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The Uzawa method is an iterative approach to find approximated solutions to the Stokes equations. This method solves velocity variables involving augmented Lagrangian operator and then updates pressure variable by Richardson update. In this paper, we construct a new version of the Uzawa method to find optimal numerical solutions of the Stokes equations including corner singularities. The proposed method is based on the dual singular function method which was developed for elliptic boundary value problems. We estimate the solvability of the proposed formulation and special orthogonality form for two singular functions. Numerical convergence tests are presented to verify our assertion.

1. Introduction

To study the solution of a partial differential equation, the equation is sometimes interpreted in a weak (variational) sense and we can define the regular problem in this manner. Consider a variational problem:

\[
a(u, v) = (f, v)_{L^2}, \quad \text{for all } v \in V,
\]

where \(H^m_0 \subset V \subset H^m(\Omega)\) and \(a(\cdot, \cdot)\) is bilinear form with continuity and coercivity. We call the problem is \(H^2\)-regular if, for every \(f \in H^{s-2m}(\Omega)\), there is a solution \(u \in H^s(\Omega)\) with a constant \(c\) such that

\[
\|u\| \leq c\|f\|_{s-2m}.
\]

It is well known that the approximated solution of regular problems shows optimal convergence by using common numerical methods such as the finite difference method or the finite element method.

However, if a computational domain of an elliptic boundary value problem is a polygon including reentrant corners, then the problem is not \(H^2\)-regular, \(s \geq 2\), and it is sometimes called a corner singular problem, and the singular solution is hard to approximate optimally. Therefore, there have been many numerical approaches developed to solve the problem efficiently. These methods aim to improve accuracy and to resolve the convergence difficulties. The \(hp\) version of the finite element method is a typical method. It employs elements of variable sizes \(h\) and polynomial degrees \(p\) to improve the convergence rate and accuracy [1].

The postprocessing method has been proposed in [2–6]. These methods calculate the coefficients of the singular coefficients from the finite element solution. Singular function boundary integral method also has been proposed to treat singular problems in [7–9]. These methods calculate the unknown coefficients of singular functions directly. The solution is approximated by the leading terms of the local asymptotic solution expansion, and the Dirichlet boundary conditions are weakly enforced utilizing Lagrange multipliers.

It is well known that the solution of an elliptic boundary value problem can be decomposed of a finite number of so-called singular functions, which come from the neighborhood of a corner point, and a smooth remainder function which is called a regular solution (see, for instance, [10–12]). The singular function method is one approach to use this fact. It takes into account the form of the singular solution by...
finding stress intensity factors and regular solution (see, for example, [13–15]). These methods consist of augmenting the spline space by the singular functions. The dual singular function is based on the observation that the regular part of the solution and the stress intensity factor are related to each other by testing a dual singular function in [16–18]. It was implemented as an iterative procedure that iterates back and forth between these equations. Also, this approach was extended to multigrid versions.

In [19], Cai and Kim developed and analyzed a finite element method for the accurate computation of the solution and intensity factors. If a regular part of the solution is smoother than the solution itself, then approximated solutions of a standard finite element lose accuracy. Therefore, the new method finds approximated regular solution first and then computes stress intensity factors and solution. This method decoupled variational formulations by testing the dual singular function and disjoint cut-off function. Consequently, the regular solution is uniquely determined by a well-posed variational problem, and stress intensity factors can be expressed by a regular solution. We call this method the finite element dual singular function method (FE-DSFM).

This method was extended to other problems. Poisson problems with mixed boundary conditions and interface problems were applied in [20, 21]. Also, this algorithm was studied to corner singularities of the Helmholtz equation and heat equation (see [22, 23]). Some studies have been designed to target the singular solution of the Stokes equations. A mixed finite element method has optimal error bounds as shown in [14]:

\[ \| u - u_h \|_0 + h \| u - u_h \|_1 + h \| p - p_h \|_0 \leq Ch^{s+1} (\| u \|_{s+1} + \| p \|_s), \]

where \( h \) is the biggest mesh size. However, if \( s < 1 \), then the error bounds only become

\[ \| u - u_h \|_0 + h^2 \| u - u_h \|_1 + h \| p - p_h \|_0 \leq Ch^{2s} (\| u \|_{s+1} + \| p \|_s). \]

For the case \( s < 1 \), we call the solution \((u, p)\) a singular solution, otherwise a regular solution. Since singularities are due to re-entrant corners of a computational domain \( \Omega \), we assume that \( \Omega \) is open and bounded polygonal domain in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) with one re-entrant corner.

To derive singular and dual singular functions for the Stokes equations, the polar coordinate \((r, \theta)\) of homogeneous Stokes system (3) should be considered, and we can find the singular and dual singular solution via solving the homogeneous system with the separation of variables. Then, we arrive at the singular function of system (3):

\[ -\mu \Delta u + \nabla p = f, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \]

\[ \nabla \cdot u = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \]

\[ u = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega, \]
Lemma 1 (see [26]). For \( \chi \approx 1.4302966653124203 \), we have the following properties:

(1) \( \lambda = 0 \) and \( \lambda = 1 \) are solutions for any \( \omega \). We call these trivial solutions.

(2) There are only trivial solutions for \( 0 \leq \omega \leq \pi \). It means that there is no \( (u, p) \notin H^1(\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega) \), solution of Stokes equation with homogeneous boundary condition on \( \Gamma_{in} \), where \( \Gamma_{in} \) is the boundary near re-entrant corner.

(3) If \( \pi \leq \omega \leq 2\pi \), then there is a unique solution \( \lambda \) except trivial solutions. Therefore, there is one singular solution \( (u, p) \in H^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \).

(4) If \( \chi \pi < \omega < 2\pi \), then there are two solutions \( \lambda \) except trivial solutions. Thus, there is two singular solutions \( (u, p) \in H^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \).

(5) If \( \omega = 2\pi \), then solution is \( \lambda = 0.5 \) except trivial solutions.

It is shown that 2 singular functions of solution (3) can be involved in each reentrant corner. If there is one reentrant corner, the solution of (3) can be written by the form

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\dot{u} \\
\dot{v} \\
\dot{p}
\end{pmatrix} = C_1 \begin{pmatrix}
r^\lambda \sin(\theta) \sin((1 - \lambda) \theta) \\
r^\lambda \sin(\theta) - \lambda \sin(\theta) \cos((1 - \lambda) \theta) \\
-2r^{\lambda-1} \lambda \cos((1 - \lambda) \theta)
\end{pmatrix} - C_2 \begin{pmatrix}
r^\lambda \sin(\theta) \sin((1 - \lambda) \theta) \\
r^\lambda \sin(\theta) \cos((1 - \lambda) \theta) \\
2r^{\lambda-1} \lambda \sin((1 - \lambda) \theta)
\end{pmatrix},
\]

where \( \lambda \) is solution of

\[
\lambda \sin^2(\omega) = \sin^2(\lambda \omega),
\]

and \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\dot{u}^d \\
\dot{v}^d \\
\dot{p}^d
\end{pmatrix} = D_1 \begin{pmatrix}
r^\lambda \sin(\theta) \sin((1 + \lambda) \theta) \\
r^\lambda \sin(\theta) - \lambda \sin(\theta) \cos((1 + \lambda) \theta) \\
2r^{\lambda-1} \lambda \cos((1 + \lambda) \theta)
\end{pmatrix} + D_2 \begin{pmatrix}
r^\lambda \sin(\theta) \sin((1 + \lambda) \theta) \\
r^\lambda \sin(\theta) \cos((1 + \lambda) \theta) \\
2r^{\lambda-1} \lambda \sin((1 + \lambda) \theta)
\end{pmatrix},
\]

where \( \lambda \) is solution of (7) and \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) are

\[
D_1 = \sin(\lambda \omega) + \lambda \sin(\omega) \cos((1 + \lambda) \omega),
\]

\[
D_2 = \lambda \sin(\omega) \sin((1 + \lambda) \omega).
\]

Similarly, the dual singular functions are derived by

\[
\left( \begin{array}{c}
\dot{u} \\
\dot{v} \\
\dot{p}
\end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{c}
w \\
\alpha_1 \dot{u}^i \\
\alpha_2 \dot{u}^i
\end{array} \right),
\]

where \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) are the stress intensity factors, \( (\dot{u}^i, p^i) \notin H^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \), \( i = 1, 2 \), are singular functions of (6), and \( (w, q) \in H^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \) is the regular solution.

Lemma 2 (see [26]). The singular function \( (\dot{u}^i, p^i) \in H^{1+\lambda}(\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega) \) and the dual singular function \( (\dot{u}^i, p^i) \notin H^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \), \( i = 1, 2 \), satisfy

\[
-\mu \Delta \dot{u}^i + \nabla p^i = 0, \quad \text{in} \ \Omega,
\]

\[
\nabla \cdot \dot{u}^i = 0, \quad \text{on} \ \Gamma_{in},
\]

\[
-\mu \Delta \dot{u}^i + \nabla p^i = 0, \quad \text{in} \ \Omega,
\]

\[
\nabla \cdot \dot{u}^i = 0, \quad \text{on} \ \Gamma_{in},
\]

respectively. The boundary conditions of \( \dot{u}^i \) and \( \dot{u}^d \) vanish on \( \Gamma_{out} \), but the boundary value of \( \dot{u}^i \) is not defined at the origin. Both of \( \dot{u}^i \) and \( \dot{u}^d \) are not \( 0 \) on \( \Gamma_{out} = \partial \Omega / \Gamma_{in} \).

3. FE-DSFM and Uzawa Iteration

Uzawa method solves velocity variables involving augmented Lagrangian operator and then updates the pressure variable by Richardson update. Algorithm 1 is the Uzawa method for solving stokes equation (3).

There are some theoretical works of literature on the Uzawa method and augmented Lagrangian method. In [29–32], the convergence of Algorithm 1 is proved. Especially, it is shown that \( \kappa = 0 \) and \( \beta = 1 \) have optimal
The solution \( (\mathbf{u}, p) \) including singular parts of (3) can be rewritten in the form (11):
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\mathbf{u} \\
p
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
\mathbf{w} \\
q
\end{pmatrix} + \alpha_1 \begin{pmatrix}
\eta_1 \mathbf{u}_1^s \\
\eta_1 p_1^s
\end{pmatrix} + \alpha_2 \begin{pmatrix}
\eta_2 \mathbf{u}_2^s \\
\eta_2 p_2^s
\end{pmatrix},
\]
where \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) are the stress intensity factors and \( (\mathbf{w}, q) \in H^2(\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega) \).

The strategy of FE-DSFM is to find the regular solution \( (\mathbf{w}, q) \in H^2(\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega) \) and stress intensity factors \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) by applying the standard Uzawa method with an additional equation. To make simpler formula, we assume that there is only one singular solution, that is, one of \( \alpha_1 \) or \( \alpha_2 \) is zero. Let \( \mathbf{u}^{n+1} = \mathbf{w}^{n+1} + \alpha_1 \eta_1 \mathbf{u}^s \) and \( q^{n+1} = q^n + \alpha_1 \eta_1 p^s \). Then, Step 1 of the Uzawa algorithm can be
\[
-\mu \Delta (\mathbf{w}^{n+1} + \alpha_1 \eta_1 \mathbf{u}^s) + \nabla (q^{n+1} + \alpha_1 \eta_1 p^s) = \mathbf{f}. 
\]

Even though \( -\mu \Delta \eta_1 \mathbf{u}^s + \nabla \eta_1 p^s \in L^2 \), we know that
\[
-\mu \Delta (\eta_1 \mathbf{u}^s) + \nabla (\eta_1 p^s) \in L^2. 
\]
So, (16) can be rewritten as
\[
-\mu \Delta \mathbf{w}^{n+1} + \nabla q^{n+1} + \alpha_1 \eta_1 \mathbf{u}^s + \nabla \eta_1 p^s = \mathbf{f}. 
\]

For the sake of a clear explanation, we note that the inner product of vectors \( \mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2) \) and \( \mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2) \) is
\[
\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle = \langle a_1, b_1 \rangle + \langle a_2, b_2 \rangle, \\
\langle \nabla \mathbf{a}, \nabla \mathbf{b} \rangle = \langle \partial_\theta a_1, \partial_\theta b_1 \rangle + \langle \partial_\theta a_2, \partial_\theta b_2 \rangle \\
+ \langle \partial_r a_1, \partial_r b_1 \rangle + \langle \partial_r a_2, \partial_r b_2 \rangle. 
\]

Then, the weak formulation of (17) is
\[
\mu \langle \nabla \mathbf{w}^{n+1}, \nabla \mathbf{v} \rangle + \langle \nabla q^{n+1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle + \alpha_1 \langle -\mu \Delta \eta_1 \mathbf{u}^s + \nabla \eta_1 p^s, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v} \rangle, 
\]
for all \( \mathbf{v} \in H^1_0(\Omega) \). Since \( q^n \in H^1(\Omega) \) and \( -\mu \Delta \eta_1 \mathbf{u}^s + \nabla \eta_1 p^s \in L^2(\Omega) \), equation (19) is solvable, and it has unique solution \( \mathbf{w}^{n+1} \in H^1_0(\Omega) \) if we know \( \alpha_1 \in \mathbb{R} \). However, since \( \alpha_1^{n+1} \) is unknown, we need one more equation, and it should be
\[
(i) \text{ A single equation because } \alpha \text{ is a real number} \\
(ii) \text{ Linearly independent to (19)} \\
(iii) \text{ } \alpha \text{ which is not disappeared} \\
(iv) \text{ Solvable near the singularity corner}
\]
Since equation (19) is a Poisson-type problem to find \( \mathbf{w}^{n+1} \), we can make the additional equation by testing the dual singular function of the following Poisson equation, instead of that of Stokes equation (9):

\[
\lambda_1 \text{ and } \lambda_2 \text{ values by numerical calculation by the bisection root-finding method.}
\]
\[ s_l^d(r, \theta) = r^{-\left(\pi/\omega\right)} \sin\left(\frac{\pi \theta}{\omega}\right). \] (20)

**Lemma 3** (see [19]). The function \( s_l^d \) in (20) has the following properties:

1. \( s_l^d \) is not defined at origin
2. \( s_l^d \in L^2 \) and \( s_l^d \notin H^1 \)
3. \( -\Delta s_l^d = 0 \)
4. \( s_l^d = 0 \) on \( \Gamma_{in} \) (except origin)

We now test \( \eta_{2p} S_L^d \) to (17) and apply Lemma 3 to obtain

\[ \mu \langle w^{n+1}, -\Delta \eta_{2p} S_L^d \rangle + \langle \nabla q^n, \eta_{2p} S_L^d \rangle + \alpha^{n+1} \langle -\mu \Delta \eta_{2p} u^s + \nabla \eta_{2p} p^s, \nu \rangle = \langle f, \nu \rangle - \langle \nabla q^n, \nu \rangle, \] (21)

Let \( \beta_\nu = -\Delta \eta_{2p} u^s + \nabla \eta_{2p} p^s, \eta_{2p} S_L^d \) and \( \beta_f = \langle f, \eta_{2p} S_L^d \rangle \) \(-\langle \nabla q^n, \eta_{2p} S_L^d \rangle \). Then, we have the system

\[ F(w) = \frac{\beta_f}{\beta_\nu} \langle w, -\Delta \eta_{2p} S_L^d \rangle. \] (23)

**Lemma 4.** Define a mapping \( T: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow H^1 \) and \( F: H^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) such that \( T(\alpha) = w \), where

\[ \begin{cases}
\mu \langle \nabla w, \nabla v \rangle + \alpha \langle -\mu \Delta \eta_{2p} u^s + \nabla \eta_{2p} p^s, v \rangle = \langle f, v \rangle - \langle \nabla q^n, v \rangle, \\
F(w) = \frac{\beta_f}{\beta_\nu} \langle w, -\Delta \eta_{2p} S_L^d \rangle.
\end{cases} \] (24)

**Theorem 1.** Formulation (22) has a unique solution \( w \) in \( H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega) \).

**Proof.** By Lemma 4, contract mapping theorem provides the existence of the unique fixed point of \( F \circ T \).

We now define finite element space similarly as in previous sections to construct fully discrete FE-DSFM. Let \( \mathcal{F} = \{ K \} \) be a shape-regular quasi-uniform partition of \( \Omega \) of mesh size \( h \) into closed elements \( K \). The vector and scalar finite element spaces are

\[ \begin{align*}
\mathcal{W}_{h} & = \{ w_h \in L^2(\Omega); w_h|_K \in \mathcal{P}(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{F} \}, \\
\mathcal{V}_{h} & = \mathcal{W}_{h} \cap H_0^1(\Omega), \\
\mathcal{P}_{h} & = \{ q_h \in L^2(\Omega) \cap C^0(\Omega); q_h|_K \in \mathcal{C}(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{F} \}.
\end{align*} \] (28)
where $P(K)$ and $Q(K)$ are spaces of polynomials with degree bounded uniformly with respect to $K \in \mathcal{I}$. We stress that the space $P_h$ is composed of continuous functions to use integration by parts:

$$\mu \langle \nabla w_h^{n+1}, \nabla v_h \rangle + \alpha_h^{n+1} \langle -\mu \Delta \eta u^s + \nabla \eta p^s, v_h \rangle = \langle f, v_h \rangle - \langle \nabla q_h^n, v_h \rangle,$$

where $\beta_h = \langle f, \eta_{1y} S^d \rangle - \langle \nabla q_h^n, \eta_{1z} S^d \rangle$. And, the matrix form of the coupled system (30) becomes

$$(A + a \cdot b^T) \mathbf{w}_h = \mathbf{f},$$

where $A$ is symmetric positive definite square matrix and $a$ and $b$ are column vectors. System (31) can be solved by the Sherman–Morrison formula:

$$(A + a \cdot b^T)^{-1} = A^{-1} - \frac{A^{-1}ab^T A^{-1}}{1 + b^T A^{-1}a}$$

and $\alpha_h^{n+1}$ can be computed by second equation of (30).

Sherman–Morrison formula is a rigorous approach to solve system (30), but it is sometimes complicated to apply for some problems including many singular functions. Since $(F \ast T)(u^s) = a^{n+1}$ by Lemma 4, we choose $\alpha_1^s$ instead of $\alpha_h^{n+1}$ in first equation of (30). Algorithm 2 is the proposed method for one singular function.

**Remark 1.** Compared with the original Uzawa iteration (Algorithm 1), the proposed method (Algorithm 2) needs only one more linear solver for the initial process.

**4. Algorithm for Two Singular Functions**

In this section, we construct an algorithm for two singularities in one corner. We consider the solution is

$$\begin{bmatrix} u \\ p \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} w \\ q \end{bmatrix} + \alpha_1 \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{1x} u_1^1 \\ \eta_{1x} p_1^1 \end{bmatrix} + \alpha_2 \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{2x} u_2^1 \\ \eta_{2x} p_2^1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{33}$$

$$\langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h, q_h \rangle = -\langle \nabla \mathbf{v}_h, \nabla q_h \rangle, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h,$$

for all $q_h \in P_h$. Then, the finite element approximation for (22) is to find $\mathbf{w}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h$ and $\alpha_h^{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}_h, q_h \rangle = -\langle \nabla \mathbf{v}_h, \nabla q_h \rangle, \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h,$$

with the implicit formation of two stress intensity factors, step 1 of Uzawa algorithm is

$$-\mu \Delta w_h^{n+1} + \nabla q_h^n + \alpha_h^{n+1} (-\Delta \eta u^s_1 + \nabla \eta p^s_1)$$

$$+ \alpha_2^{n+1} (-\Delta \eta u^s_2 + \nabla \eta p^s_2) = \mathbf{f}.$$ \tag{34}

Here, the unknowns are $w_h^{n+1}, \alpha_h^{n+1}$, and $\alpha_2^{n+1}$. However, our test function which is not in $H^1_0$ is only $\eta_{1y} S^d$. Instead of finding another test function, we use the following property.

**Theorem 2.** (Properties of singular functions). Let $u_1^j = \begin{bmatrix} u_1^j \\ v_1^j \end{bmatrix}$ and $u_2^j = \begin{bmatrix} u_2^j \\ v_2^j \end{bmatrix}$ be the singular functions of Stokes equation on same corner. Then,

$$\langle -\Delta \eta u_1^j + (\eta_{1x} p_1^j), \eta_{2y} S^d \rangle \langle -\Delta \eta u_2^j + (\eta_{2x} p_2^j), \eta_{2y} S^d \rangle$$

$$+ \langle -\Delta \eta v_1^j + (\eta_{1x} p_1^j), \eta_{2y} S^d \rangle \langle -\Delta \eta v_2^j + (\eta_{2x} p_2^j), \eta_{2y} S^d \rangle = 0.$$ \tag{35}

**Proof.** To tell the conclusion, it is too difficult to show equation (35) by algebraic calculation because the integral functions depend on some constants which are constructed by solutions of transcendental function.

First of all, from singular function (6) and cut-off function (14) with smooth function, we obtain
Let

\[ UA_1 (\theta) = -C_1 \left( \lambda \sin (\theta) \sin ((1 - \lambda)\theta) \right) + C_2 \left( \sin (\lambda \theta) + \lambda \sin (\theta) \cos ((1 - \lambda)\theta) \right), \]

\[ UB_1 (\theta) = -C_1 \left( (2\lambda + 1) \lambda \sin (\theta) \sin ((1 - \lambda)\theta) + 2\lambda \cos (\theta) \cos ((1 - \lambda)\theta) \right) + C_2 \left( (2\lambda + 1) \sin (\lambda \theta) + \lambda \sin (\theta) \cos ((1 - \lambda)\theta) - 2\lambda \cos (\theta) \sin ((1 - \lambda)\theta) \right), \]

\[ VA_1 (\theta) = -C_1 \left( \sin (\lambda \theta) - \lambda \sin (\theta) \cos ((1 - \lambda)\theta) \right) + C_2 \left( \lambda \sin (\theta) \sin ((1 - \lambda)\theta) \right), \]

\[ VB_1 (\theta) = -C_1 \left( (2\lambda + 1) \sin (\lambda \theta) - \lambda \sin (\theta) \cos ((1 - \lambda)\theta) + 2\lambda \sin (\theta) \cos ((1 - \lambda)\theta) \right) + C_2 \left( (2\lambda + 1) \lambda \sin (\theta) \sin ((1 - \lambda)\theta) - 2\lambda \sin (\theta) \sin ((1 - \lambda)\theta) \right). \]

Then,

\[ -\Delta \eta_r u_r + \left( \nabla \eta_r P \right) \cdot \eta_r = r^4 \left( \eta_r \right)_{rr} UA_1 (\theta) + r^{\lambda-1} \left( \eta_r \right)_r UB_1 (\theta), \]

\[ -\Delta \eta_r v_r + \left( \nabla \eta_r P \right) \cdot \eta_r = r^4 \left( \eta_r \right)_{rr} VA_1 (\theta) + r^{\lambda-1} \left( \eta_r \right)_r VB_1 (\theta). \]

Since

\[
\left\langle -\Delta \eta_r u_r + \left( \nabla \eta_r P \right) \cdot \eta_r, \eta_2 e_{x_1} \right\rangle
\]

\[
= \int_0^\omega \int_0^\theta \left( -\Delta \eta_r u_r + \left( \nabla \eta_r P \right) \cdot \eta_r \right) \eta_2 r^{-\left(\pi/\omega\right)} \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) d\theta dr
\]

\[
= \int_0^\omega \int_0^\theta \left( r^4 \left( \eta_r \right)_{rr} UA_1 (\theta) + r^{\lambda-1} \left( \eta_r \right)_r UB_1 (\theta) \right) \eta_2 r^{-\left(\pi/\omega\right)} \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) d\theta dr
\]
\[ \int_0^\omega U_{A1} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta \int_0^\omega U_{A12} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta \\
+ \int_0^\omega V_{A1} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta \int_0^\omega V_{A12} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta = 0, \tag{40} \]

\[ \int_0^\omega U_{B1} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta \int_0^\omega U_{B12} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta \\
+ \int_0^\omega V_{B1} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta \int_0^\omega V_{B12} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta = 0, \tag{41} \]

\[ \int_0^\omega U_{B1} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta \int_0^\omega V_{A12} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta \\
+ \int_0^\omega V_{B1} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta \int_0^\omega U_{A12} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta = 0, \tag{42} \]

\[ \int_0^\omega U_{B1} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta \int_0^\omega V_{B12} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta \\
+ \int_0^\omega V_{B1} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta \int_0^\omega U_{B12} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta = 0. \tag{43} \]

However, we could not show equations (40)–(43) are valid by algebraically computation. Therefore, we calculate them numerically.

For numerical substitution, we first compute the above integral forms:

\[ \int_0^\omega U_{A1} (\theta) \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{\omega} \theta \right) \, d\theta \]

\[ = \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\omega}{\lambda \omega - \pi} - \frac{\omega}{\lambda \omega + \pi} \right) \left( C_1 \lambda (1 + \cos (\lambda \omega)) - C_2 (2 + \lambda) \sin (\lambda \omega) \right) \]

\[ + \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\omega}{(2 - \lambda) \omega + \pi} - \frac{\omega}{(2 - \lambda) \omega - \pi} \right) \]

\[ \times \left( C_1 \lambda (1 + \cos ((2 - \lambda) \omega)) - C_2 \lambda \sin ((2 - \lambda) \omega) \right), \tag{44} \]
\[
\int_0^\omega U_{B_\lambda}(\theta) \times \sin(\frac{\pi}{\omega} + \theta) \, d\theta \\
= \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\omega}{\lambda \omega - \pi} - \frac{\omega}{\lambda \omega + \pi} \right) \left( C_1(2\lambda^2 + 3\lambda)(1 + \cos(\lambda \omega)) - C_2(2\lambda^2 + 7\lambda + 2)\sin(\lambda \omega) \right) \\
+ \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{2\lambda}{(2-\lambda)\omega + \pi} - \frac{\omega}{(2-\lambda)\omega - \pi} \right) \\
\times \left( C_1(2\lambda^2 - \lambda)(1 + \cos((2-\lambda)\omega)) - C_2(2\lambda^2 - \lambda)\sin((2-\lambda)\omega) \right),
\]
(45)

\[
\int_0^\omega V_{A_1}(\theta) \times \sin(\frac{\pi}{\omega} + \theta) \, d\theta \\
= \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\omega}{\lambda \omega - \pi} - \frac{\omega}{\lambda \omega + \pi} \right) \left( C_1(2\lambda - 2\lambda^2)(1 + \cos(\lambda \omega)) - C_1(2\lambda^2 - 5\lambda - 2)\sin(\lambda \omega) \right) \\
+ \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{2\lambda}{(2-\lambda)\omega + \pi} - \frac{\omega}{(2-\lambda)\omega - \pi} \right) \\
\times \left( C_1(\lambda - 2\lambda^2)(1 + \cos((2-\lambda)\omega)) - C_1(\lambda - 2\lambda^2)\sin((2-\lambda)\omega) \right),
\]
(46)

\[
\int_0^\omega V_{B_\lambda}(\theta) \times \sin(\frac{\pi}{\omega} + \theta) \, d\theta \\
= \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\omega}{\lambda \omega - \pi} - \frac{\omega}{\lambda \omega + \pi} \right) \left( C_1(2\lambda - 2\lambda^2)(1 + \cos(\lambda \omega)) - C_1(2\lambda^2 - 5\lambda - 2)\sin(\lambda \omega) \right) \\
+ \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{2\lambda}{(2-\lambda)\omega + \pi} - \frac{\omega}{(2-\lambda)\omega - \pi} \right) \\
\times \left( C_1(\lambda - 2\lambda^2)(1 + \cos((2-\lambda)\omega)) - C_1(\lambda - 2\lambda^2)\sin((2-\lambda)\omega) \right),
\]
(47)

We remark that the values \(\lambda_1\) and \(\lambda_2\) are from the equation
\[
\lambda^2 \sin^2(\omega) = \sin^2(\lambda \omega),
\]
(48)
and it is not possible to solve directly. So, we use the numerical root-finding method and bisection method for various tolerances of approximated \(\lambda\). For internal re-entrant corner angle \(\omega\), we choose 400 angles from \(\pi\) to \(2\pi\) by 0.0025\(\pi\) interval. Denote that
(i) \(U_{A\lambda}V_A := \text{ left side of equation (40)}\)
(ii) \(U_{A\lambda}V_B := \text{ left side of equation (41)}\)

\[
\mu \langle \mathbf{w}^{n+1}, -\Delta \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L + \langle \nabla q^{n}, \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L \rangle \rangle \\
+ a_1^{n+1} \langle -\Delta \eta_{p}u^{1}_L + \nabla \eta_{p}p^{1}_L, \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L \rangle + a_2^{n+1} \langle -\Delta \eta_{p}u^{2}_L + \nabla \eta_{p}p^{2}_L, \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L \rangle
\]
\[
= \langle f, \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L \rangle.
\]
(49)

Let \(\mathbf{w} = (w_1, w_2)\) and \(f = (f_1, f_2)\). Then, \(x\) component of (49) is
\[
\mu \langle \mathbf{w}_1^{n+1}, -\Delta \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L + \langle \nabla q^{n}, \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L \rangle \rangle \\
+ a_1^{n+1} \langle -\Delta \eta_{p}u^{1}_L + \nabla \eta_{p}p^{1}_L, \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L \rangle \\
+ a_2^{n+1} \langle -\Delta \eta_{p}u^{2}_L + \nabla \eta_{p}p^{2}_L, \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L \rangle
\]
\[
= \langle f_1, \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L \rangle,
\]
(50)

and \(y\) component of (49) is
\[
\mu \langle \mathbf{w}_2^{n+1}, -\Delta \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L + \langle \nabla q^{n}, \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L \rangle \rangle \\
+ a_1^{n+1} \langle -\Delta \eta_{p}v^{1}_L + \nabla \eta_{p}p^{1}_L, \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L \rangle \\
+ a_2^{n+1} \langle -\Delta \eta_{p}v^{2}_L + \nabla \eta_{p}p^{2}_L, \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L \rangle
\]
\[
= \langle f_2, \eta_{2p}S^{d}_L \rangle.
\]
(51)
Figure 2: $U_A V_A$, $U_A V_B$, $U_B V_A$, and $U_B V_B$ values by numerical substitution with various tolerance of $\lambda$. 
If we use the following notations
\[ U_{s_1} = \langle -\Delta \eta_1 U_1^i + (\eta_1 p_1^i), \eta_2 p_1^i \rangle, \]
\[ U_{s_2} = \langle -\Delta \eta_1 U_1^i + (\eta_1 p_2^i), \eta_2 p_2^i \rangle, \]
\[ V_{s_1} = \langle -\Delta \eta_1 V_1^i + (\eta_1 p_1^i), \eta_2 p_1^i \rangle, \]
\[ V_{s_2} = \langle -\Delta \eta_1 V_1^i + (\eta_1 p_2^i), \eta_2 p_2^i \rangle, \]
then (50) and (51) can be rewritten by
\[
\begin{align*}
\beta W_1^{n+1} &= \mu \langle w_1^{n+1}, -\Delta \eta_2 s_1^d \rangle + \langle q_1^r, \eta_2 s_1^d \rangle, \\
\beta W_2^{n+1} &= \mu \langle w_2^{n+1}, -\Delta \eta_2 s_2^d \rangle + \langle q_2^r, \eta_2 s_2^d \rangle, \\
\beta f_1 &= \beta f_2 = \langle f_1, \eta_2 s_1^d \rangle, \\
\beta f_2 &= \langle f_2, \eta_2 s_2^d \rangle, \\
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, we obtain
\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_1^{n+1} U_{s_1} \cdot U_{s_1} &= (\beta f_1 - \beta W_1^{n+1} - \alpha_2^{n+1} U_{s_2}) U_{s_1}, \\
\alpha_1^{n+1} V_{s_1} \cdot V_{s_1} &= (\beta f_2 - \beta W_2^{n+1} - \alpha_2^{n+1} V_{s_2}) V_{s_1},
\end{align*}
\]

Finally, combining (54) and (55) and equation (35) in Theorem 2 yields
\[
\alpha_1^{n+1} (U_{s_1} \cdot U_{s_1} + V_{s_1} \cdot V_{s_1}) \\
= (\beta f_1 - \beta W_1^{n+1}) U_{s_1} + (\beta f_2 - \beta W_2^{n+1}) V_{s_1} \\
- \alpha_2^{n+1} (U_{s_1} U_{s_1} + V_{s_1} V_{s_1}) \\
= (\beta f_1 - \beta W_1^{n+1}) U_{s_1} + (\beta f_2 - \beta W_2^{n+1}) V_{s_1}.
\]

As a result, we can calculate one stress intensity factor \( \alpha_1^{n+1} \) by
\[
\alpha_1^{n+1} = \frac{(\beta f_1 - \beta W_1^{n+1}) U_{s_1} + (\beta f_2 - \beta W_2^{n+1}) V_{s_1}}{U_{s_1} U_{s_1} + V_{s_1} V_{s_1}}.
\]

Similarly, another stress intensity factor \( \alpha_2^{n+1} \) can be computed by
\[
\alpha_2^{n+1} = \frac{(\beta f_1 - \beta W_1^{n+1}) U_{s_2} + (\beta f_2 - \beta W_2^{n+1}) V_{s_2}}{U_{s_2} U_{s_2} + V_{s_2} V_{s_2}}.
\]

\[ \square \]

Remark 2. Since \( \langle \eta_1 u^r, -\Delta \eta_1 s_1^d \rangle = 0 \), Lemma 4 is valid for two singular functions case.

Algorithm 3 is the proposed Uzawa iteration for two singularities.

5. Numerical Experiments

In this section, we provide numerical simulations using the standard Uzawa method and Algorithm 3. Our goal is to check their performance for the numerical solution \( u_h \) and \( p_h \), which is composed of a regular solution \( w_h \) and \( q_h \), and stress intensity factors \( \alpha_{1h} \) and \( \alpha_{2h} \). All numerical integration is calculated by the Gaussian quadrature 6 points. We notate \( \Gamma_{out} = \{(r, \theta) \in \Omega : \theta \neq 0 \text{ and } \theta \neq \pi\} \).

Example 1. Simulation environments are

1. PDE model: Stokes equation (3)
2. Computational domain: \([-1, 1] \times [-1, 1]\) \([0, 1] \times [-1, 0]\) \(\Omega \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R \Gamma}\) (2 shape domain, \(\omega = 3\pi/2\)) (see Figure 3).
3. Parameters:
\[
\begin{align*}
\mu &= 1.0 \\
\lambda_1 &= 0.5444837367824639 \\
\lambda_2 &= 0.9085291898460087 \\
\rho &= 1.0 \text{ and radius } R = 3.0 \in \mathbb{R} \text{ for cut-off function} \\
\|u^{n+1} - u^n\| &\leq \text{tolerance} = 1.0^{-8}.
\end{align*}
\]
4. Exact solution (see Figures 4 and 5):
\[
\begin{align*}
u &= -\sin^2(\pi x) \sin(2\pi y) + \alpha_1 u_1 + \alpha_2 u_2 \\
v &= \sin(2\pi x) \sin^2(\pi y) + \alpha_1 v_1 + \alpha_2 v_2 \\
p &= (2 + \cos(\pi x))(2 + \cos(\pi y)) - 4 + \alpha_1 p_1 + \alpha_2 p_2 \\
\alpha_1 &= 2.0, \alpha_2 = -3.0.
\end{align*}
\]
5. Boundary condition: Dirichlet boundary condition.
\[
u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_{in} \{|h|\} \text{ and } \Gamma_{in} \{|h|_{\partial w} \} \text{ and } u \neq 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_{out}.
\]

Minielement chooses \( \psi_h \) and \( P_h \) are the piecewise P1-bubble and piecewise P1 space pair satisfying discrete inf-sup condition. In this finite dimensional space, we desire \( \|u - u_h\| \leq Ch^2 \), \( \|u - u_h\|_{\infty} \leq Ch^2 \), \( \|u - u_h\|_2 \leq Ch \), and \( \|u - p_h\| \leq Ch \) as an optimal convergence for some constant \( C \) which does not depend on numerical solution \( (u, p) \). In Figure 6, standard Uzawa iteration loses accuracy for \( u \) and \( p \) because the solutions contain singular functions. On the contrary, proposed Uzawa algorithm shows optimal accuracy of \( w, q, \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \). Since \( u \) only depends \( w, \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \) and similarly \( p \) only depends \( q, \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \). The figure guarantees convergence rate of \( u \) and \( p \). The errors of stress intensity factors \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) decrease somewhat irregularly. However, we can see that the overall decay of both errors follows the optimal rate.

The next finite element space is the Taylor-Hood space which chooses \( \psi_h \) and \( P_h \) as the piecewise P2 and piecewise P1 space pair. This also satisfies the discrete inf-sup condition. In this space, the desired convergence rates are \( \|u - u_h\| \leq Ch^3 \), \( \|u - u_h\|_{\infty} \leq Ch^3 \), \( \|u - u_h\|_2 \leq Ch \), and \( \|p - p_h\| \leq Ch^2 \), and Figure 7 shows the results calculated by each method. Even in this case, standard Uzawa iteration shows insufficient performance, which is
\[ \begin{align*}
\mu \langle \nabla z_1, \nabla v_h \rangle + \mu \langle \Delta \eta \mu u_1^i + \nabla \eta \mu p_1^i, v_h \rangle &= 0 \\
\mu \langle \nabla z_2, \nabla v_h \rangle + \langle -\mu \Delta \eta \mu u_2^i + \nabla \eta \mu p_2^i, v_h \rangle &= 0 \\
\text{Repeat the following steps until } ||w_h^{n+1} - w_h^n|| \leq \text{tolerance}: \\
\text{Step 1: for all } v_h \in W_h, \text{ find } \tilde{w}_h^{n+1} \in W_h \text{ as the solution of } \\
\mu \langle \nabla \tilde{w}_h^{n+1}, \nabla v_h \rangle + \langle \nabla q_h^n, \nabla v_h \rangle + \alpha_{n+1}^1 \langle -\Delta \eta \mu u_1^i + \nabla \eta \mu p_1^i, v_h \rangle + \alpha_{n+1}^2 \langle -\Delta \eta \mu u_2^i + \nabla \eta \mu p_2^i, v_h \rangle = \langle f, v_h \rangle \\
\text{Step 2: by } \tilde{w}_h^{n+1} = (w_h^{n+1})_1, \text{ find } \alpha_{n+1}^1 \text{ and } \alpha_{n+1}^2 \text{ from the equations } \\
\alpha_{n+1}^1 = ((\beta f_1 - \beta W_1)z_1 + (\beta f_2 - \beta W_2)z_2) / (W_1 - z_1 + W_2 - z_2) \\
\alpha_{n+1}^2 = ((\beta f_1 - \beta W_1)z_2 + (\beta f_2 - \beta W_2)z_1) / (W_1 - z_1 + W_2 - z_2) \\
\text{Step 3: update } w_h^n \in W_h, \text{ by } w_h^{n+1} = \tilde{w}_h^{n+1} + (\alpha_{n+1}^1 - \alpha_n^1)z_1 + (\alpha_{n+1}^2 - \alpha_n^2)z_2 \\
\text{Step 4: for all } p_h \in P_h, \text{ update } q_h^{n+1} \text{ by } \langle q_h^{n+1}, p_h \rangle = \langle q_h^n, p_h \rangle - \mu \langle \nabla \cdot w_h^{n+1}, p_h \rangle - \alpha_{n+1}^1 \langle \nabla \cdot \eta \mu u_1^i, p_h \rangle - \alpha_{n+1}^2 \langle \nabla \cdot \eta \mu u_2^i, p_h \rangle \\
\end{align*} \]

Algorithm 3: (FE-DSFM Uzawa iteration for two singular functions). Start with any initial values \( p_h^0, \alpha_{1h}^0, \alpha_{2h}^0 \), \( z_1 \) and \( z_2 \), for all \( v_h \in W_h \), is the solution of
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\caption{Computational domain \((h = 1/8)\) of Example 1.}
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\caption{Exact solutions, \( u \) (a) and \( v \) (b), of Example 1.}
\end{figure}
Figure 5: Exact solution, $p$ (a) and the quiver of $u$ (b), of Example 1.

Figure 6: Error decays between standard Uzawa method and Algorithm 3 for Example 1. All algorithms use minielements.
almost the similar convergence rate as in the minielement case, despite higher-order finite element space. In contrast, the proposed Uzawa algorithm presents optimal results.

6. Conclusions

We have presented a finite element using dual singular functions with Uzawa iteration for the steady Stokes equations including corner singularities. The proposed method uses the fact that the solution of an elliptic boundary value problem can be decomposed of a finite number of singular functions and a smoother remainder function which is called a regular solution. For the decoupled variational formulations with Uzawa iteration, we test the dual singular function of the Laplace problem and another cut-off function. Also, orthogonality of singular function of Stokes equation was presented, which imply that the proposed algorithm is available for two singular functions in the same corner. A numerical example indicates that the scheme is optimally accurate in both velocity and pressure. Besides, the scheme requires only one additional linear solver in the initial step, so it is much more cost-effective than the conventional dual singular function method for solving the Sherman–Morrison formulation. Since our method is based on the Uzawa iteration, it can be an extended version to solve the Navier–Stokes equation later.
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