

# The mixed discontinuous Galerkin method for the Oseen eigenvalue problem

Lingling Sun<sup>1</sup>, Shixi Wang<sup>2</sup>, Hai Bi<sup>2</sup>, Yidu Yang<sup>2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Biology and Engineering, Guizhou Medical University, Guiyang, Guizhou 561113, China

<sup>2</sup> School of Mathematical Sciences, Guizhou Normal University, Guiyang, 550001, China

## Abstract

The Oseen eigenvalue problem plays a important role in the stability analysis of fluids. The problem is non-self-adjoint due to the presence of convection field. In this paper, we present a comprehensive investigation of the mixed discontinuous Galerkin (DG) method, employing  $\mathbb{P}_k - \mathbb{P}_{k-1}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) elements to solve the Oseen eigenvalue problem in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  ( $d = 2, 3$ ). We first develop an adjoint-consistent DG formulation for the problem. We then derive optimal a priori error estimates for the approximate eigenpairs, and propose residual-type a posteriori error estimators. Furthermore, we prove the reliability and effectiveness of these estimators for approximate eigenfunctions, as well as the reliability of the estimator for approximate eigenvalues. To validate our approach, we conduct numerical computations on both uniform and adaptively refined meshes. The numerical results demonstrate that our scheme is computationally efficient and capable of yielding high-accuracy approximate eigenvalues.

**Key words.** Oseen eigenproblem, Discontinuous Galerkin method, A priori and a posteriori error estimates, Adaptive algorithm..

## 1 Introduction

The Oseen eigenvalue problem, as a linearization of the Navier-Stokes equation, has important applications in fluid mechanics. Some references, such as [1], discuss the computation of the spectrum of the Oseen operators, which plays a role in designing appropriate solvers for the Navier-Stokes equations. Additionally, for preconditioners of the Navier-Stokes equations, the computation of the spectrum of the Oseen problem is relevant, as shown in the work of [2]. Currently, the study of numerical methods for the Oseen eigenvalue problem has attracted considerable attention in the academic community. For the Oseen eigenvalue problem based on the velocity-pressure formulation, Lepe et al. [3] derived the a priori and a posteriori error estimates using the Mini-element family and the Taylor-Hood ( $\mathbb{P}_2 - \mathbb{P}_1$ ) element on two-dimensional and three-dimensional domains, and Adak et al. [4] developed the a priori error estimates using a nonconforming virtual element discretization on two-dimensional domains. For the Oseen eigenvalue problem based on the velocity-pseudostress formulation, Lepe et al. [5] employed the Raviart-Thomas (RT) and Brezzi-Douglas-Marini (BDM) tensorized elements and proved the a priori error estimates on both two and three dimensional domains. However, to the best of our knowledge, no reports exist on the mixed discontinuous Galerkin (DG) method for the Oseen eigenvalue problem.

The DG method, first proposed by Reed and Hill [6] in 1973, has evolved into a widely used approach for solving differential equations (see, e.g., introductory textbooks [7–10]). Among them, Chapter 6 in [7], Chapter 6 in [8], Chapter 7 in [9], and Chapter 5 in [10] elaborate on the DG method for the Stokes problem. The articles [11–19] investigated the DG method for the Stokes problem. In 2006, Antonietti et

---

\*Corresponding author. Email address: ydyang@gznu.edu.cn

al. [20] first applied the DG method to solve the Laplace eigenvalue problem. Since then, many scholars have applied the DG method to solve the Stokes eigenvalue problem, for example, see [21–24] and so on. In this paper, we focus on investigating the DG  $\mathbb{P}_k - \mathbb{P}_{k-1}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) element method for solving the Oseen eigenvalue problem based on the velocity-pressure formulation in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  ( $d = 2, 3$ ).

The non-self-adjointness of the Oseen eigenvalue problem stems from the presence of the convection term, and its error analysis and numerical computation are closely related to the DG formulations of both the primal and adjoint eigenvalue problems. We establish an adjoint-consistent DG formula (2.8)-(2.9). The adjoint-consistency is crucial to get the optimal error estimates of the DG approximate solutions for problems with convection field (see Section 6 in [25] and Section 3 in [26]).

Based on [27, 28], we prove the discrete inf-sup condition (2.33), and using a subtle analysis we prove the discrete coercivity property (2.18). We then prove the convergence of the discrete solution operator to the solution operator. Consequently, by applying the spectral approximation theory [29], we derive the optimal a priori error estimates for approximate eigenpairs of the Oseen eigenvalue problem.

In practical finite element computations, it is desirable to perform computations in an adaptive fashion (see, e.g., [30–34] and the references therein). For the Oseen eigenvalue problem, Lepe et al. [3] investigated the a posteriori error estimation and adaptive computation for low-order Mini-element and low-order Taylor-Hood elements. Although high-order Taylor-Hood elements have been established by Boffi et al. (see Section 8.8.2 in [35]), but there are no reports on a posteriori error estimation adaptive computation methods for high-order Taylor-Hood elements. In this paper, we propose an adaptive mixed DG method using  $\mathbb{P}_k - \mathbb{P}_{k-1}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) elements. By the inf-sup condition (2.7), we establish the a posteriori error formula (Theorem 3.1), and propose the a posteriori error estimators of residual type. By employing the enriching operator (see [36, 37]) and the bubble function technique (see [31]), we prove the reliability and efficiency of the estimator for approximate eigenfunctions, as well as the reliability of the estimator for approximate eigenvalues.

To validate our approach, we conduct numerical computations on both uniform and adaptively refined meshes. The numerical results demonstrate that our scheme is computationally efficient and capable of yielding high-accuracy approximate eigenvalues. Additionally, a comparative analysis with methods in the existing related literature confirms the superior efficiency of our approach (see Section 4.3).

Throughout this article,  $C$  in different positions represents different positive constants, which is independent of mesh size  $h$ . We use  $a \lesssim b$  to represent  $a \leq Cb$ , and  $a \simeq b$  to represent  $a \lesssim b$  and  $b \lesssim a$ .

## 2 The mixed DG approximation and its a priori error estimate

Consider the following Oseen eigenvalue problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\mu \Delta \mathbf{u} + (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} + \nabla p &= \lambda \mathbf{u}, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} &= 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \int_{\Omega} p &= 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{u} &= 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  ( $d = 2, 3$ ) is a bounded polyhedral domain,  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_d)^T$  is the velocity of the flow,  $p$  is the pressure,  $\beta$  is a given convection field, representing a steady flow velocity such that  $\beta \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R})^d$  is divergence free,  $\mu > 0$  is the kinematic viscosity parameter of the fluid.

The standard assumptions on the coefficient are the following (see [38]):

- $\|\beta\|_{\infty, \Omega} \sim 1$  if  $\mu \leq \|\beta\|_{\infty, \Omega}$ ,
- $\mu \sim 1$  if  $\|\beta\|_{\infty, \Omega} < \mu$ ,

where the first situation is the interesting one which appears in applications.

Let  $H^\rho(D)$  be the complex Sobolev space of order  $\rho \geq 0$  on  $D \subseteq \Omega$  with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\rho, D}$ . We denote  $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\rho, D} = \sum_{i=1}^d \|v_i\|_{\rho, D}$  for  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_d) \in H^\rho(D)^d$ . If  $D = \Omega$ , we omit the subscript  $D$  from

$\|\cdot\|_{\rho,D}$ . We denote by  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  the inner product in  $L^2(\Omega)^d$  which is given by  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{u} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{v}} dx$  and  $(\nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{v}) = \int_{\Omega} \nabla \mathbf{u} : \overline{\nabla \mathbf{v}} dx$ . We denote  $H_0^1(\Omega) = \{v \in H^1(\Omega), v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}$ ,

$$\mathbb{X} = H_0^1(\Omega)^d, \quad \mathbb{W} = L_0^2(\Omega) = \{\varrho \in L^2(\Omega) : (\varrho, 1) = 0\}.$$

The weak formulation of (2.1) is given by: find  $(\lambda, \mathbf{u}, p) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{W}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{u}\|_0 = 1$ , such that

$$\mathbb{A}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{v}, p) = \lambda(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}), \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{X}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\overline{\mathbb{B}(\mathbf{u}, q)} = 0, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{W}, \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\mathbb{A}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \mu(\nabla \mathbf{u}, \nabla \mathbf{v}) + ((\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}),$$

$$\mathbb{B}(\mathbf{v}, p) = -(p, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}).$$

Thanks to Remark 5.6 in [38], we deduce that  $Re((\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}) = 0$ . Therefore, we can obtain

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 \lesssim Re \mathbb{A}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}), \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{X}. \quad (2.4)$$

Thanks to Remark 53.10 in [39] we know that the bilinear form  $\mathbb{B}(\cdot, \cdot)$  satisfies the following inf-sup condition: there is a constant  $\alpha > 0$  such that

$$\inf_{q \in \mathbb{W}} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{X}} \frac{|\mathbb{B}(\mathbf{v}, q)|}{\|q\|_0 \|\mathbf{v}\|_1} \geq \alpha. \quad (2.5)$$

Let  $\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{W}$  with norm  $\|[\mathbf{v}, q]\|_{\mathbb{V}} = \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 + \|q\|_0$ . Referring to (49.39) in [39], we introduce the following sesquilinear form

$$\mathcal{A}([\mathbf{w}, r], [\mathbf{v}, q]) = \mathbb{A}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{v}, r) + \overline{\mathbb{B}(\mathbf{w}, q)}, \quad \forall [\mathbf{w}, r], [\mathbf{v}, q] \in \mathbb{V}. \quad (2.6)$$

And from Theorem 49.15 in [39], we have

$$\inf_{[\mathbf{w}, r] \in \mathbb{V}} \sup_{[\mathbf{v}, q] \in \mathbb{V}} \frac{|\mathcal{A}([\mathbf{w}, r], [\mathbf{v}, q])|}{\|[\mathbf{w}, r]\|_{\mathbb{V}} \|[\mathbf{v}, q]\|_{\mathbb{V}}} \geq \alpha, \quad \inf_{[\mathbf{v}, q] \in \mathbb{V}} \sup_{[\mathbf{w}, r] \in \mathbb{V}} \frac{|\mathcal{A}([\mathbf{w}, r], [\mathbf{v}, q])|}{\|[\mathbf{w}, r]\|_{\mathbb{V}} \|[\mathbf{v}, q]\|_{\mathbb{V}}} \geq \alpha. \quad (2.7)$$

The formulation (2.7) plays a crucial role in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Let  $\mathcal{T}_h = \{\tau\}$  be a regular simplex partition of  $\Omega$  with the mesh diameter  $h = \max_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_{\tau}$  where  $h_{\tau}$  is the diameter of element  $\tau$ . We use  $\mathcal{E}_h^i$  and  $\mathcal{E}_h^b$  to denote the set of interior faces (edges) and the set of faces (edges) on  $\partial\Omega$ , respectively.  $\mathcal{E}_h = \mathcal{E}_h^i \cup \mathcal{E}_h^b$ . We use  $h_F$  to denote the measure of  $F \in \mathcal{E}_h$ . We denote by  $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\tau}$  and  $(\cdot, \cdot)_F$  the inner product in  $L^2(\tau)$  and  $L^2(F)$ , respectively. We use  $\omega(\tau)$  to represent the union of all elements, which share at least one edge (face) with  $\tau$ , and use  $\omega(F)$  to represent the union of the elements having in common with  $F$ .

The broken Sobolev space is defined by:

$$H^{\xi}(\mathcal{T}_h) = \{v \in L^2(\Omega) : v|_{\tau} \in H^{\xi}(\tau), \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}_h\} \quad (\xi > \frac{1}{2}).$$

For any  $F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$ , there are two simplices  $\tau^+$  and  $\tau^-$  such that  $F = \tau^+ \cap \tau^-$  (e.g. see [14]). Let  $\mathbf{n}^+$  be the unit normal of  $F$  pointing from  $\tau^+$  to  $\tau^-$  and let  $\mathbf{n}^- = -\mathbf{n}^+$ .

For any  $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h)$ , we denote its jump and mean on  $F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$  by  $[\![\varphi]\!] = \varphi^+ \mathbf{n}^+ + \varphi^- \mathbf{n}^-$  and  $\{\varphi\} = \frac{1}{2}(\varphi^+ + \varphi^-)$ , respectively, where  $\varphi^{\pm} = \varphi|_{\tau^{\pm}}$ . For  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h)^d$ , we denote by  $[\![\boldsymbol{\varphi}]\!] = \boldsymbol{\varphi}^+ \cdot \mathbf{n}^+ + \boldsymbol{\varphi}^- \cdot \mathbf{n}^-$  the jump and  $\{\boldsymbol{\varphi}\} = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^+ + \boldsymbol{\varphi}^-)$  the mean of  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$  on  $F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$ . We also denote by  $[\![\boldsymbol{\varphi}]\!] = \boldsymbol{\varphi}^+ \otimes \mathbf{n}^+ + \boldsymbol{\varphi}^- \otimes \mathbf{n}^-$  the full jump of  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$  on  $F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \otimes \mathbf{n} = [\varphi_i n_j]_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} = (\varphi_i)$ ,  $\mathbf{n} = (n_j)$ . For tensors  $\boldsymbol{\chi} \in H^1(\Omega, \mathcal{T}_h)^{d \times d}$ , we denote by  $[\![\boldsymbol{\chi}]\!] = \boldsymbol{\chi}^+ \mathbf{n}^+ + \boldsymbol{\chi}^- \mathbf{n}^-$  the jump and  $\{\boldsymbol{\chi}\} = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\chi}^+ + \boldsymbol{\chi}^-)$  the mean on  $F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$ .

For the sake of simplicity, when  $F \in \mathcal{E}_h^b$ , by modifying the above definitions appropriately, we obtain the jump and the mean on  $\partial\Omega$ . That is to say, we modify  $\varphi^- = 0$  (similarly,  $\varphi^- = 0$  and  $\chi^- = 0$ ) to obtain the definition of jump on  $\partial\Omega$ , and modify  $\varphi^- = \varphi^+$  (similarly,  $\varphi^- = \varphi^+$  and  $\chi^- = \chi^+$ ) to obtain the definition of mean on  $\partial\Omega$ .

The discrete velocity and pressure spaces are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{X}_h &= \{\mathbf{v}_h \in L^2(\Omega)^d : \mathbf{v}_h|_\tau \in \mathbb{P}_k(\tau)^d, \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}_h\}, \\ \mathbb{W}_h &= \{q_h \in \mathbb{W} : q_h|_\tau \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1}(\tau), \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}_h\},\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{P}_k(\tau)$  is the space of polynomials of degree less than or equal to  $k \geq 1$  on  $\tau$ . And let  $\mathbb{X}(h) = \mathbb{X} + \mathbb{X}_h$ .

The DG formula for the problem (2.1) is to find  $(\lambda_h, \mathbf{u}_h, p_h) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{X}_h \times \mathbb{W}_h$ ,  $\|\mathbf{u}_h\|_0 = 1$ , such that

$$\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p_h) = \lambda_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h), \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{X}_h, \quad (2.8)$$

$$\overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, q_h)} = 0, \quad \forall q_h \in \mathbb{W}_h, \quad (2.9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \mu \nabla \mathbf{u}_h : \overline{\nabla \mathbf{v}_h} dx + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \overline{\mathbf{v}_h} dx \\ &\quad - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \mu \{\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\} : \overline{\{\mathbf{v}_h\}} ds - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \mu \{\overline{\nabla \mathbf{v}_h}\} : \overline{\{\mathbf{u}_h\}} ds \\ &\quad + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \frac{\gamma}{h_F} \overline{\{\mathbf{u}_h\}} : \overline{\{\mathbf{v}_h\}} ds - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \int_F \overline{\{\mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta\}} \cdot \overline{\{\mathbf{v}_h\}} ds \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h \cap \partial\Omega} \int_F (\mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta) \mathbf{n} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{v}_h} ds, \quad (2.10)\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) = - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} q_h \overline{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h} dx + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \{q_h\} \overline{\{\mathbf{v}_h\}} ds. \quad (2.11)$$

The term  $\frac{\gamma}{h_F}$  is the interior penalty parameter, and the term

$$- \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \subset \partial\tau} \int_F \overline{\{\mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta\}} \cdot \overline{\{\mathbf{v}_h\}} ds$$

makes the DG formula adjoint consistent.

Define the DG-norm as follows:

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h^2 = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{1,\tau}^2 + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \frac{\gamma}{h_F} |\overline{\{\mathbf{v}_h\}}|^2 ds, \quad \text{on } (H^1(\mathcal{T}_h))^d; \quad (2.12)$$

$$|||\mathbf{v}_h|||^2 = \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h^2 + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F h_F |\{\nabla \mathbf{v}_h\}|^2 ds, \quad \text{on } (H^{1+s}(\mathcal{T}_h))^d, (s > \frac{1}{2}). \quad (2.13)$$

Note that  $\|\cdot\|_h$  is equivalent to  $|||\cdot|||$  on  $\mathbb{X}_h$ .

Using the trace theorem on the reference element and the scaling argument, we deduce for any  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$  that the trace inequality

$$\|w\|_{0,\partial\tau} \lesssim h_\tau^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|w\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau^{r-\frac{1}{2}} |w|_{r,\tau}, \quad \forall w \in H^r(\tau), \quad r \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]. \quad (2.14)$$

From the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we obtain

$$|\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h)| \lesssim |||\mathbf{u}_h||| |||\mathbf{v}_h|||, \quad \forall [\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h] \in (H^1(\mathcal{T}_h))^d \times (H^1(\mathcal{T}_h))^d. \quad (2.15)$$

From the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (2.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h)| \\ & \lesssim (\|\mathbf{u}_h\|_h^2 + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F h_F |\{\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\}|^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h^2 + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F h_F |\{\nabla \mathbf{v}_h\}|^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \lesssim (\|\mathbf{u}_h\|_h + (\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_\tau^{2r} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|_{r,\tau}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}) (\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h + (\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_\tau^{2r} \|\nabla \mathbf{v}_h\|_{r,\tau}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}), \\ & \quad \forall [\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h] \in (H^1(\mathcal{T}_h))^d \times (H^1(\mathcal{T}_h))^d. \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

From the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the trace inequality, we can obtain for any  $[\mathbf{v}_h, q_h] \in (H^1(\mathcal{T}_h))^d \times H^r(\mathcal{T}_h)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)| &= | - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_\tau q_h \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h dx + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \{q_h\} \llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \rrbracket ds | \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h \|q_h\|_0 + (\sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \frac{\gamma}{h_F} |\llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \rrbracket|^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \frac{h_F}{\gamma} |\{q_h\}|^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h \|q_h\|_0 + \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h (\|q_h\|_0 + (\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_\tau^{2r} \|q_h\|_{r,\tau}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h (\|q_h\|_0 + (\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_\tau^{2r} \|q_h\|_{r,\tau}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

**Lemma 2.1.** *The discrete coercivity property holds*

$$\|\mathbf{u}_h\|_h^2 \lesssim \text{Re} \mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{u}_h), \quad \forall \mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbb{X}_h. \quad (2.18)$$

**Proof.** By virtue of Green's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_\tau (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \overline{\mathbf{u}_h} dx = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_\tau \sum_{i=1}^d \beta_i \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_h}{\partial x_i} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{u}_h} dx \\ &= - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_\tau \sum_{i=1}^d \overline{\beta_i} \frac{\partial \overline{\mathbf{u}_h}}{\partial x_i} \cdot \mathbf{u}_h dx + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\partial \tau} (\mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta) \mathbf{n} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{u}_h} \cdot \mathbf{n} ds \\ &= - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_\tau (\overline{\beta \cdot \nabla} \mathbf{u}_h) \cdot \mathbf{u}_h dx + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \{\overline{\mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta}\} : \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket ds + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \int_F \{\mathbf{u}_h\} \cdot \llbracket \overline{\mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta} \rrbracket ds, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Re} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_\tau (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \overline{\mathbf{u}_h} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Re} \left( \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \{\overline{\mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta}\} : \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket ds + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \int_F \{\mathbf{u}_h\} \llbracket \overline{\mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta} \rrbracket ds \right), \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain from Young's inequality with  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$  and trace inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |Re(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \overline{\mathbf{u}_h} dx - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \subset \partial \tau} \int_F \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta \rrbracket \cdot \overline{\{\mathbf{u}_h\}} ds)| \\
&= |\frac{1}{2} Re(\sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \overline{\{\mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta\}} : \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket ds + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \{\mathbf{u}_h\} \cdot \overline{\llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta \rrbracket} ds \\
&\quad - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta \rrbracket \cdot \overline{\{\mathbf{u}_h\}} ds)| \\
&\leq \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \frac{1}{2} \|h_F^{\frac{1}{2}} \overline{\{\mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta\}}\|_{0,F} \|h_F^{-\frac{1}{2}} \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket\|_{0,F} + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \frac{3}{2} \|h_F^{\frac{1}{2}} \{\mathbf{u}_h\}\|_{0,F} \|h_F^{-\frac{1}{2}} \overline{\llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta \rrbracket}\|_{0,F} \\
&\leq \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} (\epsilon_1 \|h_F^{\frac{1}{2}} \overline{\{\mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta\}}\|_{0,F}^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon_1} \|h_F^{-\frac{1}{2}} \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket\|_{0,F}^2) + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} (\epsilon_2 \|h_F^{\frac{1}{2}} \{\mathbf{u}_h\}\|_{0,F}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\epsilon_2} \|h_F^{-\frac{1}{2}} \overline{\llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta \rrbracket}\|_{0,F}^2) \\
&\leq \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} C_0(\epsilon_1 \|\beta\|_{L^\infty} + \epsilon_2) \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{0,\tau}^2 + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} C_0(\frac{1}{\epsilon_1} h_F^{-1} + \frac{1}{\epsilon_2} h_F^{-1} \|\beta\|_{L^\infty}) \|\llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket\|_{0,F}^2. \tag{2.19}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by Young's inequality with  $\epsilon_3 > 0$  and trace inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |Re(\sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \mu \{\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\} : \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket ds + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \mu \{\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\} : \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket ds)| \\
&\leq 2\mu \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \|h_F^{\frac{1}{2}} \{\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\}\|_{0,F} \|h_F^{-\frac{1}{2}} \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket\|_{0,F} \\
&\leq \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} (\epsilon_3 \|h_F^{\frac{1}{2}} \{\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\}\|_{0,F}^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon_3} \|h_F^{-\frac{1}{2}} \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket\|_{0,F}^2) \\
&\leq \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} C_1 \epsilon_3 \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|_{0,\tau}^2 + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} C_1 \frac{1}{\epsilon_3} \|h_F^{-\frac{1}{2}} \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket\|_{0,F}^2. \tag{2.20}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (2.19) with (2.20), we can derive

$$\begin{aligned}
& Re(\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{u}_h)) \\
&\geq \mu \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|_{0,\tau}^2 - C_0(\epsilon_1 \|\beta\|_{L^\infty} + \epsilon_2) \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{0,\tau}^2 \\
&\quad - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} C_0(\frac{1}{\epsilon_1} h_F^{-1} + \frac{1}{\epsilon_2} h_F^{-1} \|\beta\|_{L^\infty}) \|\llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket\|_{0,F}^2 \\
&\quad - C_1 \epsilon_3 \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|_{0,\tau}^2 - C_1 \frac{1}{\epsilon_3} h_F^{-1} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \|\llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket\|_{0,F}^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \gamma h_F^{-1} \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket : \overline{\llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket} ds \\
&\geq (\mu - C_1 \epsilon_3) \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_h\|_{0,\tau}^2 - C_0(\epsilon_1 \|\beta\|_{L^\infty} + \epsilon_2) \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{0,\tau}^2 \\
&\quad + \left( \gamma - (C_0 \frac{1}{\epsilon_1} + C_0 \frac{1}{\epsilon_2} \|\beta\|_{L^\infty} + C_1 \frac{1}{\epsilon_3}) \right) h_F^{-1} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \|\llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket\|_{0,F}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to (1.8) in [36], and by choosing a sufficiently large  $\gamma$  and some proper  $\epsilon_i < 1$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ), we obtain (2.18).  $\square$

The weak formulation of the boundary value problem (Oseen equation) associated with (2.1) reads: find  $(\mathbf{u}^f, p^f) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{W}$  such that

$$\mathbb{A}(\mathbf{u}^f, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{v}, p^f) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}), \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{X}, \quad (2.21)$$

$$\overline{\mathbb{B}(\mathbf{u}^f, q)} = 0, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{W}. \quad (2.22)$$

The DG formula of (2.21)-(2.22) reads: find  $(\mathbf{u}_h^f, p_h^f) \in \mathbb{X}_h \times \mathbb{W}_h$  such that

$$\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^f, \mathbf{v}_h) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p_h^f) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h), \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{X}_h, \quad (2.23)$$

$$\overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^f, q_h)} = 0, \quad \forall q_h \in \mathbb{W}_h. \quad (2.24)$$

Referring to Theorem 2.1 in [3], we assume that the following regularity result is valid: for any  $\mathbf{f} \in (L^2(\Omega))^d$  ( $d = 2, 3$ ), there exists  $(\mathbf{u}^f, p^f) \in (H^{1+r}(\Omega))^d \times H^r(\Omega)$  ( $\frac{1}{2} < r \leq 1$ ) satisfying (2.21)-(2.22) and

$$\|\mathbf{u}^f\|_{1+r} + \|p^f\|_r \leq C_\Omega \|\mathbf{f}\|_0, \quad (2.25)$$

where  $C_\Omega$  is a positive constant independent of  $\mathbf{f}$ .

Using the standard argument (see Lemma 6.5 and Proposition 2.9 of [8]), we can derive the consistency lemma of (2.23)-(2.24).

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $(\mathbf{u}^f, p^f)$  be the solution to the boundary value problem (2.21)-(2.22). Then the following equations hold*

$$\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^f, \mathbf{v}_h) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p^f) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}_h), \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{X}(h), \quad (2.26)$$

$$\overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}^f, q_h)} = 0, \quad \forall q_h \in \mathbb{W}. \quad (2.27)$$

Thanks to [27, 28], the Nedelec  $H(\text{div})$  space of index  $k$  is given by

$$V_h^N = \{\mathbf{v} \in H(\Omega; \text{div}) : \mathbf{v}|_\tau \in [P_k(\tau)]^d, \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}_h\}.$$

The projection  $\Pi_h : [H^1(\Omega)]^d \rightarrow V_h^N$  is defined as follows for every  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$ :

$$\int_\tau (\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h \mathbf{v}) \cdot \overline{\mathbf{w}} = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{w} \in N_{k-1}(\tau), \quad (2.28)$$

$$\int_F (\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \bar{q} = 0, \quad \forall q \in P_k(F), \quad \forall F \subset \partial\tau, \quad (2.29)$$

where  $N_{k-1}(\tau)$  is the Nedelec space of index  $k-1$  given by

$$N_{k-1}(\tau) = [\mathbb{P}_{k-2}(\tau)]^d + \{\mathbf{v} \in [\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_{k-1}(\tau)]^d : \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{x} = 0\},$$

and  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_{k-1}(\tau)$  is the space of homogeneous polynomials of degree  $k-1$ .

We obtain from (2.28) and (2.29)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\tau \nabla \cdot (\Pi_h \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}) \bar{q} dx &= - \int_\tau (\Pi_h \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}) \cdot \overline{\nabla q} dx \\ &+ \int_{\partial\tau} (\Pi_h \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \bar{q} ds = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega)^d, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1}(\tau). \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

From Proposition 1 in [27], if  $\mathbf{u} \in (H^{1+s}(\Omega))^d$  for any  $k \geq s \geq 0$  holds

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \Pi_h \mathbf{u}\|_h \lesssim h^s \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1+s}. \quad (2.31)$$

Let  $I_h : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_h \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega})^d$  be the Lagrange interpolation operator. Let  $\vartheta_h : H^s(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{W}_h$  be the local  $L^2$  projection operator satisfying  $\vartheta_h p|_\tau \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1}(\tau)$  and

$$\int_\tau (p - \vartheta_h p) \bar{q} dx = 0, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{P}_{k-1}(\tau), \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

Then, from Section 6.1.5 in [8], when  $p \in H^s(\tau)$  ( $\frac{1}{2} < s \leq k$ ) holds

$$\|p - \vartheta_h p\|_0 \lesssim h^s \|p\|_{s,\tau}, \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}_h. \quad (2.32)$$

Using standard techniques (see Section VI.4 in [40]), by the projection operator  $\Pi_h$ , we can prove the following inf-sup condition holds.

**Lemma 2.3.** *There exists a constant  $\alpha > 0$  independent of  $h$  such that the following discrete inf-sup condition holds*

$$\inf_{0 \neq q_h \in \mathbb{W}_h} \sup_{0 \neq \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{X}_h} \frac{Re\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)}{\|q_h\|_0 \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h} \geq \alpha. \quad (2.33)$$

**Proof.** The following commuting property holds ([27]):

$$\nabla \cdot \Pi_h \mathbf{v} = \vartheta_h \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}. \quad (2.34)$$

In addition, the following bound holds:

$$\|\Pi_h \mathbf{v}\|_h \leq C \|\mathbf{v}\|_1, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in [H_0^1(\Omega)]^d. \quad (2.35)$$

From [28],  $\forall p_h \in \mathbb{W}_h$ , there exists a  $\mathbf{v} \in [H_0^1(\Omega)]^d$ , such that

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = p_h, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \mathbf{v} = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \leq C \|p_h\|_0. \quad (2.36)$$

By (2.34), we have that  $\nabla \cdot \Pi_h \mathbf{v} = p_h$ , and from (2.28) and (2.29), it is easy to know that  $[\Pi_h \mathbf{v}] = 0$ ,  $\forall F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$ , and together with  $\Pi_h \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , then

$$\|p_h\|_0^2 = \int_\Omega p_h \overline{p_h} dx = \int_\Omega p_h \overline{\nabla \cdot \Pi_h \mathbf{v}} dx = -\mathbb{B}_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{v}, p_h). \quad (2.37)$$

We get from (2.35) and (2.36)

$$-\frac{\mathbb{B}_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{v}, p_h)}{\|\Pi_h \mathbf{v}\|_h} \gtrsim -\frac{\mathbb{B}_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{v}, p_h)}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_1} \gtrsim -\frac{\mathbb{B}_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{v}, p_h)}{\|p_h\|_0} = \|p_h\|_0, \quad \forall p_h \in \mathbb{W}_h.$$

Hence, there exists a  $\alpha > 0$  independent of  $h$ , such that (2.33) holds.  $\square$

From (2.4) and (2.5), we know that (2.21)-(2.22) are well-posed. Then we define the solution operators  $\mathbb{T} : L^2(\Omega)^d \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ ,  $\mathbb{T}\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{u}^f$ , and  $\mathbb{S} : L^2(\Omega)^d \rightarrow \mathbb{W}$ ,  $\mathbb{S}\mathbf{f} = p^f$  as follows:

$$\mathbb{A}(\mathbb{T}\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbb{S}\mathbf{f}) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}), \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{X}, \quad (2.38)$$

$$\overline{\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{T}\mathbf{f}, q)} = 0, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{W}. \quad (2.39)$$

And it is valid that

$$\|\mathbb{T}\mathbf{f}\|_1 + \|\mathbb{S}\mathbf{f}\|_0 \lesssim \|\mathbf{f}\|_0. \quad (2.40)$$



Because of the compact embedding  $\mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega)^d$ ,  $\mathbb{T} : L^2(\Omega)^d \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)^d$  is compact.

By (2.18) and (2.33), we know that (2.23)-(2.24) are well-posed, and we define the discrete solution operators  $\mathbb{T}_h : L^2(\Omega)^d \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_h$ ,  $\mathbb{T}_h \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{u}_h^f$ , and  $\mathbb{S}_h : L^2(\Omega)^d \rightarrow \mathbb{W}_h$ ,  $\mathbb{S}_h \mathbf{f} = p_h^f$  as follows:

$$\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbb{T}_h \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}, \mathbb{S}_h \mathbf{f}) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}), \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{X}_h, \quad (2.41)$$

$$\overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbb{T}_h \mathbf{f}, q)} = 0, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{W}_h. \quad (2.42)$$

And there holds

$$\|\mathbb{T}_h \mathbf{f}\|_h + \|\mathbb{S}_h \mathbf{f}\|_0 \lesssim \|\mathbf{f}\|_0. \quad (2.43)$$

Thus, (2.2)-(2.3) and (2.8)-(2.9) have the following equivalent operator forms, respectively:

$$\lambda \mathbb{T} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbb{S}(\lambda \mathbf{u}) = p, \quad (2.44)$$

$$\lambda_h \mathbb{T}_h \mathbf{u}_h = \mathbf{u}_h, \quad \mathbb{S}_h(\lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h) = p_h. \quad (2.45)$$

Referring to [29], we give the adjoint eigenvalue problem of (2.2)-(2.3) and its DG formula: find  $(\lambda^*, \mathbf{u}^*, p^*) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{W}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{u}^*\|_0 = 1$ , such that

$$\mathbb{A}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}^*) + \overline{\mathbb{B}(\mathbf{v}, p^*)} = \overline{\lambda^*}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}^*), \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{X} \quad (2.46)$$

$$\mathbb{B}(\mathbf{u}^*, q) = 0, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{W}, \quad (2.47)$$

and find  $(\lambda_h^*, \mathbf{u}_h^*, p_h^*) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{X}_h \times \mathbb{W}_h$ ,  $\|\mathbf{u}_h^*\|_0 = 1$ , such that

$$\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{u}_h^*) + \overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p_h^*)} = \overline{\lambda_h^*}(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{u}_h^*), \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{X}_h, \quad (2.48)$$

$$\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^*, q_h) = 0, \quad \forall q_h \in \mathbb{W}_h. \quad (2.49)$$

The source problem associated with (2.46)-(2.47) is to find  $(\mathbf{u}^{f*}, p^{f*}) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{W}$  such that

$$\mathbb{A}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}^{f*}) + \overline{\mathbb{B}(\mathbf{v}, p^{f*})} = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{f}), \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{X}, \quad (2.50)$$

$$\mathbb{B}(\mathbf{u}^{f*}, q) = 0, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{W}, \quad (2.51)$$

and its DG formula reads: find  $(\mathbf{u}_h^{f*}, p_h^{f*}) \in \mathbb{X}_h \times \mathbb{W}_h$  such that

$$\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{u}_h^{f*}) + \overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p_h^{f*})} = (\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{f}), \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{X}_h, \quad (2.52)$$

$$\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^{f*}, q_h) = 0, \quad \forall q_h \in \mathbb{W}_h. \quad (2.53)$$

From (2.4) and (2.5), we know that (2.50)-(2.51) are well-posed. Then we define the solution operators  $\mathbb{T}^* : L^2(\Omega)^d \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ ,  $\mathbb{S}^* : L^2(\Omega)^d \rightarrow \mathbb{W}$ :

$$\mathbb{A}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbb{T}^* \mathbf{f}) + \overline{\mathbb{B}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbb{S}^* \mathbf{f})} = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{f}), \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{X}, \quad (2.54)$$

$$\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{T}^* \mathbf{f}, q) = 0, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{W}, \quad (2.55)$$

and it is valid that

$$\|\mathbb{T}^* \mathbf{f}\|_1 + \|\mathbb{S}^* \mathbf{f}\|_0 \lesssim \|\mathbf{f}\|_0. \quad (2.56)$$

By (2.18) and (2.33), we know that (2.52)-(2.53) are well-posed, and we define the discrete solution operators  $\mathbb{T}_h^* : L^2(\Omega)^d \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_h$ ,  $\mathbb{S}_h^* : L^2(\Omega)^d \rightarrow \mathbb{W}_h$  as follows:

$$\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{v}, \mathbb{T}_h^* \mathbf{f}) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}, \mathbb{S}_h^* \mathbf{f}) = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{f}), \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{X}_h, \quad (2.57)$$

$$\overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbb{T}_h^* \mathbf{f}, q)} = 0, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{W}_h. \quad (2.58)$$

And there holds

$$\|\mathbb{T}_h^* \mathbf{f}\|_h + \|\mathbb{S}_h^* \mathbf{f}\|_0 \lesssim \|\mathbf{f}\|_0. \quad (2.59)$$

From (2.54), (2.55), (2.38) and (2.39), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{T} \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z}) &= \mathbb{A}(\mathbb{T} \mathbf{v}, \mathbb{T}^* \mathbf{z}) + \overline{\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{T} \mathbf{v}, S^* \mathbf{z})} \\ &= \mathbb{A}(\mathbb{T} \mathbf{v}, \mathbb{T}^* \mathbf{z}) + \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{T}^* \mathbf{z}, \mathbb{S} \mathbf{v}) = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbb{T}^* \mathbf{z}), \quad \forall \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z} \in (L^2(\Omega))^d, \end{aligned} \quad (2.60)$$

and from (2.41), (2.42), (2.58) and (2.57), we can deduce

$$(\mathbb{T}_h \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbb{T}_h^* \mathbf{z}), \quad \forall \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z} \in (L^2(\Omega))^d. \quad (2.61)$$

Then  $\mathbb{T}^*$  and  $\mathbb{T}_h^*$  are adjoint operators of  $\mathbb{T}$  and  $\mathbb{T}_h$ , respectively. Therefore the prime and adjoint eigenvalues are connected via  $\lambda = \bar{\lambda}^*$  and  $\lambda_h = \bar{\lambda}_h^*$ .

Referring to Proposition 2.9 of [8], next we will prove the adjoint-consistency of DG formulation.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $(\mathbf{u}^{f*}, p^{f*})$  be the solution to the boundary value problem (2.50)-(2.51). Then the following equations hold*

$$\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{u}^{f*}) + \overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p^{f*})} = (\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{f}), \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{X}(h), \quad (2.62)$$

$$\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}^{f*}, q_h) = 0, \quad \forall q_h \in \mathbb{W}. \quad (2.63)$$

**Proof.** A simple calculation shows that on element  $\tau$ , there hold

$$\begin{aligned} (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v}_h &= \text{div}(\mathbf{v}_h \otimes \beta), \\ (\mathbf{v}_h \otimes \beta) : \overline{\nabla \mathbf{u}^{f*}} &= \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \overline{(\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^{f*}}. \end{aligned}$$

From the above two equations and Green's formula, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \overline{\mathbf{u}^{f*}} dx &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \text{div}(\mathbf{v}_h \otimes \beta) \cdot \overline{\mathbf{u}^{f*}} dx \\ &= - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} (\mathbf{v}_h \otimes \beta) : \overline{\nabla \mathbf{u}^{f*}} dx + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \subset \partial \tau} \int_F (\mathbf{v}_h \otimes \beta) \mathbf{n} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{u}^{f*}} ds \\ &= - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \overline{(\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^{f*}} dx + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \subset \partial \tau} \int_F \llbracket (\mathbf{v}_h \otimes \beta) \rrbracket \cdot \{\overline{\mathbf{u}^{f*}}\} ds. \\ \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \mu \nabla \mathbf{v}_h : \overline{\nabla \mathbf{u}^{f*}} dx &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left( - \int_{\tau} \mathbf{v}_h : \overline{\mu \Delta \mathbf{u}^{f*}} dx + \sum_{F \subset \partial \tau} \int_F \mathbf{v}_h \otimes \mathbf{n} : \mu \overline{\nabla \mathbf{u}^{f*}} ds \right) \\ &= - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \mathbf{v}_h : \overline{\mu \Delta \mathbf{u}^{f*}} dx + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \rrbracket : \mu \{\overline{\nabla \mathbf{u}^{f*}}\} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.10), (2.11) and the above two equations and  $\llbracket \mathbf{u}^{f*} \rrbracket = 0$  we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{u}^{f*}) + \overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p^{f*})} \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \mu \nabla \mathbf{v}_h : \overline{\nabla \mathbf{u}^{f*}} dx + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \overline{\mathbf{u}^{f*}} dx \\
&\quad - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \mu \{ \nabla \mathbf{v}_h \} : \llbracket \overline{\mathbf{u}^{f*}} \rrbracket ds - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \mu \{ \overline{\nabla \mathbf{u}^{f*}} \} : \llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \rrbracket ds \\
&\quad + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \frac{\gamma}{h_F} \llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \rrbracket : \llbracket \overline{\mathbf{u}^{f*}} \rrbracket ds - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \subset \partial \tau} \int_F \llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \otimes \beta \rrbracket \cdot \{ \overline{\mathbf{u}^{f*}} \} ds \\
&\quad - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \overline{p^{f*}} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h dx + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \{ \overline{p^{f*}} \} \llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \rrbracket ds \\
&= - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \mathbf{v}_h : \overline{\mu \Delta \mathbf{u}^{f*}} dx + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \rrbracket : \mu \{ \overline{\nabla \mathbf{u}^{f*}} \} ds \\
&\quad - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \mathbf{v}_h \cdot (\beta \cdot \nabla) \overline{\mathbf{u}^{f*}} dx + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \subset \partial \tau} \int_F \llbracket (\mathbf{v}_h \otimes \beta) \rrbracket \cdot \{ \overline{\mathbf{u}^{f*}} \} ds \\
&\quad - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \mu \{ \nabla \mathbf{v}_h \} : \llbracket \overline{\mathbf{u}^{f*}} \rrbracket ds - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \mu \{ \overline{\nabla \mathbf{u}^{f*}} \} : \llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \rrbracket ds \\
&\quad + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \frac{\gamma}{h_F} \llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \rrbracket : \llbracket \overline{\mathbf{u}^{f*}} \rrbracket ds - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \subset \partial \tau} \int_F \llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \otimes \beta \rrbracket \cdot \{ \overline{\mathbf{u}^{f*}} \} ds \\
&\quad + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left( \int_{\tau} \overline{\nabla p^{f*}} \mathbf{v}_h dx - \sum_{F \subset \partial \tau} \int_F \overline{p^{f*}} \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n} ds \right) + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \{ \overline{p^{f*}} \} \llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \rrbracket ds \\
&= - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \mathbf{v}_h : \overline{\mu \Delta \mathbf{u}^{f*}} dx - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \mathbf{v}_h \cdot (\beta \cdot \nabla) \overline{\mathbf{u}^{f*}} dx - 0 + 0 \\
&\quad + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left( \int_{\tau} \overline{\nabla p^{f*}} \mathbf{v}_h dx - \sum_{F \subset \partial \tau} \int_F \overline{p^{f*}} \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \mathbf{n} ds \right) + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \{ \overline{p^{f*}} \} \llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \rrbracket ds \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{v}_h \cdot (\overline{\mu \Delta \mathbf{u}^{f*}} - \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{u}^{f*} \otimes \beta) + \nabla p^{f*}) dx = (\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{f}). \tag{2.64}
\end{aligned}$$

Then, (2.62) holds. It is clear that (2.63) holds.  $\square$

From the inverse inequality and the interpolation estimate, we deduce

$$h_{\tau}^r |\nabla(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}_h)|_{r, \tau} \lesssim (|\nabla(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}_h)|_{0, \tau} + h_{\tau}^r |\mathbf{u} - I_h \mathbf{u}|_{1+r, \tau}), \tag{2.65}$$

$$h_{\tau}^r |p - p_h|_{r, \tau} \lesssim (|p - p_h|_{0, \tau} + h_{\tau}^r |p - \vartheta_h p|_{r, \tau}), \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{X}_h, p_h \in \mathbb{W}_h. \tag{2.66}$$

Using the same argument as Theorem 6.10 and Theorem 6.11 in [8], we prove the following two theorems.

**Theorem 2.5.** *Let  $(\mathbf{u}^f, p^f)$  and  $(\mathbf{u}_h^f, p_h^f)$  be the solution of (2.21)-(2.22) and (2.23)-(2.24), respectively, and let  $(\mathbf{u}^{f*}, p^{f*})$  and  $(\mathbf{u}_h^{f*}, p_h^{f*})$  be the solution of (2.50)-(2.51) and (2.52)-(2.53), respectively. Assume that  $(\mathbf{u}^f, p^f), (\mathbf{u}^{f*}, p^{f*}) \in H^{1+s}(\Omega)^d \times H^s(\Omega)$ ,  $s \in [r, k]$ , then*

$$||| \mathbf{u}^f - \mathbf{u}_h^f ||| + \|p^f - p_h^f\|_0 \lesssim h^s (|\mathbf{u}^f|_{1+s} + |p^f|_s), \tag{2.67}$$

$$||| \mathbf{u}^{f*} - \mathbf{u}_h^{f*} ||| + \|p^{f*} - p_h^{f*}\|_0 \lesssim h^s (|\mathbf{u}^{f*}|_{1+s} + |p^{f*}|_s). \tag{2.68}$$

**Proof.** Denote  $\varphi = \mathbf{u}_h^f - \Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f$  and  $\psi = p_h^f - \vartheta_h p^f$ . By the consistency (2.26), we deduce that the error  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  satisfy the equations

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{A}_h(\varphi, \mathbf{v}_h) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \psi) &= \mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^f - \Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f, \mathbf{v}_h) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p_h^f - \vartheta_h p^f) \\
&= \mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^f - \mathbf{u}^f + \mathbf{u}^f - \Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f, \mathbf{v}_h) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p_h^f - p^f + p^f - \vartheta_h p^f) \\
&= \mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^f - \mathbf{u}^f, \mathbf{v}_h) + \mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^f - \Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f, \mathbf{v}_h) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p_h^f - p^f) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p^f - \vartheta_h p^f) \\
&= \mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^f - \Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f, \mathbf{v}_h) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p^f - \vartheta_h p^f), \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{X}_h.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.69}$$

From (2.30) and (2.29), we get  $\mathbb{B}_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f - \mathbf{u}^f, q_h) = 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{B}_h(\varphi, q_h) &= \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^f - \Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f, q_h) = \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^f - \mathbf{u}^f + \mathbf{u}^f - \Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f, q_h) \\
&= \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^f - \mathbf{u}, q_h) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}^f - \Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f, q_h) = 0, \quad \forall q_h \in \mathbb{W}_h.
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $\mathbf{v}_h = \varphi$  in (2.69), and using the above equation, we obtain

$$\mathbb{A}_h(\varphi, \varphi) + 0 = \mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^f - \Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f, \varphi) + \mathbb{B}_h(\varphi, p^f - \vartheta_h p^f),$$

thus, by coercivity of  $Re\mathbb{A}_h(\cdot, \cdot)$ , (2.16), (2.17), (2.65) with  $\mathbf{v}_h = \Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f$ , (2.31) and (2.32), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\varphi\|_h^2 &\lesssim Re\mathbb{A}_h(\varphi, \varphi) \lesssim |\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^f - \Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f, \varphi) - \mathbb{B}_h(\varphi, p^f - \vartheta_h p^f)| \\
&\lesssim (\|\mathbf{u}^f - \Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f\|_h + (\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_\tau^{2r} \|\nabla(\mathbf{u} - I_h \mathbf{u})\|_{r,\tau}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + (\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_\tau^{2r} \|p^f - \vartheta_h p^f\|_{r,\tau}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \|\varphi\|_h \\
&\lesssim h^s (|\mathbf{u}^f|_{1+s} + |p^f|_s) \|\varphi\|_h.
\end{aligned}$$

By the triangle inequality, (2.31), (2.65) with  $\mathbf{v}_h = \Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f$  and the above estimate we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{u}^f - \mathbf{u}_h^f\| \leq \|\mathbf{u}^f - \Pi_h \mathbf{u}^f\| + \|\varphi\| \lesssim h^s (|\mathbf{u}^f|_{1+s} + |p^f|_s). \tag{2.70}$$

By virtue of (2.33) and (2.26), the following inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha \|\vartheta_h p^f - p_h^f\|_0 &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{X}_h} \frac{|\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \vartheta_h p^f - p_h^f)|}{\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h} \\
&= \sup_{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{X}_h} \frac{|\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p^f - p_h^f) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \vartheta_h p^f - p^f)|}{\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h} \\
&= \sup_{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{X}_h} \frac{|-\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^f - \mathbf{u}_h^f, \mathbf{v}_h) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \vartheta_h p^f - p^f)|}{\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.71}$$

From (2.17) and (2.32), we know

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \vartheta_h p^f - p^f) &\lesssim \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h (\|\vartheta_h p^f - p^f\|_0 + (\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_\tau^{2r} \|\vartheta_h p^f - p^f\|_{r,\tau}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\
&\lesssim h^s \|p^f\|_s \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.72}$$

From (2.15) and (2.70), we obtain

$$|\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}^f - \mathbf{u}_h^f, \mathbf{v}_h)| \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}^f - \mathbf{u}_h^f\| \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h \lesssim h^s (|\mathbf{u}^f|_{1+s} + |p^f|_s) \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h. \tag{2.73}$$

Substituting (2.72) and (2.73) into (2.71), then

$$\alpha \|\vartheta_h p^f - p_h^f\|_0 \lesssim h^s (|\mathbf{u}^f|_{1+s} + |p^f|_s),$$

applying triangle inequality and combining (2.32) yield

$$\|p^f - p_h^f\|_0 \lesssim h^s (|\mathbf{u}^f|_{1+s} + |p^f|_s). \quad (2.74)$$

Combining (2.70) with (2.74), we obtain (2.67).

By following the steps of argument as for (2.67), we can deduce that the estimate (2.68) holds.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.6.** *Let  $(\mathbf{u}^{f*}, p^{f*})$  and  $(\mathbf{u}_h^{f*}, p_h^{f*})$  be the solution of (2.50)-(2.51) and (2.52)-(2.53), respectively, and let  $(\mathbf{u}^f, p^f)$  and  $(\mathbf{u}_h^f, p_h^f)$  be the solution of (2.21)-(2.22) and (2.23)-(2.24), respectively. Then*

$$\|\mathbf{u}^{f*} - \mathbf{u}_h^{f*}\|_0 \lesssim h^r (\|\mathbf{u}^{f*} - \mathbf{u}_h^{f*}\| + \|p^{f*} - p_h^{f*}\|_0), \quad (2.75)$$

$$\|\mathbf{u}^f - \mathbf{u}_h^f\|_0 \lesssim h^r (\|\mathbf{u}^f - \mathbf{u}_h^f\| + \|p^f - p_h^f\|_0). \quad (2.76)$$

**Proof.** For any  $\mathbf{f} \in (L^2(\Omega))^d$ , we have  $I_h \mathbb{T} \mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{X}_h \cap \mathbb{X}$ , thus from (2.50) and (2.52), and from (2.3), we obtain

$$\mathbb{A}_h(I_h \mathbb{T} \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{u}^{f*} - \mathbf{u}_h^{f*}) + \overline{\mathbb{B}_h(I_h \mathbb{T} \mathbf{f}, p^{f*} - p_h^{f*})} = 0, \quad \overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbb{T} \mathbf{f}, p^{f*} - p_h^{f*})} = 0.$$

Let  $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{u}^{f*} - \mathbf{u}_h^{f*}$ , from (2.38), (2.26), the above two equations, (2.16) and (2.17), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}^{f*} - \mathbf{u}_h^{f*}\|_0^2 &= (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{u}^{f*} - \mathbf{u}_h^{f*}) = \mathbb{A}_h(\mathbb{T} \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{u}^{f*} - \mathbf{u}_h^{f*}) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}^{f*} - \mathbf{u}_h^{f*}, \mathbb{S} \mathbf{f}) \\ &= |\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbb{T} \mathbf{f} - I_h \mathbb{T} \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{u}^{f*} - \mathbf{u}_h^{f*}) + \overline{\mathbb{B}_h(I_h \mathbb{T} \mathbf{f} - \mathbb{T} \mathbf{f}, p^{f*} - p_h^{f*})}| \\ &\quad + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}^{f*} - \mathbf{u}_h^{f*}, \mathbb{S} \mathbf{f} - \mathbb{S}_h \mathbf{f}) \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbb{T} \mathbf{f} - I_h \mathbb{T} \mathbf{f}\| \|\mathbf{u}^{f*} - \mathbf{u}_h^{f*}\| + \|I_h \mathbb{T} \mathbf{f} - \mathbb{T} \mathbf{f}\|_h \|p^{f*} - p_h^{f*}\|_0 \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{u}^{f*} - \mathbf{u}_h^{f*}\|_h (\|\mathbb{S} \mathbf{f} - \mathbb{S}_h \mathbf{f}\|_0 + (\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_\tau^{2r} \|\mathbb{S} \mathbf{f} - \mathbb{S}_h \mathbf{f}\|_{r,\tau}^2 dx)^{\frac{1}{2}}), \end{aligned}$$

thus, from the interpolation estimate, (2.67) and (2.25), we obtain (2.75).

By the same argument as for (2.75), we obtain (2.76).  $\square$

Combining (2.76), (2.67), (2.75), (2.68) and (2.25), we can obtain

$$\|\mathbb{T}_h - \mathbb{T}\|_0 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0, \quad \|\mathbb{T}_h^* - \mathbb{T}^*\|_0 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.77)$$

Let  $\{\lambda_j\}$  and  $\{\lambda_{j,h}\}$  be enumerations of the eigenvalues of (2.2)-(2.3) and (2.8)-(2.9) respectively, according to the same sort rule, each repeated as many times as its multiplicity. Suppose that  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda_h$  are the  $k$ th eigenvalue of (2.2)-(2.3) and (2.8)-(2.9), respectively. Let  $q$  be the algebraic multiplicity of  $\lambda$ ,  $\lambda = \lambda_k = \lambda_{k+1} = \dots = \lambda_{k+q-1}$ . Assume that  $t(\lambda)$  and  $\mathbb{M}(\lambda)$  are generalized eigenspaces of  $\mathbb{T}$  and (2.2)-(2.3) associated with  $\lambda$ , respectively, and  $t^*(\lambda)$  and  $\mathbb{M}^*(\lambda)$  are generalized adjoint eigenspace associated with  $\lambda$ , and  $t_h(\lambda)$  the direct sum of the generalized eigenspace of  $\mathbb{T}_h$  associated with the eigenvalues  $\lambda_{j,h}$  that converge to  $\lambda$ .

For two closed subspaces  $A$  and  $B$  of  $(L^2(\Omega))^d$ , we define the gap  $\widehat{\delta}(A, B)$  between  $A$  and  $B$  in the sense of norm  $\|\cdot\|_0$  as

$$\delta(A, B) = \sup_{\phi \in A, \|\phi\|_0=1} \inf_{\psi \in B} \|\phi - \psi\|_0, \quad \widehat{\delta}(A, B) = \max\{\delta(A, B), \delta(B, A)\}.$$

**Lemma 2.7.** Let  $(\lambda, \mathbf{u}, p)$  and  $(\lambda_h, \mathbf{u}_h, p_h)$  be the  $j$ th eigenpair of (2.2)-(2.3) and (2.8)-(2.9), and let  $(\lambda^*, \mathbf{u}^*, p^*)$  and  $(\lambda_h^*, \mathbf{u}_h^*, p_h^*)$  be the  $j$ th eigenpair of (2.46)-(2.47) and (2.48)-(2.49), respectively. Then, it is holds that

$$|\lambda_h - \lambda| \lesssim |\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v}_h) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v}_h, p - p_h) + \overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, p^* - q_h)} - \lambda(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v}_h)|, \quad \text{for } [\mathbf{v}_h, q_h] = [\mathbf{u}_h^*, p_h^*] \text{ or } [I_h \mathbf{u}^*, \vartheta_h p^*]. \quad (2.78)$$

**Proof.** From (2.2)-(2.3), (2.26)-(2.27) ( $f = \lambda \mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{u}^f = \mathbf{u}$ ), (2.62)-(2.63) ( $f = \lambda^* \mathbf{u}^*$  and  $\mathbf{u}^{f*} = \mathbf{u}^*$ ) and (2.8)-(2.9), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v}_h) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v}_h, p - p_h) + \overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, p^* - q_h)} \\ & - \lambda(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{v}_h) \\ & = \mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}^*) - \mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}_h) - \mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{u}^*) + \mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \\ & + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}^*, p) - \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p) - \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}^*, p_h) + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p_h) \\ & + \overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}, p^*)} - \overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}, q_h)} - \overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, p^*)} + \overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, q_h)} \\ & - \lambda(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}^*) + \lambda(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}_h) + \lambda(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{u}^*) - \lambda(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \\ & = 0 + 0 + 0 - \lambda(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) + \lambda_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \\ & = (\lambda_h - \lambda)(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h). \end{aligned}$$

Applying the same argument as in Lemma 5 in [41], we deduce that  $|(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h)|$  has a positive lower bound uniformly with respect to  $h$ . Therefore, from the above equation we obtain (2.78).  $\square$

Denote  $\hat{\lambda}_h = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{j=k}^{k+q-1} \lambda_{j,h}$ .

**Theorem 2.8.** Let  $\mathbb{M}(\lambda), \mathbb{M}^*(\lambda) \subset (H^{1+s}(\Omega))^d \times H^s(\Omega)$  ( $r \leq s \leq k$ ), then the following estimates hold

$$\hat{\delta}(t(\lambda), t_h(\lambda)) \lesssim h^{r+s}, \quad (2.79)$$

$$|\lambda - \hat{\lambda}_h| \lesssim h^{2s}; \quad (2.80)$$

when  $\lambda$  is non-defective eigenvalue, then

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_0 \lesssim h^r (\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\| + \|p - p_h\|_0), \quad (2.81)$$

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\| + \|p - p_h\|_0 \lesssim h^s, \quad (2.82)$$

$$\|\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}_h^*\|_0 \lesssim h^r (\|\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}_h^*\| + \|p^* - p_h^*\|_0), \quad (2.83)$$

$$\|\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}_h^*\| + \|p^* - p_h^*\|_0 \lesssim h^s, \quad (2.84)$$

$$|\lambda - \lambda_h| \lesssim h^{2s}, \quad (2.85)$$

**Proof.** Since  $\|\mathbb{T}_h - \mathbb{T}\|_0 \rightarrow 0$  as  $h \rightarrow 0$ , from Theorem 7.1 and Theorem 7.2 in [29], we obtain

$$\hat{\delta}(t(\lambda), t_h(\lambda)) \lesssim \|(\mathbb{T} - \mathbb{T}_h)|_{t(\lambda)}\|_0, \quad (2.86)$$

$$|\hat{\lambda} - \hat{\lambda}_h| \lesssim \sum_{i,j=k}^{k+q-1} ((\mathbb{T} - \mathbb{T}_h)\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{u}_i^*) + \|(\mathbb{T} - \mathbb{T}_h)|_{t(\lambda)}\|_0 \|(\mathbb{T}^* - \mathbb{T}_h^*)|_{t^*(\lambda)}\|_0. \quad (2.87)$$

From (2.86), (2.76) and (2.67) we obtain (2.79).

From (2.62)-(2.63), (2.26)-(2.27) and (2.67)-(2.68), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & |((\mathbb{T} - \mathbb{T}_h)\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{u}_i^*)| = |\mathbb{A}_h((\mathbb{T} - \mathbb{T}_h)\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbb{T}^* \mathbf{u}_j^*) \\ & + \overline{\mathbb{B}_h((\mathbb{T} - \mathbb{T}_h)\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbb{S}^* \mathbf{u}_i^*)} + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbb{T}^* \mathbf{u}_i^*, \mathbb{S}^* \mathbf{u}_i^* - \mathbb{S}_h^* \mathbf{u}_i^*)| \\ & = |\mathbb{A}_h((\mathbb{T} - \mathbb{T}_h)\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbb{T}^* \mathbf{u}_i^* - I_h \mathbb{T}^* \mathbf{u}_i^*) \\ & + \mathbb{B}_h(\mathbb{T}^* \mathbf{u}_i^* - I_h \mathbb{T}^* \mathbf{u}_i^*, \mathbb{S}^* \mathbf{u}_i^* - \mathbb{S}_h^* \mathbf{u}_i^*) \\ & + \overline{\mathbb{B}_h((\mathbb{T} - \mathbb{T}_h)\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbb{S}^* \mathbf{u}_i^* - \vartheta_h \mathbb{S}^* \mathbf{u}_i^*)}| \lesssim h^{2s}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.88)$$

Substituting (2.88) into (2.87), and up to higher order term  $\|(\mathbb{T} - \mathbb{T}_h)|_{t(\lambda)}\|_0 \|(\mathbb{T}^* - \mathbb{T}_h^*)|_{t^*(\lambda)}\|_0$  we obtain (2.80).

When  $\lambda$  is non-defective eigenvalue. From spectral approximation theory and (2.76), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_0 &\lesssim \|\mathbb{T}\mathbf{u} - \mathbb{T}_h\mathbf{u}\|_0 \\ &\lesssim h^r(\|\mathbb{T}\mathbf{u} - \mathbb{T}_h\mathbf{u}\| + \|\mathbb{S}\mathbf{u} - \mathbb{S}_h\mathbf{u}\|_0). \end{aligned} \quad (2.89)$$

From (2.78) with  $[\mathbf{v}_h, q_h] = [I_h\mathbf{u}^*, \vartheta_h p^*]$ , we derive

$$|\lambda - \lambda_h| \lesssim h^r(\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_0 + \|p - p_h\|_0) \quad (2.90)$$

Applying the triangle inequality and (2.43), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} | \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\| - \|\lambda\mathbb{T}\mathbf{u} - \lambda\mathbb{T}_h\mathbf{u}\| | &\leq | \|\lambda\mathbb{T}\mathbf{u} - \lambda_h\mathbb{T}_h\mathbf{u}_h - \lambda\mathbb{T}\mathbf{u} + \lambda\mathbb{T}_h\mathbf{u}\| | \\ &\leq \|\lambda\mathbb{T}_h\mathbf{u} - \lambda_h\mathbb{T}_h\mathbf{u}_h\|_h \lesssim \|\lambda\mathbf{u} - \lambda_h\mathbf{u}_h\|_0, \\ | \|p - p_h\|_0 - \|\lambda\mathbb{S}\mathbf{u} - \lambda\mathbb{S}_h\mathbf{u}\|_0 | &\leq \|\lambda\mathbb{S}\mathbf{u} - \lambda_h\mathbb{S}_h\mathbf{u}_h - \lambda\mathbb{S}\mathbf{u} + \lambda\mathbb{S}_h\mathbf{u}\|_0 \\ &\leq \|\lambda\mathbb{S}_h\mathbf{u} - \lambda_h\mathbb{S}_h\mathbf{u}_h\|_0 \lesssim \|\lambda\mathbf{u} - \lambda_h\mathbf{u}_h\|_0. \end{aligned}$$

From the above two estimates, (2.89) and (2.90), we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\| + \|p - p_h\|_0 \simeq \|\lambda\mathbb{T}\mathbf{u} - \lambda\mathbb{T}_h\mathbf{u}\| + \|\lambda\mathbb{S}\mathbf{u} - \lambda\mathbb{S}_h\mathbf{u}\|_0. \quad (2.91)$$

From (2.91) and (2.89), we obtain (2.81). From (2.91) and (2.67), we obtain (2.82). By the same argument as for (2.81) and (2.82), we can obtain (2.83) and (2.84). By (2.78), and by (2.81), (2.82), (2.83) and (2.84), we can obtain (2.85).  $\square$

Consider the DG formulation: Find  $(\lambda_h^*, \mathbf{u}_h^*, p_h^*) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{X}_h \times \mathbb{W}_h$ ,  $\|\mathbf{u}_h^*\|_0 = 1$ , such that

$$\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{u}_h^*) + \overline{\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, p_h^*)} = \overline{\lambda_h^*}(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{u}_h^*), \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbb{X}_h, \quad (2.92)$$

$$\mathbb{B}_h(\mathbf{u}_h^*, q_h) = 0, \quad \forall q_h \in \mathbb{W}_h, \quad (2.93)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{u}_h^*) &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \mu \nabla \mathbf{v}_h : \overline{\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^*} dx - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \overline{\text{div}(\mathbf{u}_h^* \otimes \beta)} dx \\ &\quad - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \mu \{\nabla \mathbf{v}_h\} : \overline{[\mathbf{u}_h^*]} ds - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \mu [\mathbf{v}_h] : \overline{\{\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^*\}} ds \\ &\quad + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \mu \frac{\gamma}{h_F} [\mathbf{v}_h] : \overline{[\mathbf{u}_h^*]} ds + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \int_F \{\mathbf{v}_h\} \cdot \overline{[\mathbf{u}_h^* \otimes \beta]} ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h \cap \partial\Omega} \int_F \mathbf{v}_h \cdot \overline{((\mathbf{u}_h^* \otimes \beta)\mathbf{n})} ds. \end{aligned} \quad (2.94)$$

We deduce by Green's formula that

$$\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{u}_h^*) - \widehat{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{u}_h^*) = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h, \mathbf{u}_h^* \in \mathbb{X}_h. \quad (2.95)$$

Hence, the adjoint problem (2.92)-(2.93) is equivalent to the adjoint problem (2.48)-(2.49).

### 3 A posteriori error estimate

For the primal problem (2.8)-(2.9) and the adjoint problem (2.48)-(2.49), we introduce the estimators as follows.

Let  $(\lambda_h, \mathbf{u}_h, p_h) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{X}_h \times \mathbb{W}_h$  be an approximate eigenpair. For the problem (2.8)-(2.9), we introduce the estimator

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_{R_\tau}^2 &= h_\tau^2 \|\lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h + \mu \Delta \mathbf{u}_h - (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_h - \nabla p_h\|_{0,\tau}^2 + \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h\|_{0,\tau}^2, \\ \eta_{F_\tau}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{F \subset \partial\tau \setminus \partial\Omega} h_F \|[(p_h \mathbf{I} - \mu \nabla \mathbf{u}_h + \mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta)]\|_{0,F}^2,\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{I}$  denotes the  $d \times d$  ( $d = 2, 3$ ) identity matrix. Next, we introduce the following estimator  $\eta_{J_\tau}$  to measure the jump of the approximate solution  $\mathbf{u}_h$ :

$$\eta_{J_\tau}^2 = \sum_{F \subset \partial\tau, F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \gamma h_F^{-1} \|[\![\mathbf{u}_h]\!]\|_{0,F}^2 + \sum_{F \subset \partial\tau, F \in \mathcal{E}_h^b} \gamma h_F^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}_h \otimes \mathbf{n}\|_{0,F}^2.$$

The local error estimator is defined as

$$\eta_\tau^2(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) = \eta_{R_\tau}^2 + \eta_{F_\tau}^2 + \eta_{J_\tau}^2,$$

then the global a posteriori error estimator is defined as

$$\eta_h(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) = \left( \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \eta_\tau^2(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Let  $(\lambda_h^*, \mathbf{u}_h^*, p_h^*) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{X}_h \times \mathbb{W}_h$  be an approximate eigenpair of the adjoint problem (2.48)-(2.49), we introduce the estimator as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_{R_\tau}^{*2} &= h_\tau^2 \|\lambda_h^* \mathbf{u}_h^* + \mu \Delta \mathbf{u}_h^* + (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_h^* - \nabla p_h^*\|_{0,\tau}^2 + \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h^*\|_{0,\tau}^2, \\ \eta_{F_\tau}^{*2} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{F \subset \partial\tau \setminus \partial\Omega} h_F \| [p_h^* \mathbf{I} - \mu \nabla \mathbf{u}_h^* - \mathbf{u}_h^* \otimes \beta] \|_{0,F}^2, \\ \eta_{J_\tau}^{*2} &= \sum_{F \subset \partial\tau, F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \gamma h_F^{-1} \|[\![\mathbf{u}_h^*]\!]\|_{0,F}^2 + \sum_{F \subset \partial\tau, F \in \mathcal{E}_h^b} \gamma h_F^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}_h^* \otimes \mathbf{n}\|_{0,F}^2.\end{aligned}$$

The local error estimator and global estimator of problem (2.48)-(2.49) are defined as follows, respectively:

$$\eta_\tau^{*2}(\mathbf{u}_h^*, p_h^*) = \eta_{R_\tau}^{*2} + \eta_{F_\tau}^{*2} + \eta_{J_\tau}^{*2}, \quad \eta_h^*(\mathbf{u}_h^*, p_h^*) = \left( \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \eta_\tau^{*2}(\mathbf{u}_h^*, p_h^*) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We denote  $\theta_\tau = \operatorname{int}\{ \bigcup_{\bar{\tau}_i \cap \bar{\tau} \neq \emptyset} \bar{\tau}_i, \tau_i \in \mathcal{T}_h \}$  for  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , and use  $\theta_F$  to represent the set of all elements which share at least one node with face  $F$ . We denote by  $\mathbf{z}^I$  the Scott-Zhang interpolation function [42], then  $\mathbf{z}^I \in \mathbb{X} \cap \mathbb{X}_h$  and

$$\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}^I\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau \|\nabla(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}^I)\|_{0,\tau} \lesssim h_\tau \|\nabla \mathbf{z}\|_{0,\theta_\tau}, \quad \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}_h, \quad (3.1)$$

$$\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}^I\|_{0,F} \lesssim h_F^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla \mathbf{z}\|_{0,\theta_F}, \quad \forall F \subset \partial\tau. \quad (3.2)$$

We define an auxiliary discrete sesquilinear form  $\widetilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{X}(h) \times \mathbb{X}(h) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_h([\mathbf{w}, r], [\mathbf{v}, q]) = \widetilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}, r) + \overline{\mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{w}, q)}, \quad \forall [\mathbf{w}, r], [\mathbf{v}, q] \in \mathbb{X}(h) \times \mathbb{W}, \quad (3.3)$$



where

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \mu \nabla \mathbf{u}_h : \overline{\nabla \mathbf{v}_h} dx + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \overline{\mathbf{v}_h} dx \\ &+ \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \gamma h_F^{-1} \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket : \llbracket \mathbf{v}_h \rrbracket ds - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \in \partial \tau} \int_F \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta \rrbracket \cdot \overline{\{\mathbf{v}_h\}} ds,\end{aligned}\quad (3.4)$$

$$\mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) = - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} q_h \overline{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h} dx. \quad (3.5)$$

With the definition, one finds that  $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_h(\cdot, \cdot) = \mathcal{A}(\cdot, \cdot)$  on  $\mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{V}$ ,  $\widetilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\cdot, \cdot) = \mathbb{A}(\cdot, \cdot)$  on  $\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}$  and  $\mathbb{B}'_h(\cdot, \cdot) = \mathbb{B}(\cdot, \cdot)$  on  $\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{W}$ , and that

$$|\widetilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h)| \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_h \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h, \quad \forall (\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h) \in \mathbb{X}(h), \quad (3.6)$$

$$|\mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h)| \lesssim \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_h \|q_h\|_0, \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \mathbb{X}(h) \times \mathbb{W}. \quad (3.7)$$

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $(\lambda, \mathbf{u}, p)$  and  $(\lambda_h, \mathbf{u}_h, p_h)$  be the  $j$ th eigenpair of (2.2)-(2.3) and (2.8)-(2.9), and let  $(\lambda^*, \mathbf{u}^*, p^*)$  and  $(\lambda_h^*, \mathbf{u}_h^*, p_h^*)$  be the  $j$ th eigenpair of (2.46)-(2.47) and (2.48)-(2.49), respectively. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}& \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_h + \|p - p_h\|_0 \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\mathbf{0} \neq [\mathbf{v}, q] \in \mathbb{V}} \frac{|\widetilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}, p - p_h) + \overline{\mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, q)}|}{\|[\mathbf{v}, q]\|_{\mathbb{V}}} + \inf_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{X}} \|\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{v}\|_h,\end{aligned}\quad (3.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned}& \|\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}_h^*\|_h + \|p^* - p_h^*\|_0 \\ & \lesssim \sup_{\mathbf{0} \neq [\mathbf{v}, q] \in \mathbb{V}} \frac{|\widetilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}_h^*, \mathbf{v}) + \overline{\mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}, p^* - p_h^*)} + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}_h^*, q)|}{\|[\mathbf{v}, q]\|_{\mathbb{V}}} + \inf_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{X}} \|\mathbf{u}_h^* - \mathbf{v}\|_h.\end{aligned}\quad (3.9)$$

**Proof.** For any  $[\mathbf{w}, z] \in \mathbb{V}$ , due to the fact that  $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_h = \mathcal{A}$  on  $\mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{V}$ , From the inf-sup condition (2.7) we obtain

$$\alpha \|[\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}, p - z]\|_{\mathbb{V}} \leq \sup_{[\mathbf{v}, q] \in \mathbb{V}} \frac{|\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_h([\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}, p - z], [\mathbf{v}, q])|}{\|[\mathbf{v}, q]\|_{\mathbb{V}}}. \quad (3.10)$$

From (3.6) and (3.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}& |\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_h([\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}, p - z], [\mathbf{v}, q])| = |\widetilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}, p - z) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}, q)| \\ & = |\widetilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}, p - p_h) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, q) \\ & + \widetilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}, p_h - z) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{w}, q)| \\ & \lesssim |\widetilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}, p - p_h) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, q)| \\ & + \|\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{w}\|_h \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 + \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \|p_h - z\|_0 + \|\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{w}\|_h \|q\|_0, \quad \forall [\mathbf{w}, z], [\mathbf{v}, q] \in \mathbb{V}.\end{aligned}\quad (3.11)$$

Substituting (3.11) into (3.10), using the triangle inequality, noting that  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $z$  are arbitrary and  $\inf_{z \in \mathbb{W}} \|z - p_h\|_0 = 0$ , then (3.8) is valid. By the same argument as for (3.8), then (3.9) holds.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, there hold*

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}, p - p_h)| + |\mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{u}_h, q)| \\
& \lesssim \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\eta_{R_\tau} + \eta_{F_\tau} + \eta_{J_\tau}) \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_0 + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h\|_{0,\tau} \|q\|_0 \\
& \quad + \|\lambda \mathbf{u} - \lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h\|_0 \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_0, \quad \forall [\mathbf{v}, q] \in \mathbb{V},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}_h^*) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}, p^* - p_h^*)| + |\mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{u}_h, q)| \\
& \lesssim \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\eta_{R_\tau}^* + \eta_{F_\tau}^* + \eta_{J_\tau}^*) \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_0 + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h\|_{0,\tau} \|q\|_0 \\
& \quad + \|\lambda^* \mathbf{u}^* - \lambda_h^* \mathbf{u}_h^*\|_0 \|\nabla \mathbf{v}\|_0, \quad \forall [\mathbf{v}, q] \in \mathbb{V}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

**Proof.** Using (2.2), (3.4), (3.5), (2.11) and Green's formula we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}, p - p_h) \\
& = \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}, p) - \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}, p_h) \\
& = \lambda(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}, p_h) \\
& = (\lambda \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \mu \nabla \mathbf{u}_h : \overline{\nabla \mathbf{v}} dx - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \overline{\mathbf{v}} dx \\
& \quad - \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \frac{\gamma}{h_F} \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket : \llbracket \overline{\mathbf{v}} \rrbracket ds + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \subset \partial \tau} \int_F \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta \rrbracket \cdot \overline{\{\mathbf{v}\}} ds + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} p_h \overline{\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}} dx \\
& = (\lambda \mathbf{u} - \lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} (\lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h + \mu \Delta \mathbf{u}_h) \cdot \overline{\mathbf{v}} dx - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \subset \partial \tau} \int_F \mu \nabla \mathbf{u}_h \mathbf{n} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{v}} ds \\
& \quad - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_h \cdot \overline{\mathbf{v}} dx - \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} \nabla p_h \cdot \overline{\mathbf{v}} dx + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \subset \partial \tau} \int_F p_h \overline{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \mathbf{n} ds \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \subset \partial \tau} \int_F \llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta \rrbracket \cdot \overline{\{\mathbf{v}\}} ds \\
& = (\lambda \mathbf{u} - \lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \int_{\tau} (\lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h + \mu \Delta \mathbf{u}_h - (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_h - \nabla p_h) \cdot \overline{\mathbf{v}} dx \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \subset \partial \tau} \int_F \llbracket p_h \mathbf{I} - \mu \nabla \mathbf{u}_h + \mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta \rrbracket \cdot \overline{\{\mathbf{v}\}} ds, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{X}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Note that the Scott-Zhang interpolation  $\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^I \in \mathbb{X}$ . From (3.14) replacing  $\mathbf{v}$  with  $\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^I$ , the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (3.1) and (3.2), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^I) + \mathbb{B}'_h((\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^I), p - p_h)| \\
& \lesssim \left( \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\eta_{R_\tau}^2 + \eta_{F_\tau}^2) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\mathbf{v}|_1 + h \|\lambda \mathbf{u} - \lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h\|_0 |\mathbf{v}|_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

By comparing (2.10) with (3.4), using (2.2), (2.8) and  $\mathbf{v}^I \in \mathbb{X} \cap \mathbb{X}_h$ , applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

the trace inequality, and (3.15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}^I) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}^I, p - p_h)| \\
&= |\mathbb{A}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}^I) + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \mu \int_F \llbracket \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket : \{\overline{\nabla \mathbf{v}^I}\} ds + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}^I, p - p_h)| \\
&= | \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h} \int_F \mu \llbracket \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket : \{\overline{\nabla \mathbf{v}^I}\} ds + (\lambda \mathbf{u} - \lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}^I) | \\
&\lesssim \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \subset \partial\tau \setminus \partial\Omega} \mu h_F^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket\|_{0,F} \|\overline{\nabla \mathbf{v}^I}\|_{0,\tau} + \|\lambda \mathbf{u} - \lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h\|_0 \|\mathbf{v}^I\|_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}, p - p_h)| \\
&= |\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^I) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^I, p - p_h) \\
&\quad + \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}^I) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v}^I, p - p_h)| \\
&\lesssim |\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^I) + \mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}^I, p - p_h)| \\
&\quad + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{F \subset \partial\tau \setminus \partial\Omega} h_F^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket\|_{0,F} \|\overline{\nabla \mathbf{v}^I}\|_{0,\tau} + \|\lambda \mathbf{u} - \lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h\|_0 \|\mathbf{v}^I\|_0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Substituting (3.15) into (3.16), noting that  $|\mathbb{B}'_h(\mathbf{u}_h, q)| \lesssim \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h\|_{0,\tau} \|q\|_0$ , we obtain (3.12).

Using a proof method similar to (3.12), we obtain (3.13).

By virtue of the enriching operator  $E_h : \mathbb{X}_h \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_h \cap \mathbb{X}$  [36, 37], we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.3.** *The following estimates are valid:*

$$\|\mathbf{u}_h - E_h \mathbf{u}_h\|_h^2 \lesssim \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \gamma h_F^{-1} \|\llbracket \mathbf{u}_h \rrbracket\|_{0,F}^2 + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h^b} \gamma h_F^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}_h \otimes \mathbf{n}\|_{0,F}^2, \tag{3.17}$$

$$\|\mathbf{u}_h^* - E_h \mathbf{u}_h^*\|_h^2 \lesssim \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \gamma h_F^{-1} \|\llbracket \mathbf{u}_h^* \rrbracket\|_{0,F}^2 + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_h^b} \gamma h_F^{-1} \|\mathbf{u}_h^* \otimes \mathbf{n}\|_{0,F}^2. \tag{3.18}$$

**Theorem 3.4.** *Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 3.1 hold, then*

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_h + \|p - p_h\|_0 \lesssim \eta_h(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) + \|\lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h - \lambda \mathbf{u}\|_0, \tag{3.19}$$

$$\|\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}_h^*\|_h + \|p^* - p_h^*\|_0 \lesssim \eta_h^*(\mathbf{u}_h^*, p_h^*) + \|\lambda_h^* \mathbf{u}_h^* - \lambda^* \mathbf{u}^*\|_0. \tag{3.20}$$

**Proof.** Substituting (3.12) and (3.17) into (3.8), we obtain (3.19). Similarly, (3.20) can be obtained.  $\square$

Using the standard bubble argument developed by Verfürth [31], we will deduce the following local bounds. For the sake of simplicity, we restrict ourselves to the case that  $\beta(x)$  is polynomial. The general case requires only technical modifications.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, there hold*

$$\eta_{R_\tau} \lesssim \|\nabla(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h)\|_{0,\tau} + \|p - p_h\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau \|\lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h - \lambda \mathbf{u}\|_{0,\tau}, \quad (3.21)$$

$$\eta_{F_\tau} \lesssim \|\nabla(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h)\|_{0,\omega(\tau)} + \|p - p_h\|_{0,\omega(\tau)} + \left( \sum_{\tau \in \omega(\tau)} h_\tau^2 \|\lambda \mathbf{u} - \lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h\|_{0,\tau}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (3.22)$$

$$\eta_{J_\tau}^2 = \sum_{F \subset \partial\tau, F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \gamma h_F^{-1} \|\llbracket \mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u} \rrbracket\|_{0,F}^2 + \sum_{F \subset \partial\tau, F \in \mathcal{E}_h^b} \gamma h_F^{-1} \|(\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,F}^2, \quad (3.23)$$

$$\eta_{R_\tau}^* \lesssim \|\nabla(\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}_h^*)\|_{0,\tau} + \|p^* - p_h^*\|_{0,\tau} + h_\tau \|\lambda_h^* \mathbf{u}_h^* - \lambda^* \mathbf{u}^*\|_{0,\tau}, \quad (3.24)$$

$$\eta_{F_\tau}^* \lesssim \|\nabla(\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}_h^*)\|_{0,\omega(\tau)} + \|p^* - p_h^*\|_{0,\omega(\tau)} + \left( \sum_{\tau \in \omega(\tau)} h_\tau^2 \|\lambda^* \mathbf{u}^* - \lambda_h^* \mathbf{u}_h^*\|_{0,\tau}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (3.25)$$

$$\eta_{J_\tau}^{*2} = \sum_{F \subset \partial\tau, F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \gamma h_F^{-1} \|\llbracket \mathbf{u}_h^* - \mathbf{u}^* \rrbracket\|_{0,F}^2 + \sum_{F \subset \partial\tau, F \in \mathcal{E}_h^b} \gamma h_F^{-1} \|(\mathbf{u}_h^* - \mathbf{u}^*) \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{0,F}^2. \quad (3.26)$$

**Proof.** Let  $b_\tau \in H_0^1(\tau)$  and  $b_F \in H_0^1(\omega(F))$  be the standard bubble function on element  $\tau$  and face  $F$  ( $d = 3$ ) or edge  $F$  ( $d = 2$ ) of  $\tau$ , respectively.

For any  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$ , define the function  $R$  and  $K$  locally by

$$R|_\tau = \lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h + \mu \Delta \mathbf{u}_h - (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_h - \nabla p_h, \quad K|_\tau = h_\tau^2 R b_\tau.$$

From Proposition 3.37 in [31], using  $\lambda \mathbf{u} + \mu \Delta \mathbf{u} - (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} - \nabla p = 0$  and integrating by parts, together with  $\bar{K}|_{\partial\tau} = 0$  we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} Ch_\tau^2 \|R\|_{0,\tau}^2 &\leq \int_\tau R \cdot \overline{(h_\tau^2 R b_\tau)} dx = \int_\tau (\lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h + \mu \Delta \mathbf{u}_h - (\beta \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}_h - \nabla p_h) \cdot \bar{K} dx \\ &= \int_\tau \mu \Delta(\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \bar{K} dx - \int_\tau \nabla(p_h - p) \cdot \bar{K} dx + \int_\tau (\lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h - \lambda \mathbf{u}) \cdot \bar{K} dx \\ &\quad - \int_\tau (\beta \cdot \nabla)(\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \bar{K} dx \\ &= - \int_\tau \nabla(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h) \cdot \bar{\nabla} \bar{K} dx + \int_\tau (p_h - p) \operatorname{div} \bar{K} dx \\ &\quad + \int_\tau (\lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h - \lambda \mathbf{u}) \cdot \bar{K} dx - \int_\tau (\beta \cdot \nabla)(\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u}) \cdot \bar{K} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Proposition 3.37 in [31], and noting  $\|\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_h\|_0 = \|\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u})\|_0$ , we obtain (3.21).

For any interior edge/face  $F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$ , let the functions  $R$  and  $\Theta$  be such that

$$R|_F = \llbracket p_h \mathbf{I} - \mu \nabla \mathbf{u}_h + \mathbf{u}_h \otimes \beta \rrbracket|_F \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta = h_F R b_F.$$

Using Proposition 3.37 in [31] and  $\int_F \llbracket p \mathbf{I} - \mu \nabla \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \otimes \beta \rrbracket \cdot \Theta ds = 0$ , we get

$$Ch_F \|R\|_{0,F}^2 \leq \int_F R \cdot \overline{(h_F R b_F)} ds = \int_F \llbracket (p_h - p) \mathbf{I} - \mu \nabla(\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u}) + (\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u}) \otimes \beta \rrbracket \cdot \bar{\Theta} ds.$$

Applying Green's formula over each element of  $\omega(F)$ , we derive

$$\begin{aligned} Ch_E \|R\|_{0,F}^2 &\leq \int_F \llbracket ((p_h - p) \mathbf{I} - \mu \nabla(\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u})) \rrbracket \cdot \bar{\Theta} ds + \int_F \llbracket (\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u}) \otimes \beta \rrbracket \cdot \bar{\Theta} ds \\ &= \sum_{\tau \in \omega(F)} \int_\tau (-\mu \Delta(\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u}) + \nabla(p_h - p)) \cdot \bar{\Theta} dx \\ &\quad - \sum_{\tau \in \omega(F)} \int_\tau (\mu \nabla(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h) - (p - p_h) \mathbf{I}) : \bar{\nabla} \bar{\Theta} dx + \int_F \llbracket (\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u}) \otimes \beta \rrbracket \cdot \bar{\Theta} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using  $-\mu\Delta\mathbf{u} + \nabla p = \lambda\mathbf{u} - (\beta \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}$ , we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
Ch_F \|R\|_{0,F}^2 &\leq \sum_{\tau \in \omega(F)} \int_{\tau} (\lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h + \mu\Delta\mathbf{u}_h - (\beta \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}_h - \nabla p_h) \cdot \bar{\Theta} dx \\
&+ \sum_{\tau \in \omega(F)} \int_{\tau} (\lambda\mathbf{u} - \lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h) \cdot \bar{\Theta} dx + \sum_{\tau \in \omega(F)} \int_{\tau} (-\mu\nabla(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h) + (p - p_h)\mathbf{I}) : \nabla \bar{\Theta} dx \\
&- \sum_{\tau \in \omega(F)} \int_{\tau} ((\beta \cdot \nabla)(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h)) \cdot \bar{\Theta} dx + \int_F [(\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u}) \otimes \beta] \cdot \bar{\Theta} ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

By using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for each term on the right-hand side of (3.27), and by (3.21) and Proposition 3.37 in [31], we get (3.22). By using  $[\mathbf{u}] = 0$  for any  $F \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$ , and  $\mathbf{u} = 0$  for any  $F \subset \partial\Omega$ , we get (3.23).

Similarly, we can prove (3.24), (3.25) and (3.26).  $\square$

From Lemma 3.5, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, there holds*

$$\eta_h(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h)^2 \lesssim \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|_h^2 + \|p - p_h\|_0^2 + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_{\tau}^2 \|\lambda\mathbf{u} - \lambda_h \mathbf{u}_h\|_{0,\tau}^2, \tag{3.28}$$

$$\eta_h^*(\mathbf{u}_h^*, p_h^*)^2 \lesssim \|\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}_h^*\|_h^2 + \|p^* - p_h^*\|_0^2 + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_{\tau}^2 \|\lambda^* \mathbf{u}^* - \lambda_h^* \mathbf{u}_h^*\|_{0,\tau}^2. \tag{3.29}$$

**Theorem 3.7.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned}
|\lambda - \lambda_h| &\lesssim \eta_h^2(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_{\tau}^{2r} (|\mathbf{u} - I_h \mathbf{u}|_{1+r,\tau}^2 + \|p - \vartheta_h p\|_{\tau}^2) \\
&+ \eta_h^*(\mathbf{u}_h^*, p_h^*)^2 + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_{\tau}^{2r} (|\mathbf{u}^* - I_h \mathbf{u}^*|_{1+r,\tau}^2 + \|p^* - \vartheta_h p^*\|_{\tau}^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

**Proof.** Choosing  $[\mathbf{v}_h, q_h] = [\mathbf{u}_h^*, p_h^*]$  in (2.78), from (2.16), (2.17), (2.65), (2.66), (3.19) and (3.20), we obtain (3.30).  $\square$

During the past decade, the a posteriori error estimate and adaptive computation of multiple and cluster eigenvalues have become an attractive issue (see, e.g. [43–47]).

Denote the index set  $\mathbb{J} = \{k, k+1, \dots, k+m-1\}$ . Let  $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}$  be an eigenvalue cluster composed of eigenvalues of (2.2)-(2.3),  $\lambda_k \neq \lambda_{k-1}$  and  $\lambda_{k+m-1} \neq \lambda_{k+m}$ .

From Theorem 3.4, Theorem 3.6, Theorem 3.7, and up to the oscillation terms, we can obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.8.** *When the eigenvalue cluster  $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{J}}$  is composed of non-defective eigenvalues, the following inequalities hold*

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} (\|\mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{u}_{j,h}\|_h^2 + \|p_j - p_{j,h}\|_0^2) &\simeq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \eta_h(\mathbf{u}_{j,h}, p_{j,h})^2, \\
\sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} (\|\mathbf{u}_j^* - \mathbf{u}_{j,h}^*\|_h^2 + \|p_j^* - p_{j,h}^*\|_0^2) &\simeq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \eta_h^*(\mathbf{u}_{j,h}^*, p_{j,h}^*)^2, \\
|\lambda_i - \lambda_{i,h}| &\lesssim \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}} (\eta_h(\mathbf{u}_{j,h}, p_{j,h})^2 + \eta_h^*(\mathbf{u}_{j,h}^*, p_{j,h}^*)^2), \quad i \in \mathbb{J}.
\end{aligned}$$

## 4 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we present some numerical experiments for the Oseen eigenvalue problem (2.1) on two-dimensional (2D) and three-dimensional (3D) domains to exhibit the performance of the proposed method.

Based on the standard adaptive algorithm, we obtain the following algorithm.

**Algorithm 1.** The adaptive algorithm.

Choose the parameter  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ .

**Step 1.** Set  $l = 0$  and pick an initial mesh  $\mathcal{T}_{h_l}$  with the mesh size  $h_l$ .

**Step 2.** Solve Eqs.(2.8)-(2.9) and (2.92)-(2.93) on  $\mathcal{T}_{h_l}$  for the discrete solution  $\{(\lambda_{j,h_l}, \mathbf{u}_{j,h_l}, p_{j,h_l})\}_{j=k}^{k+m-1}$  with  $\|\mathbf{u}_{j,h_l}\|_0 = 1$  and  $\{(\lambda_{j,h_l}^*, \mathbf{u}_{j,h_l}^*, p_{j,h_l}^*)\}_{j=k}^{k+m-1}$  with  $\|\mathbf{u}_{j,h_l}^*\|_0 = 1$ .

**Step 3.** Compute the local indicators  $\eta_\tau(\mathbf{u}_{j,h_l}, p_{j,h_l})$  and  $\eta_\tau^*(\mathbf{u}_{j,h_l}^*, p_{j,h_l}^*)(j = k, \dots, k+m-1)$  for all  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{h_l}$ .

**Step 4.** Construct  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{h_l} \subset \mathcal{T}_{h_l}$  by Dörfler [48] **Marking strategy**

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\tau \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{h_l}} \left( \sum_{j=k}^{k+m-1} \eta_\tau(\mathbf{u}_{j,h_l}, p_{j,h_l})^2 + \eta_\tau^*(\mathbf{u}_{j,h_l}^*, p_{j,h_l}^*)^2 \right) \\ & \geq \theta \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{h_l}} \left( \sum_{j=k}^{k+m-1} \eta_\tau(\mathbf{u}_{j,h_l}, p_{j,h_l})^2 + \eta_\tau^*(\mathbf{u}_{j,h_l}^*, p_{j,h_l}^*)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

**Step 5.** Refine  $\mathcal{T}_{h_l}$  to get a new mesh  $\mathcal{T}_{h_{l+1}}$  by procedure **Refine**.

**Step 6.**  $l \leftarrow l + 1$  and go to Step 2.

We demonstrate the efficiency of our approach by applying Algorithm 1 with the  $\mathbb{P}_k - \mathbb{P}_{k-1}$  ( $k = 2, 3$ ) elements. The program is implemented using the iFEM package [49], and the matrix eigenvalue problem is solved using the command '*eigs*' in MATLAB 2019a on a ThinkPad PC with 1.80GHZ CPU and 32GB RAM. Numerical experiments are conducted in four domains: a 2D square domain, a 2D L-shaped domain, a 3D thick L-shaped domain, and the 3D unit cube domain.

The initial mesh size  $h_0$  is set as follows:

$h_0 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{16}$  for the L-shaped domain;

$h_0 = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}$  for the thick L-shaped domain and the unit cube domain.

We adapt the following symbols in our tables and figures:

$\lambda_j$ : the  $j$ th eigenvalue.

$\lambda_{j,h_l}$ : the  $j$ th approximate eigenvalue in the  $l$ th iteration.

*dof*: the degrees of freedom in the  $l$ th iteration.

$\eta_{j,h} = \eta(\mathbf{u}_{j,h_l}, p_{j,h_l})$ ,  $\eta_{j,h}^* = \eta^*(\mathbf{u}_{j,h_l}^*, p_{j,h_l}^*)$ .

$Rerr(\lambda_i) = \frac{|\lambda_{i,h} - \lambda_i|}{|\lambda_i|}$ : the relative error of the  $i$ th approximate eigenvalue.

### 4.1 2D domains

#### 4.1.1 A 2D square domain

Let us begin with the two-dimensional square domain:  $(-1, 1)^2$  with  $\beta(x, y) = (1, 0)^t$  and  $\mu = 1$ .

Since the exact eigenvalues of the problem on the unit square are unknown, in order to investigate the convergence behavior of the eigenvalues on uniform meshes, we use the following formula

$$order(\lambda_{j,h}) \approx \frac{1}{(\lg 2)} \lg \left| \frac{\lambda_{j,h} - \lambda_{j,\frac{h}{2}}}{\lambda_{j,\frac{h}{2}} - \lambda_{j,\frac{h}{4}}} \right|$$

to compute the approximate convergence order.

Tables 1-2 depict the convergence history for the first four computed eigenvalues. In all cases presented, the convergence order of the approximate eigenvalues tends to be  $h^{2k}$  for  $\mathbb{P}_k - \mathbb{P}_{k-1}$  ( $k = 2, 3$ )

elements. This indicates that the eigenfunctions are sufficiently smooth on the square domain.

Table 1: The first four approximate eigenvalues using  $\mathbb{P}_2 - \mathbb{P}_1$  element with  $\gamma = 40$  on the square domain for  $\beta = (1, 0)^t$  and  $\mu = 1$ .

$h$	$\lambda_{1,h}$	$order$	$\lambda_{2,h}$	$order$	$\lambda_{3,h}$	$order$	$\lambda_{4,h}$	$order$
$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{8}$	13.6596320		23.3381037		23.6525846		33.0749860	
$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{16}$	13.6130518		23.1452062		23.4375849		32.3542953	
$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{32}$	13.6098165	3.85	23.1307530	3.74	23.4239142	3.98	32.3018053	3.78
$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{64}$	13.6096064	3.94	23.1298126	3.94	23.4230344	3.96	32.2983688	3.93
$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{128}$	13.6095931	3.98	23.1297530	3.98	23.4229787	3.98	32.2981508	3.98

Table 2: The first four approximate eigenvalues using  $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$  element with  $\gamma = 90$  on the square domain for  $\beta = (1, 0)^t$  and  $\mu = 1$ .

$h$	$\lambda_{1,h}$	$order$	$\lambda_{2,h}$	$order$	$\lambda_{3,h}$	$order$	$\lambda_{4,h}$	$order$
$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{8}$	13.6104081		23.1342511		23.4271193		32.3204442	
$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{16}$	13.6096110		23.1298423		23.4230605		32.2986024	
$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{32}$	13.6095926	5.44	23.1297509	5.59	23.4229767	5.60	32.2981452	5.58
$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{64}$	13.6095922	5.52	23.1297491	5.67	23.4229750	5.62	32.2981363	5.68

#### 4.1.2 A 2D L-shaped domain

We present the numerical experiments on the L-shaped domain  $\Omega = (-1, 1)^2 \setminus (-1, 0)^2$  with  $\mu = 1$ . The marking parameter  $\theta$  is set to 0.75 for the 2D L-shaped domain. Referring to [3], we consider four cases for the steady flow velocity  $\beta$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_1(x, y) &= (1, 0)^t, \\ \beta_2(x, y) &= (\cos(\pi x) \sin(\pi y), -\sin(\pi x) \cos(\pi y))^t, \\ \beta_3(x, y) &= (y, -x)^t, \\ \beta_4(x, y) &= \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y}, -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x}\right)^t \text{ with } \phi(x, y) = 1000(1 - x^2)^2(1 - y^2)^2.\end{aligned}$$

The functions are normalized in the  $L^\infty$ -norm as  $\beta = \beta / \|\beta\|_{\infty, \Omega}$ .

The reference values for the first four eigenvalues of the Oseen eigenvalue problem with  $\mu = 1$  and different  $\beta$  values are listed in Table 3, which are obtained using the adaptive DG  $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$  element with as many degrees of freedom as possible.

Table 3: The reference values for the first four eigenvalues on the L-shaped domain are computed for different  $\beta$  and  $\mu = 1$ .

	$\lambda_1$	$\lambda_2$	$\lambda_3$	$\lambda_4$
$\beta_1(x, y)$	32.9600408	37.1171925	42.3976455	49.2536801
$\beta_2(x, y)$	32.1327327	37.0183457	41.9398470	48.9835958
$\beta_3(x, y)$	32.1327443	37.0183701	41.9398781	48.9836377
$\beta_4(x, y)$	32.1327060	37.0183328	41.9398268	48.9835714

The error curves of the first four eigenvalues obtained using adaptive DG  $\mathbb{P}_k - \mathbb{P}_{k-1}$  ( $k = 2, 3$ ) elements for Algorithm 1 are shown in Figures 1-4. From the figures, it can be seen that the numerical results

obtained by Algorithm 1 can achieve high accuracy.




Figure 1: The error curves on adaptive refinement meshes of the first four eigenvalues using Algorithm 1 on L-shaped domain for  $\beta(x, y) = \beta_1(x, y)$  and  $\mu = 1$  (left: DG  $\mathbb{P}_2 - \mathbb{P}_1$  with  $\gamma = 40$ ; right: DG  $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$  with  $\gamma = 90$ ).




Figure 2: The error curves on adaptive refinement meshes of the first four eigenvalues using Algorithm 1 on L-shaped domain for  $\beta(x, y) = \beta_2(x, y)$  and  $\mu = 1$  (left: DG  $\mathbb{P}_2 - \mathbb{P}_1$  with  $\gamma = 40$ ; right: DG  $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$  with  $\gamma = 90$ ).

## 4.2 3D domains

### 4.2.1 A unit cube domain

In this experiment, we consider the Oseen eigenvalue problem with  $\beta = (0, 0, 1)^t$  and  $\mu = 1$  on the unit cube domain  $\Omega = (0, 1)^3$ . The extrapolated values  $\lambda_1 = 62.4253$ ,  $\lambda_2 = 62.7107$ ,  $\lambda_3 = 62.7107$  and  $\lambda_4 = 91.8801$  (from Table 5 in [5]) are adopted as reference values for the first four eigenvalues.

The numerical solutions of the first four eigenvalues on uniform meshes are listed in Table 4. From the table, we observe that the numerical solutions fail to achieve the optimal convergence order.

The error curves of the first four eigenvalues on adaptive refinement meshes, computed by Algorithm 1 (with  $\theta = 0.5$ ), are shown in Figure 5. From the figure, it can be observed that the error curves are almost parallel to the straight line with a slope of  $-\frac{2k}{3}$  ( $k = 2, 3$ ). This indicates that the numerical results obtained by the adaptive method basically achieve the optimal convergence order.






Figure 3: The error curves on adaptive refinement meshes of the first four eigenvalues using Algorithm 1 on L-shaped domain for  $\beta(x, y) = \beta_3(x, y)$  and  $\mu = 1$  (left: DG  $\mathbb{P}_2 - \mathbb{P}_1$  with  $\gamma = 40$ ; right: DG  $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$  with  $\gamma = 90$ ).




Figure 4: The error curves on adaptive refinement meshes of the first four eigenvalues using Algorithm 1 on L-shaped domain for  $\beta(x, y) = \beta_4(x, y)$  and  $\mu = 1$  (left: DG  $\mathbb{P}_2 - \mathbb{P}_1$  with  $\gamma = 40$ ; right: DG  $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$  with  $\gamma = 90$ ).

Table 4: The first four eigenvalues on uniform meshes for the cube domain with  $\beta = (0, 0, 1)^t$  and  $\mu = 1$  (left: DG  $\mathbb{P}_2 - \mathbb{P}_1$  with  $\gamma = 50$ ; right: DG  $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$  with  $\gamma = 150$ ).

$h$	$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}$	$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{8}$	$order$	$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}$	$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{8}$	$order$
$\lambda_{1,h}$	64.3790	62.6071	3.43	62.5132	62.4281	4.97
$\lambda_{2,h}$	64.6320	62.8899	3.42	62.7973	62.7135	4.95
$\lambda_{3,h}$	64.6320	62.8899	3.42	62.7973	62.7135	4.95
$\lambda_{4,h}$	97.4784	92.3697	3.52	92.1766	91.8902	4.88




Figure 5: The error curves on adaptive refinement meshes for the first four eigenvalues on the unit cube domain for  $\beta = (0, 0, 1)^t$  and  $\mu = 1$  (left: DG  $\mathbb{P}_2 - \mathbb{P}_1$  with  $\gamma = 50$  ; right: DG  $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$  with  $\gamma = 150$ ).

#### 4.2.2 A thick L-shaped domain

In this experiment, we consider the Oseen eigenvalue problem with  $\beta = (0, 0, 1)^t$  and  $\mu = 1$  on the thick L-shaped domain  $\Omega = (-0.5, 0.5) \times (0, 1) \times (-0.5, 0.5) \setminus ((0, 0.5) \times (0, 1) \times (0, 0.5))$ . The marking parameter  $\theta$  is set to 0.5. The reference values for the first four eigenvalues, obtained by an adaptive DG  $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$  element method with as many degrees of freedom as possible, are  $\lambda_1 = 82.7955$ ,  $\lambda_2 = 89.0021$ ,  $\lambda_3 = 124.923$  and  $\lambda_4 = 125.739$ .

The error curves on adaptive refinement meshes of the first four eigenvalues for Algorithm 1 are shown in Figure 6. From the figure, it can be observed that when  $\mu = 1$ , the eigenvalue error curves and the error estimator curves are approximately parallel to a straight line with a slope of  $\frac{2k}{3}$  ( $k = 2, 3$ ). This indicates that the error estimator is reliable and effective.




Figure 6: The error curves on adaptive refinement meshes for the first four eigenvalues on the thick L-shaped domain for  $\beta = (0, 0, 1)^t$  and  $\mu = 1$  (left: DG  $\mathbb{P}_2 - \mathbb{P}_1$  with  $\gamma = 50$ ; right: DG  $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$  with  $\gamma = 150$ ).

#### 4.3 Comparison with the Mini-element method

In this section we compare the adaptive DG  $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$  element method with the adaptive Mini-element method [3]. The relative errors of the first approximate eigenvalue of the two methods for the Oseen eigenvalue problem on the L-shaped domain and on thick L-shaped domain are presented in Tables 5 and 6. These tables show that Algorithm 1 in this paper is more efficient than the adaptive algorithm in [3].

Table 5: Comparison on the relative error of the first computed eigenvalue between the DG  $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$  element method (Algorithm 1) and the mini element method (Table 5 in [3]) on the 2D L-shaped domain ( $\mu = 1$ ,  $\beta = (1, 0)^t$ ).

DG $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$ element			Mini-element (Table 5 in [3])	
<i>dof</i>	$\lambda_{i,h}$	<i>Rerr</i> ( $\lambda_1$ )	<i>dof</i>	<i>Rerr</i> ( $\lambda_1$ )
41340	32.9731338	3.9724e-04	43989	4.6942e-02
50648	32.9661870	1.8647e-04	61639	3.1572e-02
80080	32.9629315	8.7704e-05	85992	2.2001e-02
105976	32.9620582	6.1207e-05	131770	1.3896e-02

Table 6: Comparison on the relative error of the first computed eigenvalue between the DG  $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$  element method (Algorithm 1) and the mini element method (Table 7 in [3]) on the 3D thick L-shaped domain ( $\mu = 1$ ,  $\beta = (0, 0, 1)^t$ ).

DG $\mathbb{P}_3 - \mathbb{P}_2$ element			Mini-element (Table 7 in [3])	
<i>dof</i>	$\lambda_{i,h}$	<i>Rerr</i> ( $\lambda_1$ )	<i>dof</i>	<i>Rerr</i> ( $\lambda_1$ )
20160	83.02571	2.7805e-03	284817	1.5536e+00
30240	82.89948	1.2559e-03	533602	8.1289e-01
43960	82.82290	3.3100e-04	559552	7.7423e-01
55720	82.82055	3.0255e-04	1157348	2.3114e-01

## References

- [1] M. Benzi, J. Liu, An efficient solver for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in rotation form, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 29 (5) (2007) 1959-1981, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1137/060658825>.
- [2] H.-T. Fan, X.-Y. Zhu, A modified relaxed splitting preconditioner for generalized saddle point problems from the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations, Appl. Math. Lett. 55 (2016) 18-26, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aml.2015.11.011>.
- [3] F. Lepe, G. Rivera, J. Vellojin, Finite element analysis of the Oseen eigenvalue problem, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. 425 (2024) 116959, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cma.2024.116959>
- [4] D. Adak, F. Lepe, G. Rivera, A noncoforming virtual element approximation for the Oseen eigenvalue problem, IMA J. Numer. Anal., 00(2025) 1-37, <https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drae108>.
- [5] F. Lepe, G. Rivera, J. Vellojin, A Mixed finite element method for the velocity-pseudostress formulation of the Oseen eigenvalue problem, SIAM. Sci. Comput., 47(6)(2025),A3356-A3382, <https://doi.org/10.1137/24M1696950>.
- [6] W. Reed and T. Hill, Triangular Mesh Methods for the Neutron Transport Equation, Technical Report LA-UR-73-479, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, 1973.
- [7] D. Antonio, E. Alexandre, Mathematical Aspects of Discontinuous Galerkin Methods, Springer-Verlag, 2012, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22980-0>.
- [8] B. Rivière, Discontinuous Galerkin Methods for Solving Elliptic and Parabolic Equations, Theory and Implementation. SIAM., 2008, <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9780898717440>.
- [9] Jan S. Hesthaven, Tim Warburton, Nodal Discontinuous Galerkin Methods: Algorithms, Analysis, and Applications. Springer, 2008, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-72067-8>.

- [10] B. Cockburn, G. E. Karniadakis, C. W. Shu, Discontinuous Galerkin methods: theory, computation and applications, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2000, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-59721-3>.
- [11] P. Houston, D. Schötzau, T. P. Wihler, hp-adaptive discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods for the Stokes problem, ECCOMAS, 2004, 1-20.
- [12] N. Nguyen, J. Peraire, B. Cockburn, A hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin method for Stokes flow, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg., 199(15)(2010) 582-597, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cma.2009.10.007>.
- [13] K. Chrysafinos, N. Walkington, Discontinuous Galerkin approximations of the Stokes and Navier-Stokes equations, Math.Comp., 79(272) (2010) 2135-2167, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-10-02348-3>.
- [14] S. Badia, R. Codina, T. Gudi, J. Guzmán, Error analysis of discontinuous Galerkin methods for the Stokes problem under minimal regularity, IMA. J. Numer. Anal., 34 (2014) 800-819, <https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drt022>.
- [15] D. A. Di Pietro, A. Ern, Discrete functional analysis tools for discontinuous Galerkin methods with application to the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations, Math. Comp., 79 (2010) 1303-1330, <https://doi.org/10.1090/s0025-5718-10-02333-1>.
- [16] P. Houston, D. Schötzau, T. P. Wihler, Energy norm a posteriori error estimation for mixed discontinuous Galerkin approximations of the Stokes problem, J. Sci. Comput., 22 (2005) 347-370, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10915-004-4143-7>.
- [17] D. Schötzau, C. Schwab, A. Toselli, Mixed hp-DGFEM for incompressible flows, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 40 (2002), 2171-2194, <https://doi.org/10.1137/s0036142901399124>.
- [18] G. Kanschat, D. Schötzau, Energy norm a posteriori error estimation for divergence-free discontinuous Galerkin approximations of the Navier-Stokes equations. Int. J. Numer. Meth. in Fluids, 57 (2010) 1093-1113, <https://doi.org/10.1002/fld.1795>.
- [19] B. Cockburn, G. Kanschat, D. Schötzau, C. Schwab, Local discontinuous Galerkin methods for the Stokes system, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 40 (2002) 319-343, <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0036142900380121>.
- [20] Antonietti, P.F., Buffa, A., Perugia, I.: Discontinuous Galerkin approximation of the Laplace eigenproblem. Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng. 195, 3483-3503 (2006), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cma.2005.06.02330>.
- [21] K. Cliffe, E. Hall, P. Houston, Adaptive discontinuous galerkin methods for eigenvalue problems arising in incompressible fluid flows, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 31(6) (2010) 4607-4632, <https://doi.org/10.1137/080731918>.
- [22] Lingling Sun, Hai Bi, Yidu Yang, A Multigrid Discretization of Discontinuous Galerkin Method for the Stokes Eigenvalue Problem. Commun. Comput. Phys., 34(5) (2023) 1391-1419, <https://doi.org/10.4208/cicp.OA-2023-0027>.
- [23] J. Gedicke, A. Khan, Divergence-conforming discontinuous Galerkin finite elements for Stokes eigenvalue problems. Numer. Math. 144 (2020)585-614, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-019-01095-x32>.
- [24] F. Lepe, D. Mora, Symmetric and nonsymmetric discontinuous Galerkin methods for a pseudostress formulation of the Stokes spectral problem. SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 42 (2020) 698-722, <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1259535>.
- [25] D.N. Arnold, F. Brezzi, B. Cockburn, L.D. Marini, Unified analysis of discontinuous Galerkin methods for elliptic problems, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 39(2002) 1749-1779.

- [26] T. Gudi, Some nonstandard error analysis of discontinuous Galerkin methods for elliptic problems, *Calcolo*, 47(2010) 239-261.
- [27] J.C. Nédélec, A new family of mixed finite elements in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , *Numer. Math.*, 50(1986) 57-81, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01389668>.
- [28] G. Acosta, R. Durán, M. A. Muschietti, Solutions of the divergence operator on John domains. *Adv. Math.*, 206(2006) 373-401, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2005.09.004>.
- [29] I. Babuska, J. Osborn, Eigenvalue problems, in: P.G. Ciarlet, J.L. Lions (Eds.), *Finite Element Methods (Part I)*, in: *Handbook of Numerical Analysis*, North-Holland: Elsevier Science Publishers, (1991) 641-787.
- [30] I. Babuska, W. C. Rheinboldt, Error estimates for adaptive finite element computations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 15 (1978) 736-754, <https://doi.org/10.1137/0715049>.
- [31] R. Verfürth, *A Posteriori Error Estimation Techniques for Finite Element Methods*, *Numer. Math. Sci. Comput.*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199679423.001.0001>.
- [32] M. Ainsworth, J. Oden, *A Posteriori Error Estimation in Finite Element Analysis*. Wiley-Interscience, New York, 2000, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118032824>.
- [33] L. Chamoin, F. Legoll, An Introductory Review on A Posteriori Error Estimation in Finite Element Computations, *SIAM Review.* 65(4) 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1137/21M1464841>.
- [34] A. Bonito, C. Canuto, R.H. Nochetto, A. Veiser, Adaptive finite element methods. *Acta Numerica.* 33 (2024) 163-485, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0962492924000011>.
- [35] D. Boffi, F. Brezzi, M. Fortin, *Mixed finite element methods and applications*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2013, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36519-5>.
- [36] S. Brenner, Poincaré-Friedrichs inequalities for piecewise  $H^1$  functions, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 41 (2003) 306-324, <https://doi.org/10.1081/NFA-200042165>.
- [37] O. Karakashian, F. Pascal, A posteriori error estimates for a discontinuous Galerkin approximation of second-order elliptic problems, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 41 (2004) 2374-2399, <https://doi.org/10.1137/s0036142902405217>.
- [38] V. John, Finite element methods for incompressible flow problems, in: *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*, vol. 51, Springer, Cham, 2016, p.xiii+812, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-45750-5>.
- [39] A. Ern, J. Guermond, *Finite elements II: Galerkin approximation, elliptic and mixed PDEs*, Cham: Springer, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56923-5>.
- [40] F. Brezzi, M. Fortin, *Mixed and Hybrid Finite Element Methods*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-3172-1>.
- [41] S. Wang, H. Bi, Y. Yang, The a posteriori error estimates and an adaptive algorithm of the discontinuous Galerkin method for the modified transmission eigenvalue problem with absorbing media, *Numer. Algor.*, (2024), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11075-024-01981-y>.
- [42] L. Scott, S. Zhang, Finite element interpolation of non-smooth functions satisfying boundary conditions, *Math. Comp.*, 54 (1990), 483-493, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-1990-1011446-7>.
- [43] X. Dai, L. He, A. Zhou, Convergence and quasi-optimal complexity of adaptive finite element computations for multiple eigenvalues, *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 35 (2014) 1934-1977, <https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/dru059>.

- [44] D. Gallistl, An optimal adaptive FEM for eigenvalue clusters, *Numer. Math.*, 130 (2015) 467-496, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-014-0671-8>.
- [45] D. Boffi, D. Gallistl, F. Gardini, L. Gastaldi, Optimal convergence of adaptive FEM for eigenvalue clusters in mixed form, *Math. Comp.*, 86 (2017) 2213-2237.
- [46] E. Cancès, G. Dusson, Y. Maday, B. Stamm, M. Vohralík, Guaranteed a posteriori bounds for eigenvalues and eigenvectors: Multiplicities and clusters, *Math. Comp.*, 89 (2020) 2563-2611, <https://doi.org/10.1090/MCOM/3549>.
- [47] Y. Yang, S. Wang, H. Bi, The a posteriori error estimates of the FE approximation of defective eigenvalues for non-self-adjoint eigenvalue problems, *SIAM J Numer Anal.*, 62(6) (2024) 2419-2438, <https://doi.org/10.1137/23M162065X>.
- [48] W. Dörfler, A convergent adaptive algorithm for Poisson's equation, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 33(1996) 1106-1124, <https://doi.org/10.1137/0733054>.
- [49] L. Chen, *iFEM*: An integrated finite element method package in Matlab, Technical Report, University of California at Irvine, (2009).