \sum_{k=1}^3 q_T^k \Phi_{T,J}^k, \quad (4.1)$$

where $u_h \in S_h$ is the unknown function, and $u_h^J \in S_h^J$ can be explicitly constructed. We use the PPIFEM [17] for solving the nonhomogeneous flux triple-junction interface problem: Find $u_h \in S_h$ such that

$$a_h(u_h, v_h) = (f, v_h) - a_h(u_h^J, v_h) + \sum_{i=1}^3 (b_i, v_h)_{\Gamma_i}, \quad \forall v_h \in S_h. \quad (4.2)$$

where the bilinear form

$$\begin{aligned} a_h(u_h, v_h) &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \beta \nabla v_h \cdot \nabla u_h d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \int_e \{\!\{ \beta \nabla u_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_e \}\!\} [\![v_h]\!] ds \\ &\quad + \epsilon \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \int_e \{\!\{ \beta \nabla v_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_e \}\!\} [\![u_h]\!] ds + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \int_e \frac{\sigma_e}{|e|} [\![v_h]\!] [\![u_h]\!] ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Here, ϵ has the following choices. When $\epsilon = -1$, the scheme is called symmetric PPIFEM. When $\epsilon = 0, 1$, the scheme is called incomplete PPIFEM and nonsymmetric PPIFEM, respectively. The stability parameter $\sigma_e > 0$.

5. Numerical Examples

In this section, we test our new bilinear approximation in two numerical examples. The numerical experiments are carried out on Cartesian meshes with $N \times N$ rectangular elements, starting from $N = 16$. We consider the following three norms of the numerical solution:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_h - u\|_{L^\infty} &= \max_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{N}_h} |u_h(x,y) - u(x,y)|, \\ \|u_h - u\|_{L^2} &= \int_{\Omega} |u_h(x,y) - u(x,y)|^2 dx dy, \\ \|u_h - u\|_{H^1} &= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_h(x,y) - \nabla u(x,y)|^2 dx dy, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{N}_h denotes the set of all nodes in the mesh \mathcal{T}_h . To avoid redundancy, we only report errors of symmetric PPIFEM, since the results from the nonsymmetric and incomplete PPIFEM are similar.

5.1. Example 1 (straight-line interface)

In this example, we consider a square domain $\Omega = (-1, 1)^2$ separated by three straight-line interfaces. The interfaces are defined through the following level set functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_1(x,y) &= \frac{38}{7}x + y - \frac{9}{28}, \\ \varphi_2(x,y) &= 5.25x + y - 0.3125, \\ \varphi_3(x,y) &= \frac{1}{19}x + y - \frac{1}{19}. \end{aligned}$$

The exact solution of this problem is set to be

$$\begin{aligned} u_1(x, y) &= \frac{1}{\beta_1} \sin\left[\left(\frac{1}{19}x + y - \frac{1}{19}\right)(5.25x + y - 0.3125)\right], \\ u_2(x, y) &= \frac{1}{\beta_2} \sin\left[\left(\frac{1}{19}x + y - \frac{1}{19}\right)\left(\frac{38}{7}x + y - \frac{9}{28}\right)\right], \\ u_3(x, y) &= \frac{1}{\beta_3} \sin\left[\left(\frac{38}{7}x + y - \frac{9}{28}\right)(5.25x + y - 0.3125)/10\right]. \end{aligned}$$

The geometry of the interface and the element classifications are displayed in the left plot of Figure 7.




Figure 7: Geometry of the interface and element classification for Example 1 (left) and Example 2 (right)

We first consider the case with a moderate jump $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) = (10, 1, 100)$. Interpolation errors in L^2 , and semi- H^1 norms are reported in Table 1. The errors and convergence rates of the PPIFEM solutions are reported in Table 2. It can be observed that both the interpolations and PPIFEM solutions converge with optimal rates in all three norms. For comparison, we also include the numerical results of Galerkin bilinear IFEM solutions without partial penalty in Table 3. Convergence in the L^∞ norm is not optimal.

N	$\ \mathcal{I}_h u - u\ _{L^2}$	order	$ \mathcal{I}_h u - u _{H^1}$	order
16	3.05×10^{-2}		6.05×10^{-1}	
32	7.71×10^{-3}	1.98	3.02×10^{-1}	1.00
64	1.93×10^{-3}	2.00	1.51×10^{-1}	1.00
128	4.84×10^{-4}	2.00	7.52×10^{-2}	1.00
256	1.21×10^{-4}	2.00	3.76×10^{-2}	1.00
512	3.02×10^{-5}	2.00	1.88×10^{-2}	1.00

Table 1: Interpolation errors and convergences of Example 1 with coefficients (10,1,100)

N	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^\infty}$	order	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^2}$	order	$ u_h - u _{H^1}$	order
16	2.70×10^{-2}		2.81×10^{-2}		6.05×10^{-1}	
32	6.92×10^{-3}	1.96	7.10×10^{-3}	1.98	3.02×10^{-1}	1.00
64	1.75×10^{-3}	1.99	1.78×10^{-3}	2.00	1.51×10^{-1}	1.00
128	4.38×10^{-4}	2.00	4.45×10^{-4}	2.00	7.52×10^{-2}	1.00
256	1.09×10^{-4}	2.00	1.11×10^{-4}	2.00	3.76×10^{-2}	1.00
512	2.74×10^{-5}	2.00	2.78×10^{-5}	2.00	1.88×10^{-2}	1.00

Table 2: PPIFEM errors in Example 1 with coefficients (10,1,100)

N	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^\infty}$	order	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^2}$	order	$ u_h - u _{H^1}$	order
16	2.79×10^{-2}		2.83×10^{-2}		6.08×10^{-1}	
32	8.28×10^{-3}	1.75	7.16×10^{-3}	1.98	3.04×10^{-1}	1.00
64	2.44×10^{-3}	1.76	1.78×10^{-3}	2.00	1.51×10^{-1}	1.01
128	7.61×10^{-4}	1.68	4.46×10^{-4}	2.00	7.55×10^{-2}	1.00
256	3.04×10^{-4}	1.33	1.11×10^{-4}	2.00	3.77×10^{-2}	1.00
512	1.32×10^{-5}	1.20	2.79×10^{-5}	2.00	1.89×10^{-2}	1.00

Table 3: IFEM errors in Example 1 with coefficients (10,1,100)

Next we consider a larger coefficient jump, i.e., $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) = (100, 10000, 1)$. The errors of PPIFEM and Galerkin IFEM are reported in Tables 4 and 5, respectively. It can be observed that the PPIFEM scheme is robust for this large contrast case in all three norms. Again, the convergence of L^∞ norm for Galerkin IFEM is suboptimal. The magnitudes of the errors are significant larger than the errors of PPIFEM solutions.

N	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^\infty}$	order	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^2}$	order	$ u_h - u _{H^1}$	order
16	8.87×10^{-3}		2.81×10^{-2}		6.44×10^{-1}	
32	2.93×10^{-3}	1.60	7.10×10^{-3}	1.98	3.25×10^{-1}	0.99
64	7.30×10^{-4}	2.00	1.78×10^{-3}	2.00	1.63×10^{-1}	1.00
128	1.81×10^{-4}	2.01	4.45×10^{-4}	2.00	8.16×10^{-2}	1.00
256	4.43×10^{-5}	2.04	1.11×10^{-4}	2.00	4.08×10^{-2}	1.00
512	1.16×10^{-5}	1.93	2.78×10^{-5}	2.00	2.04×10^{-2}	1.00

Table 4: PPIFEM errors in Example 1 with coefficients (100,10000,1)

N	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^\infty}$	order	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^2}$	order	$ u_h - u _{H^1}$	order
16	9.27×10^{-3}		2.80×10^{-2}		6.43×10^{-1}	
32	2.84×10^{-3}	1.71	7.10×10^{-3}	1.98	3.25×10^{-1}	0.98
64	8.51×10^{-4}	1.74	1.78×10^{-3}	2.00	1.63×10^{-1}	1.00
128	4.54×10^{-4}	0.91	4.45×10^{-4}	2.00	8.16×10^{-2}	1.00
256	2.35×10^{-4}	0.95	1.11×10^{-4}	2.00	4.08×10^{-2}	1.00
512	1.19×10^{-4}	0.98	2.79×10^{-5}	2.00	2.04×10^{-2}	1.00

Table 5: IFEM Errors in Example 1 with Coefficients (100,10000,1)

5.2. Example 2

In this example, we test our numerical scheme for curved interfaces. In particular, the interfaces consist of a circle and a straight line, which are defined by the following level set functions

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_1(x, y) &= 3x - 4y, \\ \varphi_2(x, y) &= x^2 + y^2 - 0.25, \\ \varphi_3(x, y) &= -x^2 - y^2 + 0.25.\end{aligned}$$

The exact solution is set to be

$$\begin{aligned}u_1(x, y) &= \frac{1}{\beta_1}((x^2 + y^2)^{1.5} - 0.125), \\ u_2(x, y) &= \frac{1}{\beta_2}(x^2 + y^2 - 0.25) \sin(3x - 4y), \\ u_3(x, y) &= \frac{1}{\beta_3}(3x - 4y) \ln(x^2 + y^2 + 0.75).\end{aligned}$$

In the first case, we choose the coefficient to be $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) = (10, 1, 100)$. The error of the interpolation operator is reported in Table 6. Errors of symmetric PPIFEM and Galerkin IFEM are reported in Tables 7 and 8, respectively. From these tables, we can see that the PPIFEM converge optimally in L^∞ , L^2 and H^1 norms. The Galerkin IFE solutions have suboptimal convergence in L^∞ norm. Also, as the mesh size decreases, there seems to be an order deterioration in L^2 and H^1 norms for the Galerkin IFEM. In Figure 8, we compare the error surfaces of classical IFEM and the PPIFEM. This clearly demonstrates that PPIFEM outperforms the classical IFEM in terms of the accuracy around the interface.

N	$\ \mathcal{I}_h u - u\ _{L^2}$	order	$ \mathcal{I}_h u - u _{H^1}$	order
16	2.46×10^{-2}		5.27×10^{-1}	
32	6.25×10^{-3}	1.98	2.63×10^{-1}	1.00
64	1.57×10^{-3}	1.99	1.31×10^{-1}	1.00
128	3.93×10^{-4}	2.00	6.57×10^{-2}	1.00
256	9.84×10^{-5}	2.00	3.28×10^{-2}	1.00
512	2.46×10^{-5}	2.00	1.64×10^{-2}	1.00

Table 6: Interpolation errors and convergences of Example 2 with coefficients (10,1,100)

N	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^\infty}$	order	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^2}$	order	$ u_h - u _{H^1}$	order
16	1.28×10^{-2}		2.20×10^{-2}		5.26×10^{-1}	
32	3.41×10^{-3}	1.91	5.55×10^{-3}	1.99	2.63×10^{-1}	1.00
64	9.33×10^{-4}	1.87	1.39×10^{-3}	2.00	1.31×10^{-1}	1.00
128	2.43×10^{-4}	1.94	3.48×10^{-4}	2.00	6.57×10^{-2}	1.00
256	5.84×10^{-5}	2.06	8.71×10^{-5}	2.00	3.28×10^{-2}	1.00
512	1.47×10^{-5}	1.99	2.18×10^{-5}	2.00	1.64×10^{-2}	1.00

Table 7: PPIFEM Errors in Example 2 with Coefficients (10,1,100)

N	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^\infty}$	order	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^2}$	order	$ u_h - u _{H^1}$	order
16	4.75×10^{-2}		2.38×10^{-2}		5.42×10^{-1}	
32	1.49×10^{-2}	1.67	5.78×10^{-3}	2.04	2.68×10^{-1}	1.01
64	4.82×10^{-3}	1.63	1.43×10^{-3}	2.02	1.34×10^{-1}	1.01
128	2.09×10^{-3}	1.21	3.56×10^{-4}	2.01	6.70×10^{-2}	1.00
256	9.64×10^{-4}	1.11	9.04×10^{-5}	1.98	3.39×10^{-2}	0.98
512	4.74×10^{-4}	1.02	2.47×10^{-5}	1.87	1.75×10^{-2}	0.96

Table 8: IFEM errors in Example 2 with coefficients (10,1,100)

We also consider a large coefficient contrast case, $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) = (100000, 100, 10)$. The errors of symmetric PPIFEM and Galerkin IFEM are reported in Tables 9 and 10, respectively. The convergences are similar to above.




Figure 8: Comparison of error surfaces of classical IFEM and PPIFEM for Example 2.

N	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^\infty}$	order	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^2}$	order	$ u_h - u _{H^1}$	order
16	1.42×10^{-2}		3.29×10^{-3}		5.77×10^{-2}	
32	3.42×10^{-3}	2.05	7.22×10^{-4}	2.19	2.79×10^{-2}	1.05
64	1.32×10^{-3}	1.38	2.11×10^{-4}	1.78	1.34×10^{-2}	1.06
128	3.06×10^{-4}	2.11	3.60×10^{-5}	2.55	6.03×10^{-3}	1.15
256	1.05×10^{-4}	1.54	8.60×10^{-6}	2.07	2.92×10^{-3}	1.04
512	2.66×10^{-5}	1.98	2.07×10^{-6}	2.06	1.43×10^{-3}	1.03

Table 9: PPIFEM Errors in Example 2 with coefficients (1000000,100,10)

N	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^\infty}$	order	$\ u_h - u\ _{L^2}$	order	$ u_h - u _{H^1}$	order
16	2.84×10^{-3}		2.07×10^{-3}		4.59×10^{-2}	
32	2.37×10^{-3}	0.26	5.66×10^{-4}	1.87	2.40×10^{-2}	0.93
64	1.17×10^{-3}	1.02	1.85×10^{-4}	1.61	1.28×10^{-2}	0.91
128	4.60×10^{-4}	1.34	3.77×10^{-5}	2.30	6.23×10^{-3}	1.03
256	2.40×10^{-4}	0.94	1.02×10^{-5}	1.88	3.28×10^{-3}	0.93
512	1.23×10^{-4}	0.97	3.15×10^{-6}	1.70	1.82×10^{-3}	0.85

Table 10: IFEM errors in Example 2 with coefficients (1000000,100,10)

6. Conclusion

We have developed a partially penalized immersed finite element method using bilinear polynomials for solving elliptic interface problems on multi-domain with triple junction points. The immersed finite element basis functions are constructed on interface elements with for all types of geometrical configurations. The local IFE space are enriched for handle nonhomogeneous flux jump conditions. Numerical results are provided to demonstrate the effectiveness of our method. In the future, we plan to carry on the a priori error estimates for the method and will also plan to extend the method to other interface problems.

References

- [1] Z. Chen, J. Zou, Finite element methods and their convergence for elliptic and parabolic interface problems, *Numerische Mathematik* 79 (1998), no. 2, 175–202.
- [2] C. S. Peskin, Numerical analysis of blood flow in the heart, *Journal of Computational Physics* 25 (1977), no. 3, 220–252.
- [3] R. J. Leveque, Z. Li, The immersed interface method for elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients and singular sources, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 31 (1994), no. 4, 1019–1044.
- [4] S. Yu, Y. Zhou, G.-W. Wei, Matched interface and boundary (mib) method for elliptic problems with sharp-edged interfaces, *Journal of Computational Physics* 224 (2007), no. 2, 729–756.
- [5] E. Burman, S. Claus, P. Hansbo, M. Larson, A. Massing, CutFEM: discretizing geometry and partial differential equations, *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* 104 (2015), no. 7, 472–501.
- [6] J. H. Bramble and J. T. King, A finite element method for interface problems in domains with smooth boundaries and interfaces, *Advances in Computational Mathematics* 6 (1996), no. 2, 109–138.
- [7] D. M. Ingram, D. M. Causon, C. G. Mingham, Developments in Cartesian cut cell methods, *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation* 61 (2003), no. 3–6, 561–572.
- [8] Z. Li, The immersed interface method using a finite element formulation, *Applied Numerical Mathematics* 27 (1998), no. 3, 253–267.
- [9] I. Babuška, The finite element method for elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients, *Computing* 5 (1970) 207–213.
- [10] I. Babuška, U. Banerjee, Stable generalized finite element method (SGFEM), *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 201 (2012) 91–111.
- [11] T.-P. Fries, T. Belytschko, The extended/generalized finite element method: an overview of the method and its applications, *International journal for numerical methods in engineering* 84 (2010), no. 3, 253–304.
- [12] Z. Li, T. Lin, X. Wu, New Cartesian grid methods for interface problems using the finite element formulation, *Numerische Mathematik* 96 (2003), no. 1, 61–98.
- [13] Z. Li, T. Lin, Y. Lin, R. C. Rogers, An immersed finite element space and its approximation capability, *Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations* 20 (2004), no. 3, 338–367.

- [14] X. He, T. Lin, Y. Lin, Approximation capability of a bilinear immersed finite element space, *Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations* 24 (2008), no. 5, 1265–1300.
- [15] X. He, T. Lin, Y. Lin, Immersed finite element methods for elliptic interface problems with non-homogeneous jump conditions, *International Journal of Numerical Analysis & Modeling* 8 (2011), no. 2, 284–301.
- [16] W. Cao, X. Zhang, Z. Zhang, Superconvergence of immersed finite element methods for interface problems, *Advances in Computational Mathematics* 43 (2017), no. 4, 795–821.
- [17] T. Lin, Y. Lin, X. Zhang, Partially penalized immersed finite element methods for elliptic interface problems, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 53 (2015), no. 2, 1121–1144.
- [18] R. Guo, T. Lin, Q. Zhuang, Improved error estimation for the partially penalized immersed finite element methods for elliptic interface problems, *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Model.* 16 (2019), no. 4, 575–589.
- [19] H. Ji, Q. Zhang, Q. Wang, Y. Xie, A partially penalised immersed finite element method for elliptic interface problems with non-homogeneous jump conditions, *East. Asia. J Appl. Math* 8 (2018), no. 1, 1–23.
- [20] H. Guo, X. Yang, Z. Zhang, Superconvergence of partially penalized immersed finite element methods, *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis* 38 (2017), no. 4, 2123–2144.
- [21] K. Xia, M. Zhan, G. Wei, MIB method for elliptic equations with multi-material interfaces, *J. Comput. Phys* 230 (2011), no. 12, 4588–4615.
- [22] S. Hou, L. Wang, W. Wang, A numerical method for solving the elliptic interface problems with multi-domains and triple junction points, *Journal of Computational Mathematics* 30 (2012), no. 5, 504–516.
- [23] S. Hou, W. Wang, L. Wang, Numerical method for solving matrix coefficient elliptic equation with sharp-edged interfaces, *Journal of Computational Physics* 229 (2010), no. 19, 7162–7179.
- [24] L. Wang, S. Hou, L. Shi, A numerical method for solving three-dimensional elliptic interface problems with triple junction points, *Advances in Computational Mathematics* 44 (2018), no. 1, 175–193.
- [25] L. Wang, S. Hou, L. Shi, J. Solow, A numerical method for solving elasticity equations with interface involving multi-domains and triple junction points, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 251 (2015) 615–625.
- [26] Y. Chen, S. Hou, X. Zhang, An immersed finite element method for elliptic interface problems with multi-domain and triple junction points, *Advances in Applied Mathematics and Mechanics* 11 (2019), no. 5, 1005–1021.

- [27] T. Lin, Y. Lin, R. Rogers, M. L. Ryan, A rectangular immersed finite element space for interface problems, *Advances In Computation: Theory And Practice* 7 (2001) 107–114.
- [28] X. He, T. Lin, Y. Lin, Approximation capability of a bilinear immersed finite element space, *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations* 24 (2008), no. 5, 1265–1300.
- [29] T. Lin, D. Sheen, X. Zhang, A nonconforming immersed finite element method for elliptic interface problems, *Journal of Scientific Computing* 79 (2019), no. 1, 442–463.

Response to Reviewer's Report #1 on Revision 1

A Bilinear Partially Penalized Immersed Finite Element Method for Elliptic Interface Problems with Multi-domains and Triple-junction Points

by Yuan Chen, Songming Hou, and Xu Zhang

We would like to thank the referee again for providing valuable comments and suggestions to improve the quality of this paper. We have revised our paper according to the referees' comments.

The referee found out in this revision that the authors improved the results. But, the referee still got a new question in regard to the authors' explanation, that is, if the basis functions for elements in $T_{h,3}^i$ are not continuous across the interface, should we also add penalty terms on the interface to ensure the consistence of the weak form?

Response. This is a very good question. We also noticed this source of inconsistency. We have tried to add penalty terms inside the interface to ensure the consistency. We present our finding below.

As we noticed, in the interface element containing the triple-junction point, the IFE basis functions may not be continuous. This motivates us to additionally penalize the PPIFEM on the interface segments inside the triple-junction element. To be more precise, we define $\mathcal{M}_h^i = \mathcal{E}_h^i \cup \{\Gamma_t \cap K, t = 1, 2, 3 \mid K \in \mathcal{T}_{h,3}^i\}$, $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}_h^i = \mathring{\mathcal{E}}_h^i \cup \{\Gamma_t \cap K, t = 1, 2, 3 \mid K \in \mathcal{T}_{h,3}^i\}$. The bilinear form (4.3) is replaced by

$$(0.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{a}_h(u_h, v_h) &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_K \beta \nabla v_h \cdot \nabla u_h d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{e \in \mathring{\mathcal{M}}_h^i} \int_e \{\beta \nabla u_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_e\} [v_h] ds \\ &\quad + \epsilon \sum_{e \in \mathcal{M}_h^i} \int_e \{\beta \nabla v_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_e\} [u_h] ds + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{M}_h^i} \int_e \frac{\sigma_e}{|e|} [v_h] [u_h] ds. \end{aligned}$$

The new PPIFEM is to find $\bar{u}_h \in S_h$ such that

$$(0.2) \quad \bar{a}_h(\bar{u}_h, v_h) = (f, v_h) - \bar{a}_h(u_h^J, v_h) + \sum_{i=1}^3 (b_i, v_h)_{\Gamma_i}, \quad \forall v_h \in S_h.$$

In the following, we redo the Numerical examples 1 and 2 with the new PPIFEM, and report the errors in Tables 1 - 4.

Comparing with Tables 2, 4, 7, and 9 in the revised paper, the errors of \bar{u}_h are quite similar to those of u_h in L^2 and H^1 norms. The decay rates in \bar{u}_h in L^∞ norm seem not as stable as u_h , especially for large coefficient-jump cases, although the overall convergence rates in L^∞ norm in the linear regression sense are similar to u_h . Additionally, we investigated the local L^2 and H^1 errors on the triple-junction-interface elements, and found that their errors of u_h and \bar{u}_h are similar for all mesh levels. We therefore do not have a decisive conclusion whether adding penalization inside the triple-junction interface elements is necessary, and therefore prefer not to report this new algorithm in the current paper. We will leave this question to our future study with a more rigorous error analysis of these IFE schemes.

N	$\ \bar{u}_h - u\ _{L^\infty}$	order	$\ \bar{u}_h - u\ _{L^2}$	order	$ \bar{u}_h - u _{H^1}$	order
16	2.72×10^{-2}		2.81×10^{-2}		6.05×10^{-1}	
32	6.92×10^{-3}	1.97	7.10×10^{-3}	1.98	3.02×10^{-1}	1.00
64	1.75×10^{-3}	1.98	1.78×10^{-3}	2.00	1.51×10^{-1}	1.00
128	4.38×10^{-4}	2.00	4.45×10^{-4}	2.00	7.53×10^{-2}	1.00
256	1.10×10^{-4}	1.99	1.11×10^{-4}	2.00	3.76×10^{-2}	1.00
512	2.74×10^{-5}	2.01	2.78×10^{-5}	2.00	1.88×10^{-2}	1.00

TABLE 1. New PPIFEM Errors in Example 1 with Coefficients (10,1,100)

N	$\ \bar{u}_h - u\ _{L^\infty}$	order	$\ \bar{u}_h - u\ _{L^2}$	order	$ \bar{u}_h - u _{H^1}$	order
16	7.60×10^{-1}		2.10×10^{-2}		1.83×10^{-0}	
32	1.03×10^{-2}	6.21	7.23×10^{-3}	4.86	3.26×10^{-1}	2.49
64	2.34×10^{-3}	2.14	1.80×10^{-3}	2.01	1.63×10^{-1}	1.00
128	2.01×10^{-4}	3.54	4.45×10^{-4}	2.02	8.16×10^{-2}	1.00
256	6.80×10^{-4}	-1.76	1.14×10^{-4}	1.96	4.08×10^{-2}	1.00
512	4.03×10^{-5}	4.08	2.78×10^{-5}	2.04	2.04×10^{-2}	1.00

TABLE 2. New PPIFEM Errors in Example 1 with Coefficients (100,10000,1)

N	$\ \bar{u}_h - u\ _{L^\infty}$	order	$\ \bar{u}_h - u\ _{L^2}$	order	$ \bar{u}_h - u _{H^1}$	order
16	3.27×10^{-2}		2.23×10^{-2}		5.29×10^{-1}	
32	3.94×10^{-3}	3.05	5.58×10^{-3}	2.00	2.63×10^{-1}	1.01
64	1.63×10^{-3}	1.27	1.39×10^{-3}	2.01	1.31×10^{-1}	1.01
128	5.41×10^{-3}	-1.73	3.58×10^{-4}	1.96	6.63×10^{-2}	0.98
256	1.17×10^{-3}	2.21	8.84×10^{-5}	2.02	3.29×10^{-2}	1.01
512	9.06×10^{-5}	3.69	2.19×10^{-5}	2.01	1.64×10^{-2}	1.00

TABLE 3. New PPIFEM Errors in Example 2 with Coefficients (10,1,100)

N	$\ \bar{u}_h - u\ _{L^\infty}$	order	$\ \bar{u}_h - u\ _{L^2}$	order	$ \bar{u}_h - u _{H^1}$	order
16	1.39×10^{-2}		3.09×10^{-3}		6.16×10^{-2}	
32	3.46×10^{-3}	2.01	7.29×10^{-4}	2.08	2.79×10^{-2}	1.14
64	1.62×10^{-3}	1.09	2.48×10^{-4}	1.56	1.36×10^{-2}	1.04
128	3.04×10^{-4}	2.41	3.70×10^{-5}	2.74	6.04×10^{-3}	1.17
256	1.02×10^{-4}	1.58	8.49×10^{-6}	2.13	2.93×10^{-3}	1.04
512	2.68×10^{-5}	1.93	2.02×10^{-6}	2.07	1.43×10^{-3}	1.03

TABLE 4. New PPIFEM Errors in Example 2 with Coefficients (1000000,100,10)

Conflicts of Interest Statement

Manuscript title: A bilinear partially penalized immersed finite element method for Elliptic Interface Problem with Multi-domains and Triple-Junction Points

The authors whose names are listed immediately below certify that they have NO affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest (such as honoraria; educational grants; participation in speakers' bureaus; membership, employment, consultancies, stock ownership, or other equity interest; and expert testimony or patent-licensing arrangements), or non-financial interest (such as personal or professional relationships, affiliations, knowledge or beliefs) in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

Author names:

Xu Zhang

Songming Hou

Yuan Chen

The authors whose names are listed immediately below report the following details of affiliation or involvement in an organization or entity with a financial or non-financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript. Please specify the nature of the conflict on a separate sheet of paper if the space below is inadequate.

Author names:


This statement is signed by all the authors to indicate agreement that the above information is true and correct (*a photocopy of this form may be used if there are more than 10 authors*):

Author's name (typed)

Author's signature


Date

Xu Zhang



10/31/2019

Songming Hou



10-31-19

Yuan Chen



10/31/19

CRediT author statement

Yuan Chen: Writing- Original draft preparation.

Songming Hou: Conceptualization Writing- Reviewing and Editing

Xu Zhang: Methodology, Writing- Reviewing and Editing