Guaranteed and robust discontinuous Galerkin a posteriori error estimates for convection–diffusion–reaction problems☆

Alexandre Ern[a], Annette F. Stephansen[a,b], Martin Vohralík[c]

[a] *Université Paris-Est, CERMICS, Ecole des Ponts, 77455 Marne la Vallée cedex 2, France*

[b] *ANDRA, Parc de la Croix-Blanche, 1–7 rue Jean Monnet, 92298 Châtenay-Malabry, France; Current address: Centre for Integrated Petroleum Research, P.O. Box 7800 5007 Bergen, Norway*

[c] *UPMC Univ. Paris 06, UMR 7598, Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions, 75005, Paris, France & CNRS, UMR 7598, Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions, 75005, Paris, France*

Abstract

We propose and study a posteriori error estimates for convection–diffusion–reaction problems with inhomogeneous and anisotropic diffusion approximated by weighted interior-penalty discontinuous Galerkin methods. Our twofold objective is to derive estimates without undetermined constants and to analyze carefully the robustness of the estimates in singularly perturbed regimes due to dominant convection or reaction. We first derive locally computable estimates for the error measured in the energy (semi)norm. These estimates are evaluated using $\mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div}, \Omega)$-conforming diffusive and convective flux reconstructions, thereby extending previous work on pure diffusion problems. The resulting estimates are semi-robust in the sense that local lower error bounds can be derived using suitable cutoff functions of the local Péclet and Damköhler numbers. Fully robust estimates are obtained for the error measured in an augmented norm consisting of the energy (semi)norm, a dual norm of the skew-symmetric part of the differential operator, and a suitable contribution of the interelement jumps of the discrete solution. Numerical

☆This work was partly supported by the Groupement MoMaS (PACEN/CNRS, ANDRA, BRGM, CEA, EdF, IRSN)

Email addresses: ern@cermics.enpc.fr (Alexandre Ern), stephansen@cermics.enpc.fr (Annette F. Stephansen), vohralik@ann.jussieu.fr (Martin Vohralík)

experiments are presented to illustrate the theoretical results.

Key words: convection–diffusion–reaction equation, discontinuous Galerkin methods, a posteriori error estimates, robustness, dominant convection, dominant reaction, inhomogeneous and anisotropic diffusion
PACS: 02.70.Dh, 47.56.+r, 02.60.Cb
2000 MSC: 65N15, 65N30, 76S05

---

1. Introduction

We consider the convection–diffusion–reaction problem

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{K}\nabla u) + \boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\nabla u + \mu u &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega, && (1a)\\
u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, && (1b)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$, is a polyhedral domain, $\mathbf{K}$ the diffusion tensor, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ the velocity field, μ the reaction coefficient, and f the source term. We only consider homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions for the sake of simplicity; extensions to inhomogeneous Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions are possible. Our intention is to study a posteriori error estimates for the approximation of (1a)–(1b) by weighted interior-penalty discontinuous Galerkin (DG) methods with the twofold objective of deriving estimates without undetermined constants and analyzing carefully the robustness of the estimates in singularly perturbed regimes due to dominant convection or reaction. We have chosen to address the convection–diffusion–reaction problem in a general setting for the parameters $\mathbf{K}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and μ (mild assumptions on these parameters are stated below) so that our results can be readily used in practical simulations. The reader interested in simplified situations can for instance take $\mathbf{K}$ equal to ϵ times the identity matrix ($\epsilon \ll 1$), $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ a divergence-free veclocity field of order unity, and μ of order unity.

For the pure diffusion problem ((1a)–(1b) with $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mu = 0$), residual-based a posteriori energy (semi)norm error estimates for DG methods can be traced back to [6, 23]; see also [12] for a unified analysis. Although the estimates derived therein are both reliable (that is, they yield an upper bound on the difference between the exact and approximate solution) and locally efficient (that is, they give local lower bounds for the error as well), they feature various undetermined constants. This shortcoming has been remedied recently in [2] upon introducing estimators based on equilibrated fluxes (for the first-order symmetric interior-penalty DG scheme in the case $d = 2$). Such estimates can be reformulated upon introducing a reconstructed $\mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div}, \Omega)$-conforming diffusive flux, say $\mathbf{t}_h$, associated with the approximate DG diffusive flux $-\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u_h$ [24, 14, 34, 15]; see also the research report [20]. We also mention [27] where numerical experiments for similar estimators are presented. Error estimates for continuous finite element methods using reconstructed $\mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div}, \Omega)$-conforming fluxes can be traced back to the seminal work of Prager and Synge [29], while more recent developments include [25, 26, 16].

A posteriori error estimates based on flux reconstruction for DG approximations to *convection–diffusion–reaction* problems appear to be a novel topic. Our first intermediate, yet practically important, result delivers a locally computable, global upper bound for the error measured in the energy (semi)norm $|||\cdot|||$ defined by equation (5) below. Letting u be the exact solution of (1a)–(1b) and letting u_h be its DG approximation, Theorem 3.1 states that

$$|||u - u_h||| \leq \eta,$$

where η collects various locally computable contributions with only known constants, the leading terms for low enough local Péclet numbers having constant equal to one. These contributions are evaluated using a $H_0^1(\Omega)$-conforming reconstruction of the potential u_h and $\mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div}, \Omega)$-conforming reconstructions of its diffusive flux $-\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u_h$ and convective flux $\boldsymbol{\beta} u_h$, thereby extending previous work on pure diffusion problems. Theorem 3.2 then states that the elementwise contributions in η can be bounded by the local error in the energy (semi)norm augmented by the natural DG jump seminorm $|||\cdot|||_{*,\mathcal{F}_h}$ defined by (45) times suitable cutoff functions of the local Péclet and Damköhler numbers. More precisely, this yields

$$\eta \leq C\chi(|||u - u_h||| + |||u - u_h|||_{*,\mathcal{F}_h}),$$

where the constant C is independent of any mesh size and mildly depends on the data $\mathbf{K}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and μ as specified below, whereas χ collects the abovementioned cutoff functions. This result is in its form similar to that derived by Verfürth for stabilized conforming finite elements in [35] and to the results in [18, 39, 40] for DG, mixed finite element, and finite volume methods, respectively. The difference with [35] is that the present η features no undetermined constant. Moreover, η represents a lower bound for the DG residual-based a posteriori estimate derived in [18].

To achieve full robustness in singularly perturbed regimes resulting from dominant advection or reaction, we follow the approach proposed again by Verfürth for stabilized conforming finite elements in [36] and which consists in measuring the error in an augmented norm including a suitable dual norm of the skew-symmetric part of the differential operator. Another approach to robust a posteriori error estimation has been proposed by Sangalli [30, 31, 32]; it consists in evaluating the convective derivative using a fractional order norm. For DG methods, the augmented norm $|||\cdot|||_{\oplus}$ defined by (46) differs from that considered in the conforming case and features an additional contribution which depends on the interelement jumps of the discrete solution. By proceeding this way, see Theorem 3.3, an upper bound is derived in the form

$$|||u - u_h|||_{\oplus} \leq \widetilde{\eta},$$

where $\widetilde{\eta}$ again collects various locally computable contributions (with only known constants as for η) which are evaluated using the above-mentioned reconstructions. Theorem 3.4 then states that $\widetilde{\eta}$ can be globally bounded by the error measured in the augmented norm supplemented by a suitable jump seminorm $|||\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$ defined by (51), that is,

$$\widetilde{\eta} \leq \tilde{C}(|||u - u_h|||_{\oplus} + |||u - u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}),$$

where the constant $\tilde{C}$ has dependencies similar to those of the constant C above. By adding this jump seminorm to the error measure as well, we arrive at the final result of this paper, see Theorem 3.5, yielding a fully robust equivalence result between the error and the a posteriori estimate, namely

$$|||u-u_h|||_{\oplus}+|||u-u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h} \leq \widetilde{\eta}+|||u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h} \leq \tilde{C}(|||u-u_h|||_{\oplus}+|||u-u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}).$$

This result is in its form similar to the one derived recently in [33] for DG methods using residual-based techniques instead of flux reconstruction. However, there are two important differences between the present results and those in [33]. First, the latter contain undetermined constants; furthermore, the present jump seminorm features an additional cutoff function to lower its contribution in the singularly perturbed regimes.

This paper is organized as follows. We introduce the setting in Section 2, including the main notation and assumptions, the formulation of the continuous problem and its DG approximation, the reconstructed $\mathbf{H}(\text{div}, \Omega)$-conforming diffusive and convective fluxes for the DG solution, and the cutoff functions needed to formulate our results. We then present our main results in Section 3 while the proofs are collected in Section 4. Some numerical experiments illustrating the theoretical analysis are presented in Section 5. For the sake of simplicity, the above results are presented on meshes without hanging nodes. In practice, however, nonmatching meshes possessing hanging nodes are often useful and constitute one of the actual motivations for using DG methods. Appendix A briefly describes the minor modifications needed in our approach to handle this case.

2. The setting

2.1. Main notation and assumptions

Let $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_{h>0}$ be a family of simplicial meshes of the domain Ω. A generic (closed) element in $\mathcal{T}_h$ is denoted by T, h_T stands for its diameter, $|T|$ for its measure, and $\mathbf{n}_T$ for its unit outward normal. The family $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_{h>0}$ is assumed to be shape-regular in the sense that there exists a constant $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}} > 0$ such that $\min_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} d_T/h_T \geq \kappa_{\mathcal{T}}$ for all $h > 0$ where d_T denotes the diameter of the largest ball inscribed in T. The shape-regularity is actually only necessary to prove the lower error bounds. We also suppose that the meshes cover $\overline{\Omega}$ exactly. For the sake of simplicity, we assume until Appendix A that meshes do not possess hanging nodes. Mesh faces are closed sets and are collected in $\mathcal{F}_h$. It is convenient to define the following sets: For all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$\mathcal{F}_T = \{F \in \mathcal{F}_h;\ F \subset \partial T\}, \qquad \mathfrak{F}_T = \{F \in \mathcal{F}_h;\ F \cap \partial T \neq \emptyset\},$$
$$\mathcal{T}_T = \{T' \in \mathcal{T}_h;\ \mathcal{F}_T \cap \mathcal{F}_{T'} \neq \emptyset\}, \qquad \mathfrak{T}_T = \{T' \in \mathcal{T}_h;\ T \cap T' \neq \emptyset\},$$

and for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_h$,

$$\mathcal{T}_F = \{T \in \mathcal{T}_h;\ F \in \mathcal{F}_T\}, \qquad \mathfrak{T}_F = \{T \in \mathcal{T}_h;\ F \cap \partial T \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Thus, $\mathcal{F}_T$ collects the faces of T, $\mathfrak{F}_T$ the faces having a non-empty intersection with T, $\mathcal{T}_T$ the elements sharing a face with T, $\mathfrak{T}_T$ the elements having a non-empty intersection with T, $\mathcal{T}_F$ the elements of which F is a face, and $\mathfrak{T}_F$ the elements having a non-empty intersection with F.

We will be using the so-called broken Sobolev space (for nonnegative integer s)

$$H^s(\mathcal{T}_h) := \{v \in L^2(\Omega); v|_T \in H^s(T) \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}, \tag{2}$$

along with its DG approximation space

$$V^k(\mathcal{T}_h) := \{v_h \in L^2(\Omega); v_h|_T \in \mathbb{P}_k(T) \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}, \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_k(T)$, $k \geq 0$, is the set of polynomials of total degree less than or equal to k on an element T. The L^2-orthogonal projection onto $V^k(\mathcal{T}_h)$ is denoted by Π_k. The L^2-scalar product and its associated norm on a region $R \subset \Omega$ are indicated by the subscript $0, R$; shall R coincide with Ω, this subscript will be dropped. For $s \geq 1$, a norm (seminorm) with the subscript s, R stands for the usual norm (seminorm) in $H^s(R)$. Finally, ∇_h denotes the broken gradient operator, that is, for $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, $\nabla_h v \in [L^2(\Omega)]^d$ and for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, $(\nabla_h v)|_T := \nabla(v|_T)$.

We assume that $\mathbf{K} \in [L^\infty(\Omega)]^{d\times d}$ is a symmetric, uniformly positive definite, and piecewise constant tensor and for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we denote by $c_{\mathbf{K},T}$ and $C_{\mathbf{K},T}$, respectively, its minimum and maximum eigenvalue on T. We also assume that $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in [L^\infty(\Omega)]^d$ with $\nabla{\cdot}\boldsymbol{\beta} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $\mu \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\mu - \frac{1}{2}\nabla{\cdot}\boldsymbol{\beta} \geq 0$ a.e. in Ω. For all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, $c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}$ indicates the (essential) minimum value of $\mu - \frac{1}{2}\nabla{\cdot}\boldsymbol{\beta}$ on T; we suppose that if $c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T} = 0$, then $\|\mu\|_{\infty,T} = \|\frac{1}{2}\nabla{\cdot}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T} = 0$. We also assume $f \in L^2(\Omega)$. For all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, the local Péclet and Damköhler numbers can be defined as $h_T\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T}c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1}$ and $h_T^2 c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1}$, respectively. The simplified setting discussed in the Introduction leads to $C_{\mathbf{K},T} = c_{\mathbf{K},T} = \epsilon$, $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T} \simeq 1$, $c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T} \simeq 1$, so that the local Péclet and Damköhler numbers reduce to $h_T\epsilon^{-1}$ and $h_T^2\epsilon^{-1}$, respectively.

2.2. *The continuous problem*

For all $u, v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, we define the bilinear form

$$\mathcal{B}(u,v) := (\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u, \nabla_h v) + (\boldsymbol{\beta}{\cdot}\nabla_h u, v) + (\mu u, v), \tag{4}$$

and the corresponding energy (semi)norm

$$|||v|||^2 := \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} |||v|||_T^2, \qquad |||v|||_T^2 := \|\mathbf{K}^{\frac{1}{2}}\nabla v\|_{0,T}^2 + \big\|\big(\mu - \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla{\cdot}\boldsymbol{\beta}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} v\big\|_{0,T}^2. \tag{5}$$

We remark that $|||\cdot|||$ is always a norm on $H_0^1(\Omega)$, whereas it is a norm on $H^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ only if $c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T} > 0$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. For all $u, v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, we also define

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{S}}(u,v) := (\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u, \nabla_h v) + \big(\big(\mu - \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla{\cdot}\boldsymbol{\beta}\big)u, v\big), \tag{6}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{A}}(u,v) := \big(\boldsymbol{\beta}{\cdot}\nabla_h u + \tfrac{1}{2}(\nabla{\cdot}\boldsymbol{\beta})u, v\big). \tag{7}$$

Observe that $\mathcal{B}_{\rm A}$ is skew-symmetric on $H_0^1(\Omega)$ (but not on $H^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$), that $\mathcal{B}_{\rm S}(v,v) = |||v|||^2$ for all $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, and that on $H^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$,

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_{\rm S} + \mathcal{B}_{\rm A}. \tag{8}$$

The weak formulation of (1a)–(1b) consists in finding $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\mathcal{B}(u,v) = (f,v) \qquad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega). \tag{9}$$

The above assumptions, the Green theorem, and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality imply that $\mathcal{B}(v,v) = |||v|||^2$ for all $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and that for all $u, v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}(u,v) \leq\ & \max\left\{1, \max_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\{c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}^{-1}\|\mu\|_{\infty,T}\}\right\} |||u||| \, |||v||| \\ & + \max_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\{c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1/2}\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T}\} |||u||| \, \|v\|. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Hence, the problem (9) admits a unique solution.

Remark 2.1 (Notation). If $c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T} = 0$, the term $\|\mu\|_{\infty,T}/c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}$ in estimate (10) should be evaluated as zero, since in this case we assume $\|\mu\|_{\infty,T} = 0$. To simplify the notation, we will systematically use the convention $0/0 = 0$.

2.3. The discontinuous Galerkin method

To formulate the DG method, we need to introduce jumps and (weighted) averages on mesh faces. We say that F is an interior face of a given mesh if there are distinct $T^-(F)$ and $T^+(F)$ in $\mathcal{T}_h$ such that $F = \partial T^-(F) \cap \partial T^+(F)$ and we define $\mathbf{n}_F$ as the unit normal vector to F pointing from $T^-(F)$ towards $T^+(F)$. Similarly, we say that F is a boundary face of the mesh if there is $T(F) \in \mathcal{T}_h$ such that $F = \partial T(F) \cap \partial\Omega$ and we define $\mathbf{n}_F$ as the unit outward normal to $\partial\Omega$ (the arbitrariness in the orientation of $\mathbf{n}_F$ is irrelevant in the sequel). All the interior (resp., boundary) faces of the mesh are collected into the set $\mathcal{F}_h^{\rm int}$ (resp., $\mathcal{F}_h^{\rm ext}$) so that $\mathcal{F}_h = \mathcal{F}_h^{\rm int} \cup \mathcal{F}_h^{\rm ext}$. For a function v that is double-valued on a face $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^{\rm int}$, its jump and arithmetic average on F are defined as

$$[\![v]\!]_F := v|_{T^-(F)} - v|_{T^+(F)}, \qquad \{\!\{v\}\!\}_F := \tfrac{1}{2}(v|_{T^-(F)} + v|_{T^+(F)}). \tag{11}$$

We set $[\![v]\!]_F := v|_F$ and $\{\!\{v\}\!\}_F := \frac{1}{2}v|_F$ on boundary faces. The subscript F in the above jumps and averages is omitted if there is no ambiguity. To achieve robustness with respect to diffusion inhomogeneities, diffusivity-dependent weighted averages are considered [10, 21, 17]. For all $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^{\text{int}}$, let

$$\omega_{T^-(F),F} := \frac{\delta_{\mathbf{K},F+}}{\delta_{\mathbf{K},F+} + \delta_{\mathbf{K},F-}}, \qquad \omega_{T^+(F),F} := \frac{\delta_{\mathbf{K},F-}}{\delta_{\mathbf{K},F+} + \delta_{\mathbf{K},F-}}, \tag{12}$$

where $\delta_{\mathbf{K},F\mp} := \mathbf{n}_F{\cdot}\mathbf{K}|_{T^\mp(F)}\mathbf{n}_F$, and define

$$\{\!\!\{v\}\!\!\}_\omega := \omega_{T^-(F),F} v|_{T^-(F)} + \omega_{T^+(F),F} v|_{T^+(F)}. \tag{13}$$

On boundary faces, we set $\{\!\!\{v\}\!\!\}_\omega := v|_F$ and $\omega_{T(F),F} := 1$.

The interior-penalty DG methods considered herein are associated with the bilinear form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_h(u,v) := {} & (\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u, \nabla_h v) + ((\mu - \nabla{\cdot}\boldsymbol{\beta})u, v) - (u, \boldsymbol{\beta}{\cdot}\nabla_h v) \\ & - \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h} \{(\mathbf{n}_F{\cdot}\{\!\!\{\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u\}\!\!\}_\omega, [\![v]\!])_{0,F} + \theta(\mathbf{n}_F{\cdot}\{\!\!\{\mathbf{K}\nabla_h v\}\!\!\}_\omega, [\![u]\!])_{0,F}\} \\ & + \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h} \{(\gamma_F[\![u]\!], [\![v]\!])_{0,F} + (\boldsymbol{\beta}{\cdot}\mathbf{n}_F\{\!\!\{u\}\!\!\}, [\![v]\!])_{0,F}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The discrete problem consists in finding $u_h \in V^k(\mathcal{T}_h)$ with $k \geq 1$ such that

$$\mathcal{B}_h(u_h, v_h) = (f, v_h) \qquad \forall v_h \in V^k(\mathcal{T}_h). \tag{15}$$

Taking in (14) the weights on interior faces equal to 1/2 and letting $\theta \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ leads to the well-known Nonsymmetric, Incomplete, or Symmetric Interior-Penalty DG methods. The penalty parameter γ_F takes the form

$$\gamma_F := \alpha_F \gamma_{\mathbf{K},F} h_F^{-1} + \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\beta},F} \qquad \forall F \in \mathcal{F}_h, \tag{16}$$

where $\alpha_F \geq 1$ is a (user-dependent) parameter,

$$\gamma_{\mathbf{K},F} := \frac{\delta_{\mathbf{K},F+}\delta_{\mathbf{K},F-}}{\delta_{\mathbf{K},F+} + \delta_{\mathbf{K},F-}}, \tag{17}$$

h_F the diameter of F, and $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{\beta},F}$ a nonnegative scalar-valued function depending on $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and vanishing if $\boldsymbol{\beta} = 0$; we suppose here that $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{\beta},F} = \frac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{\beta}{\cdot}\mathbf{n}_F|$, which amounts to so-called upwinding. As usual with interior-penalty methods, the parameters α_F must be taken large enough to ensure the coercivity of the discrete bilinear form $\mathcal{B}_h$ on $V^k(\mathcal{T}_h)$ whenever $\theta \neq -1$.

2.4. Diffusive and convective flux reconstruction

The approximate DG diffusive flux $-\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u_h$ and convective flux $\boldsymbol{\beta} u_h$ are nonconforming since they do not belong to the space $\mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div}, \Omega)$ as their exact counterparts do. For pure diffusion problems, $\mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div}, \Omega)$-conforming reconstructions of the approximate DG diffusive flux have been investigated in [4, 19, 24]. We generalize here the approach of [19, 24] to convection–diffusion–reaction problems.

The reconstructed diffusive and convective fluxes will belong to the Raviart–Thomas–Nédélec spaces of vector functions on the mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$,

$$\mathbf{RTN}^l(\mathcal{T}_h) = \left\{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div}, \Omega)\,;\, \mathbf{v}_h|_T \in \mathbf{RTN}^l_T \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h\right\},$$

where $l \in \{k-1, k\}$ (recall that k is the polynomial degree used for the DG approximation) and $\mathbf{RTN}^l_T = \mathbb{P}^d_l(T) + \mathbf{x}\mathbb{P}_l(T)$. In particular, $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{RTN}^l(\mathcal{T}_h)$ is such that $\nabla\cdot\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{P}_l(T)$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, $\mathbf{v}_h\cdot\mathbf{n}_F \in \mathbb{P}_l(F)$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_T$ and all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, and such that its normal trace is continuous; see [8]. Using the specification of the degrees of freedom of functions in $\mathbf{RTN}^l_T$, our $\mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div}, \Omega)$-conforming flux reconstructions $\mathbf{t}_h \in \mathbf{RTN}^l(\mathcal{T}_h)$ and $\mathbf{q}_h \in \mathbf{RTN}^l(\mathcal{T}_h)$ are prescribed locally on all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ as follows: For all $F \in \mathcal{F}_T$ and all $q_h \in \mathbb{P}_l(F)$,

$$(\mathbf{t}_h\cdot\mathbf{n}_F, q_h)_{0,F} = \left(-\mathbf{n}_F\cdot\{\!\!\{\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u_h\}\!\!\}_\omega + \alpha_F \gamma_{\mathbf{K},F} h_F^{-1} [\![u_h]\!], q_h\right)_{0,F}, \tag{18}$$

$$(\mathbf{q}_h\cdot\mathbf{n}_F, q_h)_{0,F} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\mathbf{n}_F\{\!\!\{u_h\}\!\!\} + \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\beta},F}[\![u_h]\!], q_h)_{0,F}, \tag{19}$$

and for all $\mathbf{r}_h \in \mathbb{P}^d_{l-1}(T)$,

$$(\mathbf{t}_h, \mathbf{r}_h)_{0,T} = -(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h, \mathbf{r}_h)_{0,T} + \theta \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} \omega_{T,F}(\mathbf{n}_F\cdot\mathbf{K}\mathbf{r}_h, [\![u_h]\!])_{0,F}, \tag{20}$$

$$(\mathbf{q}_h, \mathbf{r}_h)_{0,T} = (u_h, \boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\mathbf{r}_h)_{0,T}. \tag{21}$$

Observe that the quantities prescribing the moments of $\mathbf{t}_h\cdot\mathbf{n}_F$ and $\mathbf{q}_h\cdot\mathbf{n}_F$ are univocally defined for each face $F \in \mathcal{F}_h$, whence the continuity of the normal traces of $\mathbf{t}_h$ and $\mathbf{q}_h$. The above construction is motivated by the following important result:

Lemma 2.1 (Local conservativity)**.** *There holds*

$$(\nabla\cdot\mathbf{t}_h + \nabla\cdot\mathbf{q}_h + \Pi_l((\mu - \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta})u_h))|_T = \Pi_l f|_T \qquad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h. \tag{22}$$

Proof. Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and let $\xi_h \in \mathbb{P}_l(T)$. Owing to the Green theorem,

$$(\nabla\cdot\mathbf{t}_h + \nabla\cdot\mathbf{q}_h, \xi_h)_{0,T} = -(\mathbf{t}_h + \mathbf{q}_h, \nabla\xi_h)_{0,T} + \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} ((\mathbf{t}_h + \mathbf{q}_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_T, \xi_h)_{0,F}.$$

Using (18)–(21) along with the definition (14) of the bilinear form B_h leads to

$$(\nabla\cdot\mathbf{t}_h + \nabla\cdot\mathbf{q}_h, \xi_h)_{0,T} = B_h(u_h, \xi_h 1_T) - ((\mu - \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta})u_h, \xi_h)_{0,T}. \quad (23)$$

Since u_h solves (15), this yields (22). □

2.5. Potential reconstruction

The approximate DG potential u_h is nonconforming since u_h is not in $H^1_0(\Omega)$ as its exact counterpart is. We use here a $H^1_0(\Omega)$-conforming potential reconstruction based on the so-called Oswald interpolation operator already considered in [23] for a posteriori DG error estimates. Specifically, the operator $\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Os}} : V^k(\mathcal{T}_h) \to V^k(\mathcal{T}_h) \cap H^1_0(\Omega)$ is defined as follows: For a function $v_h \in V^k(\mathcal{T}_h)$, $\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Os}}(v_h)$ is prescribed through its values at suitable (Lagrange) nodes of the simplices of $\mathcal{T}_h$. At the nodes located inside Ω, the average of the values of v_h at this node is used,

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Os}}(v_h)(V) = \frac{1}{\#(\mathcal{T}_V)} \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_V} v_h|_T(V),$$

where $\mathcal{T}_V$ is the set of those $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ to which the node V belongs and where for any set S, $\#(S)$ denotes its cardinality. Note that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Os}}(v_h)(V) = v_h(V)$ at those nodes V lying in the interior of some $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. At boundary nodes, the value of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Os}}(v_h)$ is set to zero.

2.6. Cutoff functions

The following local approximation results for L^2-projections hold: For all $\varphi \in H^1_0(\Omega)$,

$$\|\varphi - \Pi_0\varphi\|_{0,T} \le m_T |||\varphi|||_T \qquad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h, \quad (24)$$

$$\|\varphi - \Pi_0\varphi|_T\|_{0,F} \le C^{1/2}_{\mathrm{t},T,F}\widetilde{m}^{1/2}_T |||\varphi|||_T \qquad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h,\ \forall F \in \mathcal{F}_T, \quad (25)$$

$$\|[\![\Pi_0\varphi]\!]\|_{0,F} \le m_F \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_F} |||\varphi|||_T \qquad \forall F \in \mathcal{F}_h, \quad (26)$$

with the cutoff functions

$$m_T^2 := \min\{C_{\rm P} h_T^2 c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1}, c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}^{-1}\}, \tag{27}$$

$$\widetilde{m}_T := \min\{(C_{\rm P} + C_{\rm P}^{1/2}) h_T c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1}, h_T^{-1} c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}^{-1} + c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}^{-1/2} c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1/2}/2\}, \tag{28}$$

$$m_F^2 := \min\left\{\max_{T\in\mathcal{T}_F}\left\{C_{{\rm F},T,F}|F| h_T^2 |T|^{-1} c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1}\right\}, \max_{T\in\mathcal{T}_F}\left\{|F||T|^{-1} c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}^{-1}\right\}\right\}, \tag{29}$$

where $|F|$ denotes the $(d-1)$-dimensional measure of F. Here, $C_{\rm P}$ is the constant from the Poincaré inequality

$$\|\varphi - \Pi_0\varphi\|_{0,T}^2 \le C_{\rm P} h_T^2 \|\nabla\varphi\|_{0,T}^2 \qquad \forall \varphi \in H^1(T), \tag{30}$$

which can be evaluated as $C_{\rm P} = 1/\pi^2$ owing to the convexity of simplices [28, 5]. In addition, $C_{{\rm t},T,F}$ and $C_{{\rm F},T,F}$ are respectively the constants from the following trace and generalized Friedrichs inequalities:

$$\|\varphi\|_{0,F}^2 \le C_{{\rm t},T,F}(h_T^{-1}\|\varphi\|_T^2 + \|\varphi\|_T \|\nabla\varphi\|_T), \tag{31}$$

$$\|\varphi - \Pi_{0,F}\varphi\|_{0,T}^2 \le C_{{\rm F},T,F} h_T^2 \|\nabla\varphi\|_{0,T}^2, \tag{32}$$

valid for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, $\varphi \in H^1(T)$, and $F \in \mathcal{F}_T$; here for $l \ge 0$, $\Pi_{l,F}$ denotes the L^2-orthogonal projection onto $\mathbb{P}_l(F)$. It follows from Lemma 3.12 in [34] that $C_{{\rm t},T,F} = |F|h_T/|T|$ for a simplex T and its face F; see also [11]. Furthermore, it follows from [38, Lemma 4.1] that $C_{{\rm F},T,F} = 3d$ for a simplex T and its face F. The estimate (24) is readily inferred from the Poincaré inequality (30) and the fact that $\|\varphi - \Pi_0\varphi\|_{0,T} \le \|\varphi\|_{0,T}$. The estimate (25) is established in [13]. Finally, the estimate (26) is proved in [40, Lemma 4.5].

3. Main results

This section exposes the main results of this work; their proofs are collected in the next section. For the sake of clarity, this section is split into three subparts. The first one contains intermediate, yet practically important, results, namely global upper bounds and local, semi-robust, lower bounds for the error estimated in the energy norm. The second one contains global upper bounds and global, fully robust, lower bounds for the error estimated in an augmented norm. The third subpart contains the final, fully robust equivalence result. All the upper bounds below are valid for *arbitrary* $H_0^1(\Omega)$-conforming potential reconstructions and *arbitrary* $\mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div}, \Omega)$-conforming diffusive and convective flux reconstructions provided the latter satisfy the local conservation property (33) below. The lower bounds instead are proven for the specific choices of these reconstructions described in Sections 2.4 and 2.5.

3.1. Energy norm estimates

This section is devoted to energy norm error estimates.

3.1.1. Locally computable estimate

Let $s_h \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and let $\mathbf{t}_h, \mathbf{q}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div}, \Omega)$ with $\mathbf{t}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_F, \mathbf{q}_h \cdot \mathbf{n}_F \in L^2(F)$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_h$ be such that

$$(\nabla\cdot\mathbf{t}_h + \nabla\cdot\mathbf{q}_h + (\mu - \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta})u_h, 1)_{0,T} = (f, 1)_{0,T} \qquad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h. \tag{33}$$

In practice, s_h is constructed as in Section 2.5, while $\mathbf{t}_h$ and $\mathbf{q}_h$ are constructed as in Section 2.4 so that owing to Lemma 2.1, the local conservation property (33) holds.

Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. The *nonconformity estimator* $\eta_{\mathrm{NC},T}$, the *residual estimator* $\eta_{\mathrm{R},T}$, and the *diffusive flux estimator* $\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}$ are defined as

$$\eta_{\mathrm{NC},T} := |||u_h - s_h|||_T, \tag{34}$$

$$\eta_{\mathrm{R},T} := m_T \|f - \nabla\cdot\mathbf{t}_h - \nabla\cdot\mathbf{q}_h - (\mu - \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta})u_h\|_{0,T}, \tag{35}$$

$$\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T} := \min\left\{\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}^{(1)}, \eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}^{(2)}\right\}, \tag{36}$$

where

$$\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}^{(1)} := \|\mathbf{K}^{\frac{1}{2}}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{K}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{t}_h\|_{0,T}, \tag{37}$$

$$\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}^{(2)} := m_T \|(Id - \Pi_0)(\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h))\|_{0,T} + \widetilde{m}_T^{1/2} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} C_{\mathrm{t},T,F}^{1/2} \|(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_F\|_{0,F}. \tag{38}$$

Furthermore, we define the two *convection estimators* $\eta_{\mathrm{C},1,T}$ and $\eta_{\mathrm{C},2,T}$ and the *upwinding estimator* $\eta_{\mathrm{U},T}$ as

$$\eta_{\mathrm{C},1,T} := m_T \|(Id - \Pi_0)(\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta}s_h))\|_{0,T}, \tag{39}$$

$$\eta_{\mathrm{C},2,T} := c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}^{-1/2} \left\|\tfrac{1}{2}(\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta})(u_h - s_h)\right\|_{0,T}, \tag{40}$$

$$\eta_{\mathrm{U},T} := \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} m_F \|\Pi_{0,F}((\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta}s_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_F)\|_{0,F}. \tag{41}$$

Recall that the constants m_T, $\widetilde{m}_T$, and m_F are defined by (27)–(29). We can now state the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.1 (Energy norm estimate)**.** *Let u be the solution of* (9) *and let u_h be its DG approximation solving* (15)*. Then,*

$$|||u - u_h||| \leq \eta,$$

where

$$\eta := \left\{ \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \eta_{\mathrm{NC},T}^2 \right\}^{1/2} + \left\{ \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\eta_{\mathrm{R},T} + \eta_{\mathrm{DF},T} + \eta_{\mathrm{C},1,T} + \eta_{\mathrm{C},2,T} + \eta_{\mathrm{U},T})^2 \right\}^{1/2}.$$

Remark 3.1 (Properties of the estimate of Theorem 3.1)*.* The estimate of Theorem 3.1 yields a guaranteed upper bound, the estimate is valid uniformly with respect to the polynomial degree k, the DG parameters α_F, and no polynomial data form is needed for f. Furthermore, we observe that (33) is a local (conservation) property, in contrast to the global Galerkin orthogonality used traditionally for conforming finite element methods.

Remark 3.2 (Form of $\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}$)*.* The idea of defining the diffusive flux estimator $\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}$ as a minimum between two quantities has been proposed in [13]. The purpose is to obtain in singularly perturbed regimes resulting from dominant convection or reaction appropriate cutoff functions in the expression for $\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}^{(2)}$. This way of proceeding is coherent with the recent observation made by Verfürth [37] that the diffusive flux estimator $\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}^{(1)}$ alone cannot be shown to be robust.

Remark 3.3 (Superconvergence of $\eta_{\mathrm{R},T}$)*.* Assume that $\mathbf{t}_h$ and $\mathbf{q}_h$ are defined by (18)–(21). For pure diffusion problems, Lemma 2.1 implies $\eta_{\mathrm{R},T} = m_T \|f - \Pi_l f\|_{0,T}$ and hence, $\eta_{\mathrm{R},T}$ takes the form of a data oscillation term that superconverges by one ($l = k - 1$) or two ($l = k$) orders in mesh size if f is piecewise smooth. In the general case, taking $l = k$ and μ and $\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta}$ piecewise constant, Lemma 2.1 still implies the superconvergent form $\eta_{\mathrm{R},T} = m_T \|f - \Pi_k f\|_{0,T}$. In practice, $\eta_{\mathrm{R},T}$ should not be neglected since it can be significant on coarse grids or for singularly perturbed regimes.

3.1.2. Local efficiency

Let s_h, $\mathbf{t}_h$, and $\mathbf{q}_h$ be defined as in Sections 2.4 and 2.5. To state the local efficiency of the estimate derived in Theorem 3.1, we consider the following residual-based a posteriori error estimators introduced in [18]: For all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$\rho_{1,T} := m_T \|f + \nabla\cdot(\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u_h) - \boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\nabla_h u_h - \mu u_h\|_{0,T}, \tag{42}$$

$$\rho_{2,T} := m_T^{1/2} c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1/4} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} \bar{\omega}_{T,F} \|\mathbf{n}_F\cdot[\![\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h]\!]\|_{0,F}, \tag{43}$$

where $\bar{\omega}_{T,F} = (1 - \omega_{T,F})$. For all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, let $c_{\mathbf{K},\mathfrak{T}_T} := \min_{T' \in \mathfrak{T}_T} c_{\mathbf{K},T'}$, $c_{\mathbf{K},\mathcal{T}_T} := \min_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_T} c_{\mathbf{K},T'}$, $c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mathfrak{F}_T} := \min_{F \in \mathfrak{F}_T} \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\beta},F}$ and $c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mathcal{F}_T} := \min_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\beta},F}$, and introduce the cutoff functions

$$\chi_{\mathfrak{T}_T} := \min(h_T c_{\mathbf{K},\mathfrak{T}_T}^{-1/2}, h_T^{1/2} c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mathfrak{F}_T}^{-1/2}), \qquad \chi_{\mathcal{T}_T} := \min(h_T c_{\mathbf{K},\mathcal{T}_T}^{-1/2}, h_T^{1/2} c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mathcal{F}_T}^{-1/2}), \quad (44)$$

as well as $m_{\mathcal{T}_T} := \min(h_T c_{\mathbf{K},\mathcal{T}_T}^{-1/2}, c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,\mathcal{T}_T}^{-1/2})$ where $c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,\mathcal{T}_T} := \min_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_T} c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T'}$. Let also $\varsigma_T := m_T^{1/2} h_T^{-1/2} c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{1/4}$ (so that $\varsigma_T \leq C_{\mathrm{P}}^{1/4}$ by construction) and $\alpha_T := \max_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} \alpha_F$. For any subset $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathcal{F}_h$, define the jump seminorm

$$|||v|||_{*,\mathcal{F}}^2 := \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \|\gamma_F^{1/2} [\![v]\!]\|_{0,F}^2 \qquad v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_h). \quad (45)$$

We can now state the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.2 (Local efficiency of the energy norm estimate)**.** *Let u be the solution of* (9) *and let u_h be its DG approximation solving* (15)*. Assume for simplicity that $\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h) \in \mathbb{P}_l(T)$ and $\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} u_h) \in \mathbb{P}_l(T)$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and that $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{\beta},F}$ is facewise constant. Let $\eta_{\mathrm{NC},T}$, $\eta_{\mathrm{R},T}$, $\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}$, $\eta_{\mathrm{C},1,T}$, $\eta_{\mathrm{C},2,T}$, and $\eta_{\mathrm{U},T}$ be defined by* (34)–(41)*. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_{\mathrm{NC},T} &\leq C \left(\frac{C_{\mathbf{K},T}^{1/2}}{c_{\mathbf{K},\mathfrak{T}_T}^{1/2}} + \left\|\mu - \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta}\right\|_{\infty,T}^{1/2} \chi_{\mathfrak{T}_T} \right) |||u - u_h|||_{*,\mathfrak{F}_T}, \\
\eta_{\mathrm{C},2,T} &\leq C \left\|\tfrac{1}{2}\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta}\right\|_{\infty,T} c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}^{-1/2} \chi_{\mathfrak{T}_T} |||u - u_h|||_{*,\mathfrak{F}_T}, \\
\eta_{\mathrm{U},T} &\leq C m_{\mathcal{T}_T} h_T^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T} \chi_{\mathfrak{T}_T} |||u - u_h|||_{*,\mathfrak{F}_T}, \\
\eta_{\mathrm{C},1,T} &\leq C m_T h_T^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T} \chi_{\mathfrak{T}_T} |||u - u_h|||_{*,\mathfrak{F}_T}, \\
\eta_{\mathrm{R},T} &\leq \rho_{1,T} + C\varsigma_T \rho_{2,T} + C \left(\varsigma_T^2 \alpha_T^{1/2} \frac{C_{\mathbf{K},T}^{1/2}}{c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{1/2}} + m_T h_T^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T} \chi_{\mathcal{T}_T} \right) |||u - u_h|||_{*,\mathcal{F}_T}, \\
\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T} &\leq C\rho_{2,T} + C\varsigma_T \alpha_T^{1/2} \frac{C_{\mathbf{K},T}^{1/2}}{c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{1/2}} |||u - u_h|||_{*,\mathcal{F}_T}.
\end{aligned}$$

The constant C only depends on the space dimension d, the polynomial degree k of u_h, and the shape-regularity parameter $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Remark 3.4 (Estimates on $\rho_{1,T}$ and $\rho_{2,T}$). The following semi-robust bounds are proved in [18, Propositions 3.3 and 3.4] under the assumption that f, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and μ are piecewise polynomials of degree m:

$$\rho_{1,T} \le C m_T (C_{\mathbf{K},T}^{1/2} h_T^{-1} + \min(\zeta_{1,T}, \zeta_{2,T})) |||u - u_h|||_T,$$
$$\rho_{2,T} \le C \frac{C_{\mathbf{K},T}^{1/2}}{c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{1/2}} m_T^{1/2} c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{1/4} \sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_T} m_{T'}^{-1/2} c_{\mathbf{K},T'}^{-1/4} \left(\frac{C_{\mathbf{K},T'}^{1/2}}{c_{\mathbf{K},T'}^{1/2}} + m_{T'} \zeta_{1,T'} \right) |||u - u_h|||_{T'},$$

with $\zeta_{1,T} := \|\mu\|_{\infty,T} c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}^{-1/2} + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T} c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1/2}$ and $\zeta_{2,T} := c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}^{-1/2} (\|\mu - \nabla{\cdot}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T} + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T} h_T^{-1})$. The constant C only depends on d, k, m, and $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Remark 3.5 (Comments on the results of Theorem 3.2). In the DG energy norm, the a posteriori error estimate of Theorem 3.1 is semi-robust in the sense that the bounds on the estimators involve cutoff functions of the local Péclet and Damköhler numbers in various forms. This result is of the same quality as those achieved in [35, 39, 40, 18]. Moreover, as $h \to 0$, Theorem 3.2 shows that the estimators $\eta_{\mathrm{C},1,T}$, $\eta_{\mathrm{C},2,T}$, and $\eta_{\mathrm{U},T}$ will loose influence owing to the cutoff factor $\chi_{\mathcal{T}_T}$, while $\eta_{\mathrm{NC},T}$ and $\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}$ will become optimally efficient.

Remark 3.6 (Pure diffusion). Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 obviously apply to the pure diffusion case and deliver similar results to [2, 24, 14, 34, 20, 15]. Specifically, $\eta_{\mathrm{C},1,T}$, $\eta_{\mathrm{C},2,T}$, and $\eta_{\mathrm{U},T}$ vanish, while $\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}$ can be evaluated using $\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}^{(1)}$ only. One salient feature of the present estimate is that owing to the bounds in Remark 3.4, the residual estimator $\eta_{\mathrm{R},T}$ and the diffusion estimator $\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}$ are fully robust with respect to diffusion inhomogeneities. The robustness of the nonconforming estimator $\eta_{\mathrm{NC},T}$ can be handled under suitable assumptions on the distribution of diffusion inhomogeneities (such as those in [1, 7]).

3.2. Augmented norm estimates

We introduce the following augmented norm:

$$|||v|||_{\oplus} := |||v||| + \sup_{\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega),\, |||\varphi|||=1} \{\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{A}}(v, \varphi) + \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(v, \varphi)\} \qquad v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_h), \quad (46)$$

with $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{A}}$ defined by (7) and where for all $u, v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$,

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(u, v) := - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h} (\boldsymbol{\beta}{\cdot}\mathbf{n}_F [\![u]\!], \{\!\{\Pi_0 v\}\!\})_{0,F}. \quad (47)$$

Whenever $\|\nabla{\cdot}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T}$ is controlled by $c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, the zero-order contribution in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{A}}$ can be discarded in the definition of the augmented norm, recovering the dual norm introduced by Verfürth for conforming finite elements [36]. The additional contribution from $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}$ in the augmented norm is specific to the DG setting and has been introduced in the present work to sharpen the global efficiency result; see Remark 4.2 below.

3.2.1. *Locally computable estimate*

Let $s_h \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and let $\mathbf{t}_h, \mathbf{q}_h \in \mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div}, \Omega)$ with $\mathbf{t}_h{\cdot}\mathbf{n}_F, \mathbf{q}_h{\cdot}\mathbf{n}_F \in L^2(F)$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_h$ be such that (33) holds. Let η, $\eta_{\mathrm{R},T}$, and $\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}$ be as in Section 3.1. We define the *modified convection estimator* $\widetilde{\eta}_{\mathrm{C},1,T}$ and the *modified upwinding estimator* $\widetilde{\eta}_{\mathrm{U},T}$ as

$$\widetilde{\eta}_{\mathrm{C},1,T} := m_T \|(Id - \Pi_0)(\nabla{\cdot}(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} u_h))\|_{0,T}, \tag{48}$$

$$\widetilde{\eta}_{\mathrm{U},T} := \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} m_F \|\Pi_{0,F}(\gamma_{\boldsymbol{\beta},F} [\![u_h]\!])\|_{0,F}. \tag{49}$$

Theorem 3.3 (Augmented norm estimate)**.** *Let u be the solution of* (9) *and let u_h be its DG approximation solving* (15)*. Then,*

$$|||u - u_h|||_{\oplus} \le \widetilde{\eta} := 2\eta + \left\{ \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\eta_{\mathrm{R},T} + \eta_{\mathrm{DF},T} + \widetilde{\eta}_{\mathrm{C},1,T} + \widetilde{\eta}_{\mathrm{U},T})^2 \right\}^{1/2}. \tag{50}$$

Remark 3.7 (Comparison of η and $\widetilde{\eta}$). We observe that the estimator $\widetilde{\eta}$ is fully computable and that it has the same structure as the estimator η derived in Theorem 3.1.

3.2.2. *Global efficiency*

Let s_h, $\mathbf{t}_h$, and $\mathbf{q}_h$ be defined as in Sections 2.4 and 2.5. We show here that the $|||{\cdot}|||_{\oplus}$-norm a posteriori error estimate of Theorem 3.3 is globally efficient and fully robust. For all $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, define

$$\begin{aligned} |||v|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}^2 := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \in \mathfrak{F}_T} \frac{1}{\#(\mathfrak{T}_F)} \Bigg\{ & \frac{C_{\mathbf{K},T}}{c_{\mathbf{K},\mathfrak{T}_T}} \alpha_F \gamma_{\mathbf{K},F} h_F^{-1} \|[\![v]\!]\|_{0,F}^2 + c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T} h_F \|[\![v]\!]\|_{0,F}^2 \\ & + m_{\mathcal{T}_T}^2 \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,\mathcal{T}_T}^2 h_F^{-1} \|[\![v]\!]\|_{0,\mathcal{F}_F \cap \mathfrak{F}_T}^2 \Bigg\}, \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

where $m_{\mathcal{T}_T}$ is defined in Section 3.1.2 and $\mathcal{F}_F$ collects the faces of the one or two elements in $\mathcal{T}_F$.

Theorem 3.4 (Global efficiency of the augmented norm estimate)**.** *Along with the assumptions of Theorem* 3.2*, assume that* f*,* $\boldsymbol{\beta}$*, and* μ *are piecewise polynomials of degree* m*. Then,*

$$\widetilde{\eta} \leq \tilde{C}(|||u - u_h|||_{\oplus} + |||u - u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}), \tag{52}$$

where the constant $\tilde{C}$ *depends on the same parameters as the constant* C *in Theorem* 3.2 *and in addition on the polynomial degree* m *of* f*,* $\boldsymbol{\beta}$*, and* μ*, the ratios* $C_{\mathbf{K},T}/c_{\mathbf{K},T}$ *and* $(\|\mu\|_{\infty,T} + \|\frac{1}{2}\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T})/c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}$ *for all* $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$*, the ratios* $c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}/c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T'}$ *for all* $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_h$ *sharing a face, and finally, linearly on the DG penalty coefficients* α_F*.*

3.3. Fully robust equivalence result

This section contains the final result of this paper, namely a fully robust equivalence result between the error measured in the $(|||\cdot|||_{\oplus}+|||\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h})$-norm and a suitable a posteriori estimate with s_h, $\mathbf{t}_h$, and $\mathbf{q}_h$ defined as in Sections 2.4 and 2.5. This result is an immediate consequence of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4.

Theorem 3.5 (Fully robust equivalence between error and a posteriori estimate)**.** *Let* u *be the solution of* (9) *and let* u_h *be its DG approximation solving* (15)*. Then,*

$$|||u-u_h|||_{\oplus}+|||u-u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h} \leq \widetilde{\eta}+|||u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h} \leq \tilde{C}(|||u-u_h|||_{\oplus}+|||u-u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}), \tag{53}$$

where $\tilde{C}$ *is twice the constant in* (52)*.*

Remark 3.8 (Comparison with the results of [33])*.* The result of Theorem 3.5 is in its form comparable with that reported in [33]. One essential difference is, however, that our discrete jump seminorm $|||\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$ contains the cutoff factors $m_{\mathcal{T}_T}$ in front of $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,\mathcal{T}_T} h_F^{-1/2} \|[\![v]\!]\|_{0,\mathcal{F}_F\cap\mathfrak{F}_T}$, which can considerably reduce the size of this term. Moreover, we stress that the a posteriori estimate $\widetilde{\eta} + |||u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$ is fully computable with no undetermined constants.

Remark 3.9 ($|||\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$-seminorm). It can be argued that the discrete seminorm $|||\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$ is not fully satisfactory since it does not appear in the natural DG stability norm. In particular, a priori error estimates including this new seminorm have not been established. Moreover, the $|||\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$-seminorm is not easily localizable with respect to data.

Remark 3.10 (Pure diffusion). In the pure diffusion case, the augmented norm $|||\cdot|||_{\oplus}$ coincides with the energy norm $|||\cdot|||$ and the jump seminorm $|||\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$ reduces to the first term in the right-hand side of (51).

4. Proofs

This section collects the proofs of the results presented in Section 3.

4.1. Energy norm estimates

Lemma 4.1 (Abstract energy norm estimate)**.** *Let u be the solution of* (9) *and let $u_h \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ be arbitrary. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}|||u-u_h||| \le& \inf_{s\in H_0^1(\Omega)}\Bigg\{|||u_h - s||| + \inf_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{q}\in\mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div},\Omega)} \sup_{\varphi\in H_0^1(\Omega),\,|||\varphi|||=1} \\ &\big\{(f - \nabla\cdot\mathbf{t} - \nabla\cdot\mathbf{q} - (\mu - \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta})u_h, \varphi) - (\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u_h + \mathbf{t}, \nabla\varphi) \\ &+ (\nabla\cdot\mathbf{q} - \nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\beta}s), \varphi) - \big(\tfrac{1}{2}(\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta})(u_h - s), \varphi\big)\big\}\Bigg\} \\ \le& 2|||u-u_h|||. \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Proof. It has been proved in [39, Lemma 7.1] and [18, Lemma 3.1] that

$$|||u-u_h||| \le \inf_{s\in H_0^1(\Omega)}\Bigg\{|||u_h - s||| + \sup_{\varphi\in H_0^1(\Omega),\,|||\varphi|||=1}\big\{\mathcal{B}(u-u_h,\varphi) + \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{A}}(u_h - s, \varphi)\big\}\Bigg\}.$$

It suffices to use (9) therein, to introduce arbitrary fields $\mathbf{t},\mathbf{q} \in \mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div},\Omega)$, add and subtract $(\mathbf{t},\nabla\varphi)$ and $(\mathbf{q},\nabla\varphi)$, and to employ the Green theorem to infer the upper error bound in (54). For the lower error bound, put $s = u$, $\mathbf{t} = -\mathbf{K}\nabla u$, and $\mathbf{q} = \boldsymbol{\beta}u$ and use the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and the fact that $|||\varphi||| = 1$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We start by putting $s = s_h$, $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}_h$, and $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}_h$ in the upper error bound (54). We next write

$$\begin{aligned}&(f - \nabla\cdot\mathbf{t}_h - \nabla\cdot\mathbf{q}_h - (\mu - \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta})u_h, \varphi) - (\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u_h + \mathbf{t}_h, \nabla\varphi) + (\nabla\cdot\mathbf{q}_h - \nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\beta}s_h), \varphi) \\ &- \big(\tfrac{1}{2}(\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta})(u_h - s_h), \varphi\big) = \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\Bigg\{(f - \nabla\cdot\mathbf{t}_h - \nabla\cdot\mathbf{q}_h - (\mu - \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta})u_h, \varphi - \Pi_0\varphi)_{0,T} \\ &- (\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h, \nabla\varphi)_{0,T} - \big(\tfrac{1}{2}(\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta})(u_h - s_h), \varphi\big)_{0,T} + (\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta}s_h), \varphi - \Pi_0\varphi)_{0,T} \\ &+ \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T}((\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta}s_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_T, \Pi_0\varphi)_{0,F}\Bigg\},\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

using the local conservation property (33) in the first term and subtracting $(\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta}s_h), \Pi_0\varphi)_{0,T}$ and adding the same quantity rewritten using the

Green theorem in the last two terms. Next, in these last two terms, it is possible to replace $\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h)$ by $(Id - \Pi_0)(\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h))$ and $(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_T$ by $\Pi_{0,F}((\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_T)$; see Remark 4.1 below for the motivation. Furthermore, following [13], there are two ways to bound the term $-(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h, \nabla\varphi)_{0,T}$. Either one simply uses

$$-(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h, \nabla\varphi)_{0,T} \leq \eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}^{(1)} |||\varphi|||_T,$$

or one notices using (24) and (25) that

$$\begin{aligned}-(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h, \nabla\varphi)_{0,T} = &- (\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h, \nabla(\varphi - \Pi_0\varphi))_{0,T}\\ &= (\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h), \varphi - \Pi_0\varphi)_{0,T}\\ &\quad - \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} ((\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_T, \varphi - \Pi_0\varphi)_{0,F} \leq \eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}^{(2)} |||\varphi|||_T.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, using (26) and the continuity of the normal component of $(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h)$ for the last term in (55), it is inferred that

$$\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} (\Pi_{0,F}((\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_T), \Pi_0\varphi)_{0,F} \leq \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \eta_{\mathrm{U},T} |||\varphi|||_T.$$

Collecting the above bounds leads to

$$\begin{aligned}&(f - \nabla\cdot\mathbf{t}_h - \nabla\cdot\mathbf{q}_h - (\mu - \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta})u_h, \varphi) - (\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u_h + \mathbf{t}_h, \nabla\varphi) + (\nabla\cdot\mathbf{q}_h - \nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\beta} s_h), \varphi)\\ &- \left(\tfrac{1}{2}(\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta})(u_h - s_h), \varphi\right) \leq \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \Big(\eta_{\mathrm{R},T} + \eta_{\mathrm{DF},T} + \eta_{\mathrm{C},1,T} + \eta_{\mathrm{C},2,T} + \eta_{\mathrm{U},T}\Big) |||\varphi|||_T,\end{aligned}$$

whence the conclusion is straightforward using (54). □

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Let C denote a generic constant depending on the parameters as in the statement of the theorem. Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. The proof is decomposed in two parts.

(1) Bounds on the estimators involving $s_h = \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Os}}(u_h)$. First, consider $\eta_{\mathrm{NC},T}$ and recall the estimate

$$\|\nabla(u_h - s_h)\|_{0,T} \leq C \sum_{F\in\mathfrak{F}_T} h_F^{-1/2} \|[\![u_h]\!]\|_{0,F},$$

proved in [23, Theorem 2.2]. Using this bound, the fact that $[\![u - u_h]\!] = -[\![u_h]\!]$ and owing to (17), it is easy to see that (recall that $\alpha_F \geq 1$)

$$\|\mathbf{K}^{\frac{1}{2}}\nabla(u_h - s_h)\|_{0,T} \leq C \frac{C_{\mathbf{K},T}^{1/2}}{c_{\mathbf{K},\mathfrak{T}_T}^{1/2}} |||u - u_h|||_{*,\mathfrak{F}_T}.$$

Furthermore, it is well-known (see, e.g., [9, Lemma 3.2]) that

$$\|u_h - s_h\|_{0,T} \leq C \sum_{F \in \mathfrak{F}_T} h_F^{1/2} \|[\![u_h]\!]\|_{0,F},$$

and it follows from (16) that

$$\sum_{F \in \mathfrak{F}_T} \|[\![u_h]\!]\|_{0,F} \leq C h_T^{-1/2} \chi_{\mathfrak{T}_T} |||u - u_h|||_{*,\mathfrak{F}_T}, \tag{56}$$

with $\chi_{\mathfrak{T}_T}$ defined by (44). Hence,

$$\|u_h - s_h\|_{0,T} \leq C \chi_{\mathfrak{T}_T} |||u - u_h|||_{*,\mathfrak{F}_T}. \tag{57}$$

The bound on $\eta_{\mathrm{NC},T}$ is now straightforward. Moreover, the bound on $\eta_{\mathrm{C},2,T}$ is readily inferred from (57). Considering next $\eta_{\mathrm{U},T}$, we observe that owing to (19) and the fact that $\|\Pi_{0,F} g\|_{0,F} \leq \|g\|_{0,F}$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_T$ and $g \in L^2(F)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Pi_{0,F}((\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_F)\|_{0,F} &= \|\Pi_{0,F}(\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\mathbf{n}_F \{\!\{u_h\}\!\} + \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\beta},F}[\![u_h]\!] - \boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\mathbf{n}_F s_h)\|_{0,F} \\
&\leq \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\mathbf{n}_F \{\!\{u_h\}\!\} + \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\beta},F}[\![u_h]\!] - \boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\mathbf{n}_F s_h\|_{0,F} \\
&\leq C \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T} \sum_{F' \in \mathfrak{F}_T} \|[\![u_h]\!]\|_{0,F'},
\end{aligned}$$

since $\|u_h - s_h\|_{0,F} \leq C \sum_{F' \in \mathfrak{F}_T} \|[\![u_h]\!]\|_{0,F'}$ for the Oswald interpolate. Hence, using (56) and the fact that $m_F \leq C h_T^{-1/2} m_{\mathcal{T}_T}$, the bound on $\eta_{\mathrm{U},T}$ is inferred. Finally, to prove the bound on $\eta_{\mathrm{C},1,T}$, we observe that

$$\|(Id - \Pi_0)(\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h))\|_{0,T} \leq \|\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h)\|_{0,T} = \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{P}_l(T)} \frac{(\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h), \xi)_{0,T}}{\|\xi\|_{0,T}},$$

using the assumption that $\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h) \in \mathbb{P}_l(T)$. Using the Green theorem and (21) yields

$$(\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h), \xi)_{0,T} = -(u_h - s_h, \boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\nabla\xi)_{0,T} + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_T} ((\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_T, \xi)_{0,F}.$$

Using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, the bound (57), the fact that $(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_F = \boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\mathbf{n}_F \{\!\{u_h\}\!\} + \gamma_{\boldsymbol{\beta},F}[\![u_h]\!] - \boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\mathbf{n}_F s_h$ where the norm of the right-hand side has been bounded above, and inverse inequalities to estimate $\|\nabla\xi\|_{0,T}$

and $\|\xi\|_{0,F}$, the bound on $\eta_{\mathrm{C},1,T}$ is inferred.
(2) Bounds on $\eta_{\mathrm{R},T}$ and $\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}$. Using the triangle inequality yields

$$\eta_{\mathrm{R},T} \le \rho_{1,T} + m_T\|\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h)\|_{0,T} + m_T\|\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta}u_h)\|_{0,T},$$

with $\rho_{1,T}$ defined by (42). To bound the last two terms in the right-hand side, we proceed as we did above for $\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta}s_h)$. Since $\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta}u_h) \in \mathbb{P}_l(T)$, it is easy to see that

$$m_T\|\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta}u_h)\|_{0,T} \le C m_T h_T^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T}\chi_{\mathcal{T}_T}|||u-u_h|||_{*,\mathcal{F}_T}.$$

Similarly, using (20),

$$\sup_{\xi\in\mathbb{P}_l(T)} \frac{(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h, \nabla\xi)_{0,T}}{\|\xi\|_{0,T}} \le C\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T}\gamma_{\mathbf{K},F}h_F^{-3/2}\|[\![u_h]\!]\|_{0,F},$$

and for all $F\in\mathcal{F}_T$, (18) yields

$$\|(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_F\|_{0,F} \le C(\bar{\omega}_{T,F}\|\mathbf{n}_F\cdot[\![\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h]\!]\|_{0,F} + \alpha_F\gamma_{\mathbf{K},F}h_F^{-1}\|[\![u_h]\!]\|_{0,F}). \tag{58}$$

Hence,

$$\|\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h+\mathbf{t}_h)\|_{0,T} \le C\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T}(\alpha_F\gamma_{\mathbf{K},F}h_F^{-3/2}\|[\![u_h]\!]\|_{0,F}+h_F^{-1/2}\bar{\omega}_{T,F}\|\mathbf{n}_F\cdot[\![\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h]\!]\|_{0,F}).$$

As a result, recalling that $\varsigma_T = m_T^{1/2}h_T^{-1/2}c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{1/4}$ and $\alpha_T = \max_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T}\alpha_F$,

$$m_T\|\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h)\|_{0,T} \le C\left(\varsigma_T^2\alpha_T^{1/2}\frac{C_{\mathbf{K},T}^{1/2}}{c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{1/2}}|||u-u_h|||_{*,\mathcal{F}_T} + \varsigma_T\rho_{2,T}\right),$$

with $\rho_{2,T}$ defined by (43), whence the bound on $\eta_{\mathrm{R},T}$ is inferred. Finally, since $\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T} \le \eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}^{(2)}$ owing to (36), it suffices to bound $\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}^{(2)}$. The volume term in (38) can be bounded as above since $\|(Id-\Pi_0)g\|_{0,T} \le \|g\|_{0,T}$ for all $g\in L^2(T)$. For the face term, we use (58) and the estimate $\widetilde{m}_T \le C m_T c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1/2}$ proven in [13]. □

Remark 4.1 (Estimators $\eta_{\mathrm{C},1,T}$ and $\eta_{\mathrm{U},T}$). As observed in [40, Remark 4.1], subtracting or using mean values in the estimators $\eta_{\mathrm{C},1,T}$ and $\eta_{\mathrm{U},T}$ can only lower these quantities, with noteworthy improvements in some situations. These improvements were however not taken into account in the proof of Theorem 3.2. Hence, the actual efficiency of these estimators may still be better.

4.2. Augmented norm estimates

Lemma 4.2 (Abstract augmented norm estimate)**.** *Let u be the solution of* (9) *and let $u_h \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ be arbitrary. Then,*

$$
\begin{aligned}
|||u - u_h|||_\oplus \le 2 \inf_{s \in H_0^1(\Omega)} \Big\{ |||u_h - s||| + \inf_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{q} \in \mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div},\Omega)} \sup_{\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega),\, |||\varphi|||=1} \\
\big\{ (f - \nabla{\cdot}\mathbf{t} - \nabla{\cdot}\mathbf{q} - (\mu - \nabla{\cdot}\boldsymbol{\beta}) u_h, \varphi) - (\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u_h + \mathbf{t}, \nabla\varphi) \\
+ (\nabla{\cdot}\mathbf{q} - \nabla{\cdot}(\boldsymbol{\beta} s), \varphi) - \big(\tfrac{1}{2}(\nabla{\cdot}\boldsymbol{\beta})(u_h - s), \varphi\big) \big\} \Big\} \\
+ \inf_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div},\Omega)} \sup_{\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega),\, |||\varphi|||=1} \Big\{ (f - \nabla{\cdot}\mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\beta}{\cdot}\nabla_h u_h - \mu u_h, \varphi) \\
- (\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u_h + \mathbf{t}, \nabla\varphi) - \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(u_h, \varphi) \Big\} \le 5 |||u - u_h|||_\oplus. \qquad (59)
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Using the definition of the $|||\cdot|||$- and $|||\cdot|||_\oplus$-norms, (8), the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and the fact that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(u - u_h, \cdot) = -\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(u_h, \cdot)$, it is inferred that

$$
|||u - u_h|||_\oplus \le 2 |||u - u_h||| + \sup_{\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega),\, |||\varphi|||=1} \{ \mathcal{B}(u - u_h, \varphi) - \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(u_h, \varphi) \}.
$$

For the first term, we simply use Lemma 4.1. For the second term, we use (9), add and subtract $(\mathbf{t}, \nabla\varphi)$ for an arbitrary $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div}, \Omega)$, and employ the Green theorem. This yields the upper error bound. For the lower error bound, it suffices to use again Lemma 4.1 for the first term and the fact that

$$
\mathcal{B}(u - u_h, \varphi) - \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(u_h, \varphi) = \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{S}}(u - u_h, \varphi) + (\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{A}} + \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}})(u - u_h, \varphi) \le |||u - u_h|||_\oplus |||\varphi|||
$$

for the second one. □

Proof of Theorem 3.3. We start from the abstract estimate of Lemma 4.2. As the first term is bounded by 2η owing to Theorem 3.1, we only bound the second one where we put $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}_h$. Proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 3.1

leads to

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(f-\nabla\cdot\mathbf{t}_h-\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\nabla_h u_h-\mu u_h,\varphi)-(\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u_h+\mathbf{t}_h,\nabla\varphi)-\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(u_h,\varphi)\\
&=\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\Bigg\{(f-\nabla\cdot\mathbf{t}_h-\nabla\cdot\mathbf{q}_h-(\mu-\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta})u_h,\varphi-\Pi_0\varphi)_{0,T}-(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h+\mathbf{t}_h,\nabla\varphi)_{0,T}\\
&\quad+(\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h-\boldsymbol{\beta}u_h),\varphi-\Pi_0\varphi)_{0,T}+\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T}((\mathbf{q}_h-\boldsymbol{\beta}u_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_T,\Pi_0\varphi)_{0,F}\Bigg\}-\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(u_h,\varphi)\\
&\leq\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}(\eta_{\mathrm{R},T}+\eta_{\mathrm{DF},T}+\widetilde{\eta}_{\mathrm{C},1,T}+\widetilde{\eta}_{\mathrm{U},T})|||\varphi|||_T.
\end{aligned}
$$

For the last two terms, letting $\mathbf{y}_h=\mathbf{q}_h-\boldsymbol{\beta}u_h$, we have used the relation

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T}(\mathbf{y}_h\cdot\mathbf{n}_T,\Pi_0\varphi)_{0,F}&=\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h}(\mathbf{n}_F\cdot[\![\mathbf{y}_h]\!],\{\!\{\Pi_0\varphi\}\!\})_{0,F}+(\mathbf{n}_F\cdot\{\!\{\mathbf{y}_h\}\!\},[\![\Pi_0\varphi]\!])_{0,F}\\
&=\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(u_h,\varphi)+\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h}(\Pi_{0,F}(\gamma_{\boldsymbol{\beta},F}[\![u_h]\!]),[\![\Pi_0\varphi]\!])_{0,F},
\end{aligned}
$$

and the right-hand side is estimated using (26), leading to the $\widetilde{\eta}_{\mathrm{U},T}$ estimator. □

Remark 4.2 (Role of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}$ in the augmented norm)*.* Adding the bilinear form $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}$ to the augmented norm plays an important role in that it eliminates the term $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(u_h,\varphi)$ from the above expression.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Let $\tilde{C}$ denote a generic constant depending on the parameters as in the statement of the theorem. Proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 3.2 with the $|||\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}}$-seminorm instead of the $|||\cdot|||_{*,\mathcal{F}}$-seminorm and using similar bounds on the estimators $\widetilde{\eta}_{\mathrm{C},1,T}$ and $\widetilde{\eta}_{\mathrm{U},T}$ of Theorem 3.3, it is inferred that

$$
\widetilde{\eta}\leq\tilde{C}\left\{\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}(\rho_{1,T}^2+\rho_{2,T}^2)\right\}^{1/2}+\tilde{C}|||u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h},
$$

were $\rho_{1,T}$ and $\rho_{2,T}$ are defined by (42)–(43). Since $|||u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}=|||u-u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$, it remains to bound the contributions from the residuals $\rho_{1,T}$ and $\rho_{2,T}$. For all $T\in\mathcal{T}_h$, let ψ_T be the element bubble function introduced by Verfürth

[35], $R_T := (f + \nabla\cdot(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h) - \boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\nabla u_h - \mu u_h)|_T$ and $\Psi_T := \psi_T R_T$. Observe that

$$\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \rho_{1,T}^2 \leq \tilde{C} \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} m_T^2 \big(\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{S}}(u-u_h,\Psi_T)+(\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{A}}+\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}})(u-u_h,\Psi_T)-\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(u-u_h,\Psi_T)\big).$$

Since $m_T|||\Psi_T|||_T \leq \tilde{C}\|R_T\|_{0,T}$ with a constant $\tilde{C}$ depending on the local ratios $C_{\mathbf{K},T}/c_{\mathbf{K},T}$ and $(\|\mu\|_{\infty,T} + \|\frac{1}{2}\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T})/c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}$, it is easy to see that the first two terms in the above right-hand side are bounded by $\|u - u_h\|_{\oplus}\{\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\rho_{1,T}^2\}^{1/2}$. Concerning the last term, we use an inverse inequality to infer

$$\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} m_T^2 \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(u-u_h,\Psi_T) \leq \tilde{C}\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} m_T\|R_T\|_{0,T} m_T\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,T} h_F^{-1/2}\|[\![u_h]\!]\|_{0,F},$$

which can be bounded by $|||u-u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}\{\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\rho_{1,T}^2\}^{1/2}$. Consider now $\rho_{2,T}$. For all $F\in\mathcal{F}_h$, let ψ_F be the face bubble function introduced by Verfürth in [35] (see also [18]), $R_F := \mathbf{n}_F\cdot[\![\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u_h]\!]$, and let Ψ_F be the lifting of $\psi_F R_F$ to $\mathcal{T}_F$. Observe that

$$\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\rho_{2,T}^2 \leq \tilde{C}\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} m_T c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1/2}\bar{\omega}_{T,F}^2 \Bigg\{ -\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{S}}(u-u_h,\Psi_F) - (\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{A}}+\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}})(u-u_h,\Psi_F) + \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(u-u_h,\Psi_F) + \sum_{T'\in\mathcal{T}_F}(R_{T'},\Psi_F)_{0,T'}\Bigg\} := T_1+T_2+T_3+T_4.$$

We first consider T_1 and observe that (up to a multiplicative constant $\tilde{C}$)

$$\begin{aligned}
|T_1| &\leq \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} m_T c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1/2}\bar{\omega}_{T,F}^2 \sum_{T'\in\mathcal{T}_F} |||u-u_h|||_{T'}|||\Psi_F|||_{T'} \\
&\leq \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} m_T^{1/2} c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1/4}\bar{\omega}_{T,F}\|R_F\|_{0,F}\sum_{T'\in\mathcal{T}_F}(m_T^{1/2}c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1/4}\bar{\omega}_{T,F} m_{T'}^{-1/2}c_{\mathbf{K},T'}^{1/4})|||u-u_h|||_{T'} \\
&\leq \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} m_T^{1/2} c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1/4}\bar{\omega}_{T,F}\|R_F\|_{0,F}\sum_{T'\in\mathcal{T}_F}|||u-u_h|||_{T'},
\end{aligned}$$

since $|||\Psi_F|||_{T'} \leq \tilde{C} m_{T'}^{-1/2} c_{\mathbf{K},T'}^{1/4}\|R_F\|_{0,F}$ and since, owing to (12),

$$m_T^{1/2}c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1/4}\bar{\omega}_{T,F} m_{T'}^{-1/2}c_{\mathbf{K},T'}^{1/4} \leq m_T^{1/2}\bar{\omega}_{T,F}^{1/2} m_{T'}^{-1/2} \leq \tilde{C}, \tag{60}$$

	energy norm			augmented norm			
N	err.	est.	eff.	err.	est.	eff.	$\|\|\|u_h\|\|\|_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$
128	7.74e-3	1.10e-1	14	1.40e-1	3.28e-1	2.3	3.40e-2
512	4.03e-3	4.35e-2	11	3.97e-2	1.29e-1	3.3	1.16e-2
2048	1.88e-3	1.43e-2	7.6	9.77e-3	4.14e-2	4.2	2.72e-3
8192	9.30e-4	3.58e-3	3.8	2.98e-3	1.02e-2	3.4	8.25e-4
order	1.0	2.0	-	1.7	2.0	-	1.7

Table 1: Errors ($|||u-u_h|||$ and $|||u-u_h|||_{\oplus'} + |||u-u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$), estimates ($\eta$ and $\tilde{\eta} + |||u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$), and effectivity indices as evaluated from (64) for the energy and augmented norms; $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$

with $\tilde{C}$ depending on the ratios $c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T}/c_{\boldsymbol{\beta},\mu,T'}$. The bound on T_2 is similar (details are skipped for brevity) leading to $|T_1|+|T_2| \leq \tilde{C}\|u-u_h\|_{\oplus}\{\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\rho_{2,T}^2\}^{1/2}$. We next consider T_3 and observe that (up to a multiplicative constant $\tilde{C}$)

$$
\begin{aligned}
|T_3| &\leq \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} m_T c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1/2}\bar{\omega}_{T,F}^2\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,\mathcal{T}_T}\sum_{F'\in\mathcal{F}_F}\|[\![u_h]\!]\|_{0,F'}\|\{\!\{\Pi_0\Psi_F\}\!\}\|_{0,F'} \\
&\leq \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} m_T^{1/2}c_{\mathbf{K},T}^{-1/4}\bar{\omega}_{T,F}\|R_F\|_{0,F}m_{\mathcal{T}_T}\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_{\infty,\mathcal{T}_T}\sum_{F'\in\mathcal{F}_F}h_{F'}^{-1/2}\|[\![u_h]\!]\|_{0,F'},
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used the inverse inequality $\|\{\!\{\Pi_0\Psi_F\}\!\}\|_{0,F'} \leq \tilde{C}h_{F'}^{-1/2}\|\Psi_F\|_{0,\mathcal{T}_{F'}\cap\mathcal{T}_F}$, the fact that $\|\Psi_F\|_{0,T'} \leq \tilde{C}m_{T'}^{1/2}c_{\mathbf{K},T'}^{1/4}\|R_F\|_{0,F}$, and the bound (60). This yields $|T_3| \leq \tilde{C}|||u-u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}\{\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\rho_{2,T}^2\}^{1/2}$. Finally, we proceed similarly to bound T_4 to obtain $|T_4| \leq \tilde{C}\{\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\rho_{1,T}^2\}^{1/2}\{\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\rho_{2,T}^2\}^{1/2}$. Using the previous estimate for $\{\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\rho_{1,T}^2\}^{1/2}$ completes the proof. □

5. Numerical results

We consider the domain $\Omega = \{0 < x, y < 1\}$, the reaction coefficient $\mu = 1$, the velocity field $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (1,0)^t$, and an isotropic homogeneous diffusion tensor represented by a diffusion coefficient ϵ. We run tests with $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ and $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$. We have chosen this test case so that an exact solution can be found; namely, $u = \frac{1}{2}x(x-1)y(y-1)\,(1-\tanh(10-20x))$ and the source term f is chosen accordingly. For brevity, only results for uniformly refined

			$l = 0$		$l = 1$		
N	η_{NC}	η_{U}	η_{R}	η_{DF}	η_{R}	η_{DF}	$\eta_{\mathrm{C},1}$
128	4.29e-3	6.29e-2	3.81e-2	8.10e-3	1.03e-2	8.66e-3	3.24e-2
512	1.91e-3	2.87e-2	9.91e-3	3.79e-3	1.82e-3	4.71e-3	7.71e-3
2048	8.87e-4	9.77e-3	2.42e-3	1.42e-3	3.19e-4	2.16e-3	1.53e-3
8192	4.13e-4	2.11e-3	6.12e-4	4.97e-4	4.07e-5	8.40e-4	3.38e-4
order	1.1	2.2	2.0	1.5	3.0	1.4	2.2

Table 2: Estimators contributing to η for $l = 0$ and $l = 1$; $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$

structured meshes are presented; results on unstructured meshes are similar. In the tables below, N is the number of mesh elements. In the present setting, the jump seminorm $\|\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$ defined by (51) can be evaluated for $v \in H^1(\mathcal{T}_h)$ as

$$|||v|||^2_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h} = \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h} (\tfrac{1}{2}\alpha_F \epsilon h_F^{-1} + h_F + m_F^2 h_F^{-1}) \|[\![v]\!]\|^2_{0,F}, \qquad (61)$$

with $m_F = \min(h_F \epsilon^{-1/2}, 1)$ replacing h_T by h_F in the definition of $m_{\mathcal{T}_T}$. Moreover, observing that for all $\varphi \in H^1_0(\Omega)$,

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{A}}(v,\varphi) + \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(v,\varphi) = -(v, \boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\nabla\varphi) + \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h} (\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\mathbf{n}_F [\![v]\!], \{\!\{\varphi - \Pi_0\varphi\}\!\})_{0,F}, \qquad (62)$$

and using (25), the following upper bound on the augmented norm is inferred:

$$|||v|||_\oplus \le |||v|||_{\oplus'} := |||v||| + \epsilon^{-1/2}\|v\| + \left\{ \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} C_{\mathrm{t},T,F} \widetilde{m}_T \|[\![v]\!]\|^2_{0,F} \right\}^{1/2}. \qquad (63)$$

We will use this computable bound on $|||v|||_\oplus$ and consider two effectivity indices,

$$\frac{\eta}{|||u-u_h|||} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{\widetilde{\eta} + |||u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}}{|||u-u_h|||_{\oplus'} + |||u-u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}}, \qquad (64)$$

illustrating the results of Theorems 3.1 and 3.5. Observe that the scaling factor $\widetilde{m}_T$ in (63) scales as $\epsilon^{-1/2}$ for $\epsilon \ll 1$ while the scaling factor in the $|||\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$-seminorm behaves as $O(1)$; this is at variance with the result of [33] where the scaling factor in the $|||\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$-seminorm behaves as ϵ^{-1} for $\epsilon \ll 1$.

N	energy norm err.	energy norm est.	energy norm eff.	augmented norm err.	augmented norm est.	augmented norm eff.	$\|\|\|u_h\|\|\|_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$
128	1.70e-3	1.34e-1	79	3.67e-1	4.05e-1	1.10	4.02e-2
512	5.65e-4	7.01e-2	124	1.44e-1	2.11e-1	1.47	2.11e-2
2048	2.14e-4	3.09e-2	144	5.35e-2	9.36e-2	1.75	9.99e-3
8192	1.00e-4	1.25e-2	125	2.14e-2	3.89e-2	1.82	4.96e-3
order	1.1	1.3	-	1.3	1.3	-	1.0

Table 3: Errors ($|||u-u_h|||$ and $|||u-u_h|||_{\oplus'} + |||u-u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$), estimates ($\eta$ and $\tilde{\eta} + |||u_h|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$), and effectivity indices as evaluated from (64) for the energy and augmented norms; $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$

For $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$, convective effects dominate on the coarsest meshes, while the local Péclet number is of order unity on the finest mesh. Table 1 presents the errors, estimates, and effectivity indices as evaluated from (64) for the energy and augmented norms. The diffusive and convective fluxes are reconstructed using $l = 0$; very similar results are obtained for $l = 1$. For the energy norm, the effectivity index decreases from 14 to 3.8, reflecting the decrease in the local Péclet number. On the contrary, for the augmented norm, the effectivity index remains fairly stable and takes values around 3. We also observe that in the augmented norm, the energy norm contribution is very small and that the $|||\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$-seminorm contribution is not significant either. Finally, on the finest meshes, the energy norm and the $|||\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$-seminorm take similar values.

A more detailed analysis of the estimators contributing to η for $l = 0$ and $l = 1$ can be found in Table 2. The residual estimator η_{R} super-converges by one order for $l = 0$ and by two orders for $l = 1$. The diffusive flux estimator η_{DF} yields among the smallest contributions to the error estimate. The upwinding estimator η_{U} is dominant, along with the first convection estimator $\eta_{\mathrm{C},1}$ for $l = 1$, while this latter estimator vanishes for $l = 0$ since in this case, $\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta}\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Os}}(u_h))$ is by construction piecewise constant. Finally, the second convection estimator $\eta_{\mathrm{C},2}$ vanishes identically because $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is divergence-free. All in all, there is little gain when going from $l = 0$ to $l = 1$.

Tables 3 and 4 report the results for $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$. In this case, the local Péclet number decreases from 1250 on the coarsest mesh to 150 on the finest mesh.

N	η_{NC}	η_{U}	$l=0$ η_{R}	$l=0$ η_{DF}	$l=1$ η_{R}	$l=1$ η_{DF}	$l=1$ $\eta_{\mathrm{C},1}$
128	2.69e-3	6.91e-2	6.62e-2	3.42e-4	1.60e-2	6.25e-4	6.40e-2
512	6.76e-4	3.60e-2	3.43e-2	2.03e-4	4.55e-3	4.60e-4	3.39e-2
2048	1.66e-4	1.46e-2	1.63e-2	1.09e-4	2.01e-3	2.68e-4	1.60e-2
8192	6.78e-5	6.70e-3	5.81e-3	5.97e-5	3.66e-4	1.38e-4	5.68e-3
order	1.3	1.1	1.5	0.86	2.5	1.0	1.5

Table 4: Estimators contributing to η for $l = 0$ and $l = 1$; $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$

For the energy norm, the effectivity index remains fairly constant, owing to the cutoff functions, but takes rather large values. On the contrary, for the augmented norm, the effectivity index is very close to the optimal value of 1 on all meshes. We also observe that the $|||\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$-seminorm contribution is larger than the energy norm, but smaller than the augmented norm. This important property is a consequence of the cutoff factors $m_{\mathcal{T}_T}$ in the $|||\cdot|||_{\#,\mathcal{F}_h}$-seminorm, see Remark 3.8. Finally, the results of Table 4 are similar to those of Table 2.

A. Nonmatching meshes

This section briefly describes the modifications needed to extend the previous results to the case of nonmatching meshes.

A.1. The setting

Let $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_{h>0}$ be a family of simplicial, possibly nonmatching meshes of the domain Ω. For each $\mathcal{T}_h$, there exists a matching simplicial submesh $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_h$ of $\mathcal{T}_h$ such that $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_h = \mathcal{T}_h$ if $\mathcal{T}_h$ is itself matching. For all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we consider the refinement of T by $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_h$, namely

$$\mathfrak{R}_T = \{T' \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_h;\ T' \subset T\}.$$

Clearly, $\mathfrak{R}_T = \{T\}$ if $\mathcal{T}_h$ is matching. Furthermore, the set $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_T$ collects the faces of $T \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_h$. We assume the following on the meshes:

(A1) $\{\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_h\}_{h>0}$ is shape-regular in the sense that there exists a constant $\kappa_{\widehat{\mathcal{T}}} > 0$ such that $\min_{T\in\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_h} d_T/h_T \geq \kappa_{\widehat{\mathcal{T}}}$ for all $h > 0$ where we recall that d_T denotes the diameter of the largest ball inscribed in T, (A2) There exists a constant $\iota_{\mathcal{T}} > 0$ such that $\min_{T' \in \mathfrak{R}_T} h_{T'}/h_T \geq \iota_{\mathcal{T}}$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and all $h > 0$.

Observe that the above assumptions imply the shape-regularity of $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_{h>0}$.

A.2. Flux and potential reconstruction on nonmatching meshes

The $\mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div}, \Omega)$-conforming diffusive and convective fluxes $\mathbf{t}_h$ and $\mathbf{q}_h$ belong to the space $\mathbf{RTN}^l(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_h)$ and are prescribed locally on all $T \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_h$ (instead of $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$) as follows: For all $F \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_T$ (instead of $F \in \mathcal{F}_T$) and all $q_h \in \mathbb{P}_l(F)$, (18) and (19) hold, and for all $\mathbf{r}_h \in \mathbb{P}^d_{l-1}(T)$, (20) and (21) hold. Observe that α_F, $\gamma_{\mathbf{K},F}$, $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{\beta},F}$, and $\omega_{T,F}$ need only be evaluated on the faces of $\mathcal{T}_h$ (where they are actually defined) since $[\![u_h]\!] = 0$ and $\{\!\{\mathbf{K}\nabla_h u_h\}\!\}_\omega = \mathbf{K}\nabla u_h$ on the remaining faces of $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_h$. The above construction leads to the following extension of Lemma 2.1.

Lemma A.1 (Local conservativity on nonmatching meshes)**.** *There holds*

$$(\nabla{\cdot}\mathbf{t}_h + \nabla{\cdot}\mathbf{q}_h + (\mu - \nabla{\cdot}\boldsymbol{\beta})u_h, \xi_h)_{0,T} = (f, \xi_h)_{0,T} \qquad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h,\ \forall \xi_h \in \mathbb{P}_l(T).$$

Proof. Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and let $\xi_h \in \mathbb{P}_l(T)$. Owing to the Green theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\nabla{\cdot}\mathbf{t}_h + \nabla{\cdot}\mathbf{q}_h, \xi_h)_{0,T} &= \sum_{T' \in \mathfrak{R}_T} (\nabla{\cdot}\mathbf{t}_h + \nabla{\cdot}\mathbf{q}_h, \xi_h)_{0,T'} \\
&= \sum_{T' \in \mathfrak{R}_T} -(\mathbf{t}_h, \nabla\xi_h)_{0,T'} + \sum_{T' \in \mathfrak{R}_T} \sum_{F \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{T'}} (\mathbf{t}_h{\cdot}\mathbf{n}_{T'}, \xi_h)_{0,F} \\
&\quad + \sum_{T' \in \mathfrak{R}_T} -(\mathbf{q}_h, \nabla\xi_h)_{0,T'} + \sum_{T' \in \mathfrak{R}_T} \sum_{F \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{T'}} (\mathbf{q}_h{\cdot}\mathbf{n}_{T'}, \xi_h)_{0,F}.
\end{aligned}$$

To handle the volumetric terms, we use (20) and (21), $\nabla\xi_h|_{T'} \in \mathbb{P}_{l-1}(T')^d$ for all $T' \in \mathfrak{R}_T$, and $[\![u_h]\!] = 0$ on those faces $F \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{T'}$ that lie in the interior of T. To handle the face terms, we use (18) and (19), the continuity of ξ_h and that of the normal component of $\mathbf{t}_h$ in the interior of T and the fact that $\xi_h|_F \in \mathbb{P}_l(F)$ for all $F \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{T'}$ and all $T' \in \mathfrak{R}_T$. This yields (23), which by (15) implies the statement of the lemma. □

For pure diffusion problems, similar developments considering only flux equilibration on subfaces in nonmatching meshes can be found in [3]. Alternatively, the flux can be reconstructed by solving local Neumann problems using mixed finite elements [22].

Finally, the $H_0^1(\Omega)$-conforming potential reconstruction s_h can be evaluated using the Oswald interpolate on the matching submesh $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_h$; see [40] for details.

A.3. Modification of the estimators

The approximation results (24)–(26) need to be employed on $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_h$ and the cutoff functions m_T, $\widetilde{m}_T$, and m_F as well as the constants $C_{\mathrm{t},T,F}$ and $C_{\mathrm{F},T,F}$ are redefined accordingly for all $T \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_h$ and $F \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_T$. The $\mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div},\Omega)$-conforming diffusive and convective fluxes $\mathbf{t}_h$ and $\mathbf{q}_h$ and the $H_0^1(\Omega)$-conforming potential s_h are reconstructed as above. Then, for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, the definition of the estimators $\eta_{\mathrm{NC},T}$, $\eta_{\mathrm{R},T}$, $\eta^{(1)}_{\mathrm{DF},T}$, and $\eta_{\mathrm{C},2,T}$ is kept unchanged while we set

$$\eta_{\mathrm{C},1,T} := \left\{ \sum_{T' \in \mathfrak{R}_T} m_{T'}^2 \|(Id - \widehat{\Pi}_0)(\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h))\|_{0,T'}^2 \right\}^{1/2}, \tag{65}$$

$$\eta_{\mathrm{U},T} := \left\{ \sum_{T' \in \mathfrak{R}_T} \left(\sum_{F \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{T'}, F \cap \partial T \neq \emptyset} m_F \|\widehat{\Pi}_{0,F}((\mathbf{q}_h - \boldsymbol{\beta} s_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_F)\|_{0,F} \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2}, \tag{66}$$

where $\widehat{\Pi}_0$ denotes the L^2-orthogonal projection onto $V^0(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_h)$ and $\widehat{\Pi}_{0,F}$ the L^2-orthogonal projection onto $\mathbb{P}_0(F)$, and we also set

$$\eta^{(2)}_{\mathrm{DF},T} := \left\{ \sum_{T' \in \mathfrak{R}_T} \left(m_{T'} \|(Id - \widehat{\Pi}_0)(\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h))\|_{0,T'} \right.\right. \tag{67}$$
$$\left.\left. + \widetilde{m}_{T'}^{1/2} \sum_{F \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{T'}, F \subset \partial T} C_{\mathrm{t},T',F}^{1/2} \|(\mathbf{K}\nabla u_h + \mathbf{t}_h)\cdot\mathbf{n}_F\|_{0,F} \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2}.$$

Then, it can be verified that the results of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 still hold, with the constant $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}}$ replaced by $\kappa_{\widehat{\mathcal{T}}}$ and $\iota_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Finally, the bilinear form $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}$ is modified as

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(u,v) := -\sum_{F \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}'_h} (\boldsymbol{\beta}\cdot\mathbf{n}_F [\![u]\!], \{\!\{\widehat{\Pi}_0 v\}\!\})_{0,F},$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}'_h = \{F \in \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_h;\ \exists T \in T_h, F \subset \partial T\}$, while the estimators $\widetilde{\eta}_{\mathrm{C},1,T}$ and $\widetilde{\eta}_{\mathrm{U},T}$ are modified similarly to the estimators $\eta_{\mathrm{C},1,T}$ and $\eta_{\mathrm{U},T}$ above. Then, it can be verified that the results of Theorems 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 still hold, with again the constant $\kappa_{\mathcal{T}}$ replaced by $\kappa_{\widehat{\mathcal{T}}}$ and $\iota_{\mathcal{T}}$.

References

[1] Mark Ainsworth. Robust a posteriori error estimation for nonconforming finite element approximation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 42(6):2320–2341, 2005.

[2] Mark Ainsworth. A posteriori error estimation for discontinuous Galerkin finite element approximation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 45(4):1777–1798, 2007.

[3] Mark Ainsworth and Richard Rankin. Fully computable error bounds for discontinuous Galerkin finite element approximations on meshes with an arbitrary number of levels of hanging nodes. Research Report 9, University of Strathclyde, 2008.

[4] Peter Bastian and Béatrice Rivière. Superconvergence and $H(\mathrm{div})$ projection for discontinuous Galerkin methods. *Internat. J. Numer. Methods Fluids*, 42(10):1043–1057, 2003.

[5] M. Bebendorf. A note on the Poincaré inequality for convex domains. *Z. Anal. Anwendungen*, 22(4):751–756, 2003.

[6] Roland Becker, Peter Hansbo, and Mats G. Larson. Energy norm a posteriori error estimation for discontinuous Galerkin methods. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 192(5-6):723–733, 2003.

[7] C. Bernardi and R. Verfürth. Adaptive finite element methods for elliptic equations with non-smooth coefficients. *Numer. Math.*, 85(4):579–608, 2000.

[8] Franco Brezzi and Michel Fortin. *Mixed and hybrid finite element methods*, volume 15 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.

[9] Erik Burman and Alexandre Ern. Continuous interior penalty *hp*-finite element methods for advection and advection-diffusion equations. *Math. Comp.*, 76(259):1119–1140, 2007.

[10] Erik Burman and Paolo Zunino. A domain decomposition method based on weighted interior penalties for advection-diffusion-reaction problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 44(4):1612–1638 (electronic), 2006.

[11] C. Carstensen and S. A. Funken. Constants in Clément-interpolation error and residual based a posteriori error estimates in finite element methods. *East-West J. Numer. Math.*, 8(3):153–175, 2000.

[12] Carsten Carstensen, Thirupathi Gudi, and Max Jensen. A unifying theory of a posteriori error control for discontinuous Galerkin FEM. *Numer. Math.*, 112(3):363–379, 2009.

[13] Ibrahim Cheddadi, Radek Fučík, Mariana I. Prieto, and Martin Vohralík. Guaranteed and robust a posteriori error estimates for singularly perturbed reaction–diffusion problems. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 43(5):867–888, 2009.

[14] Sarah Cochez-Dhondt. *Méthodes d'éléments finis et estimations d'erreur a posteriori.* Ph.D. thesis, Université de Valenciennes et du Hainaut-Cambrésis, 2007.

[15] Sarah Cochez-Dhondt and Serge Nicaise. Equilibrated error estimators for discontinuous Galerkin methods. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 24(5):1236–1252, 2008.

[16] Philippe Destuynder and Brigitte Métivet. Explicit error bounds in a conforming finite element method. *Math. Comp.*, 68(228):1379–1396, 1999.

[17] Daniele A. Di Pietro, Alexandre Ern, and Jean-Luc Guermond. Discontinuous Galerkin methods for anisotropic semidefinite diffusion with advection. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 46(2):805–831, 2008.

[18] A. Ern and A. F. Stephansen. A posteriori energy-norm error estimates for advection-diffusion equations approximated by weighted interior penalty methods. *J. Comp. Math.*, 26(4):488–510, 2008.

[19] Alexandre Ern, Serge Nicaise, and Martin Vohralík. An accurate $\mathbf{H}(\mathrm{div})$ flux reconstruction for discontinuous Galerkin approximations of elliptic problems. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 345:709–712, 2007.

[20] Alexandre Ern, Annette F. Stephansen, and Martin Vohralík. Improved energy norm a posteriori error estimation based on flux reconstruction for discontinuous Galerkin methods. HAL Preprint 00193540 version 1 (04-12-2007), Université Paris 6 and Ecole des Ponts, 2007.

[21] Alexandre Ern, Annette F. Stephansen, and Paolo Zunino. A discontinuous Galerkin method with weighted averages for advection-diffusion equations with locally small and anisotropic diffusivity. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 29(2):235–256, 2009.

[22] Alexandre Ern and Martin Vohralík. Flux reconstruction and a posteriori error estimation for discontinuous Galerkin methods on general nonmatching grids. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 347:441–444, 2009.

[23] Ohannes A. Karakashian and Frédéric Pascal. A posteriori error estimates for a discontinuous Galerkin approximation of second-order elliptic problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 41(6):2374–2399, 2003.

[24] Kwang Y. Kim. A posteriori error estimators for locally conservative methods of nonlinear elliptic problems. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 57:1065–1080, 2007.

[25] P. Ladevèze. *Comparaison de modèles de milieux continus*. Ph.D. thesis, Université Pierre et Marie Curie (Paris 6), 1975.

[26] P. Ladevèze and D. Leguillon. Error estimate procedure in the finite element method and applications. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 20(3):485–509, 1983.

[27] Raytcho Lazarov, Sergey Repin, and Satyendra K. Tomar. Functional a posteriori error estimates for discontinuous Galerkin approximations of elliptic problems. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 25(4):952–971, 2009.

[28] L. E. Payne and H. F. Weinberger. An optimal Poincaré inequality for convex domains. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 5:286–292 (1960), 1960.

[29] W. Prager and J. L. Synge. Approximations in elasticity based on the concept of function space. *Quart. Appl. Math.*, 5:241–269, 1947.

[30] G. Sangalli. Analysis of the advection-diffusion operator using fractional order norms. *Numer. Math.*, 97(4):779–796, 2004.

[31] G. Sangalli. A uniform analysis of nonsymmetric and coercive linear operators. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 36(6):2033–2048 (electronic), 2005.

[32] G. Sangalli. Robust a-posteriori estimator for advection-diffusion-reaction problems. *Math. Comp.*, 77(261):41–70 (electronic), 2008.

[33] Dominik Schötzau and Liang Zhu. A robust a-posteriori error estimator for discontinuous Galerkin methods for convection-diffusion equations. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 59(9):2236–2255, 2009.

[34] A. F. Stephansen. *Méthodes de Galerkine discontinues et analyse d'erreur a posteriori pour les problèmes de diffusion hétérogène.* Ph.D. thesis, Ecole Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées, 2007.

[35] R. Verfürth. A posteriori error estimators for convection–diffusion equations. *Numer. Math.*, 80(4):641–663, 1998.

[36] R. Verfürth. Robust a posteriori error estimates for stationary convection-diffusion equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 43(4):1766–1782, 2005.

[37] R. Verfürth. A note on constant-free a posteriori error estimates. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 47(4):3180–3194, 2009.

[38] Martin Vohralík. On the discrete Poincaré–Friedrichs inequalities for nonconforming approximations of the Sobolev space H^1. *Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim.*, 26(7–8):925–952, 2005.

[39] Martin Vohralík. A posteriori error estimates for lowest-order mixed finite element discretizations of convection-diffusion-reaction equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 45(4):1570–1599, 2007.

[40] Martin Vohralík. Residual flux-based a posteriori error estimates for finite volume and related locally conservative methods. *Numer. Math.*, 111(1):121–158, 2008.