

CONVERGENCE OF MULTI POINT FLUX APPROXIMATIONS ON QUADRILATERAL GRIDS

RUNHILD A. KLAUSEN* AND RAGNAR WINTHER†

Abstract.

This paper presents a convergence analysis of the multi point flux approximation control volume method, MPFA, in two space dimensions. The MPFA version discussed here is the so-called O -method on general quadrilateral grids. The discretization is based on local mappings onto a reference square. The key ingredient in the analysis is an equivalence between the MPFA method and a mixed finite element method, using a specific numerical quadrature, such that the analysis of the MPFA method can be done in a finite element setting.

1. Introduction. The multi point flux approximation, MPFA, is a discretization method developed by the oil industry to be the next generation method in reservoir simulation. The goal was to replace the classical cell centered finite difference five or seven point molecule, that was, and still is, used outside its range of validity. In reservoir simulation the geology of the reservoir, which includes faults and non parallel layers in the media, is a major challenge. This results in a need to use non-orthogonal grids, with a full discontinuous permeability tensor in the discretization. The method is already implemented in an industry standard reservoir simulator, cf. [5], and the interest for the method is increasing due to its explicit flux as a function of cell-centered pressure values even on non-orthogonal grids.

The goal of this paper is to present convergence analysis of the MPFA method on quadrilateral grids. As is common when finite volume methods are analyzed on general quadrilateral grids, the analysis will be based on a close relation to a mixed finite element method. By introducing proper finite element spaces, and a specific numerical quadrature rule, we establish an equivalence between the two methods. The finite element space is chosen such that it exactly corresponds to the MPFA degrees of freedom. Thereafter, a standard mixed approach is used to prove linear convergence.

So far, no general convergence proof for MPFA methods has been given. Only truncation error analysis on some idealized cases, with uniform parallelepiped grids in homogeneous media, have been done, cf. [3].

In this paper the analysis is restricted to two space dimensions. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbf{R}^2 , with polygonal boundary $\partial\Omega$. The problem discussed in this paper is the elliptic equation,

$$-\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{x})\operatorname{grad}p) = g \text{ in } \Omega, \tag{1.1}$$

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

This is to be viewed as a prototype for the pressure equation in a reservoir simulation setting. The boundary condition is chosen for simplicity of exposition. Equation (1.1) can be found from assumption of mass conservation over a control volume and Darcy's law. The terminology is adopted from the application in question, and we denote p the pressure, \mathbf{K} the permeability, and $\mathbf{u} = -\mathbf{K} \operatorname{grad}p$ the Darcy velocity. Due to

* Centre of Mathematics for Applications, University of Oslo, and Centre for Integrated Petroleum Research, University of Bergen. P.O. Box 1053 Blindern, 0316 Oslo 3, Norway (runhildk@ifi.uio.no).

† Centre of Mathematics for Applications and Department of Informatics, University of Oslo. P.O. Box 1053 Blindern, 0316 Oslo 3, Norway (rwinther@cma.uio.no).

generalization to multi phase flow, some specific properties of the discretization are desirable. The method should be mass conservative and have a local explicit flux approximation. The MPFA methods meet these demands.

The MPFA discretization is a control volume formulation, where more than two pressure values are used in the flux approximation. The first derivation of the methods was published in 1994, [1] and [12]. Other references on these methods are for example [2, 3, 13]. A connection from an expanded mixed finite element method to a MPFA is shown on orthogonal grids in [17]. In [16] the relation between the MPFA and a mixed finite element method is discussed for triangular grids by numerical experiments.

Convergence analysis similar to the approach given here have during recent years been given by several authors for alternative finite volume methods, cf. for example [4]. In fact, a new finite volume method was created by this approach. Another example is the convergence proof given in [10] of the control volume mixed finite element method. A convergence proof for the support operator method, proposed in [15], can also be constructed in this manner, cf. [7].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the basic notation and concepts needed in this paper. In Section 3 the MPFA method is rewritten to give the discrete set of equations found from a mixed finite element method where a quadrature rule is applied. Section 4 contains the main error estimates for the MPFA method.

2. Preliminaries. Let $\mathcal{L}_2(E)$ denote the square Lebesgue-integrable function on the domain $E \subset \mathbf{R}^2$ with inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_E$ and norm $\|\cdot\|_E = (\cdot, \cdot)_E^{1/2}$. If E equals the domain Ω of (1.1) introduced above the subscript will be dropped. Also, let $H^1(E)$ denote the Sobolev space of first order differentiable functions in $\mathcal{L}_2(E)$, with norm

$$\|q\|_{1,E} = (\|q\|_E^2 + |q|_{1,E}^2)^{1/2},$$

and with the associated seminorm

$$|q|_{1,E} = \|\text{grad } q\|_E.$$

The space

$$H(\text{div}; E) = \{\mathbf{v} \in (\mathcal{L}_2(E))^2 : \text{div } \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{L}_2(E)\},$$

is equipped with the norm

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\text{div},E} = (\|\mathbf{v}\|_E^2 + \|\text{div}(\mathbf{v})\|_E^2)^{1/2}.$$

Also, let P_k be the set of polynomials of degree k . The permeability \mathbf{K} is a symmetric tensor which is uniformly positive definite in Ω . In fact, it is an important feature of reservoir simulation that \mathbf{K} is allowed to be discontinuous, and both the MPFA method and the mixed finite element method adapt to this case. However, for the convergence analysis presented in this paper we need the components of \mathbf{K} to be $C^1(\bar{\Omega})$, and the Darcy velocity is assumed to satisfy $\mathbf{u} \in (H^1(\Omega))^2$. This regularity is for example ensured if the domain Ω is convex, and $g \in \mathcal{L}_2$. In special cases discontinuous coefficients still give some smoothness of the solution, and for such cases relaxed smoothness condition on the permeability is allowed.

2.1. Quadrilateral Meshes. Let $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}$ denote a family of partitions of Ω into quadrilateral subdomains, or cells, where h is the maximum element edge. We will assume that the family is regular, cf. [11, page 246–247], i.e. all cells are convex, the




FIG. 2.1. To the left, the bilinear mapping F_E from \hat{E} into E . To the right, a major cell and its subcells.

angles are uniformly bounded away from zero and π , and the ratio between the length of the smallest edge and the diameter of the cell is uniformly bounded from below. We also assume $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}$ to be h^2 -uniform, cf. [6], to recover the classical interpolation estimates. Assume further that each interior vertex of \mathcal{T}_h meets four cells. Finally, denote the set of edges of \mathcal{T}_h by \mathcal{E}_h .

In order to define the proper finite element method below we need to introduce certain finite dimensional function spaces. In particular, we shall introduce a subspace of $H(\text{div})$ which can be referred to as a splitting of the lowest order Raviart-Thomas space over a quadrilateral mesh. For any cell $E \in \mathcal{T}_h$ we will utilize a bilinear mapping $F = F_E : \hat{E} \rightarrow E$ which is smooth and invertible, see Figure 2.1. Here, the reference element $\hat{E} = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$ is the unit square. Let $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_i, y_i)$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, be the four vertices of element E in counterclockwise direction as shown in Figure 2.1. If $\mathbf{x}_{ij} = (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j)$ the transformation F takes the form

$$F(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) = \mathbf{x}_1 + x_{21}\hat{x} + x_{41}\hat{y} + (x_{32} - x_{41})\hat{x}\hat{y} \quad (2.1)$$

for $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \hat{E}$. The Jacobian matrix of F is denoted $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{D}_E$ and $J = J_E$ the Jacobian of the mapping. As a consequence of the assumptions we have

$$c_1 h^2 \leq J \leq c_2 h^2, \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$|\mathbf{D}| \leq c_3 h, \quad (2.3)$$

for constants c_i independent of h . Here $|\mathbf{D}|$ denote the spectral norm of the matrix \mathbf{D} .

The partition $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}$ is said to be h^2 -uniform, if there exists a constant c , independent of h , such that

$$|F_{\hat{x}\hat{y}}| = |x_{32} - x_{41}| \leq ch^2. \quad (2.4)$$

Given a general quadrilateral grid, this is a consequence of further uniform refinement. To see this, divide all the cells of \mathcal{T}_h , into four subcells, by dividing each edge into two equal half edges, see Figure 2.1. Note that (2.1) is linear along the edges, such that dividing each cell edge into two equal parts gives the uniform refinement. The resulting refinement has cells approaching parallelogram as h decrease. Let \mathbf{x}_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, define a given cell, and \mathbf{x}'_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, define one of the four subcells. Then for the new refinement level

$$|F_{\hat{x}\hat{y}}| = |x'_{32} - x'_{41}| = \frac{1}{4}|x_{32} - x_{41}|$$

Hence after the grid size is halved j times, the factor $|F_{\hat{x}\hat{y}}|$ is reduced by a factor $(1/2)^{2j}$.

If $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ is a vector field in $H(\operatorname{div}, \hat{E})$, define a vector field \mathbf{v} on E by the Piola transform $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_E$, i.e.

$$\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{P}\hat{\mathbf{v}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{J}\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{v}} \circ F^{-1}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Then $\int_E \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} q d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\hat{E}} \operatorname{div} \hat{\mathbf{v}} \hat{q} d\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ for all $q \in \mathcal{L}_2$ when $\hat{q} = q \circ F$. Therefore,

$$\operatorname{div} \hat{\mathbf{v}} = J \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} \quad (2.5)$$

and

$$\int_e \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} ds = \int_{\hat{e}} \hat{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}} d\hat{s}, \quad (2.6)$$

where s and \hat{s} denote the arc length along the edges e and \hat{e} , respectively, with \mathbf{n} and $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ as the unit normal vectors. Hence, the flux across each edge is preserved from the reference space to the physical space. The norms $\|\mathbf{v}\|_E$ and $\|\hat{\mathbf{v}}\|_{\hat{E}}$ are equivalent uniformly in h , while from (2.2) and (2.5),

$$c_1 h^2 \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}\|_E^2 \leq \|\operatorname{div} \hat{\mathbf{v}}\|_{\hat{E}}^2 \leq c_2 h^2 \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}\|_E^2. \quad (2.7)$$

For a general reference on the Piola transform we refer to [9].

Define the analog reference permeability as

$$\hat{\mathbf{K}} = \hat{\mathbf{K}}_E = J\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{D}^{-T}. \quad (2.8)$$

Note that $\hat{\mathbf{K}}$ is bounded from above and below independent of h . Furthermore $\hat{\mathbf{K}}^{-1} = J^{-1}\mathbf{D}^T\mathbf{K}^{-1}\mathbf{D}$ and

$$(\mathbf{K}^{-1}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_E = (J\mathbf{K}^{-1}\frac{1}{J}\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \frac{1}{J}\mathbf{D}\hat{\mathbf{v}})_{\hat{E}} = (\hat{\mathbf{K}}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}})_{\hat{E}}. \quad (2.9)$$

The matrix field $\hat{\mathbf{K}}$ embodies both the permeability and the shape of the cells, and will be an essential factor in the further discussions and results. If $\hat{\mathbf{K}}$ is diagonal the grid is usually referred to as a \mathbf{K} -orthogonal grid.

Since

$$J\mathbf{D}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} y_{\hat{y}} & -x_{\hat{y}} \\ -y_{\hat{x}} & x_{\hat{x}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.10)$$

any first order derivative of this matrix field will, by (2.1), be bounded by $|F_{\hat{x}\hat{y}}|$. Hence, using (2.4),

$$|(J\mathbf{D}^{-1})_{\hat{x}}|, |(J\mathbf{D}^{-1})_{\hat{y}}| \leq ch^2. \quad (2.11)$$

Let $\bar{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{v} \circ F_E$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathbf{v}}\|_{1, \hat{E}}^2 &\leq c \left(\|J\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_{\infty, \hat{E}}^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{v}}\|_{1, \hat{E}}^2 + |F_{\hat{x}\hat{y}}|^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{v}}\|_{\hat{E}}^2 \right) \\ &\leq c \left(h^2 \|\bar{\mathbf{v}}\|_{1, \hat{E}}^2 + h^4 \|\bar{\mathbf{v}}\|_{\hat{E}}^2 \right) \\ &\leq ch^2 \|\mathbf{v}\|_{1, E}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

Similarly, any first order derivative of the Jacobian J is $O(h^3)$ for h^2 -uniform grids. To see this, note that the Jacobian is linear, with

$$\begin{aligned} J &= (x_{21}y_{41} - x_{41}y_{21}) + (x_{21}(y_{32} - y_{41}) - (x_{32} - x_{41})y_{21})\hat{x} \\ &\quad + ((x_{32} - x_{41})y_{41} - x_{41}(y_{32} - y_{41}))\hat{y}, \end{aligned}$$




FIG. 3.1. To the left, (i), the degree of freedom associated with the MPFA method. The cell centered filled dots denote the cell pressure. The open dots denote the flux, and is calculated for each half cell edge. In the middle, (ii), four interaction regions, dotted lines, and the underlying grid. The smaller filled dots denote the continuity point for the pressure on the edges, which are eliminated in order to find the transmissibilities. To the right (iii), one interaction region with main vertices x_i and half cell edges e_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$.

and this gives $|J_{\hat{x}}|, |J_{\hat{y}}| \leq ch^3$. Let $\bar{r} = \text{div } \mathbf{v} \circ F_E$, such that $\text{div } \hat{\mathbf{v}} = J\bar{r}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\text{div } \hat{\mathbf{v}}|_{1, \hat{E}}^2 &\leq c \left(\|J\|_{\infty, \hat{E}}^2 |\bar{r}|_{1, \hat{E}}^2 + \|\text{grad } J\|_{\infty, \hat{E}}^2 \|\bar{r}\|_{\hat{E}}^2 \right) \\
 &\leq c \left(h^4 |\bar{r}|_{1, \hat{E}}^2 + h^6 \|\bar{r}\|_{\hat{E}}^2 \right) \\
 &\leq ch^4 \|\text{div } \mathbf{v}\|_{1, E}^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

For later reference, also note that in the physical space we have the estimates

$$|(JD^{-1})_x|, |(JD^{-1})_y| \leq ch, \quad \text{and} \quad |J_x|, |J_y| \leq ch^2. \tag{2.14}$$

3. The Multi Point Flux Approximation. The MPFA discretization is a control volume formulation, where more than two pressure values are used in the flux approximation. The unknowns are the cell pressures, and the half edge fluxes, cf. Figure 3.1 (i).

Define a dual grid, \mathcal{I}_h , where the dual cells, denoted interaction regions $I \in \mathcal{I}_h$, consisting of the four subcells with a common vertex, cf. Figure 3.1 (ii). Furthermore let $\mathcal{E}_h^{1/2}$ be the set of all half edges created by dividing the edges of \mathcal{E}_h into two equal parts.

The MPFA method which we shall analyze can be written in a control volume form as

$$\begin{aligned}
 u_k &= \sum_{E_i \in \mathcal{T}_h} t_{k,i} p_i, & \text{for all } e_k \in \mathcal{E}_h^{1/2}, \\
 \sum_{e_k \in \mathcal{E}_h^{1/2}(E)} u_k &= \int_E g \, d\mathbf{x}, & \text{for all } E \in \mathcal{T}_h.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Here u_k is the flux across e_k , and p_i the cell pressure in cell E_i . The coefficients $t_{k,i}$ are called transmissibility coefficients. These coefficients are zero when the half edge e_k does not belong to an interaction region containing a subcell from the primal cell E_i . The transmissibilities are defined implicitly by a local linear 4×4 system on each interaction region. The second equation of (3.1) is the exact divergence on the control volume or cell E . Hence, the entire approximation is the pressure to flux relation, given by the first equation of (3.1).

Before the transmissibilities are calculated the transformation from Section 2.1 into the reference space is applied. The discrete pressure and flux values from the




FIG. 3.2. To the left: Four cells with common vertex and the corresponding interaction region in the reference and physical space. To the right: One interaction region with four sub cells, numbered 1 to 4, in the reference space, where \bullet denotes the cell pressures $\{p_i\}$, the small \bullet the edge pressure $\{\lambda_i\}$, and \circ the edge velocities $\{u_i\}$.

reference space remain unchanged compared to the discrete values in the physical space. If \mathbf{n}_e and $\hat{\mathbf{n}}_e$ are the edge unit normals we have from (2.6) that

$$u_e \equiv - \int_e \mathbf{K} \operatorname{grad} p \cdot \mathbf{n}_e ds = - \int_{\hat{e}} \hat{\mathbf{K}} \operatorname{grad} \hat{p} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_e d\hat{s} \equiv \hat{u}_e,$$

with $\hat{\mathbf{K}}$ defined in (2.8) and $\hat{p} = p \circ F_E(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$.

3.1. The Multi Point Flux Approximation on Mixed Form. Here we derive the MPFA method in a formulation that will match a version of the mixed finite element method. In this form the explicit MPFA flux is found by inverting a local 4×4 matrix. Note that $\hat{\mathbf{K}}$ is independent of any translation of the reference mapping F_E , equation (2.1), from Section 2. The reference mapping can therefore be adjusted for four and four cells with one common vertex, so that we have a reference interaction region, \hat{I} , see Figure 3.2. Denote the subcells of \hat{I} for \hat{E}_i and the inner subcell edges for e_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Evaluate $\hat{\mathbf{K}}_E$ in the midpoint of the reference cell, and denote this \mathcal{K}_E with components k_{ij}^E , $i, j = 1, 2$, and similar let κ_{ij}^E be the components of \mathcal{K}_E^{-1} .

Define the pressure space $P(\hat{I})$ on the interaction region \hat{I} to be all linears on the subcells \hat{E}_i , which are continuous on the boundary of \hat{I} . For each $\hat{p} \in P(\hat{I})$ let $\{p_k\}_{k=1,2,3,4}$ be the values of \hat{p} at the corners of \hat{I} , and $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1,2,3,4}$ the values of \hat{p} at midpoints of the edges of the boundary of \hat{I} , see Figure 3.2. The local pressure \hat{p} is then uniquely defined by the eight degrees of freedom $\{p_k, \lambda_k\}$. Let

$$u_e|_{E_i} = -\hat{\mathcal{K}}_i \operatorname{grad} \hat{p}|_{E_i} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}_e / 2 \quad (3.2)$$

for the two subcells E_i meeting each of the four inner edges e . The MPFA pressure space, $P_{\text{MPFA}}(\hat{I})$, is further restricted to

$$P_{\text{MPFA}}(\hat{I}) = \{\hat{p} \in P(\hat{I}) : [\hat{u}_e]_e = 0, \forall e \in \mathcal{E}^{1/2}(\hat{I})\}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\mathcal{E}^{1/2}(\hat{I})$ represents the four inner edges of \hat{I} , $[\cdot]_e$ is the jump across edge e , and u_e is defined by (3.2).

LEMMA 3.1. *The pressure $\hat{p} \in P_{\text{MPFA}}(\hat{I})$ is uniquely determined by the cell pressures $\{p_k\}_{k=1,2,3,4}$.*

The proof can be found at the end of this section.

The first relation of (3.1), the pressure to flux relation, is exactly the map taking $\{p_k\}$ to $\{u_k\}$ for $\hat{p} \in P_{\text{MPFA}}$. This map can now be characterized locally on each interaction region. In order to find this characterization, define the gradient variables

$\{g_1^i, g_2^i\}_{i=1,2,3,4}$ by

$$\begin{pmatrix} g_1^i \\ g_2^i \end{pmatrix} = -\text{grad}(\hat{p})/2|_{\hat{E}_i}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4, \quad (3.4)$$

where $g_j^i \in P_0(\hat{E}_i)$. Consider the two subcells E_1 and E_2 with node pressure p_1 and p_2 , and their common half edge e_1 , see Figure 3.2. Calculating the flux for half edge e_1 on subcell E_1 gives

$$u_1 = -\mathcal{K}_1 \text{grad}(\hat{p})|_{E_1} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} / 2 = k_{11}^1 g_1^1 + k_{12}^1 g_2^1 \quad (3.5)$$

and similar

$$u_4 = k_{22}^1 g_2^1 + k_{12}^1 g_1^1. \quad (3.6)$$

This can be written

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_4 \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{K}_1 \begin{pmatrix} g_1^1 \\ g_2^1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{pmatrix} g_1^1 \\ g_2^1 \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{K}_1^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_4 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.7)$$

if we solve for the gradient variables.

In the reference space, the constant gradient can be determined in each subcell between the node pressure and one point on each half edge. Let p_1 be the node pressure of cell 1 and the pressure at the midpoint of the actual edge be λ_1 , see Figure 3.2. Using (3.4) this gives

$$\begin{pmatrix} g_1^1 \\ g_2^1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 - p_1 \\ \lambda_4 - p_1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} g_1^2 \\ g_2^2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p_2 - \lambda_1 \\ \lambda_2 - p_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.8)$$

Eliminating λ_1 , gives

$$g_1^1 + g_2^2 = -(p_2 - p_1), \quad (3.9)$$

Next we use (3.7), to eliminate g_1^1 and g_2^2 to obtain the equation

$$(\kappa_{11}^1 + \kappa_{11}^2)u_1 + \kappa_{12}^1 u_4 + \kappa_{12}^2 u_2 = -(p_2 - p_1) \quad (3.10)$$

associated the edge e_1 . By deriving the similar equations for the three other interior edges of \hat{I} we obtain a 4×4 system of the form

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{b}, \quad (3.11)$$

where the components of \mathbf{b} are pressure difference, $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4)^T$, and

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} (\kappa_{11}^1 + \kappa_{11}^2) & \kappa_{12}^2 & 0 & \kappa_{12}^1 \\ \kappa_{12}^2 & (\kappa_{22}^2 + \kappa_{22}^3) & \kappa_{12}^3 & 0 \\ 0 & \kappa_{12}^3 & (\kappa_{11}^3 + \kappa_{11}^4) & \kappa_{12}^4 \\ \kappa_{12}^1 & 0 & \kappa_{12}^4 & (\kappa_{22}^1 + \kappa_{22}^2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.12)$$

Since each \mathcal{K}_E , $E = 1, 2, 3, 4$ are positive definite, so is \mathbf{A} . Inverting this matrix on each interaction region gives the explicit flux and transmissibility coefficients given in (3.1).

Proof. Lemma 3.1. It is enough to show that if $\hat{p} \in P_{\text{MPFA}}(\hat{I})$, with $\{p_k\}_{k=1,2,3,4}$ all equal zero, then $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1,2,3,4}$, must also be zero. Under the assumption $p_k = 0$ it follows from (3.5) and (3.8) that the constraint of continuous flux leads to the system

$$\mathbf{A}' \boldsymbol{\lambda} = 0$$

with $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)^T$ and

$$\mathbf{A}' = \begin{pmatrix} (k_{11}^1 + k_{11}^2) & -k_{12}^2 & 0 & k_{12}^1 \\ -k_{12}^2 & (k_{22}^2 + k_{22}^3) & k_{12}^3 & 0 \\ 0 & k_{12}^3 & (k_{11}^3 + k_{11}^4) & -k_{12}^4 \\ k_{12}^1 & 0 & -k_{12}^4 & (k_{22}^1 + k_{22}^2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.13)$$

This matrix is positive definite, so $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = 0$. \square

3.2. The Mixed Finite Element Method. Introduce the unknown velocity \mathbf{u} which leads to the classical mixed formulation of equation (1.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u} &= -\mathbf{K} \text{grad } p, \\ \text{div } \mathbf{u} &= g. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

The mixed finite element method is a discrete version of this system. A weak formulation of the system (3.14) can be formulated as the problem of finding $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in H(\text{div}) \times \mathcal{L}_2$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{K}^{-1}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - (p, \text{div } \mathbf{v}) &= 0, & \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in H(\text{div}), \\ (\text{div } \mathbf{u}, q) &= (g, q), & \text{for all } q \in \mathcal{L}_2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

where g is assumed to be an \mathcal{L}_2 function.

In order to show that the MPFA method (3.1) is equivalent to a mixed finite element method we will introduce a new pair of discrete spaces, $\mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2} \times Q_h$.

Let a, b, c , and d be piecewise constants on $(0, 1)$, with discontinuity at the midpoint. On the reference square \hat{E} the velocity space $\mathcal{RT}^{1/2} = \mathcal{RT}^{1/2}(\hat{E})$ is defined as the eight-dimensional space given as all vector fields of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} a(\hat{y}) + b(\hat{y})\hat{x} \\ c(\hat{x}) + d(\hat{x})\hat{y} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Recall that the corresponding Raviart-Thomas space, \mathcal{RT} , is of the same form, but with, a, b, c , and d taken as constants, so $\mathcal{RT} \subset \mathcal{RT}^{1/2}$. It is straightforward to check that if $\hat{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathcal{RT}^{1/2}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ is a normal vector to an edge of \hat{E} , then $\hat{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}$ is a constant along each half edge. Furthermore, this property is preserved by the Piola transform. The corresponding finite element space, $\mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2} \subset H(\text{div})$, is now defined by

$$\mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2} := \{\mathbf{v} \in H(\text{div}) : \mathbf{v}|_E \in \mathcal{P}_E(\mathcal{RT}^{1/2}), \quad \forall E \in \mathcal{T}_h\}.$$

Hence, the canonical degrees of freedom for the space $\mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}$ are $\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}$ of each half edge in $\mathcal{E}_h^{1/2}$. These degrees of freedom lead to the corresponding dual basis for $\mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}$. Also define the ordinary zero order Raviart-Thomas space, as described in for instance [9], by

$$\mathcal{RT}_h := \{\mathbf{v} \in H(\text{div}) : \mathbf{v}|_E \in \mathcal{P}_E(\mathcal{RT}), \quad \forall E \in \mathcal{T}_h\}.$$

If we let $\mathcal{RT}_{h/2}$ denote the ordinary Raviart-Thomas space on the finer subcell mesh, we have $\mathcal{RT}_h \subset \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2} \subset \mathcal{RT}_{h/2}$. In particular, the $\mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}$ functions can be characterized as $\mathcal{RT}_{h/2}$ functions, where for each cell the function value on the inner subcell edges are the arithmetic mean of the corresponding half cell edge values.

The pressure will be approximated by piecewise constants, on \mathcal{T}_h i.e., we let

$$Q_h := \{q \in \mathcal{L}_2 : q|_E \in P_0(E), \quad \forall E \in \mathcal{T}_h\}.$$




FIG. 3.3. One cell, with four subcells \hat{E}_i , and the half cell edges e_{ij} .

On the reference element we define $\hat{\Pi} : (H^1(\hat{E}))^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{RT}$ as the standard interpolation operators onto the four dimensional Raviart–Thomas space, cf. [9],

$$\int_{\hat{e}} (\hat{\mathbf{u}} - \hat{\Pi}\hat{\mathbf{u}}) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}} d\hat{s} = 0, \text{ for all edges } \hat{e} \in \mathcal{E}(\hat{E}), \quad (3.16)$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\hat{E})$ represent the four edges of \hat{E} . The operator $\Pi_h : (H^1)^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{RT}_h \subset \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}$ is then simply given by

$$\Pi_h \mathbf{v}|_E = \mathcal{P}_E \hat{\Pi} \mathcal{P}_E^{-1} \mathbf{v}. \quad (3.17)$$

It is straightforward to check, using the identity (2.5), that the operator Π_h satisfies the identity

$$(\text{div}(\Pi_h \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}), q) = 0, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in H(\text{div}), q \in Q_h. \quad (3.18)$$

The mixed finite element method derived from the pair $\mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2} \times Q_h$ is given by: Find $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) \in \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2} \times Q_h \subset H(\text{div}) \times \mathcal{L}_2$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}) - (p_h, \text{div } \mathbf{v}) &= 0, & \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}, \\ (\text{div } \mathbf{u}_h, q) &= (g, q), & \text{for all } q \in Q_h. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

3.3. The Quadrature Rule. In order to obtain the MPFA method as a mixed finite element method we need to replace the term $(\mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v})_E = (\hat{\mathbf{K}}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_h, \hat{\mathbf{v}})_{\hat{E}}$ in (3.19) by a quadrature formula. We define this numerical quadrature formula on the reference element \hat{E} , and denote it $\hat{a}_E(\cdot, \cdot)$. Remember that \mathcal{K}_E is $\hat{\mathbf{K}}_E = \mathbf{J} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{D}^{-T}$ evaluated at the midpoint of the reference cell and that the components of \mathcal{K}_E^{-1} are denoted κ_{jk}^E , $j, k = 1, 2$. For the quadrature rule we will use \mathcal{K}_E to approximate $\hat{\mathbf{K}}_E$. The rest of the quadrature formula is derived from the trapezoidal rule. If \hat{E}_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ are the four subcells of \hat{E} , let e_{ij} denote the outer half edge of subcell \hat{E}_i with the j th unit vector as a normal, cf. Figure 3.3. Note that if $\hat{\mathbf{v}} = (\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2) \in \mathcal{RT}^{1/2}$ the exactness of the trapezoidal rule for scalar linear functions implies that

$$\frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^4 \hat{v}_k|_{e_{ik}} = \int_{\hat{E}} \hat{v}_k d\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \quad k = 1, 2. \quad (3.20)$$

Let $\hat{v}_k|_{e_{ik}} = \hat{v}_{ik}$. For $\hat{\mathbf{v}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{RT}^{1/2}$ we now define

$$\hat{a}_E(\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^4 \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \kappa_{jk}^E \hat{u}_{ij} \hat{v}_{ik} \quad (3.21)$$

for functions $\hat{\mathbf{v}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}}$ in $\mathcal{RT}^{1/2}$. If $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in (P_0(\hat{E}))^2$, the term $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = \mathcal{K}_E^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}$ still is $(P_0(\hat{E}))^2$, then for any $\hat{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathcal{RT}^{1/2}$

$$\hat{a}_E(\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k=1}^2 \hat{w}_k \sum_{i=1}^4 \hat{v}_{ik} = \sum_{k=1}^2 \hat{w}_k \int_{\hat{E}} \hat{v}_k d\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\mathcal{K}_E^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}})_{\hat{E}}. \quad (3.22)$$

Hence, in this case the quadrature rule is exact. The next lemma shows two important properties of the quadrature rule, which will be essential for the analysis below.

LEMMA 3.2. *If $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in (P_0(\hat{E}))^2$, the quadrature rule defined in (3.21) satisfies*

$$\hat{a}_E(\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) = (\mathcal{K}_E^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}})_{\hat{E}} \quad \text{for all } \hat{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathcal{RT}^{1/2}, \quad (3.23)$$

and

$$\hat{a}_E(\hat{\mathbf{u}}, (\hat{\mathbf{v}} - \hat{\Pi} \hat{\mathbf{v}})) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \hat{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathcal{RT}^{1/2}. \quad (3.24)$$

Proof. Equation (3.23) follows from (3.22), since $\mathcal{K}_E^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{u}} \in (P_0(\hat{E}))^2$. For $\hat{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathcal{RT}^{1/2}$ we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 ((I - \hat{\Pi})v_k)|_{e_{ik}} = 0, \quad k = 1, 2,$$

from the definition of the operator $\hat{\Pi}$. Therefore, for $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in (P_0(\hat{E}))^2$ we have $\hat{u}_{ij} = \hat{u}_j$ and

$$\hat{a}_E(\hat{\mathbf{u}}, (I - \hat{\Pi})\hat{\mathbf{v}}) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \kappa_{jk} \hat{u}_j \sum_{i=1}^4 ((I - \hat{\Pi})v_k)|_{e_{ik}} = 0.$$

□

Define the quadrature rule in the physical space as

$$a_h(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \sum_{E \in \mathcal{T}_h} \hat{a}_E(\hat{\mathbf{v}}, \hat{\mathbf{w}}). \quad (3.25)$$

for all $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}$.

Corresponding to the approximation \mathcal{K}_E of $\hat{\mathbf{K}}$ in the reference space, we introduce \mathbf{K}_h in the physical space as an approximation of \mathbf{K} given by

$$\mathbf{K}_h|_E = J^{-1} \mathbf{D} \mathcal{K}_E \mathbf{D}^T.$$

Note that \mathbf{K}_h is not piecewise constant, but by construction

$$(\mathbf{K}_h^{-1} \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_E = (\mathcal{K}_E^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}})_{\hat{E}}.$$

If $\bar{\mathbf{u}} = J \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{u}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{v}} = J \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{v}$, on an element E ,

$$\mathbf{K}_h^{-1} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} = \mathcal{K}_E^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{v}} / J.$$

Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in (P_0(E))^2$. Then from (2.2) and (2.14) any first order derivative of $\mathbf{K}_h^{-1} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ is bounded independent h . Since the matrix norm $|(\mathbf{K}^{-1} - \mathbf{K}_h^{-1})(\mathbf{x})|$ is zero at the midpoint of each cell E , and has bounded derivatives, we conclude that

$$|(\mathbf{K}^{-1} - \mathbf{K}_h^{-1})| \leq ch, \quad (3.26)$$

where $|\cdot|$ is the spectral norm. The error estimate for the quadrature rule (3.25) will be given in Lemma 4.3.

3.4. The Mixed Finite Element Method that yields the MPFA. The last step of rewiring the MPFA as a perturbed mixed finite element method is to apply the quadrature rule on (3.25) in (3.19). We then obtain the method: Find $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) \in \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2} \times Q_h$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}) - (p_h, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}) &= 0, & \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}, \\ (\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_h, q) &= (g, q), & \text{for all } q \in Q_h. \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

THEOREM 3.3. *The perturbed mixed finite element method (3.27) is equivalent to the MPFA method from Section 3.1.*

Proof. Recall that the space $\mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}$ has a canonical basis derived from the degrees of freedom on each half edge in $\mathcal{E}_h^{1/2}$. It is easy to see that the mass matrix corresponding to this basis and the bilinear form a_h is block diagonal, where the 4×4 diagonal blocks correspond to the four half edges meeting a vertex of \mathcal{T}_h , or equivalently, to each interaction region of \mathcal{I}_h . Hence, by a transformation back to the reference space, the diagonal blocks resemble the structure of the matrix \mathbf{A} given by (3.12). The second term of the first equation in (3.27) gives a pressure difference. It is a straightforward calculation to show that for each interaction region the first equation of (3.27) corresponds exactly to the system (3.11). \square

4. Convergence of the MPFA. In this final section of the paper we show the convergence of the MPFA method based on the characterization of the method given in Theorem 3.3. Hence, we will show convergence of the mixed method (3.27). However, first we will establish some necessary preliminary results.

By equivalence of norms we have

$$\|\Pi_h \mathbf{v}\| \leq c \|\mathbf{v}\|, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}, \quad (4.1)$$

where the constant c is independent of h

LEMMA 4.1. *Let $\mathbf{v} \in (H^1)^2$, with $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} \in H^1$. Then there is a constant c , independent of h , such that*

$$\|\Pi_h \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}\| \leq ch \|\mathbf{v}\|_1, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\|\operatorname{div}(\Pi_h \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})\| \leq ch \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}\|_1, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\|\mathcal{M}_h p - p\| \leq ch \|p\|_1, \quad (4.4)$$

where \mathcal{M}_h is the \mathcal{L}_2 -projection onto Q_h .

Proof. The last inequality, (4.4), is a standard estimate, and can for instance be found in [8]. The two other estimates are consequences of the assumption that $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}$ is h^2 -uniform. They are derived locally on each element E of \mathcal{T}_h . From the equivalence of \mathcal{L}_2 -norms in Section 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_h \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}\|_E^2 &\leq c \|\hat{\Pi} \hat{\mathbf{v}} - \hat{\mathbf{v}}\|_{\hat{E}}^2 \\ &\leq c |\hat{\mathbf{v}}|_{1, \hat{E}}^2 \\ &\leq ch^2 \|\mathbf{v}\|_{1, E}^2 \end{aligned}$$

from (2.12). Let \mathcal{M} denote the \mathcal{L}_2 projection onto constant functions on the reference

square. To derive (4.3), start with (2.7) such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\operatorname{div}(\Pi_h \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})\|_E^2 &\leq ch^{-2} \|\operatorname{div}(\hat{\mathbf{v}} - \hat{\Pi} \hat{\mathbf{v}})\|_{\hat{E}}^2 \\
&= ch^{-2} \|(I - \mathcal{M}) \operatorname{div} \hat{\mathbf{v}}\|_{\hat{E}}^2 \\
&\leq ch^{-2} |\operatorname{div} \hat{\mathbf{v}}|_{1, \hat{E}}^2 \\
&\leq ch^2 \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{v}\|_{1, E}^2
\end{aligned}$$

from (2.13). Summing over all the elements and the Lemma follows. \square

In order to analyze the mixed method (3.27) we also need some properties of the bilinear form a_h defined on the space $\mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}$. Using the regularity of the mesh and the equivalence of norms on the reference element \hat{E} it is straightforward to show that $a_h(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v})^{1/2}$ is equivalent to the \mathcal{L}_2 norm on $\mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}$, i.e. there are constants $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 > 0$, independent of h , such that

$$\alpha_0 \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \leq a_h(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}) \leq \alpha_1 \|\mathbf{v}\|^2. \quad (4.5)$$

Two other central properties of the bilinear form a_h will be derived from the algebraic properties given in Lemma 3.2.

LEMMA 4.2. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in (H^1)^2$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}$. Then there is a constant c , independent of h , such that*

$$|a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u}, (I - \Pi_h) \mathbf{v})| \leq ch \|\mathbf{u}\|_1 \|(I - \Pi_h) \mathbf{v}\|.$$

Proof. Since $(I - \Pi_h)^2 = I - \Pi_h$ it is enough to show that

$$|a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u}, (I - \Pi_h) \mathbf{v})| \leq ch \|\mathbf{u}\|_1 \|\mathbf{v}\| \quad (4.6)$$

for $\mathbf{u} \in (H^1)^2$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}$. Note also that on the reference element the bilinear form $\hat{a}_E(\hat{\Pi} \cdot, (I - \hat{\Pi}) \cdot)$ is bounded on $H^1 \times \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}$, i.e. there is a constant c such that

$$|\hat{a}_E(\hat{\Pi} \hat{\mathbf{u}}, (I - \hat{\Pi}) \hat{\mathbf{v}})| \leq c \|\hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{1, \hat{E}} \|\hat{\mathbf{v}}\|_{\hat{E}}$$

for all $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in H^1(\hat{E})^2$ and $\hat{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathcal{L}_2(\hat{E})$. However, due to identity (3.24) we obtain, by a Bramble–Hilbert argument, the stronger bound

$$|\hat{a}_E(\hat{\Pi} \hat{\mathbf{u}}, (I - \hat{\Pi}) \hat{\mathbf{v}})| \leq c |\hat{\mathbf{u}}|_{1, \hat{E}} \|\hat{\mathbf{v}}\|_{\hat{E}}.$$

Hence, using (2.12) and the definition of a_h we obtain (4.6). \square

Let $a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ be the continuous bilinear form $(\mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$. The next result is a consistency result for the bilinear form a_h .

LEMMA 4.3. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in (H^1)^2$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}$. Then there is a constant c , independent of h , such that*

$$|a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})| \leq ch \|\mathbf{u}\|_1 \|\mathbf{v}\|.$$

Proof. It follows from (3.26) that

$$|a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - (\mathbf{K}_h^{-1} \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})| = |(\mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - (\mathbf{K}_h^{-1} \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})| \leq ch \|\mathbf{u}\| \|\mathbf{v}\|.$$

Hence, in order to complete the proof it is enough to show that

$$|a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - (\mathbf{K}_h^{-1} \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})| \leq ch \|\mathbf{u}\|_1 \|\mathbf{v}\|. \quad (4.7)$$

However, by employing the identity (3.23) and the Bramble–Hilbert Lemma in an argument analog to the one in the proof of Lemma 4.2 above we obtain

$$|\hat{a}_E(\hat{\Pi} \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) - (\mathcal{K}_E^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}})| \leq c \|\mathbf{u}\|_{1, \hat{E}} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\hat{E}}.$$

Therefore, (4.7) again follows from (2.12) and the definition of a_h . \square

It is well known that, in addition to the boundedness of the bilinear forms, two corresponding Brezzi conditions have to be satisfied in order to ensure stability of a mixed finite element method of the form (3.27), cf. [9]. For the continuous mixed formulation (3.15) the proper function space for the formulation is $H(\text{div}) \times \mathcal{L}_2$. Hence, in the present setting the first Brezzi condition requires that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}} \frac{(q, \text{div } \mathbf{v})}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\text{div}}} \geq \beta_1 \|q\| \quad \text{for all } q \in Q_h, \quad (4.8)$$

where $\beta_1 > 0$ is independent of h . Since $\mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2} \supset \mathcal{RT}_h$, and the corresponding condition is well known to hold for the pair $\mathcal{RT}_h \times Q_h$, cf. [9, 18], we conclude that (4.8) is fulfilled.

The second stability condition is related to the weakly divergence free vector fields in $\mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2}$. Let Z_h denote the set of weakly divergence free vector fields, i.e.

$$Z_h = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2} : (\text{div } \mathbf{v}, q) = 0, \quad \forall q \in Q_h\}.$$

The standard formulation of the second stability condition states that

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\text{div}} \leq \beta_2 \|\mathbf{v}\| \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in Z_h, \quad (4.9)$$

where β_2 is independent of h . This condition does not hold in present case since the elements of Z_h are not divergence free. However, if $\mathbf{v} \in Z_h \cap \mathcal{RT}_h$ then $\text{div } \mathbf{v} = 0$. This is seen by a transformation back to the reference space. Hence, for any $\mathbf{v} \in Z_h$ we must have that $\text{div } \hat{\Pi} \hat{\mathbf{v}} = 0$. Therefore, the weaker condition

$$\|\mathbf{v}\| + \|\text{div } \Pi_h \mathbf{v}\| \leq \beta_2 \|\mathbf{v}\| \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in Z_h, \quad (4.10)$$

holds with constant $\beta_2 = 1$. This slight lack of stability for the mixed method (3.27) will have consequences for the error estimates we shall obtain. Instead of estimates in the norm of $H(\text{div}) \times \mathcal{L}_2$ we will instead obtain estimates in the weaker norm, were $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\text{div}}$ is replaced by $\|\mathbf{v}\| + \|\text{div } \Pi_h \mathbf{v}\|$.

Remark. The use of the norm (4.10) for the convergence analysis, seems to be consistent with numerical experiments, where one observes better behavior for the averaged edge flux compared to the half edge fluxes. \square

4.1. The Error Estimates. Let $(\mathbf{u}, p) \in H(\text{div}) \times \mathcal{L}_2$ be the solution of the continuous problem (3.15) and $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) \in \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2} \times Q_h$ the corresponding solution of (3.27). We assume that \mathbf{u} , $\text{div } \mathbf{u}$, and p are all H^1 functions. Note that it follows from (3.18) that $\Pi_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h) \in Z_h \cap \mathcal{RT}_h$ and therefore $\text{div } \Pi_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h) = 0$. We can therefore conclude from (4.3) that

$$\|\text{div}(\mathbf{u} - \Pi_h \mathbf{u}_h)\| = \|\text{div}(\mathbf{u} - \Pi_h \mathbf{u})\| \leq ch \|\text{div } \mathbf{u}\|_1. \quad (4.11)$$

The \mathcal{L}_2 part of $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h$ is estimated next.

LEMMA 4.4. *There is a constant c , independent of h , such that*

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\| \leq ch\|\mathbf{u}\|_1.$$

Proof. Due to the interpolation result (4.2) it is enough to show that

$$\|\Pi_h \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\| \leq ch\|\mathbf{u}\|_1. \quad (4.12)$$

Furthermore, by (4.5) it is sufficient to estimate $a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \Pi_h \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h)^{1/2}$.

In order to do this we start by observing that since $\Pi_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h)$ is divergence free it follows from the definition of \mathbf{u}_h and (3.18) that

$$a_h(\mathbf{u}_h, \Pi_h \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h) = (p_h, \operatorname{div}(\Pi_h \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h)) = (p_h, \operatorname{div} \Pi_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h)) = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \Pi_h \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h) &= a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u}, \Pi_h \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h) \\ &= a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u}, \Pi_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h)) - a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u}, (I - \Pi_h)\mathbf{u}_h). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, since

$$a(\mathbf{u}, \Pi_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h)) = (p, \operatorname{div}(\Pi_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h))) = 0,$$

we have

$$a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u}, \Pi_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h)) = a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u}, \Pi_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h)) - a(\mathbf{u}, \Pi_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h)).$$

We have therefore obtained the identity

$$a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \Pi_h \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h) = [a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u}, \Pi_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h)) - a(\mathbf{u}, \Pi_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h))] - a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u}, (I - \Pi_h)\mathbf{u}_h).$$

From the estimates of the Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 we derive

$$\begin{aligned} a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \Pi_h \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h) &\leq ch\|\mathbf{u}\|_1(\|\Pi_h(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h)\| + \|(I - \Pi_h)\mathbf{u}_h\|) \\ &\leq ch\|\mathbf{u}\|_1\|\Pi_h \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from (4.1). By (4.5) this implies (4.12). \square

For the final estimate on $\|p - p_h\|$ it is, by (4.4), enough to bound $\|\mathcal{M}_h p - p_h\|$. The inf-sup condition on $\mathcal{RT}_h \times Q_h$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}_h p - p_h\| &\leq c \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{RT}_h} \frac{(\mathcal{M}_h p - p_h, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v})}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\operatorname{div}}} \\ &\leq c \left\{ \|\mathcal{M}_h p - p\| + \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{RT}_h} \frac{(p - p_h, \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v})}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\operatorname{div}}} \right\} \\ &\leq c \left\{ \|\mathcal{M}_h p - p\| + \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{RT}_h} \frac{|a(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})| + a_h(\Pi_h \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v})}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\operatorname{div}}} \right\} \\ &\leq ch(\|p\|_1 + \|\mathbf{u}\|_1) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (4.4), (4.12) and Lemma 4.3.

Together with (4.11) and Lemma 4.4 this implies the following set of error estimates for the MPFA method.

THEOREM 4.5. *Let (\mathbf{u}, p) be the exact solution of (3.15) and $(\mathbf{u}_h, p_h) \in \mathcal{RT}_h^{1/2} \times Q_h$ the solution of (3.27). There is a constant c , independent of h , but depending on $\|\mathbf{u}\|_1$, $\|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}\|_1$ and $\|p\|_1$, such that*

$$\|\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u}\| + \|\operatorname{div}(\Pi_h \mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u})\| + \|p_h - p\| \leq ch.$$

5. Conclusions. This paper presents the MPFA method as a finite volume method which is equivalent to a mixed finite element method using a specific numerical quadrature. This provides a finite element setting in which the MPFA method can be understood and analyzed on quadrilateral grids. Optimal first order convergence is established for the Darcy velocity in a reduced $H(\text{div})$ norm and for the pressure in the \mathcal{L}_2 -norm. The norm provides an estimate on the edge flux, as an average of the half edge fluxes. This seems to be consistent with numerical experiments, where one observes better behavior for the averaged edge flux compared to the half edge fluxes.

REFERENCES

- [1] I. Aavatsmark, T. Barkve, Ø. Bøe, and T. Mannseth: *Discretization on non-orthogonal, curvilinear grids for multi-phase flow*. Proc. 4th European Conference on the Mathematics of Oil Recovery, vol D. Røros 1994.
- [2] I. Aavatsmark, T. Barkve, Ø. Bøe, and T. Mannseth: *Discretization on Unstructured Grids for Inhomogeneous, Anisotropic Media. Part I: Derivation of the methods, Part II: Discussion and Numerical Results*. SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 19 (1998), pp. 1700–1736.
- [3] I. Aavatsmark: *An Introduction to Multipoint Flux Approximations for Quadrilateral Grids*. Computational Geosciences 6 (2002), pp. 404–432.
- [4] A. Agouzal, J. Baranger, J.-F. Maitre, and F. Oudin: *Connection Between Finite Volume and Mixed Finite Element Methods for a Diffusion Problem with Nonconstants Coefficients. Application to a Convection Diffusion Problem*. East-West J. Numer. Math. 3 (1995), pp. 237–254.
- [5] Eclipse, Technical Description, Schlumberger.
- [6] R. E. Ewing, M. M. Liu, J. Wang: *Superconvergence of Mixed Finite Element Approximations over Quadrilaterals*. SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 36 (1999), pp. 772–787.
- [7] M. Berndt, K. Lipnikov, J. D. Moulton, and M. Shashkov: *Convergence of Mimetic Finite Difference Discretizations of the Diffusion Equation*. East-West Journal on Numerical Mathematics. 9 (2001), pp. 253–316.
- [8] D. Braess: *Finite Elements*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [9] F. Brezzi and M. Fortin: *Mixed and Hybrid Finite Element Methods*. Springer Series in Computational Mathematics 15, Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [10] S. Chou, D. Y. Kwak, and K. Y. Kim: *A General Framework for Constructing and Analyzing Mixed Finite Volume Methods on Quadrilateral Grids: The Overlapping Covolume Case*. SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 39 (2001), pp. 1170–1196.
- [11] P. G. Ciarlet: *The Finite Element Method for Elliptic Problems*. Noth-Holland Publishing Company, 1978.
- [12] M. G. Edwards, C. F. Rogers, *A Flux Continuous Scheme for the Full Tensor Pressure Equation*. Proc. 4th European Conference on the Mathematics of Oil Recovery, vol D. Røros 1994.
- [13] M. G. Edwards and C. F. Rogers: *Finite Volume Discretization With Imposed Flux Continuity for the General Tensor Pressure Equation*. Computational Geosciences 2 (1998), pp. 259–290.
- [14] V. Girault, and P.-A. Raviart: *Finite Element Methods for Navier-Stokes Equation, Theory and Algorithms*. Springer-Verlag, 1986.
- [15] J. Hyman, M. Shashkov, and S. Steinberg: *The Numerical Solution of Diffusion Problems in Strongly Heterogeneous Non-isotropic Materials*. J. Comput. Phys. 132 (1997), pp. 130–148.
- [16] R. A. Klausen and G. T. Eigestad: *Multi point flux approximations and finite element methods; practical aspects of discontinuous media*. Proc. 9th European Conference on the Mathematics of Oil Recovery, Cannes, France, B003, EAGE, 2004.
- [17] R. A. Klausen and T. F. Russell: *Relationships Among some Conservative Discretization Methods which Handle Discontinuous Coefficients*. Forthcoming in Computational Geosciences.
- [18] J. Wang and T. Mathew: *Mixed Finite Element Methods Over Quadrilaterals*. In the Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Advances in Numerical Methods and Applications, Eds: I. T. Dimov, Bl. Sendov, and P. Vassilevski, World Scientific (1994), pp. 203–214.