

LOW-ORDER FINITE ELEMENT COMPLEX WITH APPLICATION TO A FOURTH-ORDER ELLIPTIC SINGULAR PERTURBATION PROBLEM

XUEWEI CUI AND XUEHAI HUANG

ABSTRACT. A low-order nonconforming finite element discretization of a smooth de Rham complex starting from the H^2 space in three dimensions is proposed, involving an H^2 -nonconforming finite element space, a new tangentially continuous H^1 -nonconforming vector-valued finite element space, the lowest-order Raviart-Thomas space, and piecewise constant functions. While nonconforming for the smooth complex, the discretization conforms to the classical de Rham complex. It is applied to develop a decoupled mixed finite element method for a fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem, focusing on the discretization of a generalized singularly perturbed Stokes-type equation. In contrast to Nitsche's method, which requires additional stabilization to handle boundary layers, the nodal interpolation operator for the lowest-order Nédélec element of the second kind is introduced into the discrete bilinear forms. This modification yields a decoupled mixed method that achieves optimal convergence rates uniformly with respect to the perturbation parameter, even in the presence of strong boundary layers, without requiring any additional stabilization.

1. INTRODUCTION

We aim to construct a nonconforming finite element discretization of the smooth de Rham complex on a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$:

$$(1.1) \quad 0 \xrightarrow{\subset} H_0^2(\Omega) \xrightarrow{\nabla} H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} H_0(\text{div}, \Omega) \xrightarrow{\text{div}} L_0^2(\Omega) \rightarrow 0,$$

where the Sobolev spaces are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} H(\text{div}, \Omega) &:= \{\mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) : \text{div } \mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega)\}, \\ H_0(\text{div}, \Omega) &:= \{\mathbf{v} \in H(\text{div}, \Omega) : \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}, \end{aligned}$$

and $L_0^2(\Omega)$ denotes the subspace of $L^2(\Omega)$ consisting of functions with zero mean value. Hilbert complexes such as (1.1) play a fundamental role in theoretical analysis and the design of stable numerical methods for partial differential equations [3, 4, 2, 15, 6]. The complex (1.1) is smoother than the standard (domain) de Rham complex

$$(1.2) \quad 0 \xrightarrow{\subset} H_0^1(\Omega) \xrightarrow{\nabla} H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega) \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} H_0(\text{div}, \Omega) \xrightarrow{\text{div}} L_0^2(\Omega) \rightarrow 0,$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 65N30; 65N12; 65N22;

Key words and phrases. Nonconforming finite element complex, Fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem, Generalized singularly perturbed Stokes-type equation, Decoupled finite element method, Interpolation operator, Robust and optimal convergence.

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China Project 12171300.

where the relevant Sobolev spaces are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} H(\text{curl}, \Omega) &:= \{\mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) : \text{curl } \mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)\}, \\ H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega) &:= \{\mathbf{v} \in H(\text{curl}, \Omega) : \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{n} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition to (1.1), other smooth de Rham complexes include the so-called Stokes complexes:

$$(1.3) \quad 0 \xrightarrow{\subseteq} H_0^1(\Omega) \xrightarrow{\nabla} H_0(\text{grad curl}, \Omega) \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \xrightarrow{\text{div}} L_0^2(\Omega) \rightarrow 0,$$

$$(1.4) \quad 0 \xrightarrow{\subseteq} H_0^2(\Omega) \xrightarrow{\nabla} H_0^1(\text{curl}, \Omega) \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \xrightarrow{\text{div}} L_0^2(\Omega) \rightarrow 0,$$

with the associated Sobolev spaces given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_0(\text{grad curl}, \Omega) &:= \{\mathbf{v} \in H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega) : \text{curl } \mathbf{v} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)\}, \\ H_0^1(\text{curl}, \Omega) &:= \{\mathbf{v} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) : \text{curl } \mathbf{v} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finite element discretizations of the de Rham complex (1.2) have been extensively studied in the literature; see, for example, [39, 40, 2, 3, 4, 19, 18, 21]. The finite element de Rham complexes with varying degrees of smoothness developed in [19, 18] cover the discretizations of all the complexes (1.1)-(1.4).

To reduce the number of degrees of freedom (DoFs), conforming macro-element Stokes complexes on split meshes have been developed for the Stokes complex (1.3); see [22, 43]. A conforming virtual element construction for the same complex was proposed in [8]. In addition, nonconforming discretizations of the Stokes complex (1.3) have been explored in [44, 47, 69]. For the Stokes complex (1.4), conforming finite element discretizations have been studied in [19, 56], as well as on split meshes in [29, 36]. Nonconforming discretizations of the Stokes complex (1.4) were investigated in [61, 37]. In two dimensions, both conforming and nonconforming finite element discretizations of the Stokes complex have been extensively studied; see, for example, [7, 51, 49, 22, 27, 38, 35, 37, 17, 63].

A conforming finite element discretization of the smooth de Rham complex (1.1) was constructed in [19]. However, to the best of our knowledge, nonconforming finite element discretizations of complex (1.1) have not yet been explored. In this paper, we develop a low-order nonconforming finite element discretization of complex (1.1):

$$(1.5) \quad 0 \xrightarrow{\subseteq} W_h \xrightarrow{\nabla} \Phi_h \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} V_h^{\text{div}} \xrightarrow{\text{div}} \mathcal{Q}_h \rightarrow 0.$$

The space W_h is taken as the continuous H^2 -nonconforming finite element space introduced in [61], V_h^{div} is chosen as the lowest-order Raviart-Thomas element space [59, 54], and \mathcal{Q}_h consists of piecewise constant functions. The main focus of this work is the construction of a new tangentially continuous, H^1 -nonconforming, vector-valued finite element space Φ_h . The shape function space of W_h is $\mathbb{P}_2(T) \oplus b_T \mathbb{P}_1(T)$, where $b_T = \lambda_0 \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3$ is the quartic bubble function on T with λ_i ($i = 0, 1, 2, 3$) denoting the barycentric coordinate corresponding to the vertex \mathbf{v}_i . Guided by the smooth de Rham complex (1.1), the shape function space of Φ_h must contain $\nabla(b_T \mathbb{P}_1(T))$ to ensure weak continuity of the normal component across element interfaces. To this end, we augment the lowest-order Nédélec element of the second kind [55] and define the local shape function space as

$$\Phi(T) := \mathbb{P}_1(T; \mathbb{R}^3) \oplus \nabla(b_T \mathbb{P}_1(T)),$$

which has dimension 16. The DoFs for $\Phi(T)$ are given by

$$\int_e (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{t}) q \, ds, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{P}_1(e), e \in \Delta_1(T); \quad \int_F \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS, \quad F \in \Delta_2(T).$$

The resulting global finite element space Φ_h has continuous tangential components across element interfaces, i.e., $\Phi_h \subset H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega)$. The finite element complex (1.5) thus constitutes a nonconforming discretization of the smooth de Rham complex (1.1), while remaining a conforming discretization of the standard de Rham complex (1.2).

We then apply the following latter part of the finite element complex (1.5):

$$(1.6) \quad \Phi_h \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} V_h^{\text{div}} \xrightarrow{\text{div}} \mathcal{Q}_h \rightarrow 0,$$

together with the quadratic Lagrange element, to develop a decoupled mixed finite element method for the following fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem:

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{cases} \varepsilon^2 \Delta^2 u - \Delta u = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = \partial_n u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ is a given function, Δ^2 is the biharmonic operator, ∂_n represents the normal derivative on the boundary, and $\varepsilon > 0$ is a real parameter. Notably, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, problem (1.7) degenerates into the classical Poisson equation, giving rise to boundary layer phenomena.

Classical approaches to problem (1.7) based on H^2 -conforming finite elements [42, 16, 13, 70] have been studied in [60]. However, due to the considerable difficulty in implementing H^2 -conforming elements, H^2 -nonconforming elements, such as those developed in [64, 14, 66, 71, 68, 65, 20, 57], are more commonly adopted. An alternative strategy is the C^0 interior penalty discontinuous Galerkin method, which employs the Lagrange element spaces and was introduced in [11, 28]. Most of the aforementioned methods, including those in [64, 14, 66, 65, 20, 57], were designed for the primal formulation of the problem (1.7). While these methods typically yield uniform error estimates with respect to ε , they do not achieve optimal convergence rates. In particular, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the convergence rate is generally limited to $\mathcal{O}(h^{1/2})$, which is sharp but suboptimal.

To develop a robust and optimal discretization for the fourth-order elliptic singularly perturbed problem (1.7) with boundary layers, it is crucial that the scheme reduce to the standard discretization of the Poisson equation when $\varepsilon = 0$. In this limiting case, the discrete space, bilinear forms, and right-hand side should involve only the boundary condition $u = 0$, without enforcing $\partial_n u = 0$ strongly or weakly.

A common strategy for achieving this is to impose the boundary condition $\partial_n u = 0$ weakly using Nitsche's method [58] or the penalty technique [1], instead of incorporating $\partial_n u = 0$ directly into the discrete space, as done in [34, 67, 45]. Another alternative is to adopt the mixed formulation for the fourth-order operator proposed in [46, 50]. However, Nitsche-type methods introduce additional stabilization terms, and mixed formulations lead to saddle-point systems, making the implementation more involved, even though both approaches can deliver optimal and parameter-uniform error estimates.

To avoid the penalty terms required by Nitsche-type methods and the saddle-point structure of mixed methods, we instead decouple the fourth-order singularly perturbed problem (1.7) into a sequence of second-order problems and incorporate

a suitable interpolation operator into the discrete bilinear forms. This yields a new finite element scheme that achieves optimal and uniform accuracy across all perturbation regimes while maintaining a simpler implementation framework. Decoupling high-order elliptic equations into Poisson-type and Stokes-type problems, as in the frameworks proposed in [15, 30], offers an effective strategy for designing efficient numerical methods for such equations. Applying the framework in [15], we decouple the fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem (1.7) into a combination of two Poisson equations and a generalized singularly perturbed Stokes-type equation involving the curl operator: find $u, w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $\mathbf{p} \in H_0(\text{div}, \Omega)$ and $\lambda \in L_0^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$(1.8a) \quad (\nabla w, \nabla v) = (f, v),$$

$$(1.8b) \quad \varepsilon^2(\nabla \phi, \nabla \psi) + (\phi, \psi) + (\text{curl } \psi, \mathbf{p}) = (\nabla w, \psi),$$

$$(1.8c) \quad (\mu, \text{div } \mathbf{p}) = 0,$$

$$(1.8d) \quad (\text{curl } \phi, \mathbf{q}) - (\lambda, \text{div } \mathbf{q}) = 0,$$

$$(1.8e) \quad (\nabla u, \nabla \chi) = (\phi, \nabla \chi),$$

for any $v, \chi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\psi \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $\mathbf{q} \in H_0(\text{div}, \Omega)$ and $\mu \in L_0^2(\Omega)$. The well-posedness of the generalized singularly perturbed Stokes-type equation (1.8b)-(1.8d) is related to the smooth de Rham complex (1.1). We establish the well-posedness of the decoupled formulation (1.8) and demonstrate its equivalence to problem (1.7).

The formulation (1.8) is termed “decoupled” because it can be solved sequentially: one first computes w from (1.8a); then solves for ϕ , \mathbf{p} , and λ using (1.8b)-(1.8d); and finally obtains u from (1.8e).

Based on the decoupled formulation (1.8), we propose a novel decoupled non-conforming finite element method for the fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem (1.7), using the short finite element complex (1.6) in conjunction with the quadratic Lagrange element. The weak formulations (1.8a) and (1.8e) of the Poisson equations are discretized using quadratic Lagrange elements, while the finite element spaces Φ_h , V_h^{div} , and \mathcal{Q}_h from complex (1.5) are employed to approximate ϕ , \mathbf{p} , and λ in the generalized singularly perturbed Stokes-type system (1.8b)-(1.8d), respectively.

Inspired by the approach in [66, 65], we introduce the nodal interpolation operator I_h^{ND} associated with the lowest-order Nédélec element of the second kind [55] into the discrete bilinear forms. Specifically, we replace (ϕ_h, ψ) and $(\text{curl } \phi_h, \mathbf{q})$ with $(I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi)$ and $(\text{curl}(I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h), \mathbf{q})$, respectively. The resulting decoupled finite element method achieves optimal convergence rates uniformly with respect to the perturbation parameter ε , even in the presence of strong boundary layers, without requiring additional stabilization, compared with the Nitsche-type methods in [34, 67, 45]. Moreover, the discrete systems arising from these Nitsche-type methods and from the mixed methods in [46, 50] correspond to the original fourth-order problem and therefore have condition numbers of order $\mathcal{O}(h^4)$. In contrast, the proposed decoupled formulation consists solely of second-order problems with $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ condition numbers, facilitating the design of more efficient solvers. We further show that the proposed method is equivalent to the following nonconforming finite element method: find $u_h^W \in W_h$ such that

$$\varepsilon^2(\nabla_h^2 u_h^W, \nabla_h^2 v) + (\nabla(I_h^{\text{grad}} u_h^W), \nabla(I_h^{\text{grad}} v)) = (f, I_h^{\text{grad}} v) \quad \forall v \in W_h,$$

where I_h^{grad} is the nodal interpolation operator of the quadratic Lagrange element.

It is worth noting that the interpolation operator introduced in [66, 65] was originally designed to address the divergence of the Morley-Wang-Xu method for the Poisson equation, rather than to improve its convergence rate; consequently, the uniform convergence achieved there remains suboptimal at $\mathcal{O}(h^{1/2})$. In contrast, we are the first to employ the interpolation operator I_h^{ND} explicitly to attain optimal convergence for the finite element method. This approach can also be extended to other singularly perturbed problems.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the necessary notation and develops a nonconforming finite element complex along with a corresponding commutative diagram. Section 3 presents the decoupled formulation of the fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem, and establishes its equivalence to the original problem. In Section 4, we propose an optimal and robust decoupled nonconforming finite element method. Finally, Section 5 provides numerical experiments to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed approach.

2. LOW-ORDER NONCONFORMING FINITE ELEMENT COMPLEX

In this section, we propose a low-order nonconforming finite element discretization of the smooth de Rham complex (1.1), given by

$$(2.1) \quad 0 \xrightarrow{\subset} W_h \xrightarrow{\nabla} \Phi_h \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} V_h^{\text{div}} \xrightarrow{\text{div}} \mathcal{Q}_h \rightarrow 0,$$

where W_h is the continuous H^2 -nonconforming finite element space in [61], Φ_h is a new tangential-continuous H^1 -nonconforming vector-valued finite element space constructed in this section, V_h^{div} is the lowest-order Raviart-Thomas element space [59, 54], and \mathcal{Q}_h is the piecewise constant space. We assume throughout this paper that the bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is topologically trivial.

2.1. Notation. Given an integer $m \geq 0$ and a bounded domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, we define $H^m(D)$ as the standard Sobolev space of functions on D . The corresponding norm and semi-norm are denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{m,D}$ and $|\cdot|_{m,D}$, respectively. Set $L^2(D) = H^0(D)$. For integer $k \geq 0$, let $\mathbb{P}_k(D)$ represent the space of all polynomials in D with the total degree no more than k . Set $\mathbb{P}_k(D) = \{0\}$ for $k < 0$. Let $L_0^2(D)$ be the space of functions in $L^2(D)$ with vanishing integral average values. For a space $B(D)$ defined on D , let $B(D; \mathbb{R}^3) := B(D) \otimes \mathbb{R}^3$ be its vector version. We denote $(\cdot, \cdot)_D$ as the usual inner product on $L^2(D)$ or $L^2(D; \mathbb{R}^3)$. We denote $H_0^m(D)$ ($H_0^m(D; \mathbb{R}^3)$) as the closure of $C_0^\infty(D)$ ($C_0^\infty(D; \mathbb{R}^3)$) with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{m,D}$. In case D is Ω , we abbreviate $\|\cdot\|_{m,D}$, $|\cdot|_{m,D}$ and $(\cdot, \cdot)_D$ as $\|\cdot\|_m$, $|\cdot|_m$ and (\cdot, \cdot) , respectively. Let $Q_D^k : L^2(D) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_k(D)$ denote the L^2 -orthogonal projection operator. Its vector-valued analogue is still denoted by Q_D^k . For brevity, we write $Q_D := Q_D^0$ for the projection onto piecewise constants. We use $\mathbf{n}_{\partial D}$ to denote the unit outward normal vector of ∂D , which will be abbreviated as \mathbf{n} if it does not cause any confusion.

Let $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_{h>0}$ be a regular family of tetrahedral meshes of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, where $h = \max_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_T$ with h_T being the diameter of tetrahedron T . For $\ell = 0, 1, 2$, denote by $\Delta_\ell(\mathcal{T}_h)$ and $\Delta_\ell(\mathcal{T}_h)$ the set of all subsimplices and all interior subsimplices of dimension ℓ in the partition \mathcal{T}_h , respectively. For a tetrahedron T , we let $\Delta_\ell(T)$ denote the set of subsimplices of dimension ℓ . For a subsimplex f of \mathcal{T}_h , let \mathcal{T}_f be the set of all tetrahedrons in \mathcal{T}_h sharing f . Denote by ω_T the union of all the simplices in the set $\{\mathcal{T}_v\}_{v \in \Delta_0(T)}$. For a face $F \in \Delta_2(\mathcal{T}_h)$, let $\Delta_1(F)$ be the set of all edges of F , and \mathbf{n}_F be its unit normal vector, which will be abbreviated as \mathbf{n} .

For an edge $e \in \Delta_1(\mathcal{T}_h)$, let \mathbf{t}_e be its unit tangent vector, which will be abbreviated as \mathbf{t} . Consider two adjacent tetrahedrons, T_1 and T_2 sharing an interior face F . Define the jump of a function w on F as

$$[w] := (w|_{T_1})|_F \mathbf{n}_F \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\partial T_1} + (w|_{T_2})|_F \mathbf{n}_F \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\partial T_2}.$$

On a face F lying on the boundary $\partial\Omega$, the jump becomes $[w] := w|_F$. For a vector-valued function \mathbf{v} , define

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}, \quad \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{v} = \nabla \times \mathbf{v},$$

where ∇ denotes the gradient operator.

Let ∇_h , curl_h and div_h be the element-wise counterpart of ∇ , curl and div with respect to \mathcal{T}_h , respectively. For piecewise smooth function v , introduce broken norms:

$$\|v\|_{1,h} := (\|v\|_0^2 + |v|_{1,h}^2)^{1/2}, \quad |v|_{j,h} := \|\nabla_h^j v\|_0 \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2.$$

In this paper, we use “ $\lesssim \dots$ ” to mean that “ $\leq C \dots$ ”, where C is a generic positive constant independent of the mesh size h and the singular perturbation parameter ε , which may take different values in different contexts. Moreover, $A \approx B$ means that $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$.

2.2. Finite element de Rham complex. We revisit the finite element de Rham complex [39, 40, 3, 4, 2] in this subsection.

Recall the quadratic Lagrange element space [25, 72]

$$V_h^{\operatorname{grad}} = \{v_h \in H_0^1(\Omega) : v_h|_T \in \mathbb{P}_2(T) \text{ for } T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$$

with the degrees of freedom (DoFs) given by

$$(2.2a) \quad v(\mathbf{v}), \quad \mathbf{v} \in \Delta_0(T),$$

$$(2.2b) \quad \int_e v \, ds, \quad e \in \Delta_1(T),$$

the lowest order Nédélec element space of the second kind [55]

$$V_h^{\operatorname{ND}} = \{\mathbf{v}_h \in H_0(\operatorname{curl}, \Omega) : \mathbf{v}_h|_T \in \mathbb{P}_1(T; \mathbb{R}^3) \text{ for } T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$$

with the DoFs given by

$$(2.3) \quad \int_e (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{t}) q \, ds, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{P}_1(e), e \in \Delta_1(T),$$

the lowest order Raviart-Thomas element space [59, 54]

$$V_h^{\operatorname{div}} = \{\mathbf{v}_h \in H_0(\operatorname{div}, \Omega) : \mathbf{v}_h|_T \in \mathbb{P}_0(T; \mathbb{R}^3) \oplus \mathbf{x}\mathbb{P}_0(T) \text{ for } T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$$

with DoFs given by

$$\int_F \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS, \quad F \in \Delta_2(T),$$

and the scalar-valued piecewise constant space

$$\mathcal{Q}_h = \{v_h \in L_0^2(\Omega) : v_h|_T \in \mathbb{P}_0(T) \text{ for } T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}.$$

A combination of the above finite element spaces leads to the following finite element de Rham complex [39, 40, 3, 4, 2]:

$$(2.4) \quad 0 \xrightarrow{\subset} V_h^{\operatorname{grad}} \xrightarrow{\nabla} V_h^{\operatorname{ND}} \xrightarrow{\operatorname{curl}} V_h^{\operatorname{div}} \xrightarrow{\operatorname{div}} \mathcal{Q}_h \rightarrow 0.$$

Let $\Pi_h^{\text{grad}} : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow V_h^{\text{grad}}$, $\Pi_h^{\text{ND}} : H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega) \rightarrow V_h^{\text{ND}}$, $I_h^{\text{RT}} : H_0(\text{div}, \Omega) \rightarrow V_h^{\text{div}}$ and $Q_h : L_0^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_h$ be the L^2 -bounded projection operators devised in [5, (5.2)] and [23, Page 826], which admit the following commutative diagram:

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H_0^1(\Omega) & \xrightarrow{\nabla} & H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega) & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & H_0(\text{div}, \Omega) & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & L_0^2(\Omega) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \Pi_h^{\text{grad}} & & \downarrow \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} & & \downarrow I_h^{\text{RT}} & & \downarrow Q_h & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & V_h^{\text{grad}} & \xrightarrow{\nabla} & V_h^{\text{ND}} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & V_h^{\text{div}} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & \mathcal{Q}_h & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}.$$

We have the following interpolation error estimates

$$(2.6) \quad \|\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \mathbf{v}\|_{0,T} + h_T \|\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \mathbf{v}\|_{1,T} \lesssim h_T^s |\mathbf{v}|_{s, \omega_T}$$

for any $\mathbf{v} \in H^s(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega)$ and $1 \leq s \leq 2$, and

$$(2.7) \quad \|\mathbf{v} - I_h^{\text{RT}} \mathbf{v}\|_0 \lesssim h |\mathbf{v}|_1 \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap H_0(\text{div}, \Omega).$$

2.3. H^1 -nonconforming finite element for vectors. In this subsection, we construct a tangential continuous H^1 -nonconforming finite element by enriching the linear Nédélec elements of the second kind [55] to enhance the weak continuity of the normal component across element interfaces.

To this end, for each tetrahedron T with vertices $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_3$, we take the shape function space as

$$\Phi(T) := \mathbb{P}_1(T; \mathbb{R}^3) \oplus \nabla(b_T \mathbb{P}_1(T)),$$

where $b_T = \lambda_0 \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3$ is the quartic bubble function on T with λ_i ($i = 0, 1, 2, 3$) denoting the barycentric coordinate corresponding to the vertex \mathbf{v}_i . The DoFs of $\Phi(T)$ are given by

$$(2.8a) \quad \int_e (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{t}) q \, ds, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{P}_1(e), e \in \Delta_1(T),$$

$$(2.8b) \quad \int_F \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS, \quad F \in \Delta_2(T).$$

The edge-based DoF (2.8a) is exactly that of the linear Nédélec elements of the second kind [55], while the face-based DoF (2.8b) enhances the weak continuity of the normal component across element interfaces. The DoFs (2.8) are illustrated in Fig. 1 (a).

Lemma 2.1. *The DoFs (2.8) are unisolvent for the shape function space $\Phi(T)$.*

Proof. Both the number of DoFs (2.8) and $\dim \Phi(T)$ are

$$\dim \mathbb{P}_1(T; \mathbb{R}^3) + \dim \nabla(b_T \mathbb{P}_1(T)) = 16.$$

Let $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_1 + \nabla(b_T p) \in \Phi(T)$ with $\mathbf{v}_1 \in \mathbb{P}_1(T; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $p \in \mathbb{P}_1(T)$ belong to the kernel of the DoFs (2.8). First, we have

$$\int_e (\nabla(b_T p) \cdot \mathbf{t}) q \, ds = 0 \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{P}_1(e), e \in \Delta_1(T).$$

Then the vanishing DoF (2.8a) implies that

$$\int_e (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{t}) q \, ds = \int_e (\mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{t}) q \, ds = 0 \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{P}_1(e), e \in \Delta_1(T).$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{v}_1 = 0$ holds from the unisolvence for the second-kind Nédélec element [55, Theorem 5]. Consequently, \mathbf{v} can be expressed as $\mathbf{v} = \nabla(b_T p)$. Furthermore, for face $F_i \in \Delta_2(T)$ opposite to vertex \mathbf{v}_i ($i = 0, 1, 2, 3$), the vanishing DoF (2.8b) yields

$$\int_{F_i} \nabla(b_T p) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS = (\nabla \lambda_i \cdot \mathbf{n}) \int_{F_i} b_{F_i} p \, dS = 0,$$

where b_{F_i} is the face bubble function on F_i determined by $b_T = \lambda_i b_{F_i}$. This implies that

$$\int_{F_i} b_{F_i} p \, dS = 0, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3.$$

Expand $p = \sum_{i=0}^3 C_i \lambda_i$ with $C_i \in \mathbb{R}$. By a direct computation, we have

$$C_1 + C_2 + C_3 = C_0 + C_2 + C_3 = C_0 + C_1 + C_3 = C_0 + C_1 + C_2 = 0.$$


Thus, $C_0 = C_1 = C_2 = C_3 = 0$, and $\mathbf{v} = 0$. \square

The H^1 -nonconforming vector-valued space Φ_h is given by


$$\Phi_h = \{\mathbf{v}_h \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) : \mathbf{v}_h|_T \in \Phi(T) \text{ for } T \in \mathcal{T}_h, \text{ all the DoFs (2.8) are single-valued, and all the DoFs (2.8) on } \partial\Omega \text{ vanish}\}.$$

This construction ensures that Φ_h has the globally continuous tangential component, i.e., $\Phi_h \subset H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega)$. Moreover, Φ_h satisfies the weak continuity

$$(2.9) \quad \int_F [\mathbf{v}_h] \, dS = 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \Phi_h, F \in \Delta_2(\mathcal{T}_h).$$



(A) Sixteen DoFs (2.8) of Φ_h .



(B) Fourteen DoFs (2.10) of W_h .

FIGURE 1. DoFs of Φ_h and W_h on a tetrahedron.

2.4. Nonconforming finite element complex. We first revisit the continuous H^2 -nonconforming finite element space in [61, Section 2]. The shape function space is $\mathbb{P}_2(T) \oplus b_T \mathbb{P}_1(T)$, and the DoFs are given by (see Fig. 1 (b)):

$$(2.10a) \quad v(\mathbf{v}), \quad \mathbf{v} \in \Delta_0(T),$$

$$(2.10b) \quad \int_e v \, ds, \quad e \in \Delta_1(T),$$

$$(2.10c) \quad \int_F \partial_n v \, dS, \quad F \in \Delta_2(T).$$

The global H^2 -nonconforming finite element space is defined by
(2.11)

$$W_h = \{v_h \in L^2(\Omega) : v_h|_T \in \mathbb{P}_2(T) \oplus b_T \mathbb{P}_1(T) \text{ for } T \in \mathcal{T}_h, \text{ all the}$$

DoFs in (2.10) are single-valued, and those located on $\partial\Omega$ vanish}.

It holds that $W_h \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Theorem 2.2. *Assume that the domain Ω is contractible. The finite element complex (2.1) is exact.*

Proof. By the definitions of W_h and Φ_h , it is clear that (2.1) is a complex. Then we show that the complex is exact.

Take $\phi_h \in \Phi_h \cap \ker(\text{curl})$. Since $H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega) \cap \ker(\text{curl}) = \nabla H_0^1(\Omega)$ (cf. [26, Theorem 1.1] and [3, (2.14)]) and $\Phi_h \subset H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega)$, there exists a $w_h \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $\phi_h = \nabla w_h$ and $w_h|_T \in \mathbb{P}_2(T) \oplus b_T \mathbb{P}_1(T)$. Apply the weak continuity (2.9) to have $w_h \in W_h$. That is $\Phi_h \cap \ker(\text{curl}) = \nabla W_h$. This also means that

$$\dim \text{curl } \Phi_h = \dim \Phi_h - \dim W_h = |\Delta_1(\dot{\mathcal{T}}_h)| - |\Delta_0(\dot{\mathcal{T}}_h)|.$$

It follows from the exactness of the finite element de Rham complex [3, Section 5.5] that $\text{div } V_h^{\text{div}} = \mathcal{Q}_h$, and

$$\dim V_h^{\text{div}} \cap \ker(\text{div}) = \dim V_h^{\text{div}} - \dim \mathcal{Q}_h = |\Delta_2(\dot{\mathcal{T}}_h)| - |\mathcal{T}_h| + 1.$$

Employing the Euler's formula, we have

$$\dim V_h^{\text{div}} \cap \ker(\text{div}) - \dim \text{curl } \Phi_h = |\Delta_0(\dot{\mathcal{T}}_h)| - |\Delta_1(\dot{\mathcal{T}}_h)| + |\Delta_2(\dot{\mathcal{T}}_h)| - |\mathcal{T}_h| + 1 = 0.$$

Therefore, $V_h^{\text{div}} \cap \ker(\text{div}) = \text{curl } \Phi_h$, which ends the proof. \square

2.5. Interpolation operators and commutative diagram. Based on the DoFs given in (2.8), we define the interpolation operator $I_h^\Phi : H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \rightarrow \Phi_h$ as follows:

$$(2.12a) \quad \int_e (I_h^\Phi \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{t} q \, ds = \int_e (\Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{t} q \, ds, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{P}_1(e), e \in \Delta_1(\dot{\mathcal{T}}_h),$$

$$(2.12b) \quad \int_F (I_h^\Phi \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS = \int_F \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS, \quad F \in \Delta_2(\dot{\mathcal{T}}_h).$$

Based on the DoFs (2.10), we define the interpolation operator $I_h^W : H_0^2(\Omega) \rightarrow W_h$ as follows:

$$(2.13a) \quad (I_h^W \mathbf{v})(\mathbf{v}) = (\Pi_h^{\text{grad}} \mathbf{v})(\mathbf{v}), \quad \mathbf{v} \in \Delta_0(\dot{\mathcal{T}}_h),$$

$$(2.13b) \quad \int_e I_h^W \mathbf{v} \, ds = \int_e \Pi_h^{\text{grad}} \mathbf{v} \, ds, \quad e \in \Delta_1(\dot{\mathcal{T}}_h),$$

$$(2.13c) \quad \int_F \partial_n(I_h^W \mathbf{v}) \, dS = \int_F \partial_n \mathbf{v} \, dS, \quad F \in \Delta_2(\dot{\mathcal{T}}_h).$$

Lemma 2.3. *For $\mathbf{v} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap H^s(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ with $1 \leq s \leq 2$. We have for $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ that*

$$(2.14) \quad \|\mathbf{v} - I_h^\Phi \mathbf{v}\|_{0,T} + h_T \|\mathbf{v} - I_h^\Phi \mathbf{v}\|_{1,T} \lesssim h_T^s \|\mathbf{v}\|_{s, \omega_T}.$$

Proof. By an inverse inequality [12, Lemma 4.5.3], and a scaling argument [24, Section 3.1], we have

$$\|\Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \mathbf{v} - I_h^\Phi \mathbf{v}\|_{0,T}^2 + h_T^2 \|\Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \mathbf{v} - I_h^\Phi \mathbf{v}\|_{1,T}^2$$

$$\lesssim h_T \sum_{F \in \Delta_2(T)} \|Q_F^0((\Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \mathbf{v} - I_h^\Phi \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n})\|_{0,F}^2 \leq h_T \|\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \mathbf{v}\|_{0,\partial T}^2,$$

which together with a trace inequality [12, Theorem 1.6.6] implies

$$\|\mathbf{v} - I_h^\Phi \mathbf{v}\|_{0,T} + h_T |\mathbf{v} - I_h^\Phi \mathbf{v}|_{1,T} \lesssim \|\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \mathbf{v}\|_{0,T} + h_T |\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \mathbf{v}|_{1,T}.$$

Hence, (2.14) follows from the last inequality and (2.6). \square

We can obtain the following commutative diagram.

Lemma 2.4. *It holds the commutative diagram:*

$$(2.15) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H_0^2(\Omega) & \xrightarrow{\nabla} & H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & H_0(\text{div}, \Omega) & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & L_0^2(\Omega) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow I_h^W & & \downarrow I_h^\Phi & & \downarrow I_h^{\text{RT}} & & \downarrow Q_h & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & W_h & \xrightarrow{\nabla} & \Phi_h & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & V_h^{\text{div}} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & \mathcal{Q}_h & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}.$$

Proof. Thanks to the diagram (2.5), it suffices to prove

$$(2.16) \quad \nabla(I_h^W v) = I_h^\Phi(\nabla v) \quad \forall v \in H_0^2(\Omega),$$

$$(2.17) \quad \text{curl}(I_h^\Phi \mathbf{v}) = I_h^{\text{RT}}(\text{curl } \mathbf{v}) \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3).$$

For $v \in H_0^2(\Omega)$, by (2.12a), $\nabla(\Pi_h^{\text{grad}} v) = \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla v)$ from the diagram (2.5), and (2.13a)-(2.13b), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_e (\nabla(I_h^W v) - I_h^\Phi(\nabla v)) \cdot \mathbf{t} q \, ds &= \int_e (\nabla(I_h^W v) - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla v)) \cdot \mathbf{t} q \, ds \\ &= \int_e \nabla(I_h^W v - \Pi_h^{\text{grad}} v) \cdot \mathbf{t} q \, ds = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for any $q \in \mathbb{P}_1(e)$ and $e \in \Delta_1(\mathring{\mathcal{T}}_h)$. Similarly, we use (2.12b) and (2.13c) to obtain

$$\int_F (\nabla(I_h^W v) - I_h^\Phi(\nabla v)) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS = \int_F \nabla(I_h^W v - v) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS = 0, \quad \forall F \in \Delta_2(\mathring{\mathcal{T}}_h).$$

Hence, all the DoFs (2.8) of function $\nabla(I_h^W v) - I_h^\Phi(\nabla v) \in \Phi_h$ vanish, that is (2.16) holds.

Next, for any $\mathbf{v} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, using the commutative diagram (2.5), we have $I_h^{\text{RT}}(\text{curl } \mathbf{v}) = \text{curl}(\Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \mathbf{v})$. Then for each $F \in \Delta_2(\mathcal{T}_h)$, we get from the integration by parts on face F and (2.12b) that

$$\int_F (\text{curl}(I_h^\Phi \mathbf{v}) - I_h^{\text{RT}}(\text{curl } \mathbf{v})) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS = \int_F \text{curl}(I_h^\Phi \mathbf{v} - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS = 0.$$

This together with the fact $\text{curl}(I_h^\Phi \mathbf{v}) - I_h^{\text{RT}}(\text{curl } \mathbf{v}) \in V_h^{\text{div}}$ yields (2.17). \square

For constructing an optimal decoupled method for the fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem, we need to introduce the nodal interpolation operator for the finite element space V_h^{ND} . Let $I_h^{\text{ND}} : H_0^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) + \Phi_h \rightarrow V_h^{\text{ND}}$ be the nodal interpolation operator based on DoFs (2.3):

$$(2.18) \quad \int_e ((I_h^{\text{ND}} \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{t}) q \, ds = \int_e (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{t}) q \, ds, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{P}_1(e), e \in \Delta_1(\mathring{\mathcal{T}}_h),$$

and $I_h^{\text{grad}} : H_0^2(\Omega) + W_h \rightarrow V_h^{\text{grad}}$ be the nodal interpolation operator based on the DoFs (2.2). It can be verified that

$$(2.19) \quad I_h^{\text{ND}}(I_h^\Phi \mathbf{v}) = \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \mathbf{v} \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega),$$

$$I_h^{\text{grad}}(I_h^W v) = \Pi_h^{\text{grad}} v \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Then the commutative diagram (2.15) can be extended to the following three-line commutative diagram

$$(2.20) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H_0^2(\Omega) & \xrightarrow{\nabla} & H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & H_0(\text{div}, \Omega) & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & L_0^2(\Omega) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow I_h^W & & \downarrow I_h^\Phi & & \downarrow I_h^{\text{RT}} & & \downarrow Q_h & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & W_h & \xrightarrow{\nabla} & \Phi_h & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & V_h^{\text{div}} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & \mathcal{Q}_h & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow I_h^{\text{grad}} & & \downarrow I_h^{\text{ND}} & & \downarrow I & & \downarrow I & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & V_h^{\text{grad}} & \xrightarrow{\nabla} & V_h^{\text{ND}} & \xrightarrow{\text{curl}} & V_h^{\text{div}} & \xrightarrow{\text{div}} & \mathcal{Q}_h & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array} .$$

Applying the standard interpolation error analysis [24, Theorem 3.1.4] and [10, Proposition 2.2.1] together with an inverse inequality [12, Lemma 4.5.3], we have the following estimate for I_h^{ND} .

Lemma 2.5. *For $v \in \Phi_h$ with $0 \leq j \leq 2$. We have that*

$$(2.21) \quad \|v - I_h^{\text{ND}} v\|_0 \lesssim h^j |v|_{j,h}.$$

3. DECOUPLED FORMULATION OF THE FOURTH-ORDER ELLIPTIC SINGULAR PERTURBATION PROBLEM

In this section, we present a decoupled variational formulation for the fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem (1.7) in three dimensions, and use the smooth de Rham complex (1.1) to establish the well-posedness of the decoupled formulation.

3.1. The decoupled variational formulation and equivalence. The primal formulation of problem (1.7) is to find $u \in H_0^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$(3.1) \quad \varepsilon^2(\nabla^2 u, \nabla^2 v) + (\nabla u, \nabla v) = (f, v) \quad \forall v \in H_0^2(\Omega).$$

Applying the framework in [15], the formulation (3.1) can be equivalently decoupled as follows: find $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $\mathbf{p} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)/\nabla H^1(\Omega)$ and $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla w, \nabla v) &= (f, v) & \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega), \\ \varepsilon^2(\nabla \phi, \nabla \psi) + (\phi, \psi) + (\text{curl } \psi, \mathbf{p}) &= (\nabla w, \psi) & \forall \psi \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3), \\ (\text{curl } \phi, \mathbf{q}) &= 0 & \forall \mathbf{q} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)/\nabla H^1(\Omega), \\ (\nabla u, \nabla \chi) &= (\phi, \nabla \chi) & \forall \chi \in H_0^1(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

This decoupled formulation is new. Related decouplings for the fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem in two dimensions and the biharmonic equation in three dimensions are discussed in [15, Section 3.2].

To eliminate the quotient space $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)/\nabla H^1(\Omega)$, we introduce a Lagrange multiplier, yielding the following equivalent formulation: find $u, w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $\mathbf{p} \in H_0(\text{div}, \Omega)$ and $\lambda \in L_0^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$(3.2a) \quad (\nabla w, \nabla v) = (f, v),$$

$$(3.2b) \quad \varepsilon^2(\nabla \phi, \nabla \psi) + (\phi, \psi) + (\text{curl } \psi, \mathbf{p}) = (\nabla w, \psi),$$

$$(3.2c) \quad (\mu, \text{div } \mathbf{p}) = 0,$$

$$(3.2d) \quad (\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathbf{q}) - (\lambda, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{q}) = 0,$$

$$(3.2e) \quad (\nabla u, \nabla \chi) = (\boldsymbol{\phi}, \nabla \chi),$$

for any $v, \chi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $\mathbf{q} \in H_0(\operatorname{div}, \Omega)$ and $\mu \in L_0^2(\Omega)$.

Remark 3.1. Although the mixed formulation (3.2) is written as a single system, the equations (3.2a)-(3.2e) are in fact decoupled. In practice, it can be solved sequentially: one first computes w from (3.2a); then solves for $\boldsymbol{\phi}$, \mathbf{p} , and λ using (3.2b)-(3.2d); and finally obtains u from (3.2e).

Next, we analyze the well-posedness of the decoupled formulation (3.2) and its equivalence to the primal formulation (3.1). Both (3.2a) and (3.2e) are Poisson equations, which are evidently well-posed. We now focus on the well-posedness of the generalized singularly perturbed Stokes-type equation (3.2b)-(3.2d) involving the curl operator. To facilitate the analysis, we introduce the following bilinear forms

$$a(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \lambda; \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu) := \varepsilon^2(\nabla \boldsymbol{\phi}, \nabla \boldsymbol{\psi}) + (\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\psi}), \quad b(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu; \mathbf{q}) := (\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{q}) - (\mu, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{q}),$$

and equip space $H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ with the ε -weighted norm

$$\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_\varepsilon := (\varepsilon^2 \|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_1^2 + \|\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\psi}\|_0^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_0^2)^{1/2}.$$

Clearly, we have the following continuity conditions

$$\begin{aligned} a(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \lambda; \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu) &\leq \|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_\varepsilon \|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_\varepsilon, \\ b(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu; \mathbf{q}) &\leq (\|\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\psi}\|_0 + \|\mu\|_0) \|\mathbf{q}\|_{H(\operatorname{div})}, \end{aligned}$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\psi} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $\lambda, \mu \in L_0^2(\Omega)$ and $\mathbf{q} \in H_0(\operatorname{div}, \Omega)$.

Lemma 3.2. For $(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu) \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \times L_0^2(\Omega)$ satisfying $b(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu; \mathbf{q}) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in H_0(\operatorname{div}, \Omega)$, we have

$$(3.3) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_\varepsilon^2 + \|\mu\|_0^2 = a(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu; \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu).$$

Proof. By taking $\mathbf{q} = \operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\psi}$ in $b(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu; \mathbf{q}) = 0$, we get $\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\psi} = 0$. Then we have $(\mu, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{q}) = 0$ for $\mathbf{q} \in H_0(\operatorname{div}, \Omega)$, so $\mu = 0$. Therefore, we get (3.3). \square

Lemma 3.3. For $\mathbf{q} \in H_0(\operatorname{div}, \Omega)$, it holds

$$(3.4) \quad \|\mathbf{q}\|_{H(\operatorname{div})} \lesssim \sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3), \mu \in L_0^2(\Omega)} \frac{b(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu; \mathbf{q})}{\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_\varepsilon + \|\mu\|_0} := \beta.$$

Proof. Firstly, utilizing $\operatorname{div} H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) = L_0^2(\Omega)$ [26, Theorem 1.1], it holds

$$(3.5) \quad \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{q}\|_0 \lesssim \sup_{\mu \in L_0^2(\Omega)} \frac{(\mu, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{q})}{\|\mu\|_0} \lesssim \beta.$$

On the other hand, for $\mathbf{q} \in H_0(\operatorname{div}, \Omega)$, according to the regular decomposition [41, Lemma 3.8]

$$H_0(\operatorname{div}, \Omega) = \operatorname{curl}(H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)) + H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3),$$

there exist $\bar{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\bar{\mathbf{p}} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$\mathbf{q} = \operatorname{curl} \bar{\boldsymbol{\phi}} + \bar{\mathbf{p}}, \quad \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\|_1 \lesssim \|\operatorname{curl} \bar{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\|_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\bar{\mathbf{p}}\|_1 \lesssim \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{q}\|_0.$$

Thus,

$$\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\|_\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\|_1 + \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\|_0 + \|\operatorname{curl} \bar{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\|_0 \lesssim \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\|_1 \lesssim \|\operatorname{curl} \bar{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\|_0.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{q}\|_0 &\leq \|\bar{\mathbf{p}}\|_0 + \|\operatorname{curl} \bar{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\|_0 \lesssim \|\bar{\mathbf{p}}\|_0 + \frac{(\operatorname{curl} \bar{\boldsymbol{\phi}}, \mathbf{q} - \bar{\mathbf{p}})}{\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\|_\varepsilon} \\
&\lesssim \|\bar{\mathbf{p}}\|_0 + \sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)} \frac{(\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{q} - \bar{\mathbf{p}})}{\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_\varepsilon} \\
&\lesssim \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{q}\|_0 + \sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)} \frac{(\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{q})}{\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_\varepsilon} \leq \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{q}\|_0 + \beta.
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude (3.4) from the above inequality and (3.5). \square

Theorem 3.4. *The decoupled formulation (3.2) is well-posed, and equivalent to the primal formulation (3.1). That is, if $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is the solution of problem (3.2a), $(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathbf{p}, \lambda) \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \times H_0(\operatorname{div}, \Omega) \times L_0^2(\Omega)$ is the solution of problem (3.2b)-(3.2d), and $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is the solution of problem (3.2e), then $\lambda = 0$, $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{p} = 0$, $\boldsymbol{\phi} = \nabla u$, and $u \in H_0^2(\Omega)$ is the solution of the primal formulation (3.1).*

Proof. Both (3.2a) and (3.2e) are the weak formulation of Poisson equation, which are evidently well-posed [24, Theorem 1.1.3]. Thanks to the coercivity (3.3) and the inf-sup condition (3.4), apply the Babuša-Brezzi theory [10, Theorem 4.2.3] to acquire the well-posedness of the generalized singularly perturbed Stokes-type equation (3.2b)-(3.2d). Thus, the decoupled formulation (3.2) is well-posed.

Next we show the equivalence between the decoupled formulation (3.2) and the primal formulation (3.1). Take $\mathbf{q} = \operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\phi}$ in (3.2d) to result in $\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\phi} = 0$ and $\lambda = 0$. Then $\boldsymbol{\phi} = \nabla \tilde{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ with some $\tilde{u} \in H_0^2(\Omega)$. From (3.2e), we have $u = \tilde{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{\phi} = \nabla u$. By setting $\boldsymbol{\psi} = \nabla v$ with $v \in H_0^2(\Omega)$ in (3.2b), we obtain

$$\varepsilon^2(\nabla^2 u, \nabla^2 v) + (\nabla u, \nabla v) = (\nabla w, \nabla v) \quad \forall v \in H_0^2(\Omega).$$

This, along with (3.2a), leads to (3.1).

Finally, choosing $\mu = \operatorname{div} \mathbf{p}$ in (3.2c) derives $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{p} = 0$. \square

Thus, the primal formulation (3.1) of the fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem (1.7) can be decoupled into two Poisson equations (3.2a) and (3.2e), and a generalized singularly perturbed Stokes equation (3.2b)-(3.2d) involving the curl operator. This decoupling not only simplifies the mathematical structure of the fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem, but also facilitates the development of efficient finite element methods and the design of fast solvers.

Remark 3.5. By applying the integration by parts to $(\mu, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{p})$ and $(\lambda, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{q})$, the formulation (3.2) is equivalent to find $u, w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $\mathbf{p} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\lambda \in H^1(\Omega) \cap L_0^2(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\nabla w, \nabla v) &= (f, v), \\
\varepsilon^2(\nabla \boldsymbol{\phi}, \nabla \boldsymbol{\psi}) + (\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\psi}) + (\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{p}) &= (\nabla w, \boldsymbol{\psi}), \\
(\nabla \mu, \mathbf{p}) &= 0, \\
(\operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathbf{q}) + (\nabla \lambda, \mathbf{q}) &= 0, \\
(\nabla u, \nabla \chi) &= (\boldsymbol{\phi}, \nabla \chi),
\end{aligned}$$

for any $v, \chi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$, $\mathbf{q} \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\mu \in H^1(\Omega) \cap L_0^2(\Omega)$.

3.2. Regularity. When $\varepsilon = 0$, the fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem (1.7) reduces to the Poisson equation

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u_0 = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_0 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Indeed, $u_0 = w$, where $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is the solution of problem (3.2a).

Hypothesis 3.6. Assume that the Poisson equation (3.6) satisfies the regularity

$$(3.7) \quad \|u_0\|_2 = \|w\|_2 \lesssim \|f\|_0,$$

and that the fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem (1.7) satisfies the regularity

$$(3.8) \quad \|u - u_0\|_1 + \varepsilon\|u\|_2 + \varepsilon^2\|u\|_3 \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}\|f\|_0.$$

When Ω is convex, we refer to [53, 31, 48, 62] for the regularity (3.7), and [57, Lemma 5.1] and [34, Lemma 4] for the regularity (3.8) in two and three dimensions.

Based on Hypothesis 3.6, we have the following regularity for ϕ and \mathbf{p} .

Lemma 3.7. Let $(w, \phi = \nabla u, \mathbf{p}, 0, u) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \times H_0(\text{div}, \Omega) \times L_0^2(\Omega) \times H_0^2(\Omega)$ be the solution of the decoupled formulation (3.2), and let $\phi_0 = \nabla u_0 \in H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega)$. Under Hypothesis 3.6, we have

$$(3.9) \quad \|\phi_0\|_1 \lesssim \|f\|_0,$$

$$(3.10) \quad \|\phi - \phi_0\|_0 + \varepsilon\|\phi\|_1 + \varepsilon^2\|\phi\|_2 \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}\|f\|_0,$$

$$(3.11) \quad \|\text{curl } \mathbf{p}\|_0 \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2}\|f\|_0.$$

Proof. The regularity results (3.9)-(3.10) follow from (3.7)-(3.8), $\phi = \nabla u$ and $\phi_0 = \nabla u_0$. By (3.2b) and $\nabla w = \nabla u_0 = \phi_0$,

$$(3.12) \quad \text{curl } \mathbf{p} = \nabla w + \varepsilon^2 \Delta \phi - \phi = \varepsilon^2 \Delta \phi + \phi_0 - \phi.$$

This together with (3.10) implies (3.11). \square

4. DECOUPLED NONCONFORMING FINITE ELEMENT METHOD

In this section, we propose an optimal decoupled nonconforming finite element method for the fourth-order singular perturbation problem (1.7), which is robust with respect to the perturbation parameter ε .

4.1. Decoupled finite element method. We propose the following nonconforming finite element method for the decoupled formulation (3.2): find $w_h \in V_h^{\text{grad}}$, $\phi_h \in \Phi_h$, $\mathbf{p}_h \in V_h^{\text{div}}$, $\lambda_h \in \mathcal{Q}_h$, and $u_h \in V_h^{\text{grad}}$ such that

$$(4.1a) \quad (\nabla w_h, \nabla v) = (f, v),$$

$$(4.1b) \quad \varepsilon^2(\nabla_h \phi_h, \nabla_h \psi) + (I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi) + (\text{curl}(I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi), \mathbf{p}_h) = (\nabla w_h, I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi),$$

$$(4.1c) \quad (\mu, \text{div } \mathbf{p}_h) = 0,$$

$$(4.1d) \quad (\text{curl}(I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h), \mathbf{q}) - (\lambda_h, \text{div } \mathbf{q}) = 0,$$

$$(4.1e) \quad (\nabla u_h, \nabla \chi) = (I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \nabla \chi),$$

for any $v, \chi \in V_h^{\text{grad}}$, $\psi \in \Phi_h$, $\mu \in \mathcal{Q}_h$, and $\mathbf{q} \in V_h^{\text{div}}$. The discrete method (4.1) is decoupled and can be solved sequentially: first compute w_h from (4.1a); next solve for ϕ_h , \mathbf{p}_h , and λ_h using (4.1b)-(4.1d); and finally obtain u_h from (4.1e).

The interpolation operator I_h^{ND} defined by (2.18) is incorporated into the decoupled method (4.1) to ensure optimal convergence rates for arbitrary values of ε , which is inspired by [66, 65]. The interpolation operator introduced in [66, Page 116] and [65, (2.5) and (3.4)] was designed to address the divergence of the Morley-Wang-Xu method for the Poisson equation, rather than to improve its convergence rate; as a result, the uniform convergence achieved there remains suboptimal at $\mathcal{O}(h^{1/2})$. In contrast, we are the first to employ the interpolation operator I_h^{ND} explicitly to attain optimal convergence for the decoupled method (4.1).

For the purpose of the analysis, we introduce the following discrete bilinear forms

$$\begin{aligned} a_h(\phi_h, \lambda_h; \psi, \mu) &:= \varepsilon^2(\nabla_h \phi_h, \nabla_h \psi) + (I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi), \\ b_h(\phi_h, \lambda_h; \mathbf{q}) &:= b(I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \lambda_h; \mathbf{q}) = (\text{curl}(I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h), \mathbf{q}) - (\lambda_h, \text{div } \mathbf{q}). \end{aligned}$$

By the commutative diagram (2.20), we have

$$(4.2) \quad \text{curl}(I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h) = \text{curl } \phi_h \quad \text{for } \phi_h \in \Phi_h,$$

which implies

$$b_h(\phi_h, \lambda_h; \mathbf{q}) = (\text{curl } \phi_h, \mathbf{q}) - (\lambda_h, \text{div } \mathbf{q}) \quad \forall \phi_h \in \Phi_h, \mathbf{q} \in V_h^{\text{div}}.$$

Remark 4.1. The identity (4.2) implies that $\text{curl } \phi_h$ is independent of the face-based DoF (2.8b). We use $(\text{curl}(I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h), \mathbf{q})$ rather than $(\text{curl } \phi_h, \mathbf{q})$ in the discrete method (4.1) to reflect this property. Moreover, $I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h$ belongs to $H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega)$, unlike ϕ_h , and this distinction is essential for achieving the optimal and uniform convergence of the discrete method (4.1).

We define the following discrete norm for function $\psi \in H_0^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) + \Phi_h$:

$$\|\psi\|_{\varepsilon, h} := (\varepsilon^2 |\psi|_{1, h}^2 + \|\text{curl}(I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi)\|_0^2 + \|I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi\|_0^2)^{1/2}.$$

By the identity (4.2),

$$(4.3) \quad \|\psi\|_{\varepsilon, h} = (\varepsilon^2 |\psi|_{1, h}^2 + \|\text{curl } \psi\|_0^2 + \|I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi\|_0^2)^{1/2} \quad \forall \psi \in \Phi_h.$$

Clearly, we have the following discrete continuity

$$\begin{aligned} a_h(\phi, \lambda; \psi, \mu) &\leq \|\phi\|_{\varepsilon, h} \|\psi\|_{\varepsilon, h}, \\ b_h(\psi, \mu; \mathbf{q}) &\leq (\|\text{curl}(I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi)\|_0 + \|\mu\|_0) \|\mathbf{q}\|_{H(\text{div})}, \end{aligned}$$

for any $\phi, \psi \in \Phi_h$, $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{Q}_h$, and $\mathbf{q} \in V_h^{\text{div}}$.

Lemma 4.2. For $(\psi, \mu) \in \Phi_h \times \mathcal{Q}_h$ satisfying $b_h(\psi, \mu; \mathbf{q}) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{q} \in V_h^{\text{div}}$, then

$$(4.4) \quad \|\psi\|_{\varepsilon, h}^2 + \|\mu\|_0^2 = \varepsilon^2 |\psi|_{1, h}^2 + \|I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi\|_0^2 = a_h(\psi, \mu; \psi, \mu).$$

Proof. By taking $\mathbf{q} = \text{curl}(I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi)$ in $b_h(\psi, \mu; \mathbf{q}) = 0$, we get $\text{curl}(I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi) = 0$. Then we have $(\mu, \text{div } \mathbf{q}) = 0$, which together with $\text{div } V_h^{\text{div}} = \mathcal{Q}_h$ implies $\mu = 0$. Therefore, (4.4) holds. \square

With the help of the commutative diagram (2.15) and (2.20), we can establish the L^2 -stable decomposition of space V_h^{div} .

Lemma 4.3. For $\mathbf{q} \in V_h^{\text{div}}$, there exist $\mathbf{p}_h \in V_h^{\text{div}}$ and $\psi_h \in \Phi_h$, such that

$$\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{p}_h + \text{curl } \psi_h, \quad \|\mathbf{p}_h\|_{1, h} \lesssim \|\text{div } \mathbf{q}\|_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\psi_h\|_{1, h} \lesssim \|\text{curl } \psi_h\|_0.$$

Proof. Since $\mathbf{q} \in V_h^{\text{div}} \subset H_0(\text{div}, \Omega)$, by $\text{div } H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) = L_0^2(\Omega)$, there exists a $\mathbf{p} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$\text{div } \mathbf{p} = \text{div } \mathbf{q}, \quad \|\mathbf{p}\|_1 \lesssim \|\text{div } \mathbf{q}\|_0.$$

Let $\mathbf{p}_h = I_h^{\text{RT}} \mathbf{p} \in V_h^{\text{div}}$. Then by the commutative diagram (2.15) and (2.7), we have

$$\text{div } \mathbf{p}_h = Q_h(\text{div } \mathbf{p}) = \text{div } \mathbf{p}, \quad \|\mathbf{p}_h\|_{1,h} \lesssim \|\mathbf{p}\|_1 \lesssim \|\text{div } \mathbf{q}\|_0.$$

By $\text{curl } H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) = H_0(\text{div}, \Omega) \cap \ker(\text{div})$ [26, Theorem 1.1] and $\text{div}(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}_h) = 0$, there exists a $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$\text{curl } \boldsymbol{\psi} = \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}_h \in V_h^{\text{div}}, \quad \|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_1 \lesssim \|\text{curl } \boldsymbol{\psi}\|_0.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\psi}_h = I_h^\Phi \boldsymbol{\psi} \in \Phi_h$. We obtain from (2.17) and (2.14) that

$$\text{curl } \boldsymbol{\psi}_h = \text{curl}(I_h^\Phi \boldsymbol{\psi}) = I_h^{\text{RT}}(\text{curl } \boldsymbol{\psi}) = \text{curl } \boldsymbol{\psi}, \quad \|\boldsymbol{\psi}_h\|_{1,h} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_1 \lesssim \|\text{curl } \boldsymbol{\psi}\|_0.$$

This ends the proof. \square

Lemma 4.4. *It holds the discrete inf-sup condition*

$$(4.5) \quad \|\mathbf{q}\|_{H(\text{div})} \lesssim \sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \Phi_h, \mu \in \mathcal{Q}_h} \frac{b_h(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu; \mathbf{q})}{\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_{\varepsilon,h} + \|\mu\|_0} := \beta_h \quad \forall \mathbf{q} \in V_h^{\text{div}}.$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{q} \in V_h^{\text{div}}$, by $\text{div } V_h^{\text{div}} = \mathcal{Q}_h$, we have

$$(4.6) \quad \|\text{div } \mathbf{q}\|_0 \lesssim \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{Q}_h} \frac{(\mu, \text{div } \mathbf{q})}{\|\mu\|_0} \lesssim \beta_h.$$

Applying Lemma 4.3 to \mathbf{q} , it follows that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_h\|_{\varepsilon,h} \lesssim \varepsilon \|\boldsymbol{\psi}_h\|_{1,h} + \|\boldsymbol{\psi}_h\|_{1,h} \lesssim \|\text{curl } \boldsymbol{\psi}_h\|_0.$$

Then by (4.3), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{q}\|_0 &\lesssim \|\text{curl } \boldsymbol{\psi}_h\|_0 + \|\mathbf{p}_h\|_0 = \frac{(\text{curl } \boldsymbol{\psi}_h, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}_h)}{\|\text{curl } \boldsymbol{\psi}_h\|_0} + \|\mathbf{p}_h\|_0 \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \Phi_h} \frac{(\text{curl } \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}_h)}{\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_{\varepsilon,h}} + \|\mathbf{p}_h\|_0 \lesssim \sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \Phi_h} \frac{(\text{curl } \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{q})}{\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_{\varepsilon,h}} + \|\mathbf{p}_h\|_0 \\ &\lesssim \beta_h + \|\text{div } \mathbf{q}\|_0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above inequality and (4.6) yields the desired result (4.5). \square

Thanks to the discrete coercivity (4.4) and the discrete inf-sup condition (4.5), we derive the following discrete stability by using the Babuša-Brezzi theory [10, Theorem 4.2.3].

Lemma 4.5. *We have the discrete stability*

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} &\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_h\|_{\varepsilon,h} + \|\tilde{\lambda}_h\|_0 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_h\|_{H(\text{div})} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \Phi_h, \mu \in \mathcal{Q}_h, \mathbf{q} \in V_h^{\text{div}}} \frac{a_h(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_h, \tilde{\lambda}_h; \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu) + b_h(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu; \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_h) + b_h(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_h, \tilde{\lambda}_h; \mathbf{q})}{\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|_{\varepsilon,h} + \|\mu\|_0 + \|\mathbf{q}\|_{H(\text{div})}} \end{aligned}$$

for any $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_h \in \Phi_h$, $\tilde{\lambda}_h \in \mathcal{Q}_h$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_h \in V_h^{\text{div}}$. It follows that the mixed finite element method (4.1b)-(4.1d) is well-posed.

Theorem 4.6. *The decoupled finite element method (4.1) is well-posed. We have $\lambda_h = 0$, $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{p}_h = 0$, $I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h = \nabla u_h$, $\phi_h = \nabla u_h^W$, and $u_h = I_h^{\text{grad}} u_h^W$, where $u_h^W \in W_h$ is the solution of the following nonconforming finite element method:*

$$(4.8) \quad \varepsilon^2 (\nabla_h^2 u_h^W, \nabla_h^2 v) + (\nabla(I_h^{\text{grad}} u_h^W), \nabla(I_h^{\text{grad}} v)) = (f, I_h^{\text{grad}} v) \quad \forall v \in W_h.$$

Proof. Both (4.1a) and (4.1e) are Lagrange finite element methods for the Poisson equation and are therefore well-posed. Together with Lemma 4.5, this implies the well-posedness of the decoupled finite element method (4.1).

By choosing $\mathbf{q} = \operatorname{curl}(I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h)$ in (4.1d), we obtain $\operatorname{curl}(I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h) = 0$ and $\lambda_h = 0$. Then it follows from the finite element de Rham complex (2.4) and (4.1e) that $I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h = \nabla u_h$. Set $\mu = \operatorname{div} \mathbf{p}_h$ in (4.1c) to acquire $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{p}_h = 0$. By (4.2), $\operatorname{curl} \phi_h = \operatorname{curl}(I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h) = 0$, which together with the complex (2.1) indicates $\phi_h = \nabla u_h^W$ for some $u_h^W \in W_h$. By the commutative diagram (2.20), it follows that

$$\nabla u_h = I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h = I_h^{\text{ND}} (\nabla u_h^W) = \nabla(I_h^{\text{grad}} u_h^W).$$

So $u_h = I_h^{\text{grad}} u_h^W$.

By taking $\psi = \nabla v$ with $v \in W_h$, the equation (4.1b) becomes

$$\varepsilon^2 (\nabla_h^2 u_h^W, \nabla_h^2 v) + (\nabla(I_h^{\text{grad}} u_h^W), \nabla(I_h^{\text{grad}} v)) = (\nabla w_h, \nabla(I_h^{\text{grad}} v)) \quad \forall v \in W_h.$$

This combined with (4.1a) implies that u_h^W satisfies (4.8). \square

Remark 4.7. When implementing the terms in the decoupled method (4.1) that involve the interpolation operator I_h^{ND} , the relation $I_h^{\text{ND}} \Phi_h = V_h^{\text{ND}}$ allows us to directly use the basis functions of the space V_h^{ND} for assembly. Consequently, there is no need to compute the interpolation matrix of I_h^{ND} , and its use does not increase the computational cost.

4.2. Robust error analysis. Let $Q_h^{\text{RT}} \mathbf{p} \in \operatorname{curl} \Phi_h = V_h^{\text{div}} \cap \ker(\operatorname{div})$ be the L^2 -projection of \mathbf{p} onto space $\operatorname{curl} \Phi_h$. By the commutative diagram (2.5), it follows that $\operatorname{div}(I_h^{\text{RT}} \mathbf{p}) = Q_h(\operatorname{div} \mathbf{p}) = 0$, then $I_h^{\text{RT}} \mathbf{p} \in V_h^{\text{div}} \cap \ker(\operatorname{div})$. Thus, for $\mathbf{p} \in H_0(\operatorname{div}, \Omega) \cap \ker(\operatorname{div})$, we have

$$(4.9) \quad \|\mathbf{p} - Q_h^{\text{RT}} \mathbf{p}\|_0 \leq \|\mathbf{p} - I_h^{\text{RT}} \mathbf{p}\|_0.$$

The projection $Q_h^{\text{RT}} \mathbf{p}$ is vital in later analysis.

For the Lagrange element method (4.1a), applying the standard error analysis in [24, Theorem 3.2.2], we have the following estimate for $|w - w_h|_1$.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $w = u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ be the solution of the Poisson equation (3.6), $w_h \in V_h^{\text{grad}}$ be the solution of the finite element method (4.1a). Assume $w = u_0 \in H^s(\Omega)$ with $2 \leq s \leq 3$. Then it holds*

$$(4.10) \quad |w - w_h|_1 \lesssim h^{s-1} |u_0|_s.$$

Next, we provide a consistent error estimate for the mixed method (4.1b)-(4.1d).

Lemma 4.9. *Let $(\phi, \mathbf{p}, 0) \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \times H_0(\operatorname{div}, \Omega) \times L_0^2(\Omega)$ be the solution of the generalized singularly perturbed Stokes-type equation (3.2b)-(3.2d). Assume $u_0 \in H^s(\Omega)$ with $2 \leq s \leq 3$. Let $0 \leq r \leq 1$. Under Hypothesis 3.6, we have*

$$(4.11) \quad \varepsilon |\phi - I_h^\Phi \phi|_{1,h} \lesssim \varepsilon^{r-1/2} h^{1-r} \|f\|_0,$$

$$(4.12) \quad \|\phi - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \phi\|_0 \lesssim \varepsilon^{r-1/2} h^{1-r} \|f\|_0 + h^{s-1} |u_0|_s.$$

Proof. Using (2.14) and the regularities (3.9)-(3.10), we have

$$\varepsilon|\phi - I_h^\Phi \phi|_{1,h} \lesssim \varepsilon h^{1-r} |\phi|_1^r |\phi|_2^{1-r} \lesssim \varepsilon^{r-1/2} h^{1-r} \|f\|_0.$$

Hence, (4.11) is true. It follows from (2.6) and the regularities (3.9)-(3.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \phi\|_0 &\leq \|(\phi - \phi_0) - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\phi - \phi_0)\|_0 + \|\phi_0 - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_0\|_0 \\ &\lesssim h^{1-r} \|\phi - \phi_0\|_0^r |\phi - \phi_0|_1^{1-r} + \|\phi_0 - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_0\|_0 \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{r-1/2} h^{1-r} \|f\|_0 + h^{s-1} |u_0|_s. \end{aligned}$$

This implies (4.12). \square

Lemma 4.10. *Assume Hypothesis 3.6 holds and $u_0 \in H^s(\Omega)$ with $2 \leq s \leq 3$. For any $(\psi, \mu) \in \Phi_h \times \mathcal{Q}_h$, we have the following consistent error estimate*

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} a_h(I_h^\Phi \phi, 0; \psi, \mu) + b_h(\psi, \mu; Q_h^{\text{RT}} \mathbf{p}) - (\nabla w_h, I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi) \\ \lesssim (\varepsilon^{r-1/2} h^{1-r} \|f\|_0 + h^{s-1} |u_0|_s) \|\psi\|_{\varepsilon,h}, \quad 0 \leq r \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Using (2.19), $\text{curl } \mathbf{p} = \nabla w + \varepsilon^2 \Delta \phi - \phi$ by (3.12), and integration by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &a_h(I_h^\Phi \phi, 0; \psi, \mu) + b_h(\psi, \mu; Q_h^{\text{RT}} \mathbf{p}) - (\nabla w_h, I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi) \\ &= \varepsilon^2 (\nabla_h(I_h^\Phi \phi), \nabla_h \psi) + (\Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \phi, I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi) + (\text{curl}(I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi), \mathbf{p}) - (\nabla w_h, I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi) \\ (4.14) \quad &= \varepsilon^2 (\nabla_h(I_h^\Phi \phi), \nabla_h \psi) + \varepsilon^2 (\Delta \phi, I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi) \\ &\quad + (\Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \phi - \phi + \nabla(w - w_h), I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi) \\ &=: I_1 + I_2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \varepsilon^2 (\nabla_h(I_h^\Phi \phi), \nabla_h \psi) + \varepsilon^2 (\Delta \phi, I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi), \\ I_2 &= (\Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \phi - \phi + \nabla(w - w_h), I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we estimate I_1 and I_2 separately.

By (2.14) and the regularity (3.10), one has

$$I_1 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 |\phi|_1 |\psi|_{1,h} + \varepsilon^2 |\phi|_2 \|I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi\|_0 \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2} \|f\|_0 \|\psi\|_{\varepsilon,h}.$$

On the other hand, by applying the integration by parts, the weak continuity (2.9), the estimate (2.14) of I_h^Φ , the estimate (2.21) of I_h^{ND} and the regularity (3.10), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \varepsilon^2 (\nabla_h(I_h^\Phi \phi - \phi), \nabla_h \psi) + \varepsilon^2 (\Delta \phi, I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi - \psi) + \varepsilon^2 ((\nabla \phi, \nabla_h \psi) + (\Delta \phi, \psi)) \\ &= \varepsilon^2 (\nabla_h(I_h^\Phi \phi - \phi), \nabla_h \psi) + \varepsilon^2 (\Delta \phi, I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi - \psi) \\ &\quad + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \in \Delta_2(T)} \varepsilon^2 (\partial_n \phi - Q_F^0(\partial_n \phi), \psi - Q_F^0 \psi)_F \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^2 h |\phi|_2 |\psi|_{1,h} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1/2} h \|f\|_0 \|\psi\|_{\varepsilon,h}. \end{aligned}$$

Combine the above two estimates to obtain

$$(4.15) \quad I_1 \lesssim \varepsilon^{r-1/2} h^{1-r} \|f\|_0 \|\psi\|_{\varepsilon,h}.$$

It follows from estimates (4.12) and (4.10) that

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq \|\Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \phi - \phi + \nabla(w - w_h)\|_0 \|I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi\|_0 \\ &\lesssim (\varepsilon^{r-1/2} h^{1-r} \|f\|_0 + h^{s-1} |u_0|_s) \|\psi\|_{\varepsilon,h}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (4.13) follows from (4.14)-(4.16). \square

Theorem 4.11. *Let $(w, \phi, \mathbf{p}, 0, u)$ be the solution of the decoupled variational formulation (3.2), $u_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ be the solution of the Poisson equation (3.6), $\phi_0 = \nabla u_0 \in H_0(\text{curl}, \Omega)$, and $(w_h, \phi_h, \mathbf{p}_h, 0, u_h)$ be the solution of the decoupled variational formulation (4.1). Assume Hypothesis 3.6 holds and $u_0 \in H^s(\Omega)$ with $2 \leq s \leq 3$. For $0 \leq r \leq 1$, we have that*

$$(4.17) \quad \varepsilon|\phi - \phi_h|_{1,h} + \|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0 \lesssim \varepsilon^{r-1/2} h^{1-r} \|f\|_0 + h^{s-1} |u_0|_s,$$

$$(4.18) \quad \varepsilon|\phi_0 - \phi_h|_{1,h} + \|\phi_0 - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0 \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2} \|f\|_0 + h^{s-1} |u_0|_s,$$

$$(4.19) \quad |u - u_h|_1 \lesssim \varepsilon^{r-1/2} h^{1-r} \|f\|_0 + h^{s-1} |u_0|_s,$$

$$(4.20) \quad |u_0 - u_h|_1 \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2} \|f\|_0 + h^{s-1} |u_0|_s.$$

Furthermore, when $\mathbf{p} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfying $\|\mathbf{p}\|_1 \lesssim \|\text{curl} \mathbf{p}\|_0$, we have

$$(4.21) \quad \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_h\|_0 \lesssim \varepsilon^{r-1/2} h^{1-r} \|f\|_0 + h^{s-1} |u_0|_s.$$

Proof. By (4.1b)-(4.1c) and (4.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & a_h(I_h^\Phi \phi - \phi_h, 0; \psi, \mu) + b_h(\psi, \mu; Q_h^{\text{RT}} \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_h) \\ &= a_h(I_h^\Phi \phi, 0; \psi, \mu) + b_h(\psi, \mu; Q_h^{\text{RT}} \mathbf{p}) - (\nabla w_h, I_h^{\text{ND}} \psi) \\ &\lesssim (\varepsilon^{r-1/2} h^{1-r} \|f\|_0 + h^{s-1} |u_0|_s) \|\psi\|_{\varepsilon,h}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.1d), (2.19), the commutative diagram (2.5) and the fact $\phi = \nabla u$, it holds that

$$b_h(I_h^\Phi \phi - \phi_h, 0; \mathbf{q}) = b_h(I_h^\Phi \phi, 0; \mathbf{q}) = (\text{curl}(\Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \phi), \mathbf{q}) = (I_h^{\text{RT}}(\text{curl} \phi), \mathbf{q}) = 0.$$

Then employing the discrete stability (4.7) with $\tilde{\phi}_h = I_h^\Phi \phi - \phi_h$, $\tilde{\lambda}_h = 0$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_h = Q_h^{\text{RT}} \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_h$, we get

$$(4.22) \quad \|I_h^\Phi \phi - \phi_h\|_{\varepsilon,h} + \|Q_h^{\text{RT}} \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_h\|_0 \lesssim \varepsilon^{r-1/2} h^{1-r} \|f\|_0 + h^{s-1} |u_0|_s.$$

This together with (4.11)-(4.12) and (2.19) implies (4.17). The estimate (4.18) follows from (4.17) and the regularity (3.9)-(3.10).

Since $\phi = \nabla u$, $\phi_0 = \nabla u_0$, and $I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h = \nabla u_h$, the estimates (4.19)-(4.20) follow directly from (4.17)-(4.18).

Finally, the estimate (4.21) holds from (4.22), (4.9), (2.7) and (3.11). \square

Next, we apply a duality argument to estimate the errors $\|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0$ and $\|u - u_h\|_0$. Let $\hat{u} \in H_0^2(\Omega)$ satisfy the following dual problem

$$(4.23) \quad \varepsilon^2 \Delta^2 \hat{u} - \Delta \hat{u} = -\text{div}(\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h) \in H^{-1}(\Omega).$$

It can be written as the form of the biharmonic equation

$$(4.24) \quad \Delta^2 \hat{u} = \varepsilon^{-2} (\Delta \hat{u} - \text{div}(\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h)).$$

Assume problem (4.24) has the following H^3 regularity

$$(4.25) \quad \varepsilon^2 \|\hat{u}\|_3 \lesssim |\hat{u}|_1 + \|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0.$$

We refer to [52, 32, 33, 9] for regularity results of the biharmonic equation on polytopal domains.

Lemma 4.12. *Assume the H^3 regularity (4.25) holds. The dual problem (4.23) has the regularity*

$$(4.26) \quad \|\hat{u}\|_1 + \varepsilon \|\hat{u}\|_2 + \varepsilon^2 \|\hat{u}\|_3 \lesssim \|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0.$$

Proof. Multiplying (4.23) by \hat{u} and integrating by parts, we have

$$\varepsilon^2 |\hat{u}|_2^2 + |\hat{u}|_1^2 = (\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \nabla \hat{u}).$$

This means that

$$\varepsilon^2 |\hat{u}|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\hat{u}|_1^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0^2.$$

Thus, the regularity (4.26) follows from (4.25) and the last inequality. \square

Lemma 4.13. *Assume the H^3 regularity (4.25) holds. There exist $\hat{\phi} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap H^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ such that*

$$(4.27) \quad -\varepsilon^2 \Delta \hat{\phi} + \hat{\phi} + \text{curl } \hat{\mathbf{p}} = \phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \quad \text{curl } \hat{\phi} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

$$(4.28) \quad \|\hat{\phi}\|_0 + \varepsilon \|\hat{\phi}\|_1 + \varepsilon^2 \|\hat{\phi}\|_2 + \|\hat{\mathbf{p}}\|_1 \lesssim \|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0.$$

Proof. Let $\hat{\phi} = \nabla \hat{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3) \cap \ker(\text{curl})$, then (4.23) can be written as

$$-\varepsilon^2 \text{div } \Delta \hat{\phi} + \text{div } \hat{\phi} = \text{div}(\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h), \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \text{div}(\varepsilon^2 \Delta \hat{\phi} - \hat{\phi} + \phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h) = 0.$$

By Theorem 1.1 in [26], there exists a $\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfying

$$\text{curl } \hat{\mathbf{p}} = \varepsilon^2 \Delta \hat{\phi} - \hat{\phi} + \phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h.$$

Then we employ (4.26) to end the proof. \square

Lemma 4.14. *Let $(w, \phi = \nabla u, \mathbf{p}, 0, u)$ be the solution of the decoupled formulation (3.2), and $(w_h, \phi_h, \mathbf{p}_h, 0, u_h)$ be the solution of the discrete method (4.1). Assume the H^3 regularity (4.25) holds. We have*

$$(4.29) \quad |u - u_h|_1 = \|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0 \lesssim \varepsilon^{-3/2} h^2 \|f\|_0.$$

Proof. By combining equation (4.27), the fact $\text{curl}(\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h) = 0$, and integration by parts, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0^2 &= (\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, -\varepsilon^2 \Delta \hat{\phi} + \hat{\phi} + \text{curl } \hat{\mathbf{p}}) \\ &= -\varepsilon^2 (\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \Delta \hat{\phi}) + (\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \hat{\phi}) \\ (4.30) \quad &= -\varepsilon^2 (\phi_h - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \Delta \hat{\phi}) - \varepsilon^2 (\phi - \phi_h, \Delta \hat{\phi}) + (\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \hat{\phi}) \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= -\varepsilon^2 (\phi_h - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \Delta \hat{\phi}) - \varepsilon^2 \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\partial_n \hat{\phi}, \phi - \phi_h)_{\partial T}, \\ I_2 &= (\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \hat{\phi} - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \hat{\phi}) + \varepsilon^2 (\nabla_h(\phi - \phi_h), \nabla_h(\hat{\phi} - I_h^{\Phi} \hat{\phi})), \\ I_3 &= (\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \hat{\phi}) + \varepsilon^2 (\nabla_h(\phi - \phi_h), \nabla_h(I_h^{\Phi} \hat{\phi})). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we estimate I_1 , I_2 and I_3 in (4.30). By (2.21), (4.17) with $r = 0$ and $s = 2$, (2.6) and (3.10),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_h - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0 &= \|\phi_h - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \phi - I_h^{\text{ND}}(\phi_h - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \phi)\|_0 \lesssim h \|\phi_h - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \phi\|_{1,h} \\ &\leq h |\phi - \phi_h|_{1,h} + h \|\phi - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \phi\|_{1,h} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-3/2} h^2 \|f\|_0. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (4.28) and the weak continuity (2.9) implies

$$(4.31) \quad I_1 \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2} h^2 \|f\|_0 |\hat{\phi}|_2 + \varepsilon^2 h |\phi - \phi_h|_{1,h} |\hat{\phi}|_2 \lesssim \varepsilon^{-3/2} h^2 \|f\|_0 \|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0.$$

Applying (4.17) with $r = 0$ and $s = 2$, (2.6), (2.14) and (4.28),

$$(4.32) \quad \begin{aligned} I_2 &\lesssim \|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0 \|\hat{\phi} - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \hat{\phi}\|_0 + \varepsilon^2 |\phi - \phi_h|_{1,h} |\hat{\phi} - I_h^{\Phi} \hat{\phi}|_{1,h} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-1/2} h^2 \|f\|_0 |\hat{\phi}|_1 + \varepsilon^{1/2} h^2 \|f\|_0 |\hat{\phi}|_2 \lesssim \varepsilon^{-3/2} h^2 \|f\|_0 \|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0. \end{aligned}$$

By the commutative diagram (2.5), $\Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \hat{\phi} = \nabla \Pi_h^{\text{grad}} \hat{u}$. Then we acquire from equation (4.1b) with $\psi = I_h^{\Phi} \hat{\phi}$ and the Galerkin orthogonality (??) that

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= (\phi, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \hat{\phi}) + \varepsilon^2 (\nabla \phi, \nabla_h (I_h^{\Phi} \hat{\phi})) - (\nabla w_h, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \hat{\phi}) \\ &= (\phi, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \hat{\phi}) + \varepsilon^2 (\nabla \phi, \nabla_h (I_h^{\Phi} \hat{\phi})) - (\nabla w, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \hat{\phi}). \end{aligned}$$

Noting the fact $\nabla w = -\varepsilon^2 \Delta \phi + \phi + \text{curl } \mathbf{p}$ by (3.12), we have from the weak continuity (2.9), estimate (2.6) of Π_h^{ND} , estimate (2.14) of I_h^{Φ} , and the regularity (3.10) and (4.28) that

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= \varepsilon^2 (\nabla \phi, \nabla_h (I_h^{\Phi} \hat{\phi})) + \varepsilon^2 (\Delta \phi, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \hat{\phi}) \\ &= \varepsilon^2 (\Delta \phi, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \hat{\phi} - I_h^{\Phi} \hat{\phi}) + \varepsilon^2 \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\partial_n \phi, I_h^{\Phi} \hat{\phi} - \hat{\phi})_{\partial T} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^2 |\phi|_2 (\|\Pi_h^{\text{ND}} \hat{\phi} - I_h^{\Phi} \hat{\phi}\|_0 + h |I_h^{\Phi} \hat{\phi} - \hat{\phi}|_{1,h}) \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^2 h^2 |\phi|_2 |\hat{\phi}|_2 \lesssim \varepsilon^{-3/2} h^2 \|f\|_0 \|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, substituting the estimates (4.31), (4.32), and the above into (4.30), we obtain the desired result (4.29). \square

Let $\tilde{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ be the solution to the following dual problem:

$$(4.33) \quad -\Delta \tilde{u} = u - u_h.$$

Assume that the dual problem (4.33) admits the following regularity estimate:

$$(4.34) \quad \|\tilde{u}\|_2 \lesssim \|u - u_h\|_0.$$

We refer the reader to [53, 31, 48, 62] for regularity results pertaining to the Poisson equation on polytopal domains.

Lemma 4.15. *Let $(w, \phi = \nabla u, \mathbf{p}, 0, u)$ be the solution of the decoupled formulation (3.2), and $(w_h, \phi_h, \mathbf{p}_h, 0, u_h)$ be the solution of the discrete method (4.1). Assume the regularity (4.34) holds. Assume $u_0 \in H^s(\Omega)$ with $2 \leq s \leq 3$. We have*

$$(4.35) \quad \|u - u_h\|_0 \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2} h \|f\|_0 + h^s |u_0|_s,$$

$$(4.36) \quad \|u_0 - u_h\|_0 \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2} \|f\|_0 + h^s |u_0|_s.$$

Proof. Using integration by parts on (4.33), $\nabla(\Pi_h^{\text{grad}} \tilde{u}) = \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})$ by the commutative diagram (2.5), and estimate (2.6) of Π_h^{ND} , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_h\|_0^2 &= -(u - u_h, \Delta \tilde{u}) = (\nabla(u - u_h), \nabla \tilde{u}) \\ &= (\nabla(u - u_h), \nabla(\tilde{u} - \Pi_h^{\text{grad}} \tilde{u})) + (\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \nabla(\Pi_h^{\text{grad}} \tilde{u})) \\ &= (\nabla(u - u_h), \nabla \tilde{u} - \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})) + (\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})) \\ &\lesssim h |u - u_h|_1 |\tilde{u}|_2 + (\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})). \end{aligned} \quad (4.37)$$

Notice that $\text{curl}(\Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})) = 0$. By taking $\boldsymbol{\psi} = I_h^\Phi(\nabla \tilde{u})$ and $\mu = 0$ in equation (4.1b), we get

$$\varepsilon^2(\nabla_h \phi_h, \nabla_h(I_h^\Phi(\nabla \tilde{u}))) + (I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})) = (\nabla w_h, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})).$$

This combined with the Galerkin orthogonality condition (??) induces

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})) &= (\phi, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})) - (I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})) \\ &= (\phi, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})) - (\nabla w_h, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})) \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2(\nabla_h \phi_h, \nabla_h(I_h^\Phi(\nabla \tilde{u}))) \\ &= (\phi - \nabla w, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})) + \varepsilon^2(\nabla_h \phi_h, \nabla_h(I_h^\Phi(\nabla \tilde{u}))). \end{aligned}$$

Using the identity $\phi = \nabla w + \varepsilon^2 \Delta \phi - \text{curl} \boldsymbol{p}$, together with the integration by parts, we obtain

$$(\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})) = (\varepsilon^2 \Delta \phi, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u})) + \varepsilon^2(\nabla_h \phi_h, \nabla_h I_h^\Phi(\nabla \tilde{u})) =: I_1 + I_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= (\varepsilon^2 \Delta \phi, \Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u}) - I_h^\Phi(\nabla \tilde{u})), \\ I_2 &= (\varepsilon^2 \Delta \phi, I_h^\Phi(\nabla \tilde{u})) + \varepsilon^2(\nabla_h \phi_h, \nabla_h I_h^\Phi(\nabla \tilde{u})). \end{aligned}$$

Now let us estimate the terms I_1 and I_2 . By employing estimate (2.6) of Π_h^{ND} , estimate (2.14) of I_h^Φ , together with the regularity results (3.10) and (4.34), we derive the following estimate:

$$I_1 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 |\phi|_2 \|\Pi_h^{\text{ND}}(\nabla \tilde{u}) - I_h^\Phi(\nabla \tilde{u})\|_0 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 h |\phi|_2 |\tilde{u}|_2 \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2} h \|f\|_0 \|u - u_h\|_0.$$

Applying the weak continuity (2.9), estimate (2.14) of I_h^Φ , estimate (4.17) with $r = 0$ and $s = 2$, the regularity (3.10) and the regularity (4.34), then

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \varepsilon^2(\nabla_h(\phi_h - \phi), \nabla_h I_h^\Phi(\nabla \tilde{u})) + \varepsilon^2 \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\partial_n \phi, I_h^\Phi(\nabla \tilde{u}))_{\partial T} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^2(|\phi - \phi_h|_{1,h} + h|\phi|_2) |I_h^\Phi(\nabla \tilde{u})|_{1,h} \lesssim \varepsilon^2(|\phi - \phi_h|_{1,h} + h|\phi|_2) |\tilde{u}|_2 \\ &\lesssim (\varepsilon h |u_0|_2 + \varepsilon^{1/2} h \|f\|_0) \|u - u_h\|_0. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the regularity (3.7).

$$(\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h, \nabla \Pi_h^{\text{grad}} \tilde{u}) \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/2} h \|f\|_0 \|u - u_h\|_0.$$

Combining this with estimate (4.19) for the case $r = 1$, and equation (4.37), the estimate (4.35) is established. Moreover, since $\|u_0 - u_h\|_0 \lesssim \|u_0 - u\|_0 + \|u - u_h\|_0$, applying the estimate (4.35) together with the regularity result (3.8), we arrive at the desired estimate (4.36). \square

Remark 4.16. By selecting $r = 0$, the estimates (4.17) and (4.29) show that

$$\varepsilon |\phi - \phi_h|_{1,h} + \|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0 = \mathcal{O}(h), \quad |u - u_h|_1 = \mathcal{O}(h^2), \quad \|u - u_h\|_0 = \mathcal{O}(h^2)$$

for fixed parameter $\varepsilon > 0$. When $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $u_0 \in H^3(\Omega)$, the estimates (4.17)-(4.20) with $r = 1$ and (4.35)-(4.36) show that

$$\varepsilon |\phi - \phi_h|_{1,h} + \|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0 = \mathcal{O}(h^2), \quad |u - u_h|_1 = \mathcal{O}(h^2), \quad \|u - u_h\|_0 = \mathcal{O}(h^3)$$

$$\varepsilon |\phi_0 - \phi_h|_{1,h} + \|\phi_0 - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0 = \mathcal{O}(h^2), \quad |u_0 - u_h|_1 = \mathcal{O}(h^2), \quad \|u_0 - u_h\|_0 = \mathcal{O}(h^3).$$

Therefore, estimates (4.17)-(4.20), (4.29) and (4.35)-(4.36) are optimal and robust with respect to both the parameter ε and the mesh size h .

Remark 4.17. An alternative decoupled finite element method for the fourth-order singular perturbation problem (1.7), which avoids the use of the interpolation operator I_h^{ND} , is defined as follows: find $w_h \in V_h^{\text{grad}}$, $\phi_{h0} \in \Phi_h$, $\mathbf{p}_{h0} \in V_h^{\text{div}}$, $\lambda_{h0} \in \mathcal{Q}_h$, and $u_{h0} \in V_h^{\text{grad}}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.38a) \quad & (\nabla w_h, \nabla v) = (f, v), \\ (4.38b) \quad & \varepsilon^2 \tilde{a}_h(\phi_{h0}, \lambda_{h0}; \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu) + (\text{curl } \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{p}_{h0}) = (\nabla w_h, \boldsymbol{\psi}), \\ (4.38c) \quad & (\mu, \text{div } \mathbf{p}_{h0}) = 0, \\ (4.38d) \quad & b(\phi_{h0}, \lambda_{h0}; \mathbf{q}) = 0, \\ (4.38e) \quad & (\nabla u_{h0}, \nabla \chi) = (\phi_{h0}, \nabla \chi), \end{aligned}$$

for any $v, \chi \in V_h^{\text{grad}}$, $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \Phi_h$, $\mu \in \mathcal{Q}_h$, and $\mathbf{q} \in V_h^{\text{div}}$, where $\tilde{a}_h(\phi_{h0}, \lambda_{h0}; \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mu) := \varepsilon^2 (\nabla_h \phi_{h0}, \nabla_h \boldsymbol{\psi}) + (\phi_{h0}, \boldsymbol{\psi})$. Following the analysis in this section, the method (4.38) is well-posed, and it satisfies $\text{curl } \phi_{h0} = 0$ and $\lambda_{h0} = 0$. As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we can establish the following error estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon |\phi - \phi_h|_{1,h} + \|\phi - \phi_h\|_0 &= \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2}), \\ \varepsilon |\phi_0 - \phi_h|_{1,h} + \|\phi_0 - \phi_h\|_0 &= \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

These estimates demonstrate a sharp, though suboptimal, half-order convergence rate, consistent with the results reported in [45, Theorem 3.4] and [67, Theorem 3.6]. This half-order convergence rate is further validated by numerical experiments. The motivation for introducing the interpolation operator I_h^{ND} in the decoupled finite element method (4.1) lies in the desire to achieve the optimal convergence.

5. NUMERICAL RESULTS

This section presents numerical results to validate the proposed decoupled mixed finite element method. Let Ω be the unit cube domain $(0, 1)^3$. Introduce error notation

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}(\phi) &:= (\varepsilon^2 |\phi - \phi_h|_{1,h}^2 + \|\phi - I_h^{\text{ND}} \phi_h\|_0^2)^{1/2}, \\ \text{Err}_0(\phi) &:= (\varepsilon^2 |\phi - \phi_{h0}|_{1,h}^2 + \|\phi - \phi_{h0}\|_0^2)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

5.1. Numerical test without boundary layer. We consider the fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem (1.7) with the exact solution given by

$$u(\mathbf{x}) = \sin^2(\pi x) \sin^2(\pi y) \sin^2(\pi z).$$

The source term f is computed from (1.7).

The corresponding numerical errors are summarized in Table 1, including $\text{Err}(\phi)$, $\|u - u_h\|_0$ and $|u - u_h|_1$ for various values of ε and mesh size h . As shown in Table 1, $\text{Err}(\phi)$ exhibits the first-order convergence $\mathcal{O}(h)$ for $\varepsilon = 1$ and 10^{-1} , consistent with the theoretical estimate (4.17) for $r = 0$ and $s = 2$. For $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$ and 10^{-6} , the convergence improves to second order $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$, which agrees with the theoretical result (4.17) for $r = 1$ and $s = 3$. Table 1 shows that $|u - u_h|_1 = \mathcal{O}(h^2)$ for $\varepsilon = 1, 10^{-1}$, which agrees with the theoretical result (4.29). For $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$ and 10^{-6} , the convergence rate remains $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$, consistent with the theoretical estimate (4.19) for $r = 1$ and $s = 3$. Furthermore, the L^2 -norm error $\|u - u_h\|_0$ exhibits second-order convergence, i.e., $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$, for $\varepsilon = 1$ and 10^{-1} , which is consistent with the theoretical estimate (4.29). As ε decreases to 10^{-4} and 10^{-6} , the convergence

improves to third order, i.e., $\mathcal{O}(h^3)$, in agreement with the refined estimate (4.35).

TABLE 1. Errors $\text{Err}(\phi)$, $\|u - u_h\|_0$ and $|u - u_h|_1$ of the decoupled method (4.1) without boundary layer.

ε	h	$\text{Err}(\phi)$	rate	$\ u - u_h\ _0$	rate	$ u - u_h _1$	rate
1	2^{-2}	7.862e+00	-	1.098e-01	-	6.965e-01	-
	2^{-3}	4.924e+00	0.68	4.378e-02	1.33	2.887e-01	1.27
	2^{-4}	2.776e+00	0.83	1.429e-02	1.62	9.735e-02	1.57
	2^{-5}	1.466e+00	0.92	4.101e-03	1.80	2.857e-02	1.77
10^{-1}	2^{-2}	9.538e-01	-	6.889e-02	-	4.656e-01	-
	2^{-3}	5.309e-01	0.85	2.175e-02	1.66	1.610e-01	1.53
	2^{-4}	2.842e-01	0.90	6.373e-03	1.77	4.913e-02	1.71
	2^{-5}	1.476e-01	0.95	1.772e-03	1.85	1.395e-02	1.82
10^{-4}	2^{-2}	2.572e-01	-	9.082e-03	-	1.985e-01	-
	2^{-3}	7.295e-02	1.82	1.118e-03	3.02	5.645e-02	1.81
	2^{-4}	1.910e-02	1.93	1.376e-04	3.02	1.483e-02	1.93
	2^{-5}	4.838e-03	1.98	1.711e-05	3.01	3.765e-03	1.98
10^{-6}	2^{-2}	2.572e-01	-	9.082e-03	-	1.985e-01	-
	2^{-3}	7.295e-02	1.82	1.118e-03	3.02	5.645e-02	1.81
	2^{-4}	1.910e-02	1.93	1.376e-04	3.02	1.483e-02	1.93
	2^{-5}	4.838e-03	1.98	1.711e-05	3.01	3.765e-03	1.98

5.2. Numerical test with boundary layer. We next verify the convergence behavior of the nonconforming finite element methods (4.1) and (4.38) for problem (1.7) with boundary layers.

To this end, consider the exact solution to the Poisson equation (3.6):

$$u_0(\mathbf{x}) = \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y) \sin(\pi z).$$

The corresponding right-hand side f computed from (3.6) is used in (1.7), for which the exact solution u is not known in closed form. When ε is small, the solution u develops pronounced boundary layers. In the numerical experiments that follow, we set $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}, 10^{-8}, 10^{-10}$ to investigate such behavior.

Numerical results for the decoupled method (4.38) are presented in Table 2, which reports $\text{Err}_0(\phi_0)$, $\|u_0 - u_{h0}\|_0$ and $|u_0 - u_{h0}|_1$. From Table 2, we observe that $\text{Err}_0(\phi_0) = \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2})$, which agrees with the theoretical estimate outlined in Remark 4.17. In addition, Table 2 shows that $|u_0 - u_{h0}|_1 = \mathcal{O}(h^{1/2})$, as anticipated, while $\|u_0 - u_{h0}\|_0 = \mathcal{O}(h)$.

Table 3 displays the numerical results for the decoupled method (4.1), including $\text{Err}(\phi_0)$, $\|u_0 - u_h\|_0$ and $|u_0 - u_h|_1$. As evidenced in Table 3, the error $\text{Err}(\phi_0) = \mathcal{O}(h^2)$, confirming the theoretical estimate in (4.18) for $s = 3$. Additionally, Table 3 indicates that $|u_0 - u_h|_1 = \mathcal{O}(h^2)$, aligning with the theoretical result (4.20) for $s = 3$. Moreover, the L^2 -norm error $\|u_0 - u_h\|_0$ achieves optimal third-order convergence, i.e., $\mathcal{O}(h^3)$, in agreement with the refined estimate (4.36).

TABLE 2. Errors $\text{Err}_0(\phi_0)$, $\|u_0 - u_{h0}\|_0$ and $|u_0 - u_{h0}|_1$ of the decoupled method (4.38) with boundary layer.

ε	h	$\text{Err}_0(\phi_0)$	rate	$\ u_0 - u_{h0}\ _0$	rate	$ u_0 - u_{h0} _1$	rate
10^{-6}	2^{-2}	5.475e-01	-	4.944e-02	-	4.183e-01	-
	2^{-3}	3.643e-01	0.59	2.278e-02	1.12	2.534e-01	0.72
	2^{-4}	2.527e-01	0.53	1.103e-02	1.04	1.656e-01	0.61
	2^{-5}	1.777e-01	0.51	5.444e-03	1.02	1.127e-01	0.56
10^{-8}	2^{-2}	5.475e-01	-	4.944e-02	-	4.183e-01	-
	2^{-3}	3.643e-01	0.59	2.278e-02	1.12	2.534e-01	0.72
	2^{-4}	2.527e-01	0.53	1.103e-02	1.04	1.656e-01	0.61
	2^{-5}	1.777e-01	0.51	5.444e-03	1.02	1.127e-01	0.56
10^{-10}	2^{-2}	5.475e-01	-	4.944e-02	-	4.183e-01	-
	2^{-3}	3.643e-01	0.59	2.278e-02	1.12	2.534e-01	0.72
	2^{-4}	2.527e-01	0.53	1.103e-02	1.04	1.656e-01	0.61
	2^{-5}	1.777e-01	0.51	5.444e-03	1.02	1.127e-01	0.56

In conclusion, when a boundary layer phenomenon is present, the decoupled method (4.1) significantly outperforms the decoupled method (4.38) by achieving higher-order convergence rates.

TABLE 3. Errors $\text{Err}(\phi_0)$, $\|u_0 - u_h\|_0$ and $|u_0 - u_h|_1$ of the decoupled method (4.1) with boundary layer.

ε	h	$\text{Err}(\phi_0)$	rate	$\ u_0 - u_h\ _0$	rate	$ u_0 - u_h _1$	rate
10^{-6}	2^{-2}	1.692e-01	-	4.981e-03	2.98	1.332e-01	-
	2^{-3}	4.499e-02	1.91	6.038e-04	3.04	3.556e-02	1.91
	2^{-4}	1.148e-02	1.97	7.453e-05	3.02	9.089e-03	1.97
	2^{-5}	2.888e-03	1.99	9.287e-06	3.00	2.885e-03	1.99
10^{-8}	2^{-2}	1.692e-01	-	4.981e-03	2.98	1.332e-01	-
	2^{-3}	4.499e-02	1.91	6.038e-04	3.04	3.556e-02	1.91
	2^{-4}	1.148e-02	1.97	7.453e-05	3.02	9.089e-03	1.97
	2^{-5}	2.888e-03	1.99	9.287e-06	3.00	2.885e-03	1.99
10^{-10}	2^{-2}	1.692e-01	-	4.981e-03	2.98	1.332e-01	-
	2^{-3}	4.499e-02	1.91	6.038e-04	3.04	3.556e-02	1.91
	2^{-4}	1.148e-02	1.97	7.453e-05	3.02	9.089e-03	1.97
	2^{-5}	2.888e-03	1.99	9.287e-06	3.00	2.885e-03	1.99

REFERENCES

- [1] D. N. Arnold. An interior penalty finite element method with discontinuous elements. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 19(4):742–760, 1982. [3](#)
- [2] D. N. Arnold. *Finite element exterior calculus*, volume 93 of *CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2018. [1](#), [2](#), [6](#)

- [3] D. N. Arnold, R. S. Falk, and R. Winther. Finite element exterior calculus, homological techniques, and applications. *Acta Numer.*, 15:1–155, 2006. [1](#), [2](#), [6](#), [9](#)
- [4] D. N. Arnold, R. S. Falk, and R. Winther. Finite element exterior calculus: from Hodge theory to numerical stability. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 47(2):281–354, 2010. [1](#), [2](#), [6](#)
- [5] D. N. Arnold and J. Guzmán. Local L^2 -bounded commuting projections in FEEC. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 55(5):2169–2184, 2021. [7](#)
- [6] D. N. Arnold and K. Hu. Complexes from complexes. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 21(6):1739–1774, 2021. [1](#)
- [7] T. M. Austin, T. A. Manteuffel, and S. McCormick. A robust multilevel approach for minimizing $\mathbf{H}(\text{div})$ -dominated functionals in an \mathbf{H}^1 -conforming finite element space. *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.*, 11(2-3):115–140, 2004. [2](#)
- [8] L. Beirão da Veiga, F. Dassi, and G. Vacca. The Stokes complex for virtual elements in three dimensions. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 30(3):477–512, 2020. [2](#)
- [9] H. Blum and R. Rannacher. On the boundary value problem of the biharmonic operator on domains with angular corners. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 2(4):556–581, 1980. [19](#)
- [10] D. Boffi, F. Brezzi, and M. Fortin. *Mixed finite element methods and applications*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2013. [11](#), [13](#), [16](#)
- [11] S. C. Brenner and M. Neilan. A C^0 interior penalty method for a fourth order elliptic singular perturbation problem. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 49(2):869–892, 2011. [3](#)
- [12] S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott. *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*. Springer, New York, third edition, 2008. [9](#), [10](#), [11](#)
- [13] C. Chen, L. Chen, T. Gao, X. Huang, and H. Wei. Implementation and basis construction for smooth finite element spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.19732*, 2025. [3](#)
- [14] H. Chen, S. Chen, and L. Xiao. Uniformly convergent C^0 -nonconforming triangular prism element for fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 30(6):1785–1796, 2014. [3](#)
- [15] L. Chen and X. Huang. Decoupling of mixed methods based on generalized Helmholtz decompositions. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 56(5):2796–2825, 2018. [1](#), [4](#), [11](#)
- [16] L. Chen and X. Huang. Geometric decompositions of the simplicial lattice and smooth finite elements in arbitrary dimension, 2021. [3](#)
- [17] L. Chen and X. Huang. Finite elements for div- and divdiv-conforming symmetric tensors in arbitrary dimension. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 60(4):1932–1961, 2022. [2](#)
- [18] L. Chen and X. Huang. Finite element complexes in two dimensions (in Chinese). *Sci. Sin. Math.*, 54:1–34, 2024. [2](#)
- [19] L. Chen and X. Huang. Finite element de Rham and Stokes complexes in three dimensions. *Math. Comp.*, 93(345):55–110, 2024. [2](#)
- [20] S. Chen, Y. Zhao, and D. Shi. Non C^0 nonconforming elements for elliptic fourth order singular perturbation problem. *J. Comput. Math.*, 23(2):185–198, 2005. [3](#)
- [21] S. H. Christiansen, J. Hu, and K. Hu. Nodal finite element de Rham complexes. *Numer. Math.*, 139(2):411–446, 2018. [2](#)
- [22] S. H. Christiansen and K. Hu. Generalized finite element systems for smooth differential forms and Stokes’ problem. *Numer. Math.*, 140(2):327–371, 2018. [2](#)
- [23] S. H. Christiansen and R. Winther. Smoothed projections in finite element exterior calculus. *Math. Comp.*, 77(262):813–829, 2008. [7](#)
- [24] P. G. Ciarlet. *The finite element method for elliptic problems*, volume Vol. 4 of *Studies in Mathematics and its Applications*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York-Oxford, 1978. [9](#), [11](#), [13](#), [17](#)
- [25] P. G. Ciarlet and C. Wagschal. Multipoint Taylor formulas and applications to the finite element method. *Numer. Math.*, 17:84–100, 1971. [6](#)
- [26] M. Costabel and A. McIntosh. On Bogovskii and regularized Poincaré integral operators for de Rham complexes on Lipschitz domains. *Math. Z.*, 265(2):297–320, 2010. [9](#), [12](#), [16](#), [20](#)
- [27] R. S. Falk and M. Neilan. Stokes complexes and the construction of stable finite elements with pointwise mass conservation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 51(2):1308–1326, 2013. [2](#)
- [28] S. Franz, H.-G. Roos, and A. Wachtel. A C^0 interior penalty method for a singularly-perturbed fourth-order elliptic problem on a layer-adapted mesh. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 30(3):838–861, 2014. [3](#)
- [29] G. Fu, J. Guzmán, and M. Neilan. Exact smooth piecewise polynomial sequences on Alföld splits. *Math. Comp.*, 89(323):1059–1091, 2020. [2](#)

- [30] D. Gallistl. Stable splitting of polyharmonic operators by generalized Stokes systems. *Math. Comp.*, 86(308):2555–2577, 2017. [4](#)
- [31] F. Gao and M. Lai. A new H^2 regularity condition of the solution to Dirichlet problem of the Poisson equation and its applications. *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)*, 36(1):21–39, 2020. [14](#), [21](#)
- [32] P. Grisvard. *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*, volume 24 of *Monographs and Studies in Mathematics*. Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, MA, 1985. [19](#)
- [33] P. Grisvard. *Singularities in boundary value problems*, volume 22 of *Recherches en Mathématiques Appliquées [Research in Applied Mathematics]*. Masson, Paris; Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992. [19](#)
- [34] J. Guzmán, D. Leykekhman, and M. Neilan. A family of non-conforming elements and the analysis of Nitsche’s method for a singularly perturbed fourth order problem. *Calcolo*, 49(2):95–125, 2012. [3](#), [4](#), [14](#)
- [35] J. Guzmán, A. Lischke, and M. Neilan. Exact sequences on Powell-Sabin splits. *Calcolo*, 57(2):Paper No. 13, 25, 2020. [2](#)
- [36] J. Guzmán, A. Lischke, and M. Neilan. Exact sequences on Worsey-Farin splits. *Math. Comp.*, 91(338):2571–2608, 2022. [2](#)
- [37] J. Guzmán and M. Neilan. A family of nonconforming elements for the Brinkman problem. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 32(4):1484–1508, 2012. [2](#)
- [38] J. Guzmán and M. Neilan. Conforming and divergence-free Stokes elements on general triangular meshes. *Math. Comp.*, 83(285):15–36, 2014. [2](#)
- [39] R. Hiptmair. Canonical construction of finite elements. *Math. Comp.*, 68(228):1325–1346, 1999. [2](#), [6](#)
- [40] R. Hiptmair. Higher order Whitney forms. *Progress in Electromagnetics Research*, 32:271–299, 2001. [2](#), [6](#)
- [41] R. Hiptmair and J. Xu. Nodal auxiliary space preconditioning in $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl})$ and $\mathbf{H}(\text{div})$ spaces. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 45(6):2483–2509, 2007. [12](#)
- [42] J. Hu, T. Lin, and Q. Wu. A construction of C^r conforming finite element spaces in any dimension. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 24(6):1941–1977, 2024. [3](#)
- [43] K. Hu, Q. Zhang, and Z. Zhang. A family of finite element Stokes complexes in three dimensions. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 60(1):222–243, 2022. [2](#)
- [44] X. Huang. Nonconforming finite element Stokes complexes in three dimensions. *Sci. China Math.*, 66(8):1879–1902, 2023. [2](#)
- [45] X. Huang, Y. Shi, and W. Wang. A Morley-Wang-Xu element method for a fourth order elliptic singular perturbation problem. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 87(3):Paper No. 84, 24, 2021. [3](#), [4](#), [23](#)
- [46] X. Huang and Z. Tang. Robust and optimal mixed methods for a fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problem. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 105(72), 2025. [3](#), [4](#)
- [47] X. Huang and C. Zhang. Robust mixed finite element methods for a quad-curl singular perturbation problem. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 451:Paper No. 116117, 19, 2024. [2](#)
- [48] J. Kadlec. The regularity of the solution of the Poisson problem in a domain whose boundary is similar to that of a convex domain. *Czechoslovak Math. J.*, 14(89):386–393, 1964. [14](#), [21](#)
- [49] Y. J. Lee. Uniform stability analysis of Austin, Manteuffel and McCormick finite elements and fast and robust iterative methods for the Stokes-like equations. *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.*, 17(1):109–138, 2010. [2](#)
- [50] K. Liu, X. Huang, and W. Wang. Mixed finite element method for fourth-order elliptic singular perturbation problems (in Chinese). *J. Wenzhou Univ. (Nat. Sci. Ed.)*, 41(2):24–30, 2020. [3](#), [4](#)
- [51] K. A. Mardal, X. Tai, and R. Winther. A robust finite element method for Darcy-Stokes flow. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 40(5):1605–1631, 2002. [2](#)
- [52] V. Maz’ya and J. Rossmann. *Elliptic equations in polyhedral domains*, volume 162 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. [19](#)
- [53] D. Mitrea, M. Mitrea, and L. Yan. Boundary value problems for the Laplacian in convex and semiconvex domains. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 258(8):2507–2585, 2010. [14](#), [21](#)
- [54] J.-C. Nédélec. Mixed finite elements in \mathbf{R}^3 . *Numer. Math.*, 35(3):315–341, 1980. [2](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [55] J.-C. Nédélec. A new family of mixed finite elements in \mathbf{R}^3 . *Numer. Math.*, 50(1):57–81, 1986. [2](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)

- [56] M. Neilan. Discrete and conforming smooth de Rham complexes in three dimensions. *Math. Comp.*, 84(295):2059–2081, 2015. [2](#)
- [57] T. K. Nilssen, X. Tai, and R. Winther. A robust nonconforming H^2 -element. *Math. Comp.*, 70(234):489–505, 2001. [3](#), [14](#)
- [58] J. Nitsche. über ein Variationsprinzip zur Lösung von Dirichlet-Problemen bei Verwendung von Teilräumen, die keinen Randbedingungen unterworfen sind. *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg*, 36:9–15, 1971. [3](#)
- [59] P.-A. Raviart and J. M. Thomas. A mixed finite element method for 2nd order elliptic problems. In *Mathematical aspects of finite element methods (Proc. Conf., Consiglio Naz. delle Ricerche (C.N.R.), Rome, 1975)*, pages 292–315. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 606. Springer, Berlin, 1977. [2](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [60] B. Semper. Conforming finite element approximations for a fourth-order singular perturbation problem. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 29(4):1043–1058, 1992. [3](#)
- [61] X. Tai and R. Winther. A discrete de Rham complex with enhanced smoothness. *Calcolo*, 43(4):287–306, 2006. [2](#), [5](#), [8](#)
- [62] G. Talenti. Sopra una classe di equazioni ellittiche a coefficienti misurabili. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 69:285–304, 1965. [14](#), [21](#)
- [63] S. Tong, Q. Zhai, and Q. Zhang. A nonconforming finite element method for the quad-curl Hodge-Laplacian problem in two dimensions. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 103(2):Paper No. 42, 23, 2025. [2](#)
- [64] L. Wang, Y. Wu, and X. Xie. Uniformly stable rectangular elements for fourth order elliptic singular perturbation problems. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 29(3):721–737, 2013. [3](#)
- [65] M. Wang and X. Meng. A robust finite element method for a 3-D elliptic singular perturbation problem. *J. Comput. Math.*, 25(6):631–644, 2007. [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [15](#)
- [66] M. Wang, J. Xu, and Y. Hu. Modified Morley element method for a fourth order elliptic singular perturbation problem. *J. Comput. Math.*, 24(2):113–120, 2006. [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [15](#)
- [67] W. Wang, X. Huang, K. Tang, and R. Zhou. Morley-Wang-Xu element methods with penalty for a fourth order elliptic singular perturbation problem. *Adv. Comput. Math.*, 44(4):1041–1061, 2018. [3](#), [4](#), [23](#)
- [68] P. Xie, D. Shi, and H. Li. A new robust C^0 -type nonconforming triangular element for singular perturbation problems. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 217(8):3832–3843, 2010. [3](#)
- [69] Q. Zhang, M. Zhang, and Z. Zhang. Nonconforming finite elements for the —curl Δ curl and Brinkman problems on cubical meshes. *Commun. Comput. Phys.*, 34(5):1332–1360, 2023. [2](#)
- [70] S. Zhang. A family of 3D continuously differentiable finite elements on tetrahedral grids. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 59(1):219–233, 2009. [3](#)
- [71] S. Zhang and M. Wang. A posteriori estimator of nonconforming finite element method for fourth order elliptic perturbation problems. *J. Comput. Math.*, 26(4):554–577, 2008. [3](#)
- [72] M. s. Zlámal. On the finite element method. *Numer. Math.*, 12:394–409, 1968. [6](#)

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SHANGHAI UNIVERSITY OF FINANCE AND ECONOMICS, SHANGHAI 200433, CHINA

Email address: xuweicui@stu.sufe.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SHANGHAI UNIVERSITY OF FINANCE AND ECONOMICS, SHANGHAI 200433, CHINA

Email address: huang.xuehai@sufe.edu.cn