

**SUBSTRUCTURING PRECONDITIONING FOR FINITE ELEMENT
APPROXIMATIONS OF SECOND ORDER ELLIPTIC PROBLEMS.
I. NONCONFORMING LINEAR ELEMENTS FOR THE POISSON
EQUATION IN A PARALLELEPIPED**

By

R.E. Ewing

Yu.A. Kuznetsov

R.D. Lazarov

and

Serguei Maliassov

IMA Preprint Series # 1280

December 1994

INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS AND ITS APPLICATIONS

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

514 Vincent Hall

206 Church Street S.E.

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

**SUBSTRUCTURING PRECONDITIONING FOR FINITE ELEMENT
APPROXIMATIONS OF SECOND ORDER ELLIPTIC PROBLEMS.
I. NONCONFORMING LINEAR ELEMENTS FOR THE POISSON
EQUATION IN A PARALLELEPIPED**

R.E. EWING, YU.A. KUZNETSOV, R.D. LAZAROV, AND SERGUEI MALIASSOV*

1.. Introduction. Let Ω be a convex polyhedral domain in \mathbb{R}^3 , $f(x) \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $A(x)$ be a sufficiently smooth three by three symmetric matrix-valued function on $\bar{\Omega}$ satisfying the uniform positive definiteness condition: there exists an $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\alpha^{-1}\xi^T\xi \leq \xi^T A(x)\xi \leq \alpha\xi^T\xi, \quad \forall x \in \bar{\Omega}, \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^3. \quad (1.1)$$

Throughout this paper, we use boldfaced letters to denote vectors in general in the space \mathbb{R}^N .

We consider the Dirichlet boundary value problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q} + A\nabla u &= 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} &= f, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

where $\partial\Omega$ is the boundary of Ω . In applications of fluid flow in porous media, $u(x)$ is referred to as pressure and \mathbf{q} as to Darcy velocity vector. It is well known that (1.2) has a unique solution $u(x) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap H^2(\Omega)$, and that the following elliptic regularity estimate holds true (cf. [14]):

$$\|u\|_{2,\Omega} \leq c\|f\|_{0,\Omega}, \quad (1.3)$$

where c is a constant dependent only on Ω and where $\|\cdot\|_{0,\Omega}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{2,\Omega}$ are the $L^2(\Omega)$ and $H^2(\Omega)$ Sobolev norms, respectively defined by

$$\|u\|_{0,\Omega} = \left(\int_{\Omega} u^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|u\|_{2,\Omega} = \left(\int_{\Omega} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} |\partial^\alpha u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (1.4)$$

The problem (1.2) can be discretized in various ways. Among the most popular and frequently used methods of approximation are the finite volume method, the Galerkin finite element method and the mixed finite element method. Each of these methods has its advantages and disadvantages when applied to particular engineering problems. For example, for petroleum reservoir problems in geometrically simple domains and heterogeneous media, the finite volume method has proven to be

* R. Ewing, R. Lazarov, S. Maliassov, Institute for Scientific Computation and Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, 326 Teague Research Center, College Station, TX 77843-3404. Yu. Kuznetsov, Institute of Numerical Mathematics, Russian Academy of Sciences, 32-a Leninski Prospect, 117334 Moscow, Russia. R. Lazarov, Institute of Mathematics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1113 Sofia, Bulgaria.

reliable, accurate and mass conserving cell-by-cell. Many engineering problems, e.g. petroleum recovery, ground-water contamination, seismic exploration etc. need very accurate velocity (flux) determination in the presence of heterogeneities, anisotropy and large jumps in the coefficient matrix $A(x)$. More accurate approximation of the velocity can be achieved through the use of the mixed finite element method. As shown by Wisler and Wheeler in [21], the mixed finite element approximations with special quadratures on rectangular grids are equivalent to the finite volume methods and give superconvergent velocity calculations for smooth solutions. Based on that equivalence, Bramble et al. in [3] have developed efficient multigrid solution procedures for structured grids. However, in general the technique of the mixed finite element method leads to an algebraic saddle point problem that is more difficult and more expensive to solve. Although some reliable preconditioning algorithms for these saddle point problems have been proposed and studied (see, e.g. [4, 11, 17, 19]), their efficiency depends strongly on the geometry of the domain, on the coefficient matrix $A(x)$ and on the type of the finite elements used.

An alternative approach can be taken by developing hybrid methods. This approach has been studied in the pioneering work of Arnold and Brezzi [2] where the continuity of the velocity vector normal to the boundary of each element is enforced by Lagrange multipliers. In general, the Lagrange multipliers on the element boundaries turn out to be none other than the trace of the pressure $u(x)$.

Now we explain briefly the main idea of the Lagrange formulation of the mixed finite element method. Introduce the spaces

$$\mathbf{V} = H(\operatorname{div}; \Omega) = \left\{ \mathbf{q} \in (L^2(\Omega))^3, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} \in L^2(\Omega) \right\}, \quad W = L^2(\Omega);$$

then the weak formulation of the system (1.2) is: find a pair $(\mathbf{q}, u) \in \mathbf{V} \times W$ such that

$$(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}, w) + (A^{-1}\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) - (u, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{p}) = (f, w), \quad \forall w \in W, \quad \mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{V}. \quad (1.5)$$

The standard mixed finite element approximation to (1.5) reads as follows: let $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_h \times W_h \subset \mathbf{V} \times W$ be a finite element space over the partition \mathcal{T}_T of Ω into tetrahedra (or over the partition \mathcal{T}_C into cubes) (see Raviart-Thomas, Brezzi-Fortin [16, 6]). The requirement $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_h \subset \mathbf{V}$ implies that the normal component of the vector \mathbf{q} is continuous across the interelement boundaries $\partial\mathcal{T}_T$. The construction of Arnold and Brezzi [2] is based on the idea of backing off this continuity requirement and defining the space $\mathbf{V}_h = \left\{ \mathbf{q} \in (L_h^2(\Omega))^3 : \mathbf{q}|_T \in \bar{\mathbf{V}}_h, T \in \mathcal{T}_T \right\}$. In order to introduce the interelement continuity of the normal component of \mathbf{q} we introduce the space of the Lagrange multipliers

$$L_h = \left\{ \lambda \in L^2(\partial\mathcal{T}_T) : \lambda|_{\partial T} \in \bar{\mathbf{V}}_h \cdot \nu \text{ for each } T \in \mathcal{T}_T \right\},$$

where ν is the normal to ∂T vector.

Now the approximation to (1.5) using Lagrange multipliers is formulated for the unknown triple $(\mathbf{q}_h, u_h, \lambda_h) \in \mathbf{V}_h \times W_h \times L_h$. We skip the details of the weak formulation of (1.5) over $\mathbf{V}_h \times W_h \times L_h$ referring to [Brenner, Z. Chen, Arbogast & Chen, Arnold and Brezzi]. If the vectors \mathbf{Q} , \mathbf{U} and $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ correspond to the representation of \mathbf{q}_h , u_h and λ_h with respect to the bases in \mathbf{V}_h , W_h and L_h , respectively, the algebraic form of this approximation is (see Brezzi & Fortin [6])

$$\begin{pmatrix} M & B & C \\ B^T & 0 & 0 \\ C^T & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{U} \\ \mathbf{\Lambda} \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{F}, \quad (1.6)$$

where M is a symmetric and positive definite matrix. Important feature of the matrices M and B is that they are block diagonal since the unknown nodal values of \mathbf{q}_h and u_h over a given finite element T are related to the nodal values on the adjacent element only through the matrix C . Therefore, using element-by-element elimination we can reduce this system to the form

$$S \Lambda = \Phi. \quad (1.7)$$

For the description of the structure and the particular form of the Shur complement S in the case of particular finite element spaces we refer to [1, 5, 7, 8].

The important discovery of Arnold and Brezzi [2] is that the system (1.7) can be obtained also from application to (1.2) the Galerkin method with nonconforming elements. Namely in [2] it is shown that the lowest-order Raviart-Thomas mixed element approximations are equivalent to the usual P_1 -nonconforming finite element approximations when the classical P_1 -nonconforming space is augmented with P_3 -bubbles. Such a relationship has been studied recently for a large variety of mixed finite element spaces [1, 5, 7].

This equivalence between the hybrid mixed and the nonconforming finite element methods establishes a framework for preconditioning and/or solving the algebraic problem and for postprocessing the finite element solution. Schematically this framework includes the following three steps:

- (a) forming the reduced algebraic problem for the Lagrange multipliers, which is equivalent to the nonconforming problem;
- (b) construction and study of efficient methods, based on multigrid, multilevel or domain decomposition, for solving or preconditioning the reduced problem;
- (c) recovery of the solution $u(x)$ and the velocity \mathbf{q} from the Lagrange multipliers that were already found.

The recent progress in each of the steps described above (see, e.g. [20, 18, 10]) gives us an indication that the mixed finite element method can be used as an accurate and efficient tool for solving general elliptic problems of second order in domains with complicated geometry.

The goal of this paper is to construct, study and implement efficient preconditioners for the nonconforming finite element approximations of problem (1.2) on arbitrary tetrahedral meshes.

2.. Problem Formulation. We consider Ω to be a unit cube in \mathbb{R}^3 and $A(x) = a(x)I$ to be a scalar matrix. Let \mathcal{T}_T be a regular partitioning of Ω into tetrahedra T with a characteristic size $h = \text{diam}(T)$ (see [9]). Later on in Section 3 we introduce a special partitioning of Ω in order to get better algebraic properties of the matrix of the corresponding algebraic system (see Fig. 1).

We introduce the set Q_h of barycenters of all faces of the tetrahedral partition of Ω , and the set $\overset{\circ}{Q}_h$ of those barycenters that are strictly inside Ω . The Crouzeix-Raviart nonconforming finite element space V_h consists of all piecewise linear functions on \mathcal{T}_T that vanish at the barycenters of the boundary faces and are continuous at the barycenters of $\overset{\circ}{Q}_h$. Note that the space V_h is not a subspace of $H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Now we define the bilinear form on V_h by

$$a_h(u, v) = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_T} \int_T a(x) \nabla u \cdot \nabla v dx, \quad \forall u, v \in V_h. \quad (2.1)$$

Thus the nonconfirming discretization of problem (2.1) is given by seeking $u_h \in V_h$ such that

$$a_h(u_h, v) = (f, v), \quad \forall v \in V_h, \quad (2.2)$$

where (f, v) denotes the L^2 -inner product of two functions.

The natural degrees of freedom of Crouzeix-Raviart nonconforming elements are the values at the barycenters of the faces of the tetrahedral elements. Denote the vector of the unknown values corresponding to a function $v_h \in V_h$ by \mathbf{v} and assume that its dimension is N , i.e., $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Note, that all unknowns on faces on the boundary with Dirichlet data are excluded.

Let (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) be a bilinear form defined on \mathbb{R}^N by

$$(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_N = h^3 \sum_{x \in \overset{\circ}{Q}_h} u(x)v(x), \quad u, v \in V_h. \quad (2.3)$$

It is clear that $(\cdot, \cdot)_N$ is equivalent to the L^2 -inner product on V_h ; i.e. there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$c^{-1} \|v\|_0^2 \leq \|\mathbf{v}\| \leq c \|v\|_0^2, \quad v \in V_h \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$\|\mathbf{v}\| = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v})_N^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{for } v \in V_h.$$

Then the discretization operator $A : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ (we shall call A sometimes global “stiffness” matrix) is defined by

$$(A\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})_N = a_h(u, w), \quad u, v \in V_h. \quad (2.5)$$

Similarly, we introduce the vector \mathbf{F} as

$$(f, v) = (\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{v})_N \quad \forall v \in V_h.$$

Now, the problem (2.2) can be rewritten in a matrix form

$$A\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{F} \quad (2.6)$$

where A is symmetric and positive definite.

3.. Matrix Formulation and Its Properties. Our goal is to introduce an algebraic formulation of the approximate problem using a type of static condensation that eliminates some of the unknowns. In this way we can reduce substantially the size of the problem. For this approach we need a special partitioning of the domain into tetrahedra that have some regularity and preserve the simplicity of the algebraic problem.

First, we partition Ω into cubes with size of the edges $h = 1/n$ and denote them by $C = C^{(i,j,k)}$ where (x_{1i}, x_{2j}, x_{3k}) is the right back upper corner of the cube. This partitioning is denoted by \mathcal{T}_C .

Next, we divide each cube $C = C^{(i,j,k)}$ into two prisms $P_1 = P_1^{(i,j,k)}$ and $P_2 = P_2^{(i,j,k)}$ as shown in Fig. 1 and denote this partitioning of Ω by \mathcal{T}_P .

Finally, we divide each prism into three tetrahedra as shown in Fig. 1 and denote this partitioning of Ω into tetrahedra by \mathcal{T}_T .

Let $P = P^{(i,j,k)} \in \mathcal{T}_P$ be a particular prism of the partition \mathcal{T}_P . Denote by V_h^P the subspace of restrictions of the functions in V_h onto P . These restrictions define vectors \mathbf{u}_P that are restrictions of a vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. The dimension of V_h^P we denote by N^P . Obviously, for prisms with no faces on $\partial\Omega$ the dimension $N^P = 10$.




FIGURE 1 Partition of cube into prisms and tetrahedra.

Local stiffness matrices A^P on prisms $P \in \mathcal{T}_P$ are defined by


$$(A^P \mathbf{u}_P, \mathbf{v}_P)_N = \sum_{T \subset P} \int_T a(x) \nabla u_h \cdot \nabla v_h \, dx \quad (3.1)$$

for any $P \in \mathcal{T}_P$.


Then the global stiffness matrix is determined by assembling the local stiffness matrices. The following equality holds true for any $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^N$:

$$(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_N = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{T}_P} (A^P \mathbf{u}_P, \mathbf{u}_P)_N. \quad (3.2)$$

Now we consider a prism P of an arbitrary cube that has no face on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ and enumerate the faces s_j , $j = 1, \dots, 10$ of the tetrahedra in this prism as shown in Fig. 2.

(a) P_1

$$\begin{array}{lllll}
 s_1 = (1, 4, 3) & s_3 = (1, 2, 5) & s_5 = (1, 2, 3) & s_7 = (2, 5, 3) & s_9 = (1, 5, 3) \\
 s_2 = (1, 4, 5) & s_4 = (3, 4, 6) & s_6 = (4, 5, 6) & s_8 = (3, 5, 6) & s_{10} = (3, 4, 5)
 \end{array}$$

(b) P_2

$$\begin{array}{lllll}
 s_1 = (2, 3, 5) & s_3 = (1, 2, 4) & s_5 = (1, 2, 3) & s_7 = (1, 3, 4) & s_9 = (2, 3, 4) \\
 s_2 = (2, 4, 5) & s_4 = (3, 5, 6) & s_6 = (4, 5, 6) & s_8 = (3, 4, 6) & s_{10} = (3, 4, 5)
 \end{array}$$

FIGURE 2. Local enumeration of faces in a prism.

Then the local stiffness matrix of this prism for the case $a(x) \equiv 1$ has the following form:

$$A^P = \frac{3h}{2} \left[\begin{array}{cccccc|cccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 4 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 4 \end{array} \right] \equiv \frac{3h}{2} \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$A_{22} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 4 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 & 4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Along with matrix A^P we introduce the following matrix B^P defined on the same space V_h^P :

$$B^P = \frac{3h}{2} \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_{22} = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 3 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.4)$$

It is easy to see that the following holds true.

PROPOSITION 1. $\ker A^P = \ker B^P$.

Remark. If the prism $P \in \mathcal{T}_P$ has a face on $\partial\Omega$, the dimension of the matrix A^P will be less than 10 and the modification of B_{22} is obvious.

Then we define the $N \times N$ matrix B by the following equality:

$$(B\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_N = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{T}_P} (B^P \mathbf{u}_P, \mathbf{v}_P)_N \quad \forall \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (3.5)$$

Since matrix B will be used for preconditioning the original problem (2.6) it is important to estimate the condition number of $B^{-1}A$.

Using the fact that all element stiffness matrices are nonnegative and following [15], we easily get the estimates:

$$\max_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(A\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})}{(B\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})} \leq \max_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{T}_P \\ (B^P \mathbf{u}_P, \mathbf{u}_P) \neq 0}} \frac{(A^P \mathbf{u}_P, \mathbf{u}_P)}{(B^P \mathbf{u}_P, \mathbf{u}_P)}, \quad (3.6)$$

$$\min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \frac{(A\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})}{(B\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})} \geq \min_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{T}_P \\ (B^P \mathbf{u}_P, \mathbf{u}_P) \neq 0}} \frac{(A^P \mathbf{u}_P, \mathbf{u}_P)}{(B^P \mathbf{u}_P, \mathbf{u}_P)}. \quad (3.7)$$

In this way the estimates of the maximal eigenvalue λ_{\max} and the minimal eigenvalue λ_{\min} of the eigenvalue problem

$$A\mathbf{u} = \lambda B\mathbf{u} \quad (3.8)$$

are estimated from above and below by local analysis, solving the local problems

$$A^P \mathbf{u}_P = \mu B^P \mathbf{u}_P, \quad (B^P \mathbf{u}_P, \mathbf{u}_P) \neq 0, \quad P \in \mathcal{T}_P. \quad (3.9)$$

Using superelement analysis it is easy to show that to get the minimal μ_{\min} and the maximal μ_{\max} eigenvalues of (3.9) one has to consider the worst case when the prism $P \in \mathcal{T}_P$ has no face on the boundary $\partial\Omega$, i.e., $P \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset$.

Then a direct calculation verifies the following result.

PROPOSITION 2. Eigenvalues of problem (3.9) lie in the interval $[2 - \sqrt{3}, 2 + \sqrt{3}]$.

Then the inequalities (3.6) and (3.7) yield:

PROPOSITION 3. Eigenvalues of problem (3.8) lie in the interval $[2 - \sqrt{3}, 2 + \sqrt{3}]$ and therefore

$$\text{cond}(B^{-1}A) \leq (2 + \sqrt{3})^2.$$

We stress that the condition number of the matrix $B^{-1}A$ is bounded by a constant independent of the step size of the mesh h .

Now we divide all unknowns in the system into two groups:

1. The first group consists of all unknowns corresponding to faces of the prisms in the partition \mathcal{T}_P , excluding, of course, the faces on $\partial\Omega$ (see Fig. 2).
2. The second group consists of the unknowns corresponding to the faces of the tetrahedra that are internal for each prism (these are faces s_9 and s_{10} on Fig. 2).

This splitting of the space \mathbb{R}^N induces the following presentation of the vectors $\mathbf{v}^T = (\mathbf{v}_1^T, \mathbf{v}_2^T)$, where $\mathbf{v}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1}$ and $\mathbf{v}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{N_2}$. Obviously, $N_1 = N - 4n^3$. Then matrix B can be presented in the following block form:

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \dim B_{11} = N_1. \quad (3.10)$$

Denote now by $\hat{B}_{11} = B_{11} - B_{12}B_{22}^{-1}B_{21}$ the Schur complement of B obtained by elimination of the vector \mathbf{v}_2 . Then $B_{11} = \hat{B}_{11} + B_{12}B_{22}^{-1}B_{21}$, so the matrix B has the form

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{B}_{11} + B_{12}B_{22}^{-1}B_{21} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.11)$$

Note that for each prism $P \in \mathcal{T}_P$ the unknowns on the faces s_9 and s_{10} (see Fig. 2) are connected through the equation $B\mathbf{v} = F$, only with the unknowns associated with this prism and therefore can be eliminated locally; i.e., the matrix B_{22} is block diagonal with 2×2 blocks and can be inverted locally (prism by prism). Thus matrix \hat{B}_{11} is easily computable.

4.. Multilevel Substructuring Preconditioner. In this section we will propose two modifications of matrix B (3.11) in the form

$$\tilde{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{B}_1 + B_{12}B_{22}^{-1}B_{21} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}$$

and consider their properties and computational schemes.

4.1.. Group Partitioning of the Grid Points. For the sake of simplicity of representation of matrices and computational schemes we introduce the following partitioning of all nodes of $\overset{\circ}{Q}_h$ into three groups.

Let us denote by $s_{r,l,m}^{(i,j,k)}$ the face of the cube $C^{(i,j,k)}$ with vertices r, l, m (see Fig. 3) and partition the nodes of $\overset{\circ}{Q}_h$ in the following manner:




FIGURE 3. Cube $c^{(i,j,k)}$.

1. First, we group the nodes on the faces

$$s_{2,4,5}^{(i,j,k)} \quad \text{and} \quad s_{4,5,7}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad i, j, k = \overline{1, n}.$$

We denote the unknowns at these nodes by $V I_\ell^{(i,j,k)}$, $\ell = 1, 2$, $i, j, k = \overline{1, n}$.

2. Then, we take the nodes on the faces perpendicular to the x , y , and z axes:

$$(i) \quad s_{1,2,4}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad s_{1,3,4}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad i = \overline{2, n}, \quad j, k = \overline{1, n}.$$

We denote the unknowns at these nodes by $V x_\ell^{(i,j,k)}$, $\ell = 1, 2$, $i = \overline{2, n}$, $j, k = \overline{1, n}$;

$$(ii) \quad s_{1,3,5}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad s_{5,3,7}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad j = \overline{2, n}, \quad i, k = \overline{1, n}. \quad (4.1)$$

We denote the unknowns at these nodes by $V y_\ell^{(i,j,k)}$, $\ell = 1, 2$, $j = \overline{2, n}$, $i, k = \overline{1, n}$;

$$(iii) \quad s_{1,2,5}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad s_{2,5,6}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad i, j = \overline{1, n}, \quad k = \overline{2, n}.$$

We denote the unknowns at these nodes by $V z_\ell^{(i,j,k)}$, $\ell = 1, 2$, $i, j = \overline{1, n}$, $k = \overline{2, n}$.

3. At last, we take the remaining nodes on faces

$$s_{1,4,5}^{(1,j,k)}, \quad s_{3,4,5}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad s_{4,5,6}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad s_{4,5,8}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad i, j, k = \overline{1, n}.$$

We denote the unknowns at these nodes by $VA_\ell^{(i,j,k)}$, $\ell = \overline{1, n}$, $i, j, k = \overline{1, n}$.

4.2.. Three Level Preconditioner: Variant I. Let us take an arbitrary cube $C^{(i,j,k)}$ that is partitioned into left and right prisms (see Fig. 1) $P_p^{(i,j,k)}$, $p = 1, 2$. Below we skip indices ' i, j, k ' and ' p ' for simplicity of notation in all cases where there is no ambiguity.

In the local numeration (Fig. 2) matrices B_1 and B_2 correspond to prisms having the form (3.3)-(3.4). We rewrite these matrices in the ordering (4.1) introduced above in this section:

$$B_1 = \left(\frac{3h}{2} \right) \left[\begin{array}{cc|cccccc|cc} 3 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ \hline -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ \hline -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 3 \end{array} \right], \quad (4.2)$$

$$B_2 = \left(\frac{3h}{2} \right) \left[\begin{array}{cc|cccccc|cc} 3 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ -1 & 3 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ \hline -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 3 \end{array} \right].$$

The partitioning of nodes into groups (4.1) induces block forms of matrices B_p , $p = 1, 2$:

$$B_p = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11,p} & B_{12,p} \\ B_{21,p} & B_{22,p} \end{bmatrix}, \quad p = 1, 2, \quad (4.3)$$

where blocks $B_{22,p}$ correspond to the unknowns of the 3-d group and blocks $B_{11,p}$ correspond to the unknowns of the first and second groups.

We eliminate the unknowns of the 3-d group from each matrix B_p , $p = 1, 2$ which is done locally on each prism. Then we get the matrices

$$\hat{B}_{11,p} = B_{11,p} - B_{12,p} B_{22,p}^{-1} B_{21,p}, \quad p = 1, 2,$$

where $p = 1$ corresponds to a right prism and $p = 2$ to a left prism

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{B}_{11,1} &= \left(\frac{3h}{2}\right) \begin{bmatrix} 8/3 & -1 & -1 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 \\ -1 & 8/3 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1/3 \\ \hline -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/3 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1/3 \\ -1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/3 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2/3 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \hat{B}_{11,2} &= \left(\frac{3h}{2}\right) \begin{bmatrix} 8/3 & -1 & -1/3 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 \\ -1 & 8/3 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 & -1/3 \\ \hline -1/3 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 & -1/3 \\ -1/3 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 & 2/3 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Together with $\hat{B}_{11,p}$, $p = 1, 2$, we define on each cube matrices $B_{1,p}$, $p = 1, 2$, in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{1,1} &= \left(\frac{3h}{2}\right) \begin{bmatrix} 8/3 & -1 & -1 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 \\ -1 & 8/3 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1/3 \\ \hline -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/3 & 0 & 1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/3 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/3 \end{bmatrix}, \\ B_{1,2} &= \left(\frac{3h}{2}\right) \begin{bmatrix} 8/3 & -1 & -1/3 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 \\ -1 & 8/3 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1/3 & 0 & -1/3 \\ \hline -1/3 & 0 & 1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/3 & 0 & 0 \\ -1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/3 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/3 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Both matrices $\hat{B}_{11,p}$ and $B_{1,p}$, $p = 1, 2$, are irreducible and have the same kernel, i.e., $\ker \hat{B}_{11,p} = \ker B_{1,p}$. It is easy to show that eigenvalues of the spectral problems (for both left and right prisms)

$$\hat{B}_{11,p} \mathbf{u} = \mu B_{1,p} \mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^8, \quad (B_{1,p} \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}) \neq 0, \quad p = 1, 2, \quad (4.6)$$

belong to the interval $\mu \in [1, 3]$.

Now we define a new matrix on each prism:

$$\tilde{B}_p = \begin{bmatrix} B_{1,p} + B_{12,p} B_{22,p}^{-1} B_{21,p} & B_{12,p} \\ B_{21,p} & B_{22,p} \end{bmatrix}, \quad p = 1, 2. \quad (4.7)$$

In the case when cube C has nonempty intersection with $\partial\Omega$ all considerations are the same; matrices $B_{1,p}$, $B_{12,p}$, $B_{21,p}$, $p = 1, 2$ will not have rows and columns corresponding to the nodes on the boundary.

Define eigenvalue problems for each prism P :

$$B_P \mathbf{u} = \xi \tilde{B}_P \mathbf{u}, \quad (\tilde{B}_P \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}) \neq 0, \quad P \in \mathcal{T}_P. \quad (4.8)$$

Remark. For inner prisms, that is for prisms which have no face on $\partial\Omega$, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{10}$. Because the eigenvalues of the problems (4.6) belong to the interval $[1, 3]$, the same is true for the problems (4.8); thus we can formulate the following:

PROPOSITION 4. Eigenvalues of the problems (4.8) belong to the interval $[1, 3]$. Moreover, the eigenvalue problems on each prism

$$A_P \mathbf{u} = \nu \tilde{B}_P \mathbf{u}, \quad (\tilde{B}_P \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}) \neq 0, \quad P \in \mathcal{T}_P, \quad (4.9)$$

has eigenvalues ν that belong to the interval

$$\nu \in [2 - \sqrt{3}, 3(2 + \sqrt{3})].$$

Now we define the symmetric positive-definite $N_1 \times N_1$ matrix \tilde{B}_1 by

$$(\tilde{B}_1 \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{T}_P} (\tilde{B}_P \mathbf{u}_{1,P}, \mathbf{v}_{1,P}), \quad (4.10)$$

where the vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{u}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1}$, and $\mathbf{u}_{1,P}, \mathbf{v}_{1,P}$ are the restrictions of the vectors $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}_1$ on the prism P .

Along with matrix B in the form of (3.11), we introduce the matrix

$$\tilde{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{B}_1 + B_{12} B_{22}^{-1} B_{21} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.11)$$

Again, using superelement analysis and Proposition 4, it is easy to prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 1. Matrix \tilde{B} , defined in (4.11), is spectrally equivalent to matrix A ; i.e.,

$$\alpha \tilde{B} \leq A \leq \beta \tilde{B},$$

with $\alpha = (2 - \sqrt{3})$ and $\beta = 3(2 + \sqrt{3})$. Therefore,

$$\text{cond}(\tilde{B}^{-1}A) \leq 3(2 + \sqrt{3})^2. \quad (4.12)$$

Instead of matrix B in the form of (3.11) we will take the matrix \tilde{B} in the form of (4.11) as the two-level preconditioner for matrix A . As we noted earlier, matrix B_{22} is block-diagonal and can be inverted locally on prisms.

Now consider the linear system

$$\tilde{B}_1 \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f}. \quad (4.13)$$

In terms of the partitioning (4.1) of nodes, the matrix \tilde{B}_1 has the block form

$$\tilde{B}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} \\ C_{21} & C_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.14)$$

where the block C_{22} corresponds to the nodes from group (2), which are on the faces of tetrahedra perpendicular to the coordinate axis. It can be shown that matrix C_{22} is diagonal. In partitioning (4.1), we present \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{f} of (4.13) in the form

$$\mathbf{u} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{u}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{f} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}_1 \\ \mathbf{f}_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.15)$$

Then, after elimination of the second group of unknowns,

$$\mathbf{u}_2 = C_{22}^{-1}(\mathbf{f}_2 - C_{21}\mathbf{u}_1)$$

we get the system of linear equations

$$(C_{11} - C_{12}C_{22}^{-1}C_{21})\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{f}_1 - C_{12}C_{22}^{-1}\mathbf{f}_2 = \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_1, \quad (4.16)$$

where the vector \mathbf{u}_1 and the block C_{11} correspond to the unknowns from the first group, which have only two unknowns per each cube. The dimension of vectors \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{f}_1 is equal to

$$\dim(\mathbf{u}_1) = 2n^3. \quad (4.17)$$

Because we have introduced a two-level subdivision of matrix \tilde{B}_1 , original matrix \tilde{B} can be considered as a three-level preconditioner.

4.3.. Computational Scheme: Variant I. Let us write explicitly the equations from (4.13) in terms of the unknowns introduced in (4.1), i.e., in the terms of

$$\begin{aligned} fI_\ell^{(i,j,k)}, \quad UI_\ell^{(i,j,k)}, \quad \ell = 1, 2, \quad i, j, k = \overline{1, n}; \\ fx_\ell^{(i,j,k)}, \quad Ux_\ell^{(i,j,k)}, \quad \ell = 1, 2, \quad i = \overline{2, n}, \quad j, k = \overline{1, n}; \\ fy_\ell^{(i,j,k)}, \quad Uy_\ell^{(i,j,k)}, \quad \ell = 1, 2, \quad j = \overline{2, n}, \quad i, k = \overline{1, n}; \\ fz_\ell^{(i,j,k)}, \quad Uz_\ell^{(i,j,k)}, \quad \ell = 1, 2, \quad k = \overline{2, n}, \quad i, j = \overline{1, n}. \end{aligned}$$

To simplify the representation of these equations we write (4.13) for the case of $a(x) \equiv 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} 16/3 & -2 \\ -2 & 16/3 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} - \\ & -(1 - \delta_{in}) \begin{bmatrix} 1/3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{Ux}^{(i,j,k)} - (1 - \delta_{i1}) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/3 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{Ux}^{(i-1,j,k)} \\ & -(1 - \delta_{jn}) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/3 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{Uy}^{(i,j,k)} - (1 - \delta_{j1}) \begin{bmatrix} 1/3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{Uy}^{(i,j-1,k)} \\ & -(1 - \delta_{kn}) \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{Uz}^{(i,j,k)} - (1 - \delta_{k1}) \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{Uz}^{(i,j,k-1)} = \left(\frac{2}{3h} \right) \mathbf{fI}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad i, j, k = \overline{1, n}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{4}{3}\mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}^{(i,j,k)} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/3 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i-1,j,k)} - \begin{bmatrix} 1/3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} &= \left(\frac{2}{3h}\right) \mathbf{f}\mathbf{x}^{(i,j,k)}, \\
& i = \overline{2,n}, \quad j, k = \overline{1,n}, \\
\frac{4}{3}\mathbf{U}\mathbf{y}^{(i,j,k)} - \begin{bmatrix} 1/3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j-1,k)} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/3 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} &= \left(\frac{2}{3h}\right) \mathbf{f}\mathbf{y}^{(i,j,k)}, \\
& j = \overline{2,n}, \quad i, k = \overline{1,n}, \\
\frac{2}{3}\mathbf{U}\mathbf{z}^{(i,j,k)} - \frac{1}{3}\mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k-1)} - \frac{1}{3}\mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} &= \left(\frac{2}{3h}\right) \mathbf{f}\mathbf{z}^{(i,j,k)}, \\
& k = \overline{2,n}, \quad i, j = \overline{1,n},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

where the function $\delta_{ik} = \begin{cases} 1, & i = k \\ 0, & i \neq k \end{cases}$ is introduced to take into account the Dirichlet

boundary conditions, and any vector $\mathbf{vr}^{(i,j,k)} = \begin{bmatrix} vr_1^{(i,j,k)} \\ vr_2^{(i,j,k)} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

After eliminating the unknowns $Ux_\ell^{(i,j,k)}$, $Uy_\ell^{(i,j,k)}$, $Uz_\ell^{(i,j,k)}$ from equations (4.18), we will have a block “seven-point” computational scheme with the 2×2 -blocks for the unknowns $UI_\ell^{(i,j,k)}$.

From (4.19) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}^{(i,j,k)} &= \frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{2}{3h}\right) \mathbf{f}\mathbf{x}^{(i,j,k)} + \frac{3}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/3 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i-1,j,k)} + \frac{3}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 1/3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)}, \\
& i = \overline{2,n}, \quad j, k = \overline{1,n}, \\
\mathbf{U}\mathbf{y}^{(i,j,k)} &= \frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{2}{3h}\right) \mathbf{f}\mathbf{y}^{(i,j,k)} + \frac{3}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 1/3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j-1,k)} + \frac{3}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/3 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)}, \\
& i, k = \overline{1,n}, \quad j = \overline{2,n}, \\
\mathbf{U}\mathbf{z}^{(i,j,k)} &= \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{2}{3h}\right) \mathbf{f}\mathbf{z}^{(i,j,k)} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k-1)} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)}, \\
& i, j = \overline{1,n}, \quad k = \overline{2,n}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Substituting these expressions for $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}^{(i,j,k)}$, $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{y}^{(i,j,k)}$, and $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{z}^{(i,j,k)}$ into (4.18) we get the equations

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{bmatrix} 16/3 & -2 \\ -2 & 16/3 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} \\
& - (1 - \delta_{i1}) \left(\frac{1}{4} \mathbf{UI}^{(i-1,j,k)} + \begin{bmatrix} 3/4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/12 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} \right) \\
& - (1 - \delta_{in}) \left(\frac{1}{4} \mathbf{UI}^{(1+1,j,k)} + \begin{bmatrix} 1/12 & 0 \\ 0 & 3/4 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -(1 - \delta_{j1}) \left(\frac{1}{4} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j-1,k)} + \begin{bmatrix} 1/12 & 0 \\ 0 & 3/4 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} \right) \\
& -(1 - \delta_{jn}) \left(\frac{1}{4} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j+1,k)} + \begin{bmatrix} 3/4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/12 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} \right) \\
& -(1 - \delta_{k1}) \frac{1}{6} \left(\mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k-1)} + \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} \right) - (1 - \delta_{kn}) \frac{1}{6} \left(\mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k+1)} + \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} \right) \\
& = \mathbf{F}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad ij, k = \overline{1, n}, \tag{4.21}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{F}^{(i,j,k)} = & \left(\frac{2}{3h} \right) \left\{ \mathbf{fI}^{(i,j,k)} + \right. \\
& +(1 - \delta_{i1}) \frac{3}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 1/3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{fX}^{(i-1,j,k)} + (1 - \delta_{in}) \frac{3}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/3 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{fX}^{(i+1,j,k)} + \\
& +(1 - \delta_{j1}) \frac{3}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/3 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{fY}^{(i,j-1,k)} + (1 + \delta_{jn}) \frac{3}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 1/3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{fY}^{(i,j+1,k)} + \\
& \left. +(1 - \delta_{k1}) \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{fZ}^{(1,j,k-1)} + (1 - \delta_{kn}) \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{fZ}^{(i,j,k+1)} \right\}, \quad i, j, k = \overline{1, n}. \tag{4.22}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for solving the linear system with matrix \tilde{B}_1 (4.13), we first solve problem (4.21) for \mathbf{u}_1 with $(2n \times 2n)$ -seven-block-diagonal matrix and after that compute the vector \mathbf{u}_2 from (4.20).

Unfortunately, the matrix of linear system (4.21) has a rather complicated form which makes the solution rather difficult. Below we show that if on each prism instead of matrices (4.5) we introduce another matrix $B_1^{(i,j,k)}$, then we will have as a result a simlier matrix (4.21). In that case for solving the sytem for unknowns \mathbf{u}_1 , we can use the method of separation of variables or another fast method.

4.4.. Three-Level Preconditioner: Variant II. Instead of matrices (4.5) we introduce other matrices $B_{1,p} = \hat{B}_1$, $p = 1, 2$:

$$\hat{B}_1 = \left(\frac{3h}{2} \right) \begin{bmatrix} 8/3 & -1 & -2/3 & 0 & -2/3 & 0 & -1/6 & -1/6 \\ -1 & 8/3 & 0 & -2/3 & 0 & -2/3 & -1/6 & -1/6 \\ \hline -2/3 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2/3 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -2/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2/3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 & 0 \\ -1/6 & -1/6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/3 & 0 \\ -1/6 & -1/6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/3 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.23}$$

This matrix is irreducible and has the same kernel as matrices $B_{11,p}$, $p = 1, 2$; that is

$$\ker B_{11,p} = \ker \hat{B}_1, \quad p = 1, 2.$$

Then we have the following

PROPOSITION 5. For any $P \in \mathcal{T}_P$ the eigenvalues of the spectral problems

$$B_{11,P} \mathbf{u} = \mu \hat{B}_1 \mathbf{u}, \quad (\hat{B}_1, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}) \neq 0,$$

belong to the interval

$$\mu \in \left[\frac{5}{11}(3 - \sqrt{3}), \frac{3}{5}(3 + \sqrt{3}) \right]. \quad (4.24)$$

Again, we define the matrices \hat{B}_P (similar to (4.7))

$$\hat{B}_P = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{B}_1 + B_{12,P} B_{22,P}^{-1} B_{21,P} & B_{12,P} \\ B_{21,P} & B_{22,P} \end{bmatrix}, \quad P \in \mathcal{T}_P \quad (4.25)$$

and consider the eigenvalue problems (4.8). For those problems we can formulate the following statement.

PROPOSITION 6. Eigenvalues of the problems (4.8) with the new block \hat{B}_1 belong to the interval defined in (4.24). For the same reason, eigenvalues of the spectral problems (4.9) for each prism belong to the interval

$$\nu \in \left[\frac{5}{11}(3 - \sqrt{3})(2 - \sqrt{3}), \frac{3}{5}(3 + \sqrt{3})(2 + \sqrt{3}) \right].$$

Now we define another symmetric positive-definite $N_1 \times N_1$ -matrix \hat{B}_1 , using equality (4.10) with \hat{B}_P instead of \hat{B}_P . Then the new preconditioner \hat{B} is defined by

$$\hat{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{B}_1 + B_{12} B_{22}^{-1} B_{21} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.26)$$

In the same way as in Section 4.2, using superelement analysis and Proposition 6, we prove the following:

THEOREM 2. Matrix \hat{B} defined in (4.26) with the new blocks \hat{B}_1 in the form of (4.23) is spectrally equivalent to matrix A ; i.e.,

$$\alpha \hat{B} \leq A \leq \beta \hat{B}$$

with $\alpha = \frac{5}{11}(3 - \sqrt{3})(2 - \sqrt{3})$ and $\beta = \frac{3}{5}(3 + \sqrt{3})(2 + \sqrt{3})$. Therefore,

$$\text{cond}(\hat{B}^{-1}A) \leq \nu, \quad (4.27)$$

where $\nu = 5(2 + \sqrt{3})^2$.

Let us now consider the linear system with matrix \hat{B}_1 :

$$\hat{B}_1 \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f}. \quad (4.28)$$

Similar to matrix \hat{B}_1 , matrix \hat{B}_1 can be represented in the block form

$$\hat{B}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} C_{11} & \hat{C}_{12} \\ \hat{C}_{21} & \hat{C}_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.29)$$

where block C_{11} coincides with the same block of matrix \hat{B}_1 (4.14), and matrix \hat{C}_{22} is diagonal.

4.5.. Computational Scheme: Variant II. Again, we write equations (4.28) explicitly in terms of the unknowns introduced in (4.1) for the case $a(x) \equiv 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{bmatrix} 16/3 & -2 \\ -2 & 16/3 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} - (1 - \delta_{i1}) \frac{2}{3} \mathbf{UX}^{(i-1,j,k)} - (1 - \delta_{in}) \frac{2}{3} \mathbf{UX}^{(i,j,k)} \\
& - (1 - \delta_{j1}) \frac{2}{3} \mathbf{UY}^{(i,j-1,k)} - (1 - \delta_{jn}) \frac{2}{3} \mathbf{UY}^{(i,j,k)} \\
& - (1 - \delta_{k1}) \frac{1}{6} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UZ}^{(i,j,k-1)} - (1 - \delta_{kn}) \frac{1}{6} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UZ}^{(i,j,k)} \\
& = \left(\frac{2}{3h} \right) \mathbf{fI}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad i, j, k = \overline{1, n},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{4}{3} \mathbf{UX}^{(i,j,k)} - \frac{2}{3} \mathbf{UI}^{(i-1,j,k)} - \frac{2}{3} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} &= \left(\frac{2}{3h} \right) \mathbf{fx}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad i = \overline{2, n}, \quad j, k = \overline{1, n}, \\
\frac{4}{3} \mathbf{UY}^{(i,j,k)} - \frac{2}{3} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j-1,k)} - \frac{2}{3} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} &= \left(\frac{2}{3h} \right) \mathbf{fy}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad j = \overline{2, n}, \quad i, k = \overline{1, n}, \\
\frac{2}{3} \mathbf{UZ}^{(i,j,k)} - \frac{1}{6} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k-1)} - \frac{1}{6} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} &= \frac{2}{3h} \mathbf{fz}^{(i,j,k)}, \\
& k = \overline{2, n}, \quad i, j = \overline{1, n}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

Here the function $\delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & i = j \\ 0, & i \neq j \end{cases}$ is introduced to take into account the Dirichlet boundary conditions. Eliminating unknowns $Ux_\ell^{(i,j,k)}$, $Uy_\ell^{(i,j,k)}$, $Uz_\ell^{(i,j,k)}$, $\ell = 1, 2$, from equations (4.30), we will get the block “seven-point” scheme with 2×2 -blocks for the unknowns $UI_\ell^{(i,j,k)}$, $\ell = 1, 2$, $i, j, k = \overline{1, n}$. From (4.31) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{UX}^{(i,j,k)} &= \frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{2}{3h} \right) \mathbf{fx}^{(i,j,k)} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{UI}^{(i-1,j,k)} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad i = \overline{2, n}, \quad j, k = \overline{1, n}, \\
\mathbf{UY}^{(i,j,k)} &= \frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{2}{3h} \right) \mathbf{fy}^{(i,j,k)} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j-1,k)} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad j = \overline{2, n}, \quad i, k = \overline{1, n}, \\
\mathbf{UZ}^{(i,j,k)} &= \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{2}{3h} \right) \mathbf{fz}^{(i,j,k)} + \frac{1}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k-1)} + \frac{1}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)}, \\
& k = \overline{2, n}, \quad i, j = \overline{1, n}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

Substituting (4.32) into (4.30) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{bmatrix} 16/3 & -2 \\ -2 & 16/3 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} - \\
& -(1 - \delta_{i1}) \frac{1}{3} \left(\mathbf{UI}^{(i-1,j,k)} + \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} \right) - (1 - \delta_{in}) \frac{1}{3} \left(\mathbf{UI}^{(i+1,j,k)} + \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} \right) \\
& -(1 - \delta_{j1}) \frac{1}{3} \left(\mathbf{UI}^{(i,j-1,k)} + \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} \right) - (1 - \delta_{jn}) \frac{1}{3} \left(\mathbf{UI}^{(i,j+1,k)} + \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} \right) \\
& -(1 - \delta_{k1}) \frac{1}{12} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \left(\mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k-1)} + \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} \right) \\
& -(1 - \delta_{kn}) \frac{1}{12} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \left(\mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k+1)} + \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} \right) = \mathbf{F}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad i, j, k = \overline{1, n},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{F}^{(i,j,k)} = & \left(\frac{2}{3h} \right) \left\{ \mathbf{fI}^{(i,j,k)} + (1 - \delta_{i1}) \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{fx}^{(i-1,j,k)} + (1 - \delta_{in}) \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{fx}^{(i,j,k)} \right. \\
& + (1 - \delta_{j1}) \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{fy}^{(i,j-1,k)} + (1 - \delta_{jn}) \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{fy}^{(i,j,k)} \\
& \left. + (1 - \delta_{k1}) \frac{1}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{fz}^{(i,j,k-1)} + (1 - \delta_{kn}) \frac{1}{4} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{fz}^{(i,j,k)} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

For solving system (4.33) we introduce the rotation matrix $Q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and new vectors $\mathbf{V}^{(i,j,k)} = (V_1^{(i,j,k)} \ V_2^{(i,j,k)})^T$, $i, j, k = \overline{1, n}$ such that

$$\mathbf{V}^{(i,j,k)} = Q \cdot \mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad i, j, k = \overline{1, n}. \tag{4.35}$$

Then replacing $\mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)}$ in (4.33) by

$$\mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)} = Q^T \cdot \mathbf{V}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad i, j, k = \overline{1, n}, \tag{4.36}$$

and multiplying both sides of each matrix equation (4.33) by matrix Q we get the following problem for the unknowns $\mathbf{V}^{(i,j,k)}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{bmatrix} 10/3 & 0 \\ 0 & 22/3 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^{(i,j,k)} - \\
& -(1 - \delta_{i1}) \frac{1}{3} \left(\mathbf{V}^{(i-1,j,k)} + \mathbf{V}^{(i,j,k)} \right) - (1 - \delta_{in}) \frac{1}{3} \left(\mathbf{V}^{(i+1,j,k)} + \mathbf{V}^{(i,j,k)} \right) \\
& -(1 - \delta_{j1}) \frac{1}{3} \left(\mathbf{V}^{(i,j-1,k)} + \mathbf{V}^{(i,j,k)} \right) - (1 - \delta_{jn}) \frac{1}{3} \left(\mathbf{V}^{(i,j+1,k)} + \mathbf{V}^{(i,j,k)} \right) \\
& -(1 - \delta_{k1}) \frac{1}{6} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \left(\mathbf{V}^{(i,j,k-1)} + \mathbf{V}^{(i,j,k)} \right) \\
& -(1 - \delta_{kn}) \frac{1}{6} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \left(\mathbf{V}^{(i,j,k+1)} + \mathbf{V}^{(i,j,k)} \right) = Q \cdot \mathbf{F}^{(i,j,k)} = \tilde{\mathbf{F}}^{(i,j,k)}, \quad i, j, k = \overline{1, n}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.37}$$

It is easy to see that problem (4.37) is decomposed into the following two independent problems:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{10}{3}V_1^{(i,j,k)} - (1 - \delta_{i1})\frac{1}{3}\left(V_1^{(i-1,j,k)} + V_1^{(i,j,k)}\right) - (1 - \delta_{in})\frac{1}{3}\left(V_1^{(i+1,j,k)} + V_1^{(i,j,k)}\right) \\
& - (1 - \delta_{j1})\frac{1}{3}\left(V_1^{(i,j-1,k)} + V_1^{(i,j,k)}\right) - (1 - \delta_{jn})\frac{1}{3}\left(V_1^{(i,j+1,k)} + V_1^{(i,j,k)}\right) \\
& - (1 - \delta_{k1})\frac{1}{6}\left(V_1^{(i,j,k-1)} + V_1^{(i,j,k)}\right) - (1 - \delta_{kn})\frac{1}{6}\left(V_1^{(i,j,k+1)} + V_1^{(i,j,k)}\right) \\
& = \tilde{F}_1^{(i,j,k)}, \quad i, j, k = 1, n
\end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{22}{3}V_2^{(i,j,k)} - (1 - \delta_{i1})\frac{1}{3}\left(V_2^{(i-1,j,k)} + V_2^{(i,j,k)}\right) - (1 - \delta_{in})\frac{1}{3}\left(V_2^{(i+1,j,k)} + V_2^{(i,j,k)}\right) \\
& - (1 - \delta_{j1})\frac{1}{3}\left(V_2^{(i,j-1,k)} + V_2^{(i,j,k)}\right) - (1 - \delta_{jn})\frac{1}{3}\left(V_2^{(i,j+1,k)} + V_2^{(i,j,k)}\right) \\
& = \tilde{F}_2^{(i,j,k)}, \quad i, j = \overline{1, n}, \quad \forall k = \overline{1, n}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

That is, we reduced the linear system (4.33) of dimension $(2n^3)$ to one linear system of equations (4.38) of dimension n^3 and n linear systems of equations (4.39) of dimension n^2 . For all these problems the method of separation of variables can be used.

After we find the solution of these problems we easily retrieve vectors $\mathbf{UI}^{(i,j,k)}$ by using the relations (4.36).

4.6.. The Method of Separation of Variables. Let us consider the method of separation of variables for problems (4.38) and (4.39).

Problem (4.38) can be represented in the form

$$C^{(3)}\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{f}, \quad \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n^3)} \tag{4.40}$$

with the matrix

$$C^{(3)} = \frac{1}{2}C_0 \otimes I_0 \otimes I_0 + I_0 \otimes C_0 \otimes I_0 + I_0 \otimes I_0 \otimes C_0,$$

where I_0 is an $(n \times n)$ -identity matrix and $(n \times n)$ -matrix C_0 has the form

$$C_0 = \frac{1}{3} \begin{bmatrix} 3 & -1 & & & & \\ -1 & 2 & -1 & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & -1 & 2 & -1 & \\ & & & -1 & 3 & \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.41}$$

If we represent matrix C_0 in the form

$$C_0 = Q_0 \Lambda_0 Q_0^T,$$

where Λ_0 is an $(n \times n)$ -diagonal matrix and Q_0 is an $(n \times n)$ -orthogonal matrix ($Q_0^{-1} = Q_0^T$), then matrix $C^{(3)}$ can be rewritten in the form

$$C^{(3)} = Q^{(3)} \Lambda^{(3)} Q^{(3)},$$

where

$$Q^{(3)} = Q_0 \otimes Q_0 \otimes Q_0,$$

$$\Lambda^{(3)} = \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_0 \otimes I_0 \otimes I_0 + I_0 \otimes \Lambda_0 \otimes I_0 + I_0 \otimes I_0 \otimes \Lambda_0.$$

Remark. $Q^{(3)}$ is an $(n^3 \times n^3)$ -orthogonal matrix and $\Lambda^{(3)}$ is an $(n^3 \times n^3)$ -diagonal matrix.

Then we can use the following method of solving system (4.40):

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & \tilde{\mathbf{f}} = [Q^{(3)}]^T \mathbf{f}, \\ (2) \quad & \Lambda^{(3)} \mathbf{W} = \tilde{\mathbf{f}}, \\ (3) \quad & \mathbf{V} = Q^{(3)} \mathbf{W}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.42}$$

Similarly, problem (4.39) can be rewritten in the form

$$C^{(2)} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{b}, \quad \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n^2)} \tag{4.43}$$

with the matrix

$$C^{(2)} = K_0 \otimes I_0 + I_0 \otimes K_0,$$

where $(n \times n)$ -matrix K_0 has the form

$$K_0 = \frac{1}{3} \begin{bmatrix} 10 & -1 & & & & \\ -1 & 9 & -1 & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & -1 & 9 & -1 \\ & & & & -1 & 10 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.44}$$

Representing matrix K_0 in the form

$$K_0 = R_0 D_0 R_0^T,$$

where D_0 is an $(n \times n)$ -diagonal matrix and R_0 is an $(n \times n)$ -orthogonal matrix, we can rewrite matrix $C^{(2)}$ in the form

$$C^{(2)} = Q^{(2)} \Lambda^{(2)} Q^{(2)T},$$

where $Q^{(2)} = R_0 \otimes R_0$ and $\Lambda^{(2)} = D_0 \otimes I_0 + I_0 \otimes D_0$. Then, for solving system (4.43) we will use the same method as (4.42):

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & \tilde{\mathbf{b}} = [Q^{(2)}]^T \mathbf{b}, \\ (2) \quad & \Lambda^{(2)} \mathbf{W} = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}, \\ (3) \quad & \mathbf{u} = Q^{(2)} \mathbf{W}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.45}$$

4.7.. Preconditioned Conjugate Gradient Method. We will solve system (2.9) by a preconditioned method of conjugate gradients in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_0 &= 0, & \mathbf{u}^{(k+1)} &= \mathbf{u}^k - \frac{1}{P_k} \left[\tilde{B}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}^k - d_{k-1} (\mathbf{u}^k - \mathbf{u}^{k-1}) \right], \\ \boldsymbol{\xi}^k &= A \mathbf{u}^k - \mathbf{f}, & P_k &= \frac{\|B^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}^k\|_A}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}^k\|_{B^{-1}}^2} - d_{k-1}, & d_k &= P_k \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}^{k+1}\|_{B^{-1}}^2}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}^k\|_{B^{-1}}^2}, \\ & & k &= 0, 1, \dots, k_\varepsilon; & k_{-1} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.46)$$

It is well known that for a given accuracy ε ($\varepsilon \ll 1$) in the sense of inequality

$$\|\mathbf{u}^{k_\varepsilon+1} - \mathbf{u}^*\|_A \leq \varepsilon \|\mathbf{u}^\circ - \mathbf{u}^*\|_A, \quad (4.47)$$

where $\mathbf{u}^* = A^{-1} \mathbf{f}$ and $\mathbf{u}^\circ \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is any initial vector, the number of iterations K_ε can be chosen from the inequality

$$K_\varepsilon > \frac{\ell n \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right)}{\ell n q},$$

where $q = \frac{\sqrt{\nu}-1}{\sqrt{\nu}+1}$ (the value of ν is defined in (4.27)).

So, we have:

THEOREM 3. *The number of operations for solving system (2.9) by method (4.46) with matrix \tilde{B} defined in (4.26) with accuracy ε in the sense of (4.47) is evaluated above by the expression $cN^{4/3} \ln \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \right)$, where the constant $c > 0$ does not depend on N .*

Remark. If $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$ then $K_\varepsilon \leq 60$ iterations.

5.. Results of the Numerical Experiments. The method of preconditioning on the basis of multilevel substructuring as discussed above was tested on the model problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u &= f, & \text{in } \Omega &= (0, 1)^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3, \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

with the nonconformal finite element method of approximation.

The domain was divided into n^3 cubes (n in each direction) and each cube was partitioned into 6 tetrahedra. The total dimension of the original algebraic system was $N = 12n^3 - 6n^2$.

The right hand side was generated randomly. The original algebraic problem has been solved by the conjugate gradient method in the form of (4.46) with the preconditioner in the form of (4.26) with accuracy $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$. For comparison that problem has been solved by the same method without preconditioning. The condition number of matrix $B^{-1}A$ was calculated from the relation between conjugate gradients and Lanczos algorithm ([13]).

The method was implemented in FORTRAN-77 in DOUBLE PRECISION. All experiments were carried out on a Sun Workstation. The results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

n	N	CG WITHOUT PRECONDITIONING			CG WITH PRECONDITIONING		
		n_{iter}	cond	time (sec)	n_{iter}	cond	time (sec)
4	672	40	66	0.18	22	9.84	0.22
8	5760	73	265	2.18	24	10.7	1.27
16	47616	130	1062	49.2	24	11.94	15.7
32	387072	200<	—	1248	25	12.2	163
40	758400				25	12.26	376
50	1485000				25	12.33	771

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Arbogast and Z. Chen, On the implementation of mixed methods as nonconforming methods for second order elliptic problems. IMA Preprint #1172, 1993. (*Submitted to Math. Comp.*)
- [2] D.N. Arnold and F. Brezzi, Mixed and nonconforming finite element methods: implementation, postprocessing and error estimates, *RAIRO, Model. Math. Anal. Numer.*, **19** (1985), 7–32.
- [3] J. Bramble, R. Ewing, J. Pasciak, and J. Shen, Analysis of the multigrid algorithms for cell-centered finite difference approximations, Preprint, 1994.
- [4] J.H. Bramble and J.E. Pasciak, A preconditioning technique for indefinite systems resulting from mixed approximations of elliptic problems. *Math. Comp.*, **50** (1988), 1–17.
- [5] S.C. Brenner, A multigrid algorithm for the lowest-order Raviart-Thomas mixed triangular finite element method, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **29** (1992), 647–678.
- [6] F. Brezzi and M. Fortin, *Mixed and Hybrid Finite Element Methods*, Springer-Verlag, New York, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1991.
- [7] Z. Chen, Analysis of mixed methods using conforming and nonconforming finite element methods, *RAIRO, Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, **27** (1993), 9–34.
- [8] Z. Chen, Multigrid algorithms for mixed methods for second order elliptic problems, *submitted to Math. Comp.*
- [9] P.G. Ciarlet, *The Finite Element Method for Elliptic Problems*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, New York, Oxford, 1978.
- [10] L.C. Cowsar, Domain decomposition methods for nonconforming finite elements spaces of Lagrange-type, *Preprint TR93-11*, March 1993.
- [11] R.E. Ewing and M.F. Wheeler, Computational aspects of mixed finite element methods, In: *Numerical Methods for Scientific Computing*, R.S. Stepleman, ed., North-Holland, New York, 1983, 163–172.
- [12] R. Falk and J. Osborn, Error estimates for mixed methods, *RAIRO, Model. Math. Anal. Numer.*, **14** (1980), 249–277.
- [13] G.M. Golub and C.F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computations*, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- [14] P. Grisvard, *Elliptic Problems in Nonsmooth Domains*, Pitman, Boston, Massachusetts, 1985.
- [15] Yu.A. Kuznetsov, Multigrid domain decomposition methods, *Proceedings of 3rd International Symposium on Domain Decomposition Methods*, 1989 (T. Chan, R. Glowinski, J. Periaux, O. Widlund, Eds), SIAM, Philadelphia, 1990, 290–313.
- [16] P.A. Raviart and J.M. Thomas, A mixed finite element method for second order elliptic problems, In: *Mathematical aspects of the FEM, Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, **606**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin & New York (1977), 292–315.
- [17] T. Rusten and R. Winther, A preconditioned iterative method for saddle-point problems, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, **13** (1992), 887–904.
- [18] M. Sarkis, Two-level Schwarz methods for nonconforming finite elements and discontinuous coefficients, *Preprint*, 1993.
- [19] P. Vassilevski and R. Lazarov, Preconditioning saddle-point problems arising from mixed finite element discretization of elliptic equations, UCLA CAM Report 92-46, 1992.
- [20] P.S. Vassilevski and J. Wang, Multilevel iterative methods for mixed finite element discretizations of elliptic problems, *Numer. Math.*, **63** (1992), 503–520.
- [21] A. Weiser and M. Wheeler, On convergence of block-centered finite-differences for elliptic problems, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, **25** (1988), 351–375.

#	Author/s	Title
1189	Frank H. Shaw & Charles J. Geyer	Constrained covariance component models
1190	Tomasz Luczaka	A greedy algorithm estimating the height of random trees
1191	Timo Seppäläinen	Maximum entropy principles for disordered spins
1192	Yuandan Lin, Eduardo D. Sontag & Yuan Wang	Recent results on Lyapunov-theoretic techniques for nonlinear stability
1193	Svante Janson	Random regular graphs: Asymptotic distributions and contiguity
1194	Rachid Ababou	Random porous media flow on large 3-D grids: Numerics, performance, & application to homogenization
1195	Moshe Fridman	Hidden Markov model regression
1196	Petr Klouček, Bo Li & Mitchell Luskin	Analysis of a class of nonconforming finite elements for Crystalline microstructures
1197	Steven P. Lalley	Random series in inverse Pisot powers
1198	Rudy Yaksick	Expected optimal exercise time of a perpetual American option: A closed-form solution
1199	Rudy Yaksick	Valuation of an American put catastrophe insurance futures option: A Martingale approach
1200	János Pach, Farhad Shahrokhi & Mario Szegedy	Application of the crossing number
1201	Avner Friedman & Chaocheng Huang	Averaged motion of charged particles under their self-induced electric field
1202	Joel Spencer	The Erdős-Hanani conjecture via Talagrand's inequality
1203	Zhangxin Chen	Superconvergence results for Galerkin methods for wave propagation in various porous media
1204	Russell Lyons, Robin Pemantle & Yuval Peres	When does a branching process grow like its mean? Conceptual proofs of $L \log L$ criteria
1205	Robin Pemantle	Maximum variation of total risk
1206	Robin Pemantle & Yuval Peres	Galton-Watson trees with the same mean have the same polar sets
1207	Robin Pemantle	A shuffle that mixes sets of any fixed size much faster than it mixes the whole deck
1208	Itai Benjamini, Robin Pemantle & Yuval Peres	Martin capacity for Markov chains and random walks in varying dimensions
1209	Włodzimierz Bryc & Amir Dembo	On large deviations of empirical measures for stationary Gaussian processes
1210	Martin Hildebrand	Some random processes related to affine random walks
1211	Alexander E. Mazel & Yurii M. Suhov	Ground states of a Boson quantum lattice model
1212	Roger L. Fosdick & Darren E. Mason	Single phase energy minimizers for materials with nonlocal spatial dependence
1213	Bruce Hajek	Load balancing in infinite networks
1214	Petr Klouček	The transonic flow problems stability analysis and numerical results
1215	Petr Klouček	On the existence of the entropic solutions for the transonic flow problem
1216	David A. Schmidt & Chjan C. Lim	Full sign-invertibility and symplectic matrices
1217	Piermarco Cannarsa & Maria Elisabetta Tessitore	Infinite dimensional Hamilton-Jacobi equations and Dirichlet boundary control problems of parabolic type
1218	Zhangxin Chen	Multigrid algorithms for mixed methods for second order elliptic problems
1219	Zhangxin Chen	Expanded mixed finite element methods for linear second order elliptic problems I
1220	Gang Bao	A note on the uniqueness for an inverse diffraction problem
1221	Moshe Fridman	A two state capital asset pricing model
1222	Paolo Baldi	Exact asymptotics for the probability of exit from a domain and applications to simulation
1223	Carl Dou & Martin Hildebrand	Enumeration and random random walks on finite groups
1224	Jaksa Cvitanic & Ioannis Karatzas	On portfolio optimization under “drawdown” constraints
1225	Avner Friedman & Yong Liu	A free boundary problem arising in magnetohydrodynamic system
1226	Dominic Welsh	Randomised approximation schemes for Tutte-Gröthendieck invariants
1227	Zhangxin Chen, Bernardo Cockburn, Carl L. Gardner, & Joseph W. Jerome	Quantum hydrodynamic simulation of hysteresis in the resonant tunneling diode
1228	E.G. Kalnins, G.C. Williams, & Willard Miller, Jr.	Intrinsic characterisation of the separation constant for spin one and gravitational perturbations in Kerr geometry
1229	Zhangxin Chen	Large-scale averaging analysis of multiphase flow in fractured reservoirs
1230	Bruce Hajek & Babu Narayanan	Multigraphs with the most edge covers
1231	K.B. Athreya	Entropy maximization
1232	F.I. Karpelevich & Yu.M. Suhov	Functional equations in the problem of boundedness of stochastic branching dynamics
1233	E. Dibenedetto & V. Vespri	On the singular equation $\beta(u)_t = \Delta u$
1234	M.Ya. Kelbert & Yu.M. Suhov	The Markov branching random walk and systems of reaction-diffusion (Kolmogorov-Petrovskii-Piskunov) equations
1235	M. Hildebrand	Random walks on random regular simple graphs

- 1236 **W.S. Don & A. Solomonoff**, Accuracy enhancement for higher derivatives using Chebyshev collocation and a mapping technique
- 1237 **D. Gurarie**, Symmetries and conservation laws of two-dimensional hydrodynamics
- 1238 **Z. Chen**, Finite element methods for the black oil model in petroleum reservoirs
- 1239 **G. Bao & A. Friedman**, Inverse problems for scattering by periodic structure
- 1240 **G. Bao**, Some inverse problems in partial differential equations
- 1241 **G. Bao**, Diffractive optics in periodic structures: The TM polarization
- 1242 **C.C. Lim & D.A. Schmidt**, On noneven digraphs and symplectic pairs
- 1243 **H.M. Soner, S.E. Shreve & J. Cvitanić**, There is no nontrivial hedging portfolio for option pricing with transaction costs
- 1244 **D.L. Russell & B-Yu Zhang**, Exact controllability and stabilizability of the Korteweg-de Vries equation
- 1245 **B. Morton, D. Enns & B-Yu Zhang**, Stability of dynamic inversion control laws applied to nonlinear aircraft pitch-axis models
- 1246 **S. Hansen & G. Weiss**, New results on the operator Carleson measure criterion
- 1247 **V.A. Malyshev & F.M. Spijksma**, Intrinsic convergence rate of countable Markov chains
- 1248 **G. Bao, D.C. Dobson & J.A. Cox**, Mathematical studies in rigorous grating theory
- 1249 **G. Bao & W.W. Symes**, On the sensitivity of solutions of hyperbolic equations to the coefficients
- 1250 **D.A. Huntley & S.H. Davis**, Oscillatory and cellular mode coupling in rapid directional solidification
- 1251 **M.J. Donahue, L. Gurvits, C. Darken & E. Sontag**, Rates of convex approximation in non-Hilbert spaces
- 1252 **A. Friedman & B. Hu**, A Stefan problem for multi-dimensional reaction diffusion systems
- 1253 **J.L. Bona & B-Y. Zhang**, The initial-value problem for the forced Korteweg-de Vries equation
- 1254 **A. Friedman & R. Gulliver**, Organizers, Mathematical modeling for instructors
- 1255 **S. Kichenassamy**, The prolongation formula for tensor fields
- 1256 **S. Kichenassamy**, Fuchsian equations in Sobolev spaces and blow-up
- 1257 **H.S. Dumas, L. Dumas, & F. Golse**, On the mean free path for a periodic array of spherical obstacles
- 1258 **C. Liu**, Global estimates for solutions of partial differential equations
- 1259 **C. Liu**, Exponentially growing solutions for inverse problems in PDE
- 1260 **Mary Ann Horn & I. Lasiecka**, Nonlinear boundary stabilization of parallelly connected Kirchhoff plates
- 1261 **B. Cockburn & H. Gau**, A posteriori error estimates for general numerical methods for scalar conservation laws
- 1262 **B. Cockburn & P-A. Gremaud**, A priori error estimates for numerical methods for scalar conservation laws. Part I: The general approach
- 1263 **R. Spigler & M. Vianello**, Convergence analysis of the semi-implicit euler method for abstract evolution equations
- 1264 **R. Spigler & M. Vianello**, WKB-type approximation for second-order differential equations in C^* -algebras
- 1265 **M. Menshikov & R.J. Williams**, Passage-time moments for continuous non-negative stochastic processes and applications
- 1266 **C. Mazza**, On the storage capacity of nonlinear neural networks
- 1267 **Z. Chen, R.E. Ewing & R. Lazarov**, Domain decomposition algorithms for mixed methods for second order elliptic problems
- 1268 **Z. Chen, M. Espedal & R.E. Ewing**, Finite element analysis of multiphase flow in groundwater hydrology
- 1269 **Z. Chen, R.E. Ewing, Y.A. Kuznetsov, R.D. Lazarov & S. Maliassov**, Multilevel preconditioners for mixed methods for second order elliptic problems
- 1270 **S. Kichenassamy & G.K. Srinivasan**, The structure of WTC expansions and applications
- 1271 **A. Zinger**, Positiveness of Wigner quasi-probability density and characterization of Gaussian distribution
- 1272 **V. Malkin & G. Papanicolaou**, On self-focusing of short laser pulses
- 1273 **J.N. Kutz & W.L. Kath**, Stability of pulses in nonlinear optical fibers using phase-sensitive amplifiers
- 1274 **S.K. Patch**, Recursive recovery of a family of Markov transition probabilities from boundary value data
- 1275 **C. Liu**, The completeness of plane waves
- 1276 **Z. Chen & R.E. Ewing**, Stability and convergence of a finite element method for reactive transport in ground water
- 1277 **Z. Chen & Do Y. Kwak**, The analysis of multigrid algorithms for nonconforming and mixed methods for second order elliptic problems
- 1278 **Z. Chen**, Expanded mixed finite element methods for quasilinear second order elliptic problems II
- 1279 **M.A. Horn & W. Littman**, Boundary control of a Schrödinger equation with nonconstant principal part
- 1280 **R.E. Ewing, Yu.A. Kuznetsov, R.D. Lazarov & S. Maliassov**, Substructuring preconditioning for finite element approximations of second order elliptic problems. I. Nonconforming linear elements for the Poisson equation in a parallelepiped
- 1281 **S. Maliassov**, Substructuring preconditioning for finite element approximations of second order elliptic problems. II. Mixed method for an elliptic operator with scalar tensor
- 1282 **V. Jakšić & C.-A. Pillet**, On model for quantum friction II. Fermi's golden rule and dynamics at positive temperatures
- 1283 **V. M. Malkin**, Kolmogorov and nonstationary spectra of optical turbulence