


---

# NUMERICAL ANALYSIS OF SEVERAL FFT-BASED SCHEMES FOR COMPUTATIONAL HOMOGENIZATION

---

A PREPRINT

 **Changqing Ye**

Department of Mathematics  
The Chinese University of Hong Kong  
Hong Kong Special Administrative Region  
cqye@math.cuhk.edu.hk

**Eric T. Chung**

Department of Mathematics  
The Chinese University of Hong Kong  
Hong Kong Special Administrative Region  
tschung@math.cuhk.edu.hk

January 7, 2022

## ABSTRACT

We study the convergences of several FFT-based schemes that are widely applied in computational homogenization for deriving effective coefficients, and the term “convergence” here means the limiting behaviors as spatial resolutions going to infinity. Those schemes include Moulinec-Suquent’s scheme [Comput Method Appl M, 157 (1998), pp. 69-94], Willot’s scheme [Comptes Rendus Mécanique, 343 (2015), pp. 232-245], and the FEM scheme [Int J Numer Meth Eng, 109 (2017), pp. 1461-1489]. Under some reasonable assumptions, we prove that the effective coefficients obtained by those schemes are all convergent to the theoretical ones. Moreover, for the FEM scheme, we can present several convergence rate estimates under additional regularity assumptions.

**Keywords** Computational homogenization · FFT · effective coefficients · convergence · convergence rates · numerical analysis

## 1 Introduction and preliminaries

In an inhomogeneous material that obeys the linear elasticity law, the fourth-order stiffness tensor  $\mathbf{C}(x)$  varies at different  $x$ . The central goal of computational homogenization methods is determining an effective constitutive law, which may serve as a surrogate model for downstream applications Milton [2002], Zohdi and Wriggers [2008].

Let  $Y = (0, 1)^d$  be a Representative Volume Element (RVE) where  $d = 3$  through the whole paper, and  $\mathbf{C}(x)$  be the fourth-order stiffness tensor for any  $x \in Y$ . We denote by  $H_{\#}^1(Y)$  the closure of smooth  $Y$ -periodic functions with respect to ordinary  $H^1$ -norm Cioranescu and Donato [1999], and define  $W_{\#}^{1,p}(Y)$  accordingly. The notation  $H_{\#}^1(Y)$  will be replaced as  $H_{\#}^1(Y; \mathbb{R}^d)$  or  $H_{\#}^1(Y; \mathbb{C}^d)$  for vector-valued functions, while  $\|u\|_{W^{m,p}(\omega)}$  ( $\|u\|_{L^p(\omega)}$ ,  $\|u\|_{H^m(\omega)}$ ) should be always understood as  $W^{m,p}$ -norm ( $L^p$ -norm,  $H^m$ -norm) of  $u$  on the domain  $\omega$  regardless of whether  $u$  is vector-valued or not. For a discrete set  $D \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ , let  $l(D; W)$  be the linear space of discrete functions which take inputs in  $D$  and return values of  $W$ , where  $W$  may be  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbb{C}^d$  and  $\mathbb{S}^d$  (the set of symmetric  $d \times d$  matrices). The double dot operator “:” and the single dot operator “·” are defined conventionally for any order tensors (including vectors and matrices), and note that now the matrix-vector product  $Eu$  is rewritten as  $E \cdot u$ . A popular method to derive the effective coefficients  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{eff}}$  of  $\mathbf{C}(x)$  is solving a periodic boundary value problem: find  $u \in H_{\#}^1(Y; \mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $\langle u \rangle = \mathbf{0}$  such that for any  $v \in H_{\#}^1(Y; \mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\langle \nabla^s v : \mathbf{C}(x) : \nabla^s u \rangle = -\langle \nabla^s v : \mathbf{C}(x) \rangle : E, \quad (1)$$

where  $\langle f \rangle$  stands for  $f_Y$ ,  $f$  dx,  $E$  belongs to  $\mathbb{S}^d$  and  $[\nabla^s v]_{mn} = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_m [v]_n + \partial_n [v]_m)$ . The effective stiffness tensor  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{eff}}$  can be obtained by

$$\mathbf{C}^{\text{eff}} : E = \langle \mathbf{C}(x) : (\nabla^s u + E) \rangle \quad (2)$$

via choosing different  $E$ .

The starting point of FFT-based homogenization is rewriting the above variational form into the Lippmann-Schwinger equation. Taking  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}}$  as a linear elastic reference medium, which is a *constant* fourth-order tensor satisfying certain coercive conditions, we can introduce a Green function  $\mathbf{G}^0$  such that for any  $F(x) \in L^2(Y; \mathbb{S}^d)$ , the convolution  $\mathbf{G}^0 * F \in H_{\#}^1(Y; \mathbb{R}^d)$  is the solution to the variational form

$$\langle \nabla^s v : \mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}} : \nabla^s (\mathbf{G}^0 * F) \rangle = \langle \nabla^s v : F \rangle, \forall v \in H_{\#}^1(Y; \mathbb{R}^d).$$

By setting  $[\mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}}]_{mnpq} = \lambda^0 \delta_{mn} \delta_{pq} + \mu^0 (\delta_{mp} \delta_{nq} + \delta_{mq} \delta_{np})$  and taking the Fourier series expansion of  $F(x)$  as  $F(x) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \widehat{F} \exp(2\pi i x \cdot \xi)$ , we can derive that for  $\xi \neq \mathbf{0}$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{G}^0 * F}[\xi] = \frac{i}{2\pi |\xi|^2 \mu^0} \left[ \frac{(\mu^0 + \lambda^0) \xi \otimes \xi}{(2\mu^0 + \lambda^0) |\xi|^2} - I_d \right] \cdot \widehat{F} \cdot \xi,$$

where  $I_d$  is the  $d \times d$  identity matrix and  $\otimes$  is the Kronecker product. Moreover, it is easy to show that eq. (1) is equivalent to

$$u = -\mathbf{G}^0 * (\delta \mathbf{C} : (\nabla^s u + E) + \mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}} : E) = -\mathbf{G}^0 * (\delta \mathbf{C} : (\nabla^s u + E)),$$

where  $\delta \mathbf{C} := \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}}$  and  $\mathbf{G}^0 * (\mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}} : E)$  vanishes due to that  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}} : E$  is a constant matrix. If taking  $\varepsilon := \nabla^s u + E$  and  $\Gamma^0 := \nabla^s \mathbf{G}^0$ , we can immediately read the above equation as

$$\varepsilon + \Gamma^0 * (\delta \mathbf{C} : \varepsilon) = E \quad (3)$$

the so-called Lippmann-Schwinger equation Lippmann and Schwinger [1950]. The alternative form of eq. (3) in the Fourier space is

$$\widehat{\varepsilon}[\xi] = \begin{cases} -\widehat{\Gamma^0} : \widehat{\delta \mathbf{C}} : \varepsilon, & \xi \neq \mathbf{0}, \\ E, & \xi = \mathbf{0}. \end{cases}$$

Specifically, when  $[\mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}}]_{mnpq} = \lambda^0 \delta_{mn} \delta_{pq} + \mu^0 (\delta_{mp} \delta_{nq} + \delta_{mq} \delta_{np})$ , we can derive a closed form of  $\widehat{\Gamma^0}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} [\widehat{\Gamma^0}]_{mnpq}[\xi] &= \frac{1}{4 |\xi|^2 \mu^0} (\xi_m \xi_q \delta_{np} + \xi_n \xi_q \delta_{mp} + \xi_m \xi_p \delta_{nq} + \xi_n \xi_p \delta_{mq}) \\ &\quad - \frac{(\lambda^0 + \mu^0) \xi_m \xi_n \xi_p \xi_q}{\mu^0 (\lambda^0 + 2\mu^0) |\xi|^4} \end{aligned}$$

Now it comes to discretization schemes. For simplicity, we equally split  $Y$  into  $N$  parts in every dimension. For any  $d$ -dimensional index  $I = (I_1, I_2, I_3) \in \mathcal{I}_N \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$  with  $\mathcal{I}_N = \{I \in \mathbb{Z}^d : 0 \leq I_m < N, \forall 1 \leq m \leq d\}$ , we denote by

$$Y_I = \left( \frac{I_1}{N}, \frac{I_1 + 1}{N} \right) \times \left( \frac{I_2}{N}, \frac{I_2 + 1}{N} \right) \times \left( \frac{I_3}{N}, \frac{I_3 + 1}{N} \right)$$

an element in the language of Finite Element Methods (FEM), which could be interpreted as a pixel (for 2D problems) or voxel (for 3D problems). Correspondingly, the frequency domain is denoted by  $\mathcal{F}_N := \{\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d : -N/2 \leq \xi_m < N/2, \forall 1 \leq m \leq d\}$ . We always postulate that an image-like  $\mathbf{C}_N(x)$  (i.e.,  $\mathbf{C}_N(x)$  is constant in every  $Y_I$ ) rather than the ground truth  $\mathbf{C}(x)$  is provided, and introduce a notation  $\mathbf{C}_N^*[I] = \mathbf{C}_N(x_I)$  where  $x_I$  is the geometric center of  $Y_I$ . The basic scheme of FFT-based homogenization was proposed by Moulinec and Suquet in Moulinec and Suquet [1995, 1998], and can be stated as algorithm 1. Depending on the type of a function's domain, the Fourier coefficients are defined differently, i.e. if  $f \in L^2(Y; \mathbb{C})$ , then  $\widehat{f}[\xi]$  is determined by the formula

$$f(x) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \widehat{f}[\xi] \exp(2\pi i \xi \cdot x),$$

and if  $f^* \in l(\mathcal{I}_N; \mathbb{C})$ , then  $\widehat{f^*}[\xi]$  satisfies

$$f^*[I] = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} \widehat{f^*}[\xi] \exp(2\pi i \frac{\xi \cdot I}{N}).$$

Note that if is labeled with a superscript “\*”, the function should be understood as a discrete one with  $\mathcal{I}_N$  as its domain.

Moulinec-Suquet's scheme (we also call it the basic scheme) gains considerable popularity. The reasons can be summarized as follows: 1) microstructures in heterogeneous materials may be rather complex, which causes that

**Algorithm 1** Moulinec-Suquent's scheme

- 
- 1: Set  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}}$  and  $E$ , initiate a tensor variable  $\varepsilon_N^* \in l(\mathcal{I}_N; \mathbb{S}^d)$  with  $\varepsilon_N^*[I] = E$  for all  $I \in \mathcal{I}_N$
  - 2: **while** not meet the convergence criterion **do**
  - 3:   Evaluate  $\tau_N^*[I] = (\mathbf{C}_N^*[I] - \mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}}) : \varepsilon_N^*[I]$  for all  $I \in \mathcal{I}_N$
  - 4:   Perform a FFT  $\widehat{\tau}_N^* = \text{FFT}(\tau_N^*)$
  - 5:   Initiate a temporary tensor variable  $\widehat{\varepsilon}_N^*$  and evaluate  $\widehat{\varepsilon}_N^*[\mathbf{0}] = E$ ,  $\widehat{\varepsilon}_N^*[\xi] = -\widehat{\Gamma}^0[\xi] : \widehat{\tau}_N^*[\xi]$  for all  $\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$
  - 6:   Perform an inverse FFT  $\varepsilon_N^* = \text{FFT}^{-1}(\widehat{\varepsilon}_N^*)$
  - 7:   Calculate the convergence indicator via  $\varepsilon_N^*$  and  $\varepsilon_N^*$  and  $\varepsilon_N^* \leftarrow \varepsilon_N^*$
  - 8: **end while**
  - 9: **return**  $\varepsilon_N^*$  and  $N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : \varepsilon_N^*[I]$
- 

generating high quality meshes dominates overall computational overheads Hughes et al. [2005]; 2) the primary information of microstructures is usually provided by modern digital volume imaging techniques Larson et al. [2002], Poulsen [2004], Landis and Keane [2010], and we may not be capable to retrieve the original geometric descriptions and to perform a preprocessing for FEMs; 3) the easy implementation of those schemes and highly optimized FFT packages (e.g., Intel®MKL, FFTW Frigo and Johnson [2005]) secure the global efficiency; 4) generally, it is  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{eff}}$  the effective coefficients we are more interested in rather than  $u$  the local displacement or  $\varepsilon$  the local stress, and unfitted structured meshes may have less influence on desired  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{eff}}$  comparing to  $u$  and  $\varepsilon$ . Moreover, those methods are not limited in linear elasticity, versatile applications such as nonlinear elasticity Moulinec and Suquet [1998], Michel et al. [2001], piezoelectricity Brenner [2009], damage and fracture mechanics Zhu and Yvonnet [2015], Chai et al. [2020], polycrystalline materials Segurado et al. [2018] can be found in literature. We strongly recommend a recent review article Schneider [2021] as an exhaustive reference for historical developments and the current state of the art of FFT-base homogenization methods.

Willot's scheme is another popular discretization method of the Lippmann-Schwinger equation Willot [2015]. The main idea in Willot's scheme is replacing  $2\pi i \xi$  the gradient operator  $\nabla$  in the *Fourier space* with

$$k_N[\xi] = \frac{iN}{4} \prod_{m=1}^d \left\{ \exp\left(2\pi i \frac{\xi_m}{N}\right) + 1 \right\} \left[ \tan\left(\frac{\pi \xi_1}{N}\right), \tan\left(\frac{\pi \xi_2}{N}\right), \tan\left(\frac{\pi \xi_3}{N}\right) \right] \quad (4)$$

that is derived from a finite difference stencil. If  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}}$  is isotropic with the Lamé coefficients  $(\lambda^0, \mu^0)$ , the closed form of  $\widehat{\Gamma}_W^0$  is

$$\begin{aligned} [\widehat{\Gamma}_W^0]_{mnpq}[\xi] = & \frac{1}{4\mu^0 |k_N|^2} \left\{ [k_N]_m [\overline{k_N}]_q \delta_{np} + [k_N]_n [\overline{k_N}]_q \delta_{mp} \right. \\ & \left. + [k_N]_m [\overline{k_N}]_p \delta_{nq} + [k_N]_n [\overline{k_N}]_p \delta_{mq} \right\} \\ & - \frac{(\lambda^0 + \mu^0) [k_N]_m [\overline{k_N}]_n [k_N]_p [\overline{k_N}]_q}{\mu^0 (\lambda^0 + 2\mu^0) |k_N|^4}, \end{aligned}$$

and this is the major difference from the basic scheme. Take

$$\mathcal{F}_{N^-} := \left\{ \xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d : -N/2 < \xi_m < N/2, \forall 1 \leq m \leq d \right\},$$

and Willot's scheme states as algorithm 2.

It has been numerically demonstrated that convergences of Moulinec-Suquent's scheme will deteriorate as the contrast ratio of  $\mathbf{C}_N$  grows, and an extreme example shows that the basic scheme indeed fails to converge for a porous material Schneider et al. [2016], while Willot's scheme stays a stable convergence history in high contrast settings Willot [2015]. Meanwhile, computational overheads of the basic and Willot's schemes are almost same. Those advantages make Willot's scheme become another standard method in discretizing the Lippmann-Schwinger equation eq. (3).

Interestingly, it is pointed in Schneider et al. [2017] that Willot's scheme is related to a *reduced integration* variational problem: find  $u_N \in V_N^d$  with  $\langle u_N \rangle = \mathbf{0}$  such that for any  $v_N \in V_N^d$ ,

$$N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \nabla^s v_N(x_I) : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : \nabla^s u_N(x_I) = -N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \nabla^s v_N(x_I) : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : E,$$

**Algorithm 2** Willot's scheme

- 
- 1: Set  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}}$  and  $E$ , initiate a tensor variable  $\varepsilon_N^* \in l(\mathcal{I}_N; \mathbb{S}^d)$  with  $\varepsilon_N^*[I] = E$  for all  $I \in \mathcal{I}_N$
  - 2: **while** not meet the convergence criterion **do**
  - 3:   Evaluate  $\tau_N^*[I] = (\mathbf{C}_N^*[I] - \mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}}) : \varepsilon_N^*[I]$  for all  $I \in \mathcal{I}_N$
  - 4:   Perform a FFT  $\widehat{\tau}_N^* = \text{FFT}(\tau_N^*)$
  - 5:   Initiate a temporary tensor variable  $\widehat{\varepsilon}_N^*$ , evaluate  $\widehat{\varepsilon}_N^*[\mathbf{0}] = E$ ,  $\widehat{\varepsilon}_N^*[\xi] = -\widehat{\Gamma}_W^0[\xi] : \widehat{\tau}_N^*[\xi]$  for all  $\xi \in \mathcal{F}_{N^-} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , and  $\widehat{\varepsilon}_N^*[\xi] = \mathbf{0}$  for all  $\xi \in \mathcal{F}_{N^-} \setminus \mathcal{F}_{N^-}$ .
  - 6:   Perform an inverse FFT  $\varepsilon_N^* = \text{FFT}^{-1}(\widehat{\varepsilon}_N^*)$
  - 7:   Calculate the convergence indicator via  $\varepsilon_N^*$  and  $\varepsilon_N^*$  and  $\varepsilon_N^* \leftarrow \varepsilon_N^*$
  - 8: **end while**
  - 9: **return**  $\varepsilon_N^*$  and  $N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : \varepsilon_N^*[I]$
- 

where  $V_N$  is the trilinear Lagrange finite element space of  $H_{\#}^1(Y)$ . The reduced integration technique is significantly efficient in constructing stiffness matrices comparing to *full integration*, while the latter needs evaluations on all the Gaussian quadrature points (8 for trilinear elements) in each element. However, due to that the stiffness matrix derived by reduced integration may be singular, there exist so-called ‘‘hourglassing’’ or ‘‘zero-energy’’ modes Koh and Kikuchi [1987], Pugh et al. [1978]. For example when  $N$  is an even integer, it is easy to find nonzero  $v_N$  such that  $\nabla^s v_N(x_I) = \mathbf{0}$  for all  $I$ , and this  $v_N$  is closely related with the frequency  $\xi = [-N/2, -N/2, -N/2]$ , which also implies there does *not* exist a positive constant  $c$  independent of  $N$  satisfying

$$c \|v_N\|_{H^1(Y)}^2 \leq N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \nabla^s v_N(x_I) : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : \nabla^s v_N(x_I).$$

In Schneider et al. [2017], Schneider et al. proposed a novel scheme by replacing reduced integration in Willot's scheme with full integration, i.e., find  $u_N \in V_N^d$  with  $\langle u_N \rangle = \mathbf{0}$  such that for any  $v_N \in V_N^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & (2N)^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \sum_{b \in \{-1, 1\}^d} \nabla^s v_N(x_I^b) : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : \nabla^s u_N(x_I^b) = \langle \nabla^s v_N : \mathbf{C}_N : \nabla^s u_N \rangle \\ & = -N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \nabla^s v_N(x_I) : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : E = -\langle \nabla^s v_N : \mathbf{C}_N \rangle : E, \end{aligned}$$

where  $x_I^b$  is the Gaussian quadrature point on the element  $Y_I$  determined by symbols of  $b \in \{-1, 1\}^d$ . The FFT technique is utilized in solving reference problem: find  $w_N \in V_N^d$  with  $\langle w_N \rangle = \mathbf{0}$  such that for any  $v_N \in V_N^d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & (2N)^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \sum_{b \in \{-1, 1\}^d} \nabla^s v_N(x_I^b) : \mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}} : \nabla^s u_N(x_I^b) = \langle \nabla^s v_N : \mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}} : \nabla^s w_N \rangle \\ & = (2N)^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \sum_{b \in \{-1, 1\}^d} \nabla^s v_N(x_I^b) : F_N^{b, *}[I], \end{aligned}$$

where  $F_N^{b, *}[I] \in \mathbb{S}^d$ . The motivation is converting  $\nabla^s v_N(x_I^b)$  into  $k_N^b[\xi] \otimes^s \widehat{v}_N^*[\xi]$  via the Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT), where  $\otimes^s$  is the symmetric Kronecker product and  $v_N^*[I] = v_N(I/N)$ . Combining the symmetric relations of  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}}$ , we can hence derive an explicit formula of  $w_N(I/N)$  in the Fourier space as  $B_N^{-1}[\xi] \cdot \zeta_N[\xi]$  for  $\xi \neq \mathbf{0}$ , where  $B_N = 2^{-d} \sum_b \widehat{k}_N^b \cdot \mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}} \cdot k_N^b$  and  $\zeta_N = 2^{-d} \sum_b \widehat{F}_N^{b, *} \cdot \widehat{k}_N^b$ . The scheme is summarized in algorithm 3, we called it ‘‘the FEM scheme’’ for it is essentially a FEM with the FFT acting as a preconditioner Saad [2003].

Currently, most researches on FFT-based homogenization are focused on developing fast algorithms to accelerate convergences of iterating processes and designing schemes to stabilize performances on high/infinite contrast materials Eyre and Milton [1999], Michel et al. [2001], Zeman et al. [2010], Elo et al. [2019], Schneider [2020], while few of them consider the convergences of those methods with respect to the spatial resolution  $N$ , which could be viewed as an analogy of  $h$ -estimate theories in FEMs Ciarlet [1991], Brenner and Scott [2008]. To our knowledge, the work by Schneider [2015] is only published one which seriously discusses such a question. In his article, a priori error estimate of Moulinec-Suquet's scheme is formulated with the trigonometric interpolation operator Zygmund [1968]. However, because of involving pointwise evaluations, the trigonometric interpolation operator is to some certain ‘‘incompatible’’ with Lebesgue integrable functions.

---

**Algorithm 3** The FEM scheme
 

---

- 1: Set  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}}$  and  $E$ , initiate a tensor variable  $u_N^* \in l(\mathcal{I}_N; \mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $u_N^*[I] = \mathbf{0}$  for all  $I \in \mathcal{I}_N$
  - 2: **while** not meet the convergence criterion **do**
  - 3: Evaluate  $\tau_N^{b,*}[I] = (\mathbf{C}_N^*[I] - \mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}}) : (\nabla^s u_N(x_I^b) + E)$  for all  $I \in \mathcal{I}_N$  and  $b \in \{-1, 1\}^d$ , where  $\nabla^s u_N(x_I^b)$  is obtained by the trilinear interpolation of  $u_N^*$
  - 4: Perform FFTs  $\widehat{\tau}_N^{b,*} = \text{FFT}(\tau_N^{b,*})$  for all  $b \in \{-1, 1\}^d$
  - 5: Initiate a temporary tensor variable  $\widehat{v}_N^*$  with  $\widehat{v}_N^*[\mathbf{0}] = \mathbf{0}$  and evaluate  $\widehat{v}_N^*[\xi] = B_N^{-1}[\xi] \cdot \zeta_N[\xi]$  for nonzero  $\xi$ , where  $B_N = 2^{-d} \sum_b \overline{k}_N^b \cdot \mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}} \cdot k_N^b$  and  $\zeta_N = 2^{-d} \sum_b \widehat{\tau}_N^{b,*} \cdot \overline{k}_N^b$
  - 6: Perform an inverse FFT  $v_N^* = \text{FFT}^{-1}(\widehat{v}_N^*)$
  - 7: Calculate the convergence indicator via  $u_N^*$  and  $v_N^*$  and  $u_N^* \leftarrow v_N^*$
  - 8: **end while**
  - 9: **return**  $u_N^*$  and  $N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : (\nabla^s u_N(x_I) + E)$
- 

Since the main objective in this article is studying convergences with respect to spatial resolutions, it is necessary to clarify the relation between the provided information  $\mathbf{C}_N^*$  and the ground truth  $\mathbf{C}$ . As mentioned previously, the ground truth is hidden from the scheme part, we hence cannot hold an optimistic anticipation on convergence rates like immersed FEMs Li et al. [2003], Chen et al. [2009] or unfitted FEMs Burman et al. [2014], Huang et al. [2017], Chen et al. [2021]. The assumptions for  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_N^*$  is elucidated as follows.

**Assumption A** The RVE domain  $Y$  consists of  $(M + 1)$  Lipschitz subdomains that are labeled by  $D_0, D_1, \dots, D_M$ , and  $\mathbf{C}(x)$  only takes a constant tensor  $\mathbf{A}_l$  in each subdomain  $D_l$ .

**Assumption B** The constant tensors  $\{\mathbf{A}_l\}_{0 \leq l \leq M}$  satisfy properties: (symmetricity) for any  $0 \leq l \leq M$ ,

$$[\mathbf{A}_l]_{mnpq} = [\mathbf{A}_l]_{nmpq} = [\mathbf{A}_l]_{mnpq} = [\mathbf{A}_l]_{pqmn}, \forall 1 \leq m, n, p, q \leq d;$$

(coercivity) there exist positive constants  $A'$  and  $A''$  such that for any  $F \in \mathbb{S}^d$  and  $0 \leq l \leq M$ ,

$$A'F : F \leq F : \mathbf{A}_l : F \leq A''F : F.$$

**Assumption C** For any  $I \in \mathcal{I}_N$ , if  $Y_I \subset D_l$  then  $\mathbf{C}_N^*[I] = \mathbf{A}_l$ , else  $\mathbf{C}_N^*[I]$  will be arbitrarily chosen from  $\{\mathbf{A}_{l'} : Y_I \cap D_{l'} \neq \emptyset\}$ .

In some cases, we will use the notation  $C(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$  to represent a *positive* constant  $C$  which depends on  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n$ .

Here are the contributions and structure of this article:

1. In section 2, we rebuild the theories in Schneider [2015] on the convergence of Moulinec-Suquet's scheme by introducing a new operator which is well-defined for Lebesgue integrable functions.
2. In section 3, we prove the convergence of the effective coefficients obtained by Willot's scheme.
3. In section 4, by assuming some suitable regularities and combining several priori estimates in FEM theories, we present convergence *rates* of the solution and the effective coefficients derived by the FEM scheme.

## 2 Convergence of Moulinec-Suquent's scheme

Let  $S_N$  be a *complex* trigonometric polynomial space

$$\left\{ f(x) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} c[\xi] \exp(2\pi i \xi \cdot x) : c[\xi] \in \mathbb{C} \right\},$$

and  $\mathcal{P}_N : L^2(Y; \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow L^2(Y; \mathbb{C})$  be the orthogonal projection onto  $S_N$  Conway [1990]. Take  $G_N(x) := N^d \mathbf{1}_{C_N}(x)$  where the set  $C_N$  is the cube with  $\mathbf{0}$  as its center and  $1/N$  as its edge length. In the following analysis, for a function

$f \in L^2(Y; \mathbb{C})$ , the convolution  $G_N * f$  should be understood as applying  $G_N$  to the *periodic extension* of  $f$ , which induces that

$$G_N * f(x) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \widehat{G}_N[\xi] \widehat{f}[\xi] \exp(2\pi i \xi \cdot x),$$

where

$$\widehat{G}_N[\xi] = \begin{cases} \prod_{m=1}^d \frac{N \sin\left(\frac{\pi \xi_m}{N}\right)}{\pi \xi_m}, & \text{if } \prod_{m=1}^d \xi_m \neq 0, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

It is easy to see that  $(2/\pi)^d \leq \widehat{G}_N[\xi] \leq 1$  for  $\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N$ , and we can hence define an operator  $\mathcal{Q}_N$  that plays an essential role in our analysis:

**Definition 1.** For any  $f \in L^2(Y; \mathbb{C})$ ,

$$\mathcal{Q}_N f(x) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} \widehat{G}_N^{-1}[\xi] \exp\left(-\pi i \frac{\xi \cdot \mathbf{1}}{N}\right) \widehat{f}^*[\xi] \exp(2\pi i \xi \cdot x),$$

where  $\mathbf{1} = [1, 1, 1]$  and

$$f^*[I] = G_N * f(x_I) = \int_{Y_I} f(x) dx.$$

We can show the following facts of  $\mathcal{Q}_N$ :

**Proposition 1.** The following statements hold true for  $\mathcal{Q}_N$

- Let  $f \in L^2(Y; \mathbb{C})$ , then  $\mathcal{Q}_N f \in S_N$ , and if  $f \in S_N$  then  $\mathcal{Q}_N f = f$ ;
- Let  $f \in L^2(Y; \mathbb{C})$ , then  $\|\mathcal{Q}_N f\|_{L^2(Y)} \leq (\pi/2)^d \|f\|_{L^2(Y)}$  and

$$\|f - \mathcal{Q}_N f\|_{L^2(Y)} \leq \left\{1 + (\pi/2)^d\right\} \|f - \mathcal{P}_N f\|_{L^2(Y)};$$

- for a series of  $\{f_N\} \subset L^2(Y; \mathbb{C})$  with  $f_N \rightarrow f_\infty$ , then  $\mathcal{Q}_N f_N \rightarrow f_\infty$ .

*Proof.* From the definition of  $S_N$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{Q}_N f \in S_N$ . Moreover, if  $f(x) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} \widehat{f}[\xi] \exp(2\pi i \xi \cdot x)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} f^*[I] &= \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} \widehat{G}_N[\xi] \widehat{f}[\xi] \exp(2\pi i \xi \cdot x_I) \\ &= \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} \widehat{G}_N[\xi] \widehat{f}[\xi] \exp\left(\pi i \frac{\xi \cdot \mathbf{1}}{N}\right) \exp\left(2\pi i \frac{\xi \cdot I}{N}\right) \\ &= \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} \widehat{f}^*[\xi] \exp\left(2\pi i \frac{\xi \cdot I}{N}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\mathcal{Q}_N f = f$  holds by taking  $\widehat{f}^*[\xi] = \widehat{G}_N[\xi] \widehat{f}[\xi] \exp\left(\pi i \frac{\xi \cdot \mathbf{1}}{N}\right)$  into the definition of  $\mathcal{Q}_N f$ .

From the fact  $(2/\pi)^d \leq \widehat{G}_N[\xi] \leq 1$  for  $\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\mathcal{Q}_N f\|_{L^2(Y)}^2 &= \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} \left| \widehat{G}_N^{-1}[\xi] \right|^2 \left| \widehat{f^*}[\xi] \right|^2 \\
 &\leq \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right)^{2d} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} \left| \widehat{f^*}[\xi] \right|^2 \\
 &= \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right)^{2d} \frac{1}{N^d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} |f^*[I]|^2 && \text{(Parseval's theorem)} \\
 &= \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right)^{2d} \frac{1}{N^d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \left| \int_{Y_I} f(x) dx \right|^2 && \text{(by the definition of } f^*[I]) \\
 &\leq \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right)^{2d} \frac{1}{N^d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \int_{Y_I} |f(x)|^2 dx && \text{(Jensen's inequality)} \\
 &= \left( \frac{\pi}{2} \right)^{2d} \|f\|_{L^2(Y)}^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

The estimate of  $\|f - \mathcal{Q}_N f\|_{L^2(Y)}$  is a direct corollary via

$$f - \mathcal{Q}_N f = f - \mathcal{P}_N f + \mathcal{P}_N f - \mathcal{Q}_N f = (f - \mathcal{P}_N f) + \mathcal{Q}_N (\mathcal{P}_N f - f).$$

For checking the weak convergence of  $\{\mathcal{Q}_N f_N\}$ , we only need to show that

$$\langle \exp(-2\pi i \xi' \cdot x) \mathcal{Q}_N f_N \rangle \rightarrow \langle \exp(-2\pi i \xi' \cdot x) f_\infty \rangle$$

for any  $\xi' \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . Take a large enough  $N$  such that  $\xi' \in \mathcal{F}_N$ ,

$$\langle \exp(-2\pi i \xi' \cdot x) \mathcal{Q}_N f_N \rangle = \widehat{G}_N^{-1}[\xi'] \exp\left(-\pi i \frac{\xi' \cdot \mathbf{1}}{N}\right) \widehat{f_N^*}[\xi'],$$

and we are left to show  $\widehat{f_N^*}[\xi'] \rightarrow \widehat{f_\infty}[\xi']$ . By a direct calculation,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \widehat{f_N^*}[\xi'] &= N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} f_N^*[I] \exp\left(-2\pi i \frac{I \cdot \xi'}{N}\right) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \int_{Y_I} f_N(x) d\xi \exp\left(-2\pi i \frac{I \cdot \xi'}{N}\right) \\
 &= \langle f_N(x) \exp(-2\pi i x \cdot \xi') \rangle \\
 &\quad + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \int_{Y_I} f_N(x) \left\{ \exp\left(-2\pi i \frac{I \cdot \xi'}{N}\right) - \exp(-2\pi i x \cdot \xi') \right\} dx \\
 &:= J'_N + J''_N.
 \end{aligned}$$

We have  $J'_N \rightarrow \langle f_\infty \exp(-2\pi i x \cdot \xi') \rangle$  due to the weak convergence of  $\{f_N\}$ , and it is easy to see that

$$|J''_N| \leq C(d) \frac{|\xi'|}{N} \|f_N\|_{L^2(Y)} \leq C(d) \frac{|\xi'|}{N} \sup_{N'} \|f_{N'}\|_{L^2(Y)},$$

which implies  $J''_N \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . We hence complete the proof of  $\mathcal{Q}_N f_N \rightharpoonup f_\infty$ .  $\square$

**Remark 1.** The operator  $\mathcal{Q}_N$  defined here is a natural modification of the trigonometric interpolation in Schneider [2015]. Generally, the coefficients  $\mathbf{C}$  and strain field  $\varepsilon$  are discontinuous, while the trigonometric interpolation requires pointwise evaluations in the domain  $Y$ , which is problematic for Lebesgue integrable functions.

The next lemma reveals the relation between Moulinec-Suquet's scheme (i.e., algorithm 1) and the original variational problem eq. (1).

**Lemma 1.** The following statements are equivalent:

1. There exists  $\varepsilon_N^*$  such that

$$\widehat{\varepsilon_N^*}[\xi] = \begin{cases} -\widehat{\Gamma^0}[\xi] : \tau_N^*[\xi], & \forall \xi \neq \mathbf{0}, \\ E, & \xi = \mathbf{0}, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $\tau_N^*[I] = (\mathbf{C}_N^*[I] - \mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}}) : \varepsilon_N^*[I]$  for all  $I \in \mathcal{I}_N$ .

2. There exists  $u_N \in S_N^d$  with  $\langle u_N \rangle = \mathbf{0}$ , such that for any  $v_N \in S_N^d$

$$\begin{aligned} & N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s \overline{v_N} \, dx : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s u_N \, dx \\ &= -N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s \overline{v_N} \, dx : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : E. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

3. There exists  $u_N \in S_N^d$  with  $\langle u_N \rangle = \mathbf{0}$ , such that for any  $v \in H_{\#}^1(Y; \mathbb{C}^d)$

$$\langle \mathcal{R}_N(\nabla^s \bar{v}) : \mathcal{Q}_N(\mathbf{C}_N : \nabla^s u_N) \rangle = -\langle \mathcal{R}_N(\nabla^s \bar{v}) : \mathcal{Q}_N(\mathbf{C}_N : E) \rangle, \quad (8)$$

where the operator  $\mathcal{R}_N$  is defined as  $\mathcal{R}_N f = G_N * G_N * f$ .

**Remark 2.** Because we have not imposed any regularity assumptions, any statement above may not be true. The purpose of this lemma is showing eqs. (6) to (8) are equivalent transformations, and we can jump out the original scheme description algorithm 1 and study a more “mathematical” formulation, i.e. eq. (8).

*Proof.* We first prove that statements 1 and 2 are equivalent. Take an expression of  $v_N$  as  $v_N(x) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} \widehat{v}_N[\xi] \exp(2\pi i \xi \cdot x)$ , we have

$$\int_{Y_I} \nabla^s v_N \, dx = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} 2\pi i \xi \otimes \widehat{v}_N^*[\xi] \exp\left(2\pi i \frac{\xi \cdot I}{N}\right),$$

where  $\widehat{v}_N^*$  is derived from the DFT of  $v_N^*[I] = \int_{Y_I} v_N \, dx$ . By splitting  $\mathbf{C}_N^* = \mathbf{C}_N^{\text{ref}} + \delta \mathbf{C}_N^*$  and applying Parseval’s theorem, we can convert eq. (7) into

$$\begin{aligned} & N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s \overline{v_N} \, dx : \mathbf{C}_N^{\text{ref}} : \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s u_N \, dx \\ &= \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} 4\pi^2 \left( \xi \otimes \widehat{v}_N^* \right) : \mathbf{C}_N^{\text{ref}} : \left( \xi \otimes \widehat{u}_N^* \right) \\ &= -N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s \overline{v_N} \, dx : \left\{ \delta \mathbf{C}_N^* : \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s u_N \, dx + \mathbf{C}_N^* : E \right\} \\ &= \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} 2\pi i \left( \xi \otimes \widehat{v}_N^* \right) : \delta \widehat{\mathbf{C}_N^*} : \tau_N^*, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tau_N^*[I] = \delta \mathbf{C}_N^* : \left( \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s u_N \, dx + E \right)$ . Note this exactly repeats the derivation of the Lipmann-Schwinger equation eq. (3), we hence show that the statement 2 leads to 1. Meanwhile, according the definition of  $\widehat{\Gamma}^0$ , we can find  $\widehat{u}_N^*$  such that  $\widehat{\varepsilon}_N^*[\xi] = 2\pi i \xi \otimes \widehat{u}_N^*[\xi]$  for  $\xi \neq \mathbf{0}$ . Then, via reverse steps in proving (2  $\Rightarrow$  1), we complete the proof of equivalence between statements 1 and 2.

We then prove that statements 2 and 3 are equivalent. Without loss of generality, we assume  $v \in S_N^d$  in eq. (8) and  $v(x) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} \widehat{v}[\xi] \exp(2\pi i \xi \cdot x)$ . Then recalling the definitions of  $\mathcal{R}_N$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_N$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \nabla^s(\mathcal{R}_N \bar{v}) : \mathcal{Q}_N(\mathbf{C}_N : \nabla^s u_N) \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} -2\pi i \left( \widehat{G}_N \right)^2 \left( \xi \otimes \widehat{v}[\xi] \right) : \left( \widehat{G}_N \right)^{-1} \exp\left(-\pi i \frac{\xi \cdot \mathbf{1}}{N}\right) \widehat{\mathbf{C}_N^*} : \widehat{U^*}[\xi] \\ &= \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} \widehat{V^*}[\xi] : \widehat{\mathbf{C}_N^*} : \widehat{U^*}[\xi] \\ &= N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \bar{V^*}[I] : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : U^*[I], \end{aligned}$$

where  $V^*[I] = \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s v \, dx$  and  $U^*[I] = \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s u_N \, dx$ . Similarly,

$$-\langle \nabla^s(\mathcal{R}_N \bar{v}) : \mathcal{Q}_N(\mathbf{C}_N : E) \rangle = -N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \bar{V^*}[I] : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : E.$$

We hence arrive at (2  $\Leftrightarrow$  3). □



The following theorem provides a priori estimate and a convergence proof of the basic scheme.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_N$  satisfy Assumptions A-C,  $u$  be the solution of eq. (1). Then there exists a unique solution  $u_N$  of the variation problem eq. (8) with an estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & A' \|\nabla^s (u_N - u)\|_{L^2(Y)} \\ & \leq C \left\{ A'' \|\varepsilon - \mathcal{P}_N \varepsilon\|_{L^2(Y)} + \|\sigma - \mathcal{P}_N \sigma\|_{L^2(Y)} + \|(\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{C}_N) : \varepsilon\|_{L^2(Y)} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\varepsilon = \nabla^s u + E$ ,  $\sigma = \mathbf{C} : \varepsilon$  and  $C$  is a positive constant.

*Proof.* We need first prove a coercivity estimate. Taking any  $v_N(x) \in S_N^d$  with  $\widehat{v}_N[\xi]$  as its Fourier coefficients, recalling the proof of lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \nabla^s (\mathcal{R}_N \overline{v}_N) : \mathcal{Q}_N (\mathbf{C}_N : \nabla^s v_N) \rangle \\ & = N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s \overline{v}_N \, dx : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s v_N \, dx \\ & \geq N^{-d} A' \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s \overline{v}_N \, dx : \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s v_N \, dx \\ & = A' \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} |\widehat{V}^*|^2 [\xi], \end{aligned}$$

where  $V^*[I] = \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s v_N \, dx$ . Note that for any  $\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N$ ,

$$|\widehat{V}^*| [\xi] = \widehat{G}_N |2\pi i \xi \otimes^s \widehat{v}_N| \geq \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^d |\widehat{\nabla^s v_N}| [\xi],$$

which leads

$$\langle \nabla^s (\mathcal{R}_N \overline{v}_N) : \mathcal{Q}_N (\mathbf{C}_N : \nabla^s v_N) \rangle \geq A' \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{2d} \|\nabla^s v_N\|_{L^2(Y)}^2.$$

Replace  $v_N$  with  $e_N = u_N - \mathcal{P}_N u$  in the above inequality and combine the variational equalities eqs. (1) and (8),

$$\begin{aligned} & A' \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{2d} \|\nabla^s e_N\|_{L^2(Y)}^2 \\ & \leq -\langle \nabla^s (\mathcal{R}_N \overline{e}_N) : \mathcal{Q}_N (\mathbf{C}_N : E) \rangle - \langle \nabla^s (\mathcal{R}_N \overline{e}_N) : \mathcal{Q}_N (\mathbf{C}_N : \nabla^s \mathcal{P}_N u) \rangle \\ & = \langle \nabla^s (\mathcal{R}_N \overline{e}_N) : (\mathbf{C} : \nabla^s u + \mathbf{C} : E - \mathcal{Q}_N (\mathbf{C}_N : E + \mathbf{C}_N : \nabla^s \mathcal{P}_N u)) \rangle \\ & = \langle \nabla^s (\mathcal{R}_N \overline{e}_N) : (\sigma - \mathcal{Q}_N \sigma - \mathcal{Q}_N (\mathbf{C}_N : (\mathcal{P}_N \varepsilon - \varepsilon)) + (\mathbf{C}_N - \mathbf{C}) : \varepsilon) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to show that  $\|\nabla^s (\mathcal{R}_N \overline{e}_N)\|_{L^2(Y)} = \|\mathcal{R}_N (\nabla^s \overline{e}_N)\|_{L^2(Y)} \leq \|\nabla^s e_N\|_{L^2(Y)}$ . Finally, the priori estimate follows from proposition 1 and Hölder's inequality.  $\square$

Denote by  $\mathbf{C}_N^{\text{eff,B}}$  the effective coefficients obtained by Moulinec-Suquent's scheme, based on the equivalent results in lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_N^{\text{eff,B}} : E &= N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : \varepsilon_N^*[I] \\ &= N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : \left( \int_{Y_I} \nabla^s u_N \, dx + E \right) \\ &= \langle \mathbf{C}_N : (\nabla^s u_N + E) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The following theorem shows the convergence of the effective coefficients.

**Theorem 2.** *Under Assumptions A-C,  $\mathbf{C}_N^{\text{eff,B}}$  converges to  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{eff}}$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{eff}}$  is defined by eq. (2).*

### 3 Convergence of Willot's scheme

Let  $S_{N^-} \subset S_N$  be defined as

$$S_{N^-} := \left\{ f(x) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_{N^-}} c[\xi] \exp(2\pi i \xi \cdot x) : c[\xi] \in \mathbb{C} \right\},$$

denote by  $V_{N^-}$  a subset of  $V_N$  with

$$V_{N^-} := \left\{ v_N \in V_N : v_N \left( \frac{I}{N} \right) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_{N^-}} c[\xi] \exp \left( 2\pi i \frac{\xi \cdot I}{N} \right), \forall I \in \mathcal{I}_N \right\},$$

we first present a similar lemma of lemma 1 for Willot's scheme.

**Lemma 2.** *The following statements are equivalent:*

1. *There exists  $\varepsilon_N^*$  such that*

$$\widehat{\varepsilon}_N^*[\xi] = \begin{cases} -\widehat{\Gamma}_W^0[\xi] : \widehat{\tau}_N^*[\xi], & \forall \xi \in \mathcal{F}_{N^-} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}, \\ E, & \xi = \mathbf{0}, \\ \mathbf{0}, & \forall \xi \in \mathcal{F}_N \setminus \mathcal{F}_{N^-} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where  $\tau_N^*[I] = (\mathbf{C}_N^*[I] - \mathbf{C}^{\text{ref}}) : \varepsilon_N^*[I]$  for all  $I \in \mathcal{I}_N$ .

2. *There exists  $u_N \in V_{N^-}^d$  with  $\langle u_N \rangle = \mathbf{0}$ , such that for any  $v_N \in V_{N^-}^d$*

$$\begin{aligned} & N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \nabla^s v_N(x_I) : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : \nabla^s u_N(x_I) \\ &= -N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \nabla^s v_N(x_I) : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : E. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

3. *There exists  $u_N \in S_{N^-}^d$  with  $\langle u_N \rangle = \mathbf{0}$ , such that for any  $v_N \in S_{N^-}^d$*

$$\begin{aligned} & N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \int_{Y_I} \mathcal{D}_N^s \bar{v}_N \, dx : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : \int_{Y_I} \mathcal{D}_N^s u_N \, dx \\ &= -N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \int_{Y_I} \mathcal{D}_N^s \bar{v}_N \, dx : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : E, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the operator  $\mathcal{D}_N^s$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{D}_N^s f = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_{N^-}} k_N[\xi] \otimes^s \widehat{f}[\xi] \exp(2\pi i \xi \cdot x)$$

for  $f \in L^2(Y; \mathbb{C})$ .

4. *There exists  $u_N \in S_{N^-}^d$  with  $\langle u_N \rangle = \mathbf{0}$ , such that for any  $v \in H_{\#}^1(Y; \mathbb{C}^d)$*

$$\langle \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{D}_N^s \bar{v}) : \mathcal{Q}_N(\mathbf{C}_N : \mathcal{D}_N^s u_N) \rangle = -\langle \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{D}_N^s \bar{v}) : \mathcal{Q}_N(\mathbf{C}_N : E) \rangle. \quad (12)$$

The proof of this lemma is exactly same as lemma 1. The variational form eq. (10) could be treated as a reduced integration FEM. Note that eqs. (11) and (12) are parallel versions to eqs. (7) and (8), while original  $\nabla^s$  is replaced with  $\mathcal{D}_N^s$ . The difficulty in analyzing Willot's scheme is losing coercivity, and we will explain it as follows. It is easy to see that  $\mathcal{D}_N^s \bar{f} = \overline{\mathcal{D}_N^s f}$ , and the left-hand side of eq. (11) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \int_{Y_I} \mathcal{D}_N^s \bar{v}_N \, dx : \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : \int_{Y_I} \mathcal{D}_N^s v_N \, dx \\ & \geq \Lambda' N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \left| \int_{Y_I} \mathcal{D}_N^s v_N \, dx \right|^2 \\ &= \Lambda' \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_{N^-}} \left| k_N \otimes^s \widehat{v}_N^*[\xi] \right|^2 \\ & \geq \frac{\Lambda'}{2} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_{N^-}} |k_N|^2 \left| \widehat{v}_N^* \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

where  $v_N^*[I] = \int_{Y_I} v_N dx$ . Then recall the definition of  $k_N$  eq. (4),

$$\begin{aligned} |k_N|^2 &= \frac{1}{64} \left\{ \prod_{m=1}^d \left| \exp\left(2\pi i \frac{\xi_m}{N}\right) + 1 \right|^2 \right\} \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^d \left| 2N \tan\left(\pi \frac{\xi_n}{N}\right) \right|^2 \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \prod_{m=1}^d \cos^2\left(\pi \frac{\xi_m}{N}\right) \right\} \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^d \left| 2N \tan\left(\pi \frac{\xi_n}{N}\right) \right|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

According to the basic inequality  $|\tan(x)| \geq |x|$  for  $x \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ , we obtain  $\left\{ \sum_{n=1}^d \left| 2N \tan\left(\pi \frac{\xi_n}{N}\right) \right|^2 \right\} \geq 4\pi^2 |\xi|^2$ , and the coercivity

$$c \|\nabla v_N\|_{L^2(Y)}^2 \leq N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \int_{Y_I} \mathcal{D}_N^s \bar{v}_N dx : \mathbf{C}_N^* [I] : \int_{Y_I} \mathcal{D}_N^s v_N dx$$

would emerge if  $\prod_{m=1}^d \cos^2\left(\pi \frac{\xi_m}{N}\right)$  can be uniformly bounded below. However, this is not true, because  $\min_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} \prod_{m=1}^d \cos^2\left(\pi \frac{\xi_m}{N}\right) = O(N^{-2d})$ .

A remedy is considering a modified gradient operator  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N$  as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N f(x) := \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} \tilde{k}_N[\xi] \hat{f}[\xi] \exp(2\pi i \xi \cdot x) \quad (13)$$

for  $f \in L^2(Y; \mathbb{C})$ , where

$$\tilde{k}_N = 2iN \left[ \tan\left(\pi \frac{\xi_1}{N}\right), \tan\left(\pi \frac{\xi_2}{N}\right), \tan\left(\pi \frac{\xi_3}{N}\right) \right],$$

and  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s$  is the symmetrization of  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N$  as  $\nabla^s$  of  $\nabla$  for vector-valued functions. We also rewrite eq. (12) as follows: find  $w_N \in S_{N-}^d$  such that for any  $v \in H_{\#}^1(Y; \mathbb{C}^d)$ ,

$$\left\langle \mathcal{R}_N \left( \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s \bar{v} \right) : \mathcal{Q}_N \left( \mathbf{C}_N : \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s w_N \right) \right\rangle = - \left\langle \mathcal{R}_N \left( \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s \bar{v} \right) : \mathcal{Q}_N \left( \mathbf{C}_N : E \right) \right\rangle. \quad (14)$$

The motivation behind is an observation that  $w_N$  and  $u_N$  of eq. (12) are connected with

$$\frac{1}{8} \prod_{m=1}^d \left( \exp\left(\pi \frac{\xi_m}{N}\right) + 1 \right) \widehat{u}_N[\xi] = \widehat{w}_N[\xi]$$

for all  $\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N$ .

To unveil the limiting behavior of  $w_N$ , we first prove several properties corresponding to  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N$ :

**Proposition 2.** *For any  $f \in C_{\#}^{\infty}(Y; \mathbb{C})$ , it holds that  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N f \rightarrow \nabla f$  in  $L^2(Y; \mathbb{C}^d)$ . If a series  $\{f_N\} \subset H_{\#}^1(Y; \mathbb{C})$  satisfies  $f_N \rightarrow f_{\infty}$  in  $H_{\#}^1(Y; \mathbb{C})$  and  $\{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N f_N\} \subset L^2(Y; \mathbb{C}^d)$ , then  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N f_N \rightarrow \nabla f_{\infty}$  in  $L^2(Y; \mathbb{C}^d)$ .*

*Proof.* For the first argument, after taking the Fourier expansion of  $f$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N f - \nabla f \right\|_{L^2(Y)}^2 &= \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N} \left| \tilde{k}_N[\xi] - 2\pi i \xi \right|^2 \left| \hat{f} \right|^2[\xi] + \sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \mathcal{F}_N} 4\pi |\xi|^2 \left| \hat{f} \right|^2[\xi] \\ &:= J'_N + J''_N. \end{aligned}$$

According to smoothness of  $f \in C_{\#}^{\infty}(Y; \mathbb{C})$ , we have  $J''_N \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . We rewrite  $J'_N$  as  $\sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d} a_N[\xi] \left| \hat{f} \right|^2[\xi]$ , where

$$a_N[\xi] := \begin{cases} 4\pi^2 \sum_{d=1}^m \left| \frac{N}{\pi} \tan\left(\xi_m \frac{\pi}{N}\right) - \xi_m \right|^2, & N \geq 2 \max_m |\xi_m| + 1 \\ 0, & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

By the fact that  $\tan(x)/x$  is monotone in  $x \in (0, \pi/2)$ , we have

$$\left| \frac{N}{\pi} \tan\left(\xi_m \frac{\pi}{N}\right) \right| \leq \frac{2|\xi_m| + 1}{\pi} \tan\left(\frac{\pi|\xi_m|}{2|\xi_m| + 1}\right) \leq C(2|\xi_m| + 1)^2$$

for  $N \geq 2 \max_m |\xi_m| + 1$ , which implies that there exists a positive constant  $C$  such that  $|a_N[\xi]| \leq C(|\xi|^4 + 1)$ . Recalling smoothness of  $f$ , we arrive at  $\sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (1 + |\xi|^4) |\hat{f}|^2[\xi] < \infty$ . It is easy to see that  $a_N[\xi] \rightarrow 0$  for any  $\xi$ , then  $J'_N \rightarrow 0$  follows from the dominated convergence theorem.

For the second argument, it suffices to prove that

$$\left\langle \exp(-2\pi i \xi' \cdot x) \bar{v} \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N f_N \right\rangle \rightarrow \left\langle \exp(-2\pi i \xi' \cdot x) \bar{v} \cdot \nabla f_\infty \right\rangle = 2\pi i \bar{v} \cdot \xi' \widehat{f}_\infty[\xi']$$

for any  $\xi' \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $v \in \mathbb{C}^d$ . According to the definition of  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N$ , we get

$$\left\langle \exp(-2\pi i \xi' \cdot x) \bar{v} \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N f_N \right\rangle = \bar{v} \cdot \tilde{k}_N[\xi'] \widehat{f}_N[\xi']$$

for large enough  $N$ . Combining  $\tilde{k}_N[\xi'] \rightarrow 2\pi i \xi$  and  $f_N \rightarrow f_\infty$  which leads  $\widehat{f}_N[\xi'] \rightarrow \widehat{f}_\infty[\xi']$ , we hence finish the proof.  $\square$

The following lemma says that  $w_N$  weakly converges to  $u$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Lemma 3.** *Under Assumptions A-C, let  $u$  be the solution of eq. (1). Then there exists a unique  $w_N$  satisfying eq. (14) such that  $w_N \rightharpoonup u$  in  $H_{\#}^1(Y; \mathbb{C})$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof.* This proof consists of several steps.

**Step1** As previously stated, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \mathcal{R}_N \left( \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s \bar{v}_N \right) : \mathcal{Q}_N \left( \mathbf{C}_N : \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s v_N \right) \right\rangle \geq \frac{A'}{2} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N^-} |\tilde{k}_N|^2 |\widehat{v}_N^*|^2 \\ & \geq \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right)^{2d} \frac{A'}{2} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_N^-} |\tilde{k}_N|^2 |\widehat{v}_N|^2 \\ & = \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right)^{2d} \frac{A'}{2} \left\| \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N v_N \right\|_{L^2(Y)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, for the right-hand side,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left\langle \mathcal{R}_N \left( \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s \bar{v}_N \right) : \mathcal{Q}_N \left( \mathbf{C}_N : E \right) \right\rangle \right| \leq \left\| \mathcal{R}_N \left( \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s v_N \right) \right\|_{L^2(Y)} \left\| \mathcal{Q}_N \left( \mathbf{C}_N : E \right) \right\|_{L^2(Y)} \\ & \leq C A'' \left\| \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N v_N \right\|_{L^2(Y)} \sqrt{E : E}. \end{aligned}$$

We hence obtain that  $\left\| \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N w_N \right\|_{L^2(Y)} \leq C A'' / A' \sqrt{E : E}$ . Recalling that  $|\tilde{k}_N| \geq 2\pi |\xi|$ , we show that  $\|w_N\|_{H^1(Y)}$  is uniformly bounded. Up to a subsequence, we derive that  $w_N \rightharpoonup w_\infty$  in  $H_{\#}^1(Y; \mathbb{C}^d)$  (such a subsequence is still denoted by  $\{w_N\}$ ).

**Step2** The goal is proving  $\mathcal{Q}_N \left( \mathbf{C}_N : \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s w_N \right) \rightarrow \mathbf{C} : \nabla^s w_\infty$ . According to the results presented in proposition 1, we are left to prove that  $\mathbf{C}_N : \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s w_N \rightarrow \mathbf{C} : \nabla^s w_\infty$  in  $L^2(Y; \mathbb{S}^d)$ . Arbitrarily choosing  $V \in L^2(Y; \mathbb{S}^d)$ , we have

$$\left\langle V : \mathbf{C}_N : \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s w_N \right\rangle = \left\langle (V : \mathbf{C}_N) : \left( \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s w_N \right) \right\rangle.$$

Note that  $V : \mathbf{C}_N$  converges to  $V : \mathbf{C}$  strongly by Assumption C and  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s w_N \rightarrow \nabla^s w_\infty$  by proposition 2, it comes that

$$\left\langle V : \mathbf{C}_N : \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s w_N \right\rangle \rightarrow \left\langle V : \mathbf{C} : \nabla^s w_\infty \right\rangle,$$

and we hence show that  $\mathcal{Q}_N \left( \mathbf{C}_N : \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s w_N \right) \rightarrow \mathbf{C} : \nabla^s w_\infty$ .

**Step3** The final step is to identify  $w_\infty$  as  $u$ . For any  $v \in C_{\#}^\infty(Y; \mathbb{C}^d)$ , we have that  $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s v$  converges to  $\nabla^s v$  strongly in  $L^2(Y; \mathbb{S}^d)$  according to proposition 2. It is not difficult to show that  $\mathcal{R}_N(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s v) \rightarrow \nabla^s v$  because  $\mathcal{R}_N$  is essentially a mollifier. Applying the “strong-weak” argument in both sides of eq. (14), we arrive at

$$\langle \nabla^s \bar{v} : \mathbf{C} : \nabla^s w_\infty \rangle = - \langle \nabla^s \bar{v} : \mathbf{C} : E \rangle$$

for any smooth  $v$ , which implies  $w_\infty = u$ . Moreover, the weak limiting point of any subsequence of  $\{w_N\}$  is unique, we complete the proof of  $w_N \rightarrow u$ .  $\square$

Let  $\mathbf{C}_N^{\text{eff}, W}$  be the effective coefficients obtained by Willot’s scheme. It is easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_N^{\text{eff}, W} : E &= N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : \varepsilon_N^*[I] \\ &= N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : \left( \int_{Y_I} \mathcal{D}_N^s u_N \, dx + E \right) \\ &= \langle \mathbf{C}_N : (\mathcal{D}_N^s u_N + E) \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{C}_N : (\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_N^s w_N + E) \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\varepsilon_N^*$  is from eq. (9),  $u_N$  is from eqs. (11) and (12), and  $w_N$  is from eq. (14). A direct result from lemma 3 is the convergence of the effective coefficients.

**Theorem 3.** *Under Assumptions A-C,  $\mathbf{C}_N^{\text{eff}, W}$  converges to  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{eff}}$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{eff}}$  is defined by eq. (2).*

## 4 Convergence rates of the FEM scheme

We emphasize that algorithm 3 is actually equivalent to solving a variational problem: find  $u_N \in V_N^d$  with  $\langle u_N \rangle = \mathbf{0}$  such that for any  $v_N \in V_N^d$ ,

$$\langle \nabla^s v_N : \mathbf{C}_N : \nabla^s u_N \rangle = - \langle \nabla^s v_N : \mathbf{C}_N \rangle : E. \quad (15)$$

Because  $\mathbf{C}_N$  is only piecewisely constant and globally discontinuous, we cannot assume a better regularity than  $W^{1, \infty}$  of  $u$ . The local regularization operator proposed in Bernardi and Girault [1998] is an appropriate framework for our problem.

**Lemma 4** (cf. Bernardi and Girault [1998]). *There exists an operator  $\mathcal{L}_N : H_{\#}^1(Y) \rightarrow V_N$  such that for any  $v \in H_{\#}^1(Y)$ ,  $\|v - \mathcal{L}_N v\|_{H^1(Y)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, there exists a positive constant  $C_{\text{int}}$ , such that if  $v \in W^{1, p}(\Delta_I)$  with  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ ,*

$$\|v - \mathcal{L}_N v\|_{W^{1, p}(Y_I)} \leq C_{\text{int}} \|v\|_{W^{1, p}(\Delta_I)},$$

and if  $v \in H^2(\Delta_I)$ ,

$$\|v - \mathcal{L}_N v\|_{H^1(Y_I)} \leq C_{\text{int}} N^{-1} \|v\|_{H^2(\Delta_I)},$$

where  $Y_I \subset \Delta_I$  and

$$\Delta_I = \left( \frac{I_1 - 1}{N}, \frac{I_1 + 1}{N} \right) \times \left( \frac{I_2 - 1}{N}, \frac{I_2 + 1}{N} \right) \times \left( \frac{I_3 - 1}{N}, \frac{I_3 + 1}{N} \right).$$

Utilizing C ea’s lemma, we could obtain a similar priori estimate as theorem 1

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_N$  satisfy Assumptions A-C,  $u$  be the solution of eq. (1). Then there exists a unique solution  $u_N$  of the variation problem eq. (15) with an estimate*

$$A' \|\nabla^s (u_N - u)\|_{L^2(Y)} \leq C \left\{ A'' \|\nabla^s (u - \mathcal{L}_N u)\|_{L^2(Y)} + \|(\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{C}_N) : \varepsilon\|_{L^2(Y)} \right\}$$

where  $\varepsilon = \nabla^s u + E$  and  $C$  is a positive constant.

The proof of the above lemma is straight, and we omit it here. Interestingly, the assumption  $A' > 0$  could be relaxed as  $A' \geq 0$  in the FEM scheme. Because eq. (15) minimizes the energy  $\langle \nabla^s v_N : \mathbf{C}_N : \nabla^s v_N \rangle$ , and the subdomain  $\{\mathbf{C}_N(x) = \mathbf{0}\}$  corresponding to the porous part of the RVE does *not* affect the global coercivity. This good property does not hold for Moulinec-Suquent’s scheme, which could be explained from the proof of theorem 1: the coercivity

of  $\langle \nabla^s (\mathcal{R}_N \bar{v}_N) : \mathcal{Q}_N (\mathbf{C}_N : \nabla^s u_N) \rangle$  is proven by converting it into the Fourier space, and such an operation is not applicable under  $A' = 0$ . This observation to some extent reveals why the FEM scheme is more robust in porous settings Schneider et al. [2017].

Convergence rate estimates rely on the regularity of  $u$ . The celebrating work by Li and Nirenberg Li and Nirenberg [2003] says that under some regularity assumptions of subdomains, the solution  $u$  will be globally gradient bounded.

**Proposition 3** (cf. Li and Nirenberg [2003]). *Let the subdomains  $D_0, D_1, \dots, D_M$  satisfy several regularity assumptions and  $u$  be the solution of eq. (1). Then there exists a positive constant  $C_{\text{reg}}$  such that*

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(Y)} \leq C_{\text{reg}} \sqrt{E : E}, \text{ and } \|u\|_{H^2(D_l)} \leq C_{\text{reg}} \sqrt{E : E} \quad (16)$$

for any subdomain  $D_l$ .

Then the convergence rate estimate of  $\|\nabla^s (u_N - u)\|$  is stated as follows.

**Theorem 4.** *Suppose that the assumption in proposition 3 holds. Let  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_N$  satisfy Assumptions A-C,  $u_N$  be the solution of eq. (15). Then*

$$\|\nabla^s (u_N - u)\|_{L^2(Y)} \leq CN^{-1/2} \sqrt{E : E},$$

where the positive constant  $C$  is independent of  $N$ .

*Proof.* Since proposition 3 tells that  $u$  is piecewisely regular enough, we first part  $\mathcal{I}_N$  into two sets  $\mathcal{I}'_N$  and  $\mathcal{I}''_N$  defined as

$$\mathcal{I}'_N = \{I : \exists 0 \leq l \leq M, \text{ s.t. } \Delta_I \subset D_l\} \text{ and } \mathcal{I}''_N = \mathcal{I}_N \setminus \mathcal{I}'_N.$$

The cardinality of  $\mathcal{I}''_N$  can be controlled as  $\text{card}(\mathcal{I}''_N) \leq C_0 N^{d-1}$ , because  $Y_I$  for  $I \in \mathcal{I}''_N$  belongs to  $O(N^{-1})$ -width layers of interfaces of subdomains. Then, recalling Assumption C, we have  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}_N$  in  $Y_I$  with  $I \in \mathcal{I}'_N$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{C}_N) : \varepsilon\|_{L^2(Y)}^2 &= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}''_N} \int_{Y_I} |(\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{C}_N) : \varepsilon|^2 \, dx \\ &\leq C(d, A'') \|\nabla^s u + E\|_{L^\infty(Y)}^2 \{N^{-d} \text{card}(\mathcal{I}''_N)\} \\ &\leq C(d, A'', C_0, C_{\text{reg}}) (E : E) N^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from proposition 3. Similarly, for  $\|\nabla^s (u - \mathcal{L}_N u)\|_{L^2(Y)}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla^s (u - \mathcal{L}_N u)\|_{L^2(Y)}^2 \\ &\leq C(d) \left( \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}'_N} + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}''_N} \right) \int_{Y_I} |\nabla (u - \mathcal{L}_N u)|^2 \, dx \\ &\leq C(d, C_{\text{int}}) \left\{ \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}'_N} N^{-2} \|u\|_{H^2(\Delta_I)}^2 + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}''_N} \|u\|_{H^1(\Delta_I)}^2 \right\} \\ &\leq C(d, C_{\text{int}}) \left\{ N^{-2} \sum_{0 \leq l \leq M} \|u\|_{H^2(D_l)}^2 + N^{-d} \text{card}(\mathcal{I}''_N) \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(Y)}^2 \right\} \\ &\leq C(d, C_{\text{int}}, C_{\text{reg}}) (E : E) \{N^{-2} + C_0 N^{-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining lemma 5, we complete the estimate. □

For the FEM scheme, we can obtain numerical effective coefficients by the formula

$$\mathbf{C}_N^{\text{eff,F}} : E := N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \mathbf{C}_N^* [I] : (\nabla^s u_N(x_I) + E).$$

Another important estimate in this section shows that  $\mathbf{C}_N^{\text{eff,F}} : E$  can approximate  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{eff}}$  with a higher rate.

**Theorem 5.** *Under the same assumptions in theorem 4. Then*

$$\left| E : (\mathbf{C}^{\text{eff}} - \mathbf{C}_N^{\text{eff,F}}) : E \right| \leq CN^{-1} (E : E),$$

where  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{eff}}$  is defined by eq. (2) and  $C$  is a positive constant independent of  $N$ .

*Proof.* The proof is based on an observation that

$$E : \mathbf{C}^{\text{eff}} : E = \langle (\nabla^s u + E) : \mathbf{C} : (\nabla^s u + E) \rangle,$$

which is a direct result of  $\langle \nabla^s u : \mathbf{C} : (\nabla^s u + E) \rangle = 0$ . Similarly, for  $\mathbf{C}_N^{\text{eff,F}}$ , recalling that  $u_N$  is piecewisely trilinear in each element, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E : \mathbf{C}_N^{\text{eff,F}} : E &= E : \left\{ N^{-d} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_N} \mathbf{C}_N^*[I] : (\nabla^s u_N(x_I) + E) \right\} \\ &= \langle (\nabla^s u_N + E) : \mathbf{C}_N : (\nabla^s u_N + E) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &E : \left( \mathbf{C}_N^{\text{eff,F}} - \mathbf{C}^{\text{eff}} \right) : E \\ &= \langle (\nabla^s u_N + E) : \mathbf{C}_N : (\nabla^s u_N + E) \rangle - \langle (\nabla^s u + E) : \mathbf{C} : (\nabla^s u + E) \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla^s (u_N - u) : \mathbf{C}_N : \nabla^s (u_N - u) \rangle + 2 \langle \nabla^s (u_N - u) : \mathbf{C} : (\nabla^s u + E) \rangle \\ &\quad + 2 \langle \nabla^s (u_N - u) : (\mathbf{C}_N - \mathbf{C}) : (\nabla^s u + E) \rangle + \langle \varepsilon : (\mathbf{C}_N - \mathbf{C}) : \varepsilon \rangle \\ &:= J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\varepsilon = \nabla^s u + E$  as previously. For  $J_1$ , we have  $|J_1| \leq CN^{-1}(E : E)$  according to theorem 4. Meanwhile,  $J_2 = 0$  follows from the variational form eq. (1). For  $J_4$ , applying the proof steps of theorem 4, we have  $|J_4| \leq CN^{-1}(E : E)$  by the boundedness of  $\varepsilon$  and Assumption C. Then it is left to estimate  $J_3$ , by Young's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |J_3| &\leq \langle \nabla^s (u_N - u) : \nabla^s (u_N - u) \rangle + \langle \varepsilon : (\mathbf{C}_N - \mathbf{C}) : (\mathbf{C}_N - \mathbf{C}) : \varepsilon \rangle \\ &\leq CN^{-1}(E : E). \end{aligned}$$

We hence finish the proof.  $\square$

## References

- Graeme W. Milton. *The theory of composites*, volume 6 of *Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002. ISBN 0-521-78125-6. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511613357.
- Tarek I. Zohdi and Peter Wriggers. *An introduction to computational micromechanics*, volume 20 of *Lecture Notes in Applied and Computational Mechanics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008. ISBN 978-3-540-77482-2. Corrected second printing of the 2005 original.
- Doina Cioranescu and Patrizia Donato. *An introduction to homogenization*, volume 17 of *Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999. ISBN 0-19-856554-2.
- B. A. Lippmann and Julian Schwinger. Variational principles for scattering processes. I. *Physical Review. Series II*, 79: 469–480, 1950. ISSN 0031-899X.
- H. Moulinec and P. Suquet. A FFT-based numerical method for computing the mechanical properties of composites from images of their microstructures. In R. Pyrz, editor, *IUTAM Symposium on Microstructure-Property Interactions in Composite Materials*, pages 235–246, Dordrecht, 1995. Springer Netherlands. ISBN 978-94-011-0059-5.
- H. Moulinec and P. Suquet. A numerical method for computing the overall response of nonlinear composites with complex microstructure. *Comput Method Appl M*, 157(1-2):69–94, 1998. ISSN 0045-7825. doi:10.1016/S0045-7825(97)00218-1.
- T. J. R. Hughes, J. A. Cottrell, and Y. Bazilevs. Isogeometric analysis: CAD, finite elements, NURBS, exact geometry and mesh refinement. *Comput Method Appl M*, 194(39-41):4135–4195, 2005. ISSN 0045-7825. doi:10.1016/j.cma.2004.10.008.
- B. C. Larson, W. Yang, G. E. Ice, J. D. Budai, and J. Z. Tischler. Three-dimensional X-ray structural microscopy with submicrometre resolution. *Nature*, 415(6874):887–890, February 2002. ISSN 0028-0836. doi:10.1038/415887a.
- Henning Poulsen. *Three-dimensional X-ray diffraction microscopy*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004. doi:10.1007/b97884.
- Eric N. Landis and Denis T. Keane. X-ray microtomography. *Mater. Charact.*, 61(12):1305–1316, 2010. ISSN 1044-5803. doi:10.1016/j.matchar.2010.09.012.
- M. Frigo and S. G. Johnson. The design and implementation of FFTW3. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 93(2):216–231, February 2005. doi:10.1109/jproc.2004.840301.

- J. C. Michel, H. Moulinec, and P. Suquet. A computational scheme for linear and non-linear composites with arbitrary phase contrast. *Int J Numer Meth Eng*, 52(12):139–160, September 2001. doi:10.1002/nme.275.
- R. Brenner. Numerical computation of the response of piezoelectric composites using Fourier transform. *Phys. Rev. B*, 79:184106, May 2009. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.79.184106.
- Qi-Zhi Zhu and Julien Yvonnet. An incremental-iterative method for modeling damage evolution in voxel-based microstructure models. *Comput. Mech.*, 55(2):371–382, 2015. ISSN 0178-7675. doi:10.1007/s00466-014-1106-1.
- Yuan Chai, Ying Wang, Zeshan Yousaf, Nghia T. Vo, Tristan Lowe, Prasad Potluri, and Philip J. Withers. Damage evolution in braided composite tubes under torsion studied by in-situ X-ray computed tomography. *Compos. Sci. Technol.*, 188:107976, 2020. ISSN 0266-3538. doi:10.1016/j.compscitech.2019.107976.
- Javier Segurado, Ricardo A. Lebensohn, and Javier LLorca. Chapter one - computational homogenization of polycrystals. In Mahmoud I. Hussein, editor, *Advances in Crystals and Elastic Metamaterials, Part 1*, volume 51 of *Advances in Applied Mechanics*, pages 1–114. Elsevier, 2018. doi:10.1016/bs.aams.2018.07.001.
- Matti Schneider. A review of nonlinear FFT-based computational homogenization methods. *Acta Mech*, 232(6): 2051–2100, March 2021. doi:10.1007/s00707-021-02962-1.
- François Willot. Fourier-based schemes for computing the mechanical response of composites with accurate local fields. *Comptes Rendus Mécanique*, 343(3):232–245, 2015. ISSN 1631-0721. doi:10.1016/j.crme.2014.12.005.
- Matti Schneider, Felix Ospald, and Matthias Kabel. Computational homogenization of elasticity on a staggered grid. *Int J Numer Meth Eng*, 105(9):693–720, 2016. ISSN 0029-5981. doi:10.1002/nme.5008.
- Matti Schneider, Dennis Merkert, and Matthias Kabel. FFT-based homogenization for microstructures discretized by linear hexahedral elements. *Int J Numer Meth Eng*, 109(10):1461–1489, 2017. ISSN 0029-5981. doi:10.1002/nme.5336.
- Byeong C. Koh and Noboru Kikuchi. New improved hourglass control for bilinear and trilinear elements in anisotropic linear elasticity. *Comput Method Appl M*, 65(1):1–46, November 1987. doi:10.1016/0045-7825(87)90181-2.
- E. D. L. Pugh, E. Hinton, and O. C. Zienkiewicz. A study of quadrilateral plate bending elements with ‘reduced’ integration. *Int J Numer Meth Eng*, 12(7):1059–1079, 1978. doi:10.1002/nme.1620120702.
- Yousef Saad. *Iterative methods for sparse linear systems*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, second edition, 2003. ISBN 0-89871-534-2. doi:10.1137/1.9780898718003.
- D. J. Eyre and G. W. Milton. A fast numerical scheme for computing the response of composites using grid refinement. *The European Physical Journal Applied Physics*, 6(1):41–47, April 1999. doi:10.1051/epjap:1999150.
- Jan Zeman, Jaroslav Vondřejc, Jan Novák, and Ivo Marek. Accelerating a FFT-based solver for numerical homogenization of periodic media by conjugate gradients. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 229(21):8065–8071, October 2010. doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2010.07.010.
- Komlavi Sényo Eloh, Alain Jacques, and Stéphane Berbenni. Development of a new consistent discrete green operator for FFT-based methods to solve heterogeneous problems with eigenstrains. *Int. J. Plast.*, 116:1–23, May 2019. doi:10.1016/j.ijplas.2018.10.011.
- Matti Schneider. A dynamical view of nonlinear conjugate gradient methods with applications to FFT-based computational micromechanics. *Comput. Mech.*, 66(1):239–257, May 2020. doi:10.1007/s00466-020-01849-7.
- P. G. Ciarlet. Basic error estimates for elliptic problems. In *Handbook of numerical analysis, Vol. II*, Handb. Numer. Anal., II, pages 17–351. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991.
- Susanne C. Brenner and L. Ridgway Scott. *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*, volume 15 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer, New York, third edition, 2008. ISBN 978-0-387-75933-3. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-75934-0.
- Matti Schneider. Convergence of FFT-based homogenization for strongly heterogeneous media. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 38(13):2761–2778, 2015. ISSN 0170-4214. doi:10.1002/mma.3259.
- A. Zygmund. *Trigonometric series: Vols. I, II*. Cambridge University Press, London-New York, 1968. Second edition, reprinted with corrections and some additions.
- Zhilin Li, Tao Lin, and Xiaohui Wu. New Cartesian grid methods for interface problems using the finite element formulation. *Numer Math*, 96(1):61–98, November 2003. doi:10.1007/s00211-003-0473-x.
- Zhiming Chen, Yuanming Xiao, and Linbo Zhang. The adaptive immersed interface finite element method for elliptic and Maxwell interface problems. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 228(14):5000–5019, August 2009. doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2009.03.044.
- Erik Burman, Susanne Claus, Peter Hansbo, Mats G. Larson, and André Massing. CutFEM: Discretizing geometry and partial differential equations. *Int J Numer Meth Eng*, 104(7):472–501, December 2014. doi:10.1002/nme.4823.



- Peiqi Huang, Haijun Wu, and Yuanming Xiao. An unfitted interface penalty finite element method for elliptic interface problems. *Comput Method Appl M*, 323:439–460, August 2017. doi:10.1016/j.cma.2017.06.004.
- Zhiming Chen, Ke Li, and Xueshuang Xiang. An adaptive high-order unfitted finite element method for elliptic interface problems. *Numer Math*, 149(3):507–548, November 2021. doi:10.1007/s00211-021-01243-2.
- John B. Conway. *A course in functional analysis*, volume 96 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1990. ISBN 0-387-97245-5.
- C. Bernardi and V. Girault. A local regularization operator for triangular and quadrilateral finite elements. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 35(5):1893–1916, 1998. ISSN 0036-1429. doi:10.1137/S0036142995293766.
- Yan Yan Li and Louis Nirenberg. Estimates for elliptic systems from composite material. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 56(7):892–925, April 2003. doi:10.1002/cpa.10079.