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Abstract. For the nonconforming rotated $Q_1$ element over a mildly distorted quadrilateral mesh, we propose a superconvergence property at the element center, the vertices and the midpoints of four edges. Numerics are presented to confirm this observation.
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1. Introduction

Nonconforming rotated $Q_1$ element [21] (NRQ$_1$) with mean integral over edges as degrees of freedom (NRQ$_1^e$) has been widely used in several fields including the computational fluids [21, 25], the crystalline microstructure [11, 13], the Chapman-Ferraro problem [12], the Reissner-Mindlin plate bending problem [16], and the streamline-diffusion problem [22, 24]. Compared with the standard bilinear element, NRQ$_1^e$ exhibits better stability in these problems.

A new NRQ$_1$ element introduced by Ming and Shi leads to a truly locking-free Reissner-Mindlin plate element over general quadrilateral meshes [19]. Compared to NRQ$_1^e$, this element has an extra degree of freedom (we call it the five-point NRQ$_1$, see Definition 2.3). A similar element was presented in [4] to approximate Navier-Stokes equations.

The convergence rate in the energy norm of both NRQ$_1$ elements is of first order over a rectangular mesh [11, 21]. As to the general quadrilateral mesh, the five-point NRQ$_1$ retains the first order convergence rate, while NRQ$_1^e$ converges with first order if the mesh is mildly distorted [15, 17]. An example is given to show the first order optimality [15].

Meanwhile, a superconvergence property at element center on the rectangular parallelopiped mesh was obtained for NRQ$_1^e$ [11]. For the mildly distorted quadrilateral mesh, we proved [20] that the superconvergence property is valid not only for the element center, but also for the vertices and midpoints of four edges. Therefore, both elements share the same superconvergence points as the bilinear element [5]. Extensive numerics will be presented in this paper to confirm the theoretic prediction. The same phenomenon was also numerically observed for another NRQ$_1$ element that employs midpoints value of each edge as degrees of freedom, however,
there is no theoretic support up to now. Some superclose results for the rectangular NRQ\textsubscript{1} element and its variants can be found in [2, 14, 15, 22].

The outline of this paper is as follows. In the next section, we introduce NRQ\textsubscript{1}, NRQ\textsuperscript{p}, and the five-point NRQ\textsubscript{1} element, the quadrilateral mesh conditions. The main results are stated in § 3. Numerical results and discussion are given in the last section.

2. Nonconforming Rotated Q\textsubscript{1} Element

For any convex polygon \( \Omega \), we use the standard Sobolev space \( W^{k,p}(\Omega) \) [1]. Denote by \( \int_{\Omega} f \) the mean value of a function \( f \) over the sub-domain \( \Omega \) of \( \Omega \).

We consider the general second order elliptic boundary value problem

\[
- \partial_x (a_{11} \partial_x u) - \partial_x (a_{12} \partial_y u) - \partial_y (a_{21} \partial_x u) - \partial_y (a_{22} \partial_y u) = f \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega,
\]

\[
u = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial \Omega,
\]

where \( a_{ij} \in W^{2,\infty}(\Omega) \), and

\[
\lambda |\xi|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^2 a_{ij} \xi_i \xi_j \leq A|\xi|^2 \quad \text{for all} \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2.
\]

Let \( T_h \) be a partition of \( \overline{\Omega} \) by convex quadrilaterals \( K \) with the mesh size \( h_K \) and \( h := \max_{K \in T_h} h_K \). We assume that \( T_h \) is shape regular in the sense of Ciarlet-Raviart [6, p. 247]. Namely, all quadrilaterals are convex and there exist constants \( \rho_1 \geq 1 \) and \( 0 < \rho_2 < 1 \) such that

\[
h_K / h_K \leq \rho_1, \quad \cos \theta_{i,K} \leq \rho_2, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \quad \text{for all} \quad K \in T_h.
\]

Here \( h_K, h_K \) and \( \theta_{i,K} \) denote the diameter, the shortest length of sides, and the interior angles of \( K \), respectively.

We introduce a mesh condition which quantifies the deviation of a quadrilateral from a parallelogram.

**Definition 2.1.** (1 + \( \alpha \))-section condition \((0 \leq \alpha \leq 1)\) [18] The distance \( d_K \) between the midpoints of two diagonals of \( K \in T_h \) is of order \( O(h_K^{1+\alpha}) \) uniformly for all elements \( K \) as \( h \to 0 \).

The extreme case \( \alpha = 0 \) represents an unstructured quadrilateral mesh subdivision. The mesh partition in Fig. 4 is a particular one, which consists of trapezoids generating from a typical trapezoid with translation and dilation. In case of \( \alpha = 1 \), the mesh satisfies the Bi-section condition [23], which is also the 1-strongly regular mesh [27].

**Definition 2.2.** For every element \( K \in T_h \), we call \( K \) satisfies the (1 + \( \beta_K \))-uniform condition if for every elements \( K^* \in S(K) \), there exist constants \( \beta_1(K^*) \) and \( \beta_2(K^*) \) such that

\[
|\overline{M_1M_3} - \overline{M_3M_6}| = O(h_K^{1+\beta_1(K^*)} + h_K^{1+\beta_2(K^*)}),
\]

\[
|\overline{M_2M_4} - \overline{M_5M_7}| = O(h_K^{1+\beta_2(K^*)} + h_K^{1+\beta_2(K^*)}).
\]

We define \( \beta_K \) as

\[
\beta_K := \min_{K^* \in S(K)} \min(\beta_1(K^*), \beta_2(K^*)),
\]

where \( S(K) \) is the subset of \( T_h \) with nonempty intersection with \( K \), and we refer to Fig. 1 for \( M_1M_3, M_3M_6 \) and \( M_2M_4, M_5M_7 \).
We call $\mathcal{T}_h$ satisfies the $(1 + \beta)$-uniform condition if every element $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ satisfies the $(1 + \beta_K)$-uniform condition, where $\beta := \min_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \beta_K$.

Let $\hat{K}$ be the unit square $(-1,1)^2$ and the bilinear function $F_K$ be an isomorphism from $\hat{K} \rightarrow K = F_K(\hat{K})$.

Rannacher and Turek introduced NRQ$_1$ element [21], which is defined as

$$X_h := \{ v \in L^2(\Omega) \mid v|_K \in Q_1, \text{ } v \text{ is continuous regarding } Q_e \}$$

(2.3) and $Q_e(v) = 0$ if $e \subset \partial \Omega$,

where

$$Q_1 := \{ q \circ F_K^{-1} \mid q \in \text{Span}\{1, \hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{x}^2 - \hat{y}^2\} \},$$

and $Q_e(v) := \int_K v$ for a smooth function $v : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $e \subset \partial K$.

For any $v \in X_h$, define

$$\|v\|^2_{l,p,h} = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|v\|^2_{l,p,K}, \quad \|v\|^2_{l,h} = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|v\|^2_{l,p,K}, \quad l = 1, 2 \text{ and } 1 \leq p \leq \infty.$$

It is seen that $\cdot |_{1,2,h}$ is a norm on $X_h$.

Denote by $\Pi$ the standard interpolation operator over $X_h$. If $\mathcal{T}_h$ satisfies the $(1 + \alpha)$-section condition, then for each $v \in H^1_0(\Omega) \cap W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)$, using the general theory in [3], we have the interpolation error estimate

$$\|v - \Pi v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + h\|v - \Pi v\|_{1,\infty,h} \leq C(h\|v\|_{2,\infty} + h^\alpha)\|v\|_{1,\infty}.$$

Observe that the interpolation error degenerates if $\alpha = 0$. To avoid such degradation, similar to [4], we define

Definition 2.3.

$$X_h := \{ v \in L^2(\Omega) \mid v|_K \in \hat{Q}_1, \text{ } v \text{ is continuous regarding } Q_e \text{ and } 0 \leq \int_K (v \circ F_K)\hat{x}\hat{y} = 1 \}$$

(2.5) and $Q_e(v) = 0$ if $e \subset \partial \Omega$

with $\hat{Q}_1 := \{ q \circ F_K^{-1} \mid q \in \text{Span}\{1, \hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{x}\hat{y}, \hat{x}^2 - \hat{y}^2\} \}$.

Another version of NRQ$_1$ is also introduced in [21], which uses midpoints of four edges as degrees of freedoms. We call this element as NRQ$_p^5$, the one defined in (2.3) as NRQ$_p^4$ and the one defined in (2.5) as the five-point NRQ$_1$.

The variational problem of (2.1) is to find $u \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ such that

$$a(u,v) = (f,v) \text{ for all } v \in H^1_0(\Omega),$$

where the bilinear form $a$ is defined for each $v,w \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ as

$$a(v,w) := \int_{\Omega} (a_{11}\partial_x u \partial_x v + a_{12}\partial_y u \partial_x v + a_{21}\partial_x u \partial_y v + a_{22}\partial_y u \partial_y v) \, dx \, dy.$$
The finite element solution \( u_h \in X_h \) satisfies

\[
(2.7) \quad a_h(u_h, v) = (f, v) \quad \text{for all } v \in X_h,
\]

where \( a_h \) is defined piecewise for each \( v, w \in X_h \) as

\[
a_h(v, w) := \sum_{K \in T_h} \int_K \left( a_{11} \partial_x u \partial_x v + a_{12} \partial_y u \partial_x v + a_{21} \partial_y u \partial_y v + a_{22} \partial_y u \partial_y v \right) \, dx \, dy,
\]

where \( X_h \) is NRQ\(_2\) or the five-point NRQ\(_1\).

3. Main Results

The main results of this paper are

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \( u \) be the solution of (2.6), and \( u_h \in X_h(\text{NRQ}_2) \) be the solution of (2.7). We assume that \( u \in W^{3, \infty}(\Omega) \) and \( T_h \) satisfies the \( (1 + \alpha) \)-section condition.

If \( z \) is the element center, then

\[
| \nabla(u - u_h)(z) | \leq C h^{2\alpha} | \ln h | \| u \|_{3, \infty}.
\]

If \( z \) are vertices or midpoints of each edges of the element \( K \), and if \( K \) satisfies the \( (1 + \beta_K) \)-uniform condition, then

\[
| \nabla(u - u_h)(z) | \leq C (h^{2\alpha} | \ln h | + h^{\alpha + \beta_K}) \| u \|_{3, \infty},
\]

where \( \nabla \) refers to taking average over all neighboring elements around \( z \).

This theorem is proved in [20, Theorem 2.5], which also holds for many variants of other quadrilateral nonconforming elements, e.g. [7, 9].

As to the five-point NRQ\(_1\), we have

**Theorem 3.2.** Under the same condition of Theorem 3.1 and \( u_h \) belongs to the five-point NRQ\(_1\), we have

If \( z \) is the element center, then

\[
| \nabla(u - u_h)(z) | \leq C h^{1 + \alpha} | \ln h | \| u \|_{3, \infty}.
\]

If \( z \) are vertices or midpoints of each edges of the element \( K \), and if \( K \) satisfies the \( (1 + \beta_K) \)-uniform condition, then

\[
| \nabla(u - u_h)(z) | \leq C (h^{1 + \alpha} | \ln h | + h^{1 + \beta_K}) \| u \|_{3, \infty}.
\]

This theorem is proved in [20, Theorem 2.6].

Another standard measurement of the error is the discrete \( \ell^2 \) norm \( \| \cdot \|_{\ell^2} \), which is defined as

\[
\| \nabla(u - u_h)(Z) \|_{\ell^2} := (\# Z)^{-1/2} \left( \sum_{z \in Z} | \nabla(u - u_h)(z) |^2 \right)^{1/2},
\]

where \( Z \) may be the element center, the vertices and the midpoints of each edges, and \( \# Z \) denotes the number of elements in \( Z \).

Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 require the \( (1 + \beta_K) \)-uniform condition around the points of interest. For an unstructured mesh, an adaptive mesh refinement will usually bring in such kind of local structure (e.g. diagonal swapping and Lagrange smoothing). However, such local structure usually cannot be retained over the whole triangulation, in particular for elements near the boundary or near the discontinuous line of the coefficients. It is thus reasonable to assume the following condition:

\[1\text{Notice that elements proposed in [7, 9] are rectangular, which can be directly extended to a quadrilateral mesh.}
**Definition 3.3.** The triangulation $T_h = T_{1,h} \cup T_{2,h}$ is said to satisfy the Condition $(\beta, \sigma)$ if there exist nonnegative constants $\beta$ and $\sigma$ such that every element inside $T_{1,h}$ satisfies the $(1 + \beta)$-uniform condition and

$$\Omega_{1,h} \cup \Omega_{2,h} = \Omega, \quad |\Omega_{2,h}| = O(h^{\sigma}), \quad \Omega_{i,h} = \sum_{K \in T_{i,h}} K, \quad i = 1, 2.$$ 

**Remark 3.4.** A similar condition for a triangular mesh was appeared in [26].

**Corollary 3.5.** If $T_h$ satisfies the $(1 + \alpha)$-section condition, then

$$\|\nabla (u - u_h)(z)\|_{\ell^2} \leq \begin{cases} Ch^{2\alpha} \ln h & \text{NRQ}_1^\alpha, \\
Ch^{1+\alpha} \ln h & \text{FIVE-POINT NRQ}_1 \end{cases}$$

for $z$ being the element center.

If, in addition, $T_h$ satisfies the Condition $(\beta, \sigma)$, then

$$\|\nabla (u - u_h)(z)\|_{\ell^2} \leq \begin{cases} Ch^{2\alpha} \ln h + h^{\alpha+\beta} + h^{1+\sigma/2} \ln h & \text{NRQ}_1^\alpha, \\
Ch^{1+\alpha} \ln h + h^{1+\beta} + h^{1+\sigma/2} \ln h & \text{FIVE-POINT NRQ}_1 \end{cases}$$

for $z$ being the vertex or midpoint of each edge.

**Proof.** We only prove the case for NRQ$_1^\alpha$, the case for the five-point NRQ$_1$ may be proceeded similarly.

For $z$ being the element center, the estimate is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.1.

While for $z$ being the vertex or midpoint of each edge, since $T_h$ satisfies the Condition $(\beta, \sigma)$, we may decompose $Z = Z_1 \cup Z_2$, where

$$Z_i : = \{ z \in Z \mid z \in \Omega_{i,h} \} \quad i = 1, 2.$$ 

Therefore, using Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\|\nabla (u - u_h)(z)\|_{\ell^2} = (\# Z)^{-1/2} \left( \sum_{z \in Z_1} |\nabla (u - u_h)(z)|^2 + \sum_{z \in Z_2} |\nabla (u - u_h)(z)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C(\# Z_1/\# Z)^{1/2} (h^{2\alpha} \ln h + h^{\alpha+\beta}) + C(\# Z_2/\# Z)^{1/2} h \ln h \leq C(h^{2\alpha} \ln h + h^{\alpha+\beta} + h^{1+\sigma/2} \ln h),$$

where we have used $(\# Z_1/\# Z) \leq C$ and $(\# Z_2/\# Z) \leq Ch^\sigma$. 

**Remark 3.6.** We did not prove a similar result for NRQ$_p^\alpha$, however, we are apt to conclude that Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.5 are also valid for NRQ$_1^\alpha$ by numerics in the next section.

**4. Numerical Results and Discussion**

In this section, we report on numerical results for NRQ$_p^\alpha$, NRQ$_p$ and the five-point NRQ$_1$ element on three sequences of meshes: the Bi-section mesh, which is obtained by applying the bisection refined strategy to the domain, the Kershaw mesh [10]; and a pedagogic trapezoid mesh. For the Kershaw mesh and the trapezoid mesh, we solve the Dirichlet problem (2.1) in the unit square $[0, 1]^2$ with the coefficients

\begin{equation} a_{11} = 1 + x^2, \quad a_{12} = a_{21} = xy, \quad a_{22} = 1 + y^2, \end{equation}

and $f$ is chosen so that the exact solution is

$$u(x, y) = x(1 - x) \sin(\pi y).$$
As to the Bi-section mesh, we solve the problem (2.1) in

$$\Omega = \{(x, y) \mid 0 \leq x \leq 1/2, 0 \leq y \leq 1\} \cup \{1/2 \leq x \leq 1 \mid 2x - 1 \leq y \leq 1\}$$

with the same coefficients as (4.1), and $f$ is taken so that the exact solution is

$$u(x, y) = x(y - 2x + 1)\sin(\pi y).$$

Here follows are three sequences of meshes we employed in the computation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mesh</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bi-section</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$+\infty$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kershaw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapezoid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.** Mesh quality indicators for three meshes
In this subsection, we measure the error rate that this element shares the same superconvergence property as NRQ\(^2\).

### 4.1. Numerics in discrete \(\ell_2\) norm

In this subsection, we measure the error by the \(\ell_2\) norm. The numerical results for NRQ\(^a\) are presented in Table 2, Table 3 and Table 8, respectively. Using the corresponding values of \(\alpha, \beta\) and \(\sigma\) in Table 1, these results confirm the theoretic prediction: Corollary 3.5.

As to the five-point NRQ\(^1\), we list the results on the Bi-section mesh and the Kershaw mesh in Table 4 and Table 5, respectively. By Table 1, these results confirm Corollary 3.5: For the element center, a second order convergence is observed for both meshes, while for the vertex and the midpoint of each edge, a second order convergence is retained over the Bi-section mesh, whereas 3/2-order convergence is obtained for the Kershaw mesh.

### Table 2. NRQ\(^a\) on Bi-section mesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>error</th>
<th>(n = 4)</th>
<th>(n = 8)</th>
<th>(n = 16)</th>
<th>(n = 32)</th>
<th>(n = 64)</th>
<th>rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vertex</td>
<td>1.19e - 1</td>
<td>3.44e - 2</td>
<td>9.06e - 3</td>
<td>2.32e - 3</td>
<td>5.85e - 4</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midpoint</td>
<td>6.69e - 2</td>
<td>1.81e - 2</td>
<td>4.63e - 3</td>
<td>1.17e - 3</td>
<td>2.95e - 4</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center</td>
<td>2.63e - 2</td>
<td>6.51e - 3</td>
<td>1.63e - 3</td>
<td>4.07e - 4</td>
<td>1.02e - 4</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. NRQ\(^a\) on Kershaw mesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>error</th>
<th>(n = 6)</th>
<th>(n = 12)</th>
<th>(n = 24)</th>
<th>(n = 48)</th>
<th>(n = 96)</th>
<th>rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vertex</td>
<td>1.90e - 1</td>
<td>8.95e - 2</td>
<td>3.44e - 2</td>
<td>1.24e - 2</td>
<td>4.43e - 3</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midpoint</td>
<td>1.57e - 1</td>
<td>6.81e - 2</td>
<td>2.53e - 2</td>
<td>8.98e - 3</td>
<td>3.1653e - 3</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center</td>
<td>9.97e - 2</td>
<td>3.30e - 2</td>
<td>9.20e - 3</td>
<td>2.39e - 3</td>
<td>6.04e - 4</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. five-point NRQ\(^1\) on Bi-section mesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>error</th>
<th>(n = 4)</th>
<th>(n = 8)</th>
<th>(n = 16)</th>
<th>(n = 32)</th>
<th>(n = 64)</th>
<th>rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vertex</td>
<td>1.15e - 1</td>
<td>3.28e - 2</td>
<td>8.59e - 3</td>
<td>2.19e - 3</td>
<td>5.54e - 4</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midpoint</td>
<td>6.46e - 2</td>
<td>1.71e - 2</td>
<td>4.37e - 3</td>
<td>1.10e - 3</td>
<td>2.77e - 4</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center</td>
<td>2.71e - 2</td>
<td>6.68e - 3</td>
<td>1.67e - 3</td>
<td>4.17e - 4</td>
<td>1.04e - 4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. five-point NRQ\(^1\) on Kershaw mesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>error</th>
<th>(n = 6)</th>
<th>(n = 12)</th>
<th>(n = 24)</th>
<th>(n = 48)</th>
<th>(n = 96)</th>
<th>rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vertex</td>
<td>2.21e - 1</td>
<td>9.39e - 2</td>
<td>3.58e - 2</td>
<td>1.30e - 2</td>
<td>4.69e - 3</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midpoint</td>
<td>1.72e - 1</td>
<td>7.17e - 2</td>
<td>2.65e - 2</td>
<td>9.47e - 3</td>
<td>3.35e - 3</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center</td>
<td>7.79e - 2</td>
<td>2.80e - 2</td>
<td>7.74e - 3</td>
<td>2.01e - 3</td>
<td>5.08e - 4</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our theoretic results do not cover NRQ\(^p\), however, the following numerics suggest that this element shares the same superconvergence property as NRQ\(^a\), which we shall explore in a forthcoming paper. We list the results on the Bi-section mesh, and the Kershaw mesh in Table 6 and Table 7 below. Table 8 shows the numerics on the trapezoid mesh.

### 4.2. Numerics in maximum norm

In this subsection, we present the numerics in the maximum norm. We still consider problem (2.1) with coefficients (4.1). The right-hand side \(f\) is taken such that the exact solution is \(\sin(\pi x)\sin(\pi y)y(1 - y)\).
We choose nine special points in Figure 5. This mesh is refined by the bisection first order convergence is observed for points.

We employ the following maximum norm to measure the error:

\[
| \nabla (u - u_h)(p) | = | \nabla_x (u - u_h)(p) | + | \nabla_y (u - u_h)(p) | .
\]

We choose nine special points in Figure 5. This mesh is refined by the bisection strategy, so it automatically satisfies the Bi-section condition, i.e., \( \alpha = 1 \). Moreover, for points 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7, we have \( \beta_K = 0 \), while for points 3, 6, 8 and 9, we have \( \beta_K = 1 \). Table 10, Table 12 and Table 14 confirm the theoretic prediction (3.2): a first order convergence is observed for points 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7, while a second order convergence is observed for points 3, 6, 8 and 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>error</th>
<th>( n = 4 )</th>
<th>( n = 8 )</th>
<th>( n = 16 )</th>
<th>( n = 32 )</th>
<th>( n = 64 )</th>
<th>rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vertex</td>
<td>1.39e - 1</td>
<td>4.12e - 2</td>
<td>1.09e - 2</td>
<td>2.77e - 3</td>
<td>6.98e - 4</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midpoint</td>
<td>7.66e - 2</td>
<td>2.17e - 2</td>
<td>5.63e - 3</td>
<td>1.43e - 3</td>
<td>3.59e - 4</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center</td>
<td>4.95e - 2</td>
<td>1.24e - 2</td>
<td>3.10e - 3</td>
<td>7.76e - 4</td>
<td>1.94e - 4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. NRQ\(_p^1\) on Bi-section mesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>error</th>
<th>( n = 6 )</th>
<th>( n = 12 )</th>
<th>( n = 24 )</th>
<th>( n = 48 )</th>
<th>( n = 96 )</th>
<th>rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vertex</td>
<td>1.84e - 1</td>
<td>8.80e - 2</td>
<td>3.41e - 2</td>
<td>1.24e - 2</td>
<td>4.42e - 3</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midpoint</td>
<td>1.52e - 1</td>
<td>6.71e - 2</td>
<td>2.51e - 2</td>
<td>8.93e - 3</td>
<td>3.15e - 3</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center</td>
<td>9.69e - 2</td>
<td>3.35e - 2</td>
<td>9.43e - 3</td>
<td>2.46e - 3</td>
<td>6.25e - 4</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. NRQ\(_p^1\) on Kershaw mesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>error</th>
<th>( n = 4 )</th>
<th>( n = 8 )</th>
<th>( n = 16 )</th>
<th>( n = 32 )</th>
<th>( n = 64 )</th>
<th>rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{NRQ}^{1^*} )</td>
<td>1.87e - 1</td>
<td>9.53e - 2</td>
<td>4.98e - 2</td>
<td>2.87e - 2</td>
<td>2.03e - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{NRQ}^{1^p} )</td>
<td>1.90e - 1</td>
<td>9.64e - 2</td>
<td>5.04e - 2</td>
<td>2.90e - 2</td>
<td>2.04e - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five-point</td>
<td>1.85e - 1</td>
<td>9.28e - 2</td>
<td>4.65e - 2</td>
<td>2.33e - 2</td>
<td>1.17e - 2</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Numerics on trapezoid mesh
Table 10. NRQ₁⁺: superconvergence rate on Kershaw mesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>error</th>
<th>n = 12</th>
<th>n = 24</th>
<th>n = 48</th>
<th>n = 96</th>
<th>n = 192</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P₁$</td>
<td>2.81e−1</td>
<td>8.82e−2</td>
<td>3.66e−2</td>
<td>1.68e−2</td>
<td>8.09e−3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₂$</td>
<td>5.43e−2</td>
<td>6.31e−2</td>
<td>3.83e−2</td>
<td>2.64e−2</td>
<td>1.91e−2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₃$</td>
<td>5.25e−2</td>
<td>1.35e−2</td>
<td>3.40e−3</td>
<td>8.53e−4</td>
<td>2.13e−4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₄$</td>
<td>2.88e−1</td>
<td>9.95e−2</td>
<td>4.10e−2</td>
<td>1.81e−2</td>
<td>8.44e−3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₅$</td>
<td>1.42e−1</td>
<td>6.57e−2</td>
<td>3.13e−2</td>
<td>1.47e−2</td>
<td>7.29e−3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₆$</td>
<td>9.86e−3</td>
<td>2.19e−3</td>
<td>5.62e−4</td>
<td>1.41e−4</td>
<td>3.54e−5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₇$</td>
<td>6.56e−2</td>
<td>5.63e−2</td>
<td>3.61e−2</td>
<td>2.12e−2</td>
<td>1.67e−2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₈$</td>
<td>2.64e−2</td>
<td>7.25e−3</td>
<td>1.84e−3</td>
<td>4.60e−4</td>
<td>1.02e−4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₉$</td>
<td>1.20e−1</td>
<td>3.47e−2</td>
<td>8.98e−3</td>
<td>2.21e−3</td>
<td>5.61e−4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. five-point NRQ₁: $|\nabla(u − u₈)(p)|$ on Kershaw mesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rate</th>
<th>12 − 24</th>
<th>24 − 48</th>
<th>48 − 96</th>
<th>96 − 192</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P₁$</td>
<td>1.6716</td>
<td>1.2952</td>
<td>1.0973</td>
<td>1.0540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₂$</td>
<td>−0.2166</td>
<td>0.7187</td>
<td>0.9123</td>
<td>1.0065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₃$</td>
<td>1.9611</td>
<td>1.9869</td>
<td>1.9971</td>
<td>1.9997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₄$</td>
<td>1.5319</td>
<td>1.2837</td>
<td>1.1747</td>
<td>1.1043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₅$</td>
<td>1.1149</td>
<td>1.0686</td>
<td>1.0923</td>
<td>1.0122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₆$</td>
<td>2.1673</td>
<td>1.9643</td>
<td>1.9990</td>
<td>1.9901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₇$</td>
<td>0.2204</td>
<td>0.6405</td>
<td>0.8359</td>
<td>0.9136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₈$</td>
<td>1.8669</td>
<td>1.9817</td>
<td>1.9964</td>
<td>2.1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P₉$</td>
<td>1.7868</td>
<td>1.9676</td>
<td>2.0048</td>
<td>1.9781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. five-point NRQ₁: superconvergence rate on Kershaw mesh

Figure 5. Location of the above nine points on Kershaw mesh
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