

Two-level hybrid Schwarz preconditioners with piecewise-polynomial coarse spaces for the high-frequency Helmholtz equation

I. G. Graham* and E. A. Spence†

March 21, 2025

Abstract

We analyse two-level hybrid Schwarz domain-decomposition GMRES preconditioners for finite-element discretisations of the Helmholtz equation with wavenumber k , where the coarse space consists of piecewise polynomials.

We prove results for fixed polynomial degree (in both the fine and coarse spaces), as well as for polynomial degree increasing like $\log k$. In the latter case, we exhibit choices of fine and coarse spaces such that, modulo factors of $\log k$, the fine and coarse spaces are both pollution free (with the ratio of the coarse-space dimension to the fine-space dimension arbitrarily small), the number of degrees of freedom per subdomain is constant, and the number of GMRES iterations is constant; i.e., modulo the important question of how to efficiently solve the coarse problem, this is the (arguably) theoretically ideal situation.

Along with the results in the companion paper [38] (which cover only fixed polynomial degree), these are the first rigorous convergence results about a two-level Schwarz preconditioner applied to the high-frequency Helmholtz equation with a coarse space that does not consist of problem-adapted basis functions.

1 Introduction

1.1 Context and motivation

When solving self-adjoint positive-definite problems (such as Laplace’s equation) with domain-decomposition (DD) methods, coarse spaces provide global transfer of information, and are the key to parallel scalability (see, e.g., [69, 71], [23, Chapter 4]). However, the design of practical coarse spaces for high-frequency wave problems, such as the high-frequency Helmholtz equation, is much more difficult than in the self-adjoint positive-definite case (see, e.g., the recent computational study [10] and the references therein) and there have been several preprints appearing in the last year on the rigorous numerical analysis of this question [46, 57, 50, 52, 31].

The heart of the issue is that the accurate approximation of a function oscillating at frequency $\lesssim k$ in a domain of characteristic length scale L requires $\sim (kL)^d$ degrees of freedom. Furthermore, the *pollution effect* [2] means that finite-element methods (FEMs) with fixed polynomial degree applied to the Helmholtz equation require $\gg (kL)^d$ degrees of freedom to be accurate. In particular, [7] recently exhibited examples of meshes in 2-d with $(kL)^d$ degrees of freedom for which the Helmholtz FEM solution with fixed polynomial degree does not exist. In contrast, if the polynomial degree increases logarithmically with $\log(kL)$, then the resulting *hp*-FEM method does *not* suffer from the pollution effect [55, 56, 30, 49, 36, 37, 6], provided that the solution operator of the Helmholtz problem grows polynomially with kL (as occurs for “most” frequencies by [48]).

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Bath, UK, i.g.graham@bath.ac.uk

†Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Bath, UK, e.a.spence@bath.ac.uk

A popular strategy for designing coarse spaces is to solve appropriate local problems to create basis functions adapted to the underlying Helmholtz problem, and then glue these together using a partition of unity. We highlight two such spaces specifically designed as DD coarse spaces: the GenEO (generalized eigenvalue problems on the overlap) method [67, 9] and the method of [21, 58] based on computing eigenfunctions of local Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps. Other such spaces, which also can be used as approximation spaces independent of DD, are the so-called “multiscale” methods, which use ideas originally introduced to create basis functions for positive-definite problems with strongly varying coefficients [45, 26]; such multiscale methods for the Helmholtz equation include [40, 61, 12, 60, 18, 32, 51, 19]. The four recent papers [46, 50, 52, 31] all analysed two-level “hybrid” Schwarz preconditioners (i.e., the one-level solves and the coarse solves are combined in a multiplicative way – see, e.g., (1.12) below) with multiscale coarse spaces. In [52, 31], the preconditioned matrix is shown to be close to the identity, while in [46, 50] GMRES is shown to converge in a k -independent number of iterations (via appropriate bounds on the field of values of the preconditioned matrix).

The recent preprint [38] gives sufficient conditions for the preconditioned matrix to be close to the identity for certain hybrid Schwarz preconditioners, with this theory allowing DD subdomains of arbitrary size, and arbitrary absorbing layers/boundary conditions on both the global and local Helmholtz problems. The assumptions on the coarse space in [38] are satisfied (i) by the multiscale coarse spaces in the recent analyses [46, 50, 52, 31] and (ii) if the Galerkin problem in the coarse space is known to be quasi-optimal via the Schatz argument [64, 65]. Using Point (ii), [38] proved the first rigorous convergence results about two-level DD with piecewise polynomial coarse spaces, albeit of fixed degree. This fixed-degree requirement arises since the theory in [38] uses a super-approximation result, and the current proof of this result gives a constant that blows up as the polynomial degree increases. Therefore, because of the pollution effect, the piecewise-polynomial fine and coarse spaces covered by [38] have $\gg (kL)^d$ degrees of freedom.

The main goal of the present paper is to obtain results about piecewise-polynomial fine and coarse spaces that allow the polynomial degree to increase with k , and hence obtain, up to factors of $\log(kL)$, fine and coarse spaces with $\sim (kL)^d$ degrees of freedom.

We highlight that [38] uses arguments similar to those in the analysis in [43] of one-level DD for the Helmholtz equation with complex k . The present paper, on the other hand, uses arguments similar to the two-level DD analysis in [42], again for the Helmholtz problem with complex k , with [42] in turn drawing ideas from the two-level DD analysis in [13] for the Helmholtz equation with k small (see the discussion in Remark 5.9 below). The present paper also makes crucial use of the hp -FEM convergence results of [37], as well as the recent results of [22] (building on [4]) about the exponential decay away from the support of its argument of the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto finite-element spaces

1.2 The Helmholtz problem considered in this paper

We are interested in computing (accurate) approximations to the following scattering problem.

Definition 1.1 (Helmholtz scattering problem). *Let $A_{\text{scat}} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$, $d = 2, 3$, be symmetric, positive-definite, and bounded in \mathbb{R}^d . Let $c_{\text{scat}} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ be positive and bounded in \mathbb{R}^d . Furthermore, let A_{scat} and c_{scat} be such that $\text{supp}(I - A_{\text{scat}})$ and $\text{supp}(1 - c_{\text{scat}})$ are both compactly supported. Given $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with compact support and $k > 0$, $v \in H_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies the Helmholtz scattering problem if*

$$k^{-2} \nabla \cdot (A_{\text{scat}} \nabla v) + c_{\text{scat}}^{-2} v = -f \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d$$

and

$$k^{-1} \partial_r v(\mathbf{x}) - iv(\mathbf{x}) = o(r^{-(d-1)/2}) \quad \text{as } r := |\mathbf{x}| \rightarrow \infty, \text{ uniformly in } \hat{x} := \mathbf{x}/r.$$

We approximate the solution of the Helmholtz scattering problem of Definition 1.1 by the solution of the following problem, posed on $H_0^1(\Omega)$ where Ω is bounded Lipschitz domain.

Definition 1.2. (Complex-absorbing-potential (CAP) approximation to Helmholtz scattering problem) *Let A_{scat} and c_{scat} be as in Definition 1.1. Let Ω_{int} be a bounded Lipschitz open set containing $\text{supp}(I - A_{\text{scat}})$ and $\text{supp}(1 - c_{\text{scat}})$, and let Ω be a larger bounded Lipschitz polyhedron that strictly contains Ω_{int} . Let $V \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ be non-negative, supported in $\Omega \setminus \Omega_{\text{int}}$ and strictly positive in a neighbourhood of $\partial\Omega$. Given $f \in (H_0^1(\Omega))^*$ and $k > 0$, $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ satisfies the CAP problem if*

$$k^{-2}\nabla \cdot (A_{\text{scat}} \nabla u) + (c_{\text{scat}}^{-2} + iV)u = -f \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (1.1)$$

The weak form of (1.1) is

$$a(u, w) := \int_{\Omega} (A_{\text{scat}} \nabla u) \cdot \overline{\nabla w} - ((c_{\text{scat}})^{-2} + iV)u \overline{w} = \langle f, w \rangle \quad \text{for all } w \in H_0^1(\Omega). \quad (1.2)$$

The solution of the CAP problem is unique by the unique continuation principle and then exists by the Fredholm alternative (see Theorem 7.1 below).

The difference between the solution of the scattering problem of Definition 1.1 and the CAP problem is smooth and super-algebraically small in k as $k \rightarrow \infty$ on Ω_{int} (see Theorem 7.3 below); this is in contrast to approximations based on an impedance boundary condition (considered in many papers on the numerical analysis of the Helmholtz equation), where the error is bounded below by a positive constant, independent of k , as $k \rightarrow \infty$ [35].

We work in the inner product (depending on both k and A_{scat})

$$(u, v)_{H_k^1(\Omega)} := k^{-2}(A_{\text{scat}} \nabla u, \nabla v)_{L^2(\Omega)} + (u, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad (1.3)$$

so that

$$\|u\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 := k^{-2}\|(A_{\text{scat}})^{1/2}\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (1.4)$$

We note that many papers on the numerical analysis of the Helmholtz equation use the alternative weighted H^1 norm $\|v\|^2 := \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + k^2\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$; we work with (1.4) instead, because (i) weighting the j th derivative with k^{-j} is easier to keep track of than weighting the j th derivative with k^{-j+1} , and (ii) the norm of the Helmholtz solution operator then has the same kL -dependence between any two spaces in which this norm is well defined (e.g. $L^2 \rightarrow L^2$, $L^2 \rightarrow H_k^1$, $(H_k^1)^* \rightarrow H_k^1$).

The appearance of the real symmetric positive-definite matrix A_{scat} in the inner product (1.3) is crucial for the proof of the main result – see Lemma 5.7 and Remark 5.9 below – with the idea behind this going back to [13, Proof of Theorem 1]. This appearance of A_{scat} in the inner product means that the analysis in this paper does not cover perfectly-matched-layer (PML) truncation, where the coefficient of the highest-order term in the PDE is not real symmetric positive-definite (since it is complex-valued in the PML region) and thus cannot appear in a weighted inner product/norm. We emphasise, however, that both the CAP problem and the PML problem approximate the Sommerfeld radiation condition in the $k \rightarrow \infty$ limit with error super-algebraically small in k . Finally, we note that, while the CAP problem is perhaps less well-known in the numerical analysis of FEM and DD for Helmholtz, it is a standard tool for computing resonances; see, e.g., [62, 68] and the references therein.

1.3 Recap of h -FEM and hp -FEM convergence theory

The pollution effect is the fact that $\gg (kL)^d$ degrees of freedom are needed for k -independent quasi-optimality of the FEM if the polynomial degree is fixed. This effect is quantified by the following result (first proved for a specific Helmholtz problem with impedance boundary conditions in [24], and then proved for general Helmholtz problems in [39]).

Theorem 1.3 (Informal recap of h -FEM convergence theory). *Let C_{sol} be the $L^2 \rightarrow H_k^1$ norm of the Helmholtz solution operator (recall that, with the definition (1.4) of the H_k^1 norm, $C_{\text{sol}} \sim kL$ for nontrapping problems and $C_{\text{sol}} \gg kL$ for trapping problems). Suppose that the Helmholtz equation is solved using the Galerkin FEM with degree p polynomials. If the domain is $C^{p,1}$, the coefficients are piecewise $C^{p-1,1}$, and*

$$(kh)^{2p}C_{\text{sol}} \text{ is sufficiently small,}$$

then the Galerkin solution u_h exists, is unique, and satisfies

$$\|u - u_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq C \left(1 + (kh)^p C_{\text{sol}}\right) \min_{v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h} \|u - v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad (1.5)$$

$$\|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \left(kh + (kh)^p C_{\text{sol}}\right) \min_{v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h} \|u - v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}. \quad (1.6)$$

Furthermore, if the data is k -oscillatory and piecewise H^{p-1} , then

$$\frac{\|u - u_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}}{\|u\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}} \leq C \left(1 + (kh)^p C_{\text{sol}}\right) (kh)^p; \quad (1.7)$$

i.e., the relative H_k^1 error can be made controllably small by making $(kh)^{2p}C_{\text{sol}}$ sufficiently small.

Theorem 1.3 shows that the pollution effect is less pronounced for larger p , i.e., for higher-degree polynomials. The following result shows that the hp -FEM with $p \sim \log k$ does not suffer from the pollution effect; this result was proved for a variety of constant-coefficient Helmholtz problems in [55, 56, 30] and variable-coefficient Helmholtz problems in [49, 36, 37, 6].

Theorem 1.4 (Informal recap of hp -FEM convergence theory). *Suppose that C_{sol} is polynomially bounded in kL (as occurs for “most” k by [48]). Under suitable regularity assumptions on the domains and coefficients, given $k_0, C_{\text{deg,f}}, \epsilon > 0$ there exists $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that if $k \geq k_0$,*

$$\frac{kh}{p} \leq C_1 \quad \text{and} \quad p \geq (1 + C_{\text{deg,f}} \log k),$$

then the Galerkin solution u_h exists, is unique, and satisfies

$$\|u - u_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq C_2 \min_{v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h} \|u - v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}, \quad \text{and} \quad (1.8)$$

$$\|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon \|u - u_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}. \quad (1.9)$$

Note that, technically, Theorem 1.4 with $C_{\text{deg,f}}$ arbitrary is only stated and proved in [6]. The first paper establishing this type of hp -FEM convergence result, [55], proved that there exists $C > 0$ such that (1.8) holds for $p \geq C \log k$ (see [55, Corollary 5.6]), and the subsequent papers [56, 49, 36, 37] followed [55]. Corollary 7.9 below shows that, arguing slightly more carefully than in [55, Corollary 5.6], we can obtain (1.8) with $C_{\text{deg,f}}$ arbitrary (as in [6]).

1.4 The hybrid Schwarz preconditioner

In this paper we are interested in algorithms for computing the Galerkin solution to the CAP problem (1.2) discretised in a space $\mathcal{V}_h \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ of piecewise-polynomial Lagrange finite elements (as defined e.g., in [11, Chapter 3] or [29, Section 1.2.3]) on a shape-regular simplicial mesh of diameter h ; we call \mathcal{V}_h the *fine space*. With $\{\phi_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}_h}$ denoting the finite element basis for \mathcal{V}_h (where \mathcal{J}_h is a suitable index set), there exists an interpolation operator $\mathfrak{I}_h : C(\overline{\Omega}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_h$ of the form

$$\mathfrak{I}_h f = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_h} f(x_j) \phi_j$$

where the $x_j \subset \Omega$ are the *nodes* and $f(x_j)$ are the *freedoms*. Examples of such Lagrange elements (suitable for low or high polynomial degree) are given in [29, page 31]. The approximation theory for the operator \mathfrak{J}_h is standard and is given in, e.g., [11, Theorem 4.4.20]. Applying the Galerkin method to (1.2) in the space \mathcal{V}_h yields a linear system, with system matrix here denoted \mathbf{A} .

We construct domain-decomposition preconditioners for \mathbf{A} using a coarse space, $\mathcal{V}_0 \subset \mathcal{V}_h$, and a set of overlapping subdomains $\{\Omega_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^N$. Let $\mathcal{V}_\ell := \mathcal{V}_h \cap H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$ (with freedoms in the interior of each Ω_ℓ); i.e., we impose zero Dirichlet boundary conditions on the subdomain problems. With $\{\Phi_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{J}_0}$ denoting a Lagrange basis for \mathcal{V}_0 (with suitable index set \mathcal{J}_0), for all $p \in \mathcal{J}_0$,

$$\Phi_p = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_h} (\mathbf{R}_0)_{pj} \phi_j, \quad \text{where} \quad (\mathbf{R}_0)_{pj} = \Phi_p(x_j). \quad (1.10)$$

The matrix \mathbf{R}_0^T then maps the freedoms of any function in \mathcal{V}_0 to its freedoms in \mathcal{V}_h . Similarly, let \mathbf{R}_ℓ^T be the usual extension matrix that maps the freedoms of any $v_{h,\ell} \in \mathcal{V}_\ell$ to its freedoms in \mathcal{V}_h (via padding by zeros) and $\mathbf{R}_\ell = (\mathbf{R}_\ell^T)^T$. The matrices $\mathbf{A}_0 := \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{R}_0^T$, and $\mathbf{A}_\ell := \mathbf{R}_\ell \mathbf{A} \mathbf{R}_\ell^T$ are then Galerkin matrices of $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ discretised in \mathcal{V}_0 and \mathcal{V}_ℓ , respectively.

Let the real symmetric positive-definite matrix $\mathbf{D}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be such that

$$(v_h, w_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)} = \langle \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} \rangle_{\mathbf{D}_k}, \quad (1.11)$$

for all $v_h, w_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$ with freedoms \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} . Let \dagger denote the adjoint with respect to the Euclidean inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ (i.e., $\mathbf{C}^\dagger = \overline{\mathbf{C}}^T$). We consider the following left preconditioner for \mathbf{A} ,

$$\mathbf{B}_L^{-1} = \mathbf{B}_L^{-1}(\mathbf{A}) := \mathbf{R}_0^T \mathbf{A}_0^{-1} \mathbf{R}_0 + \mathbf{D}_k^{-1} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^\dagger \mathbf{R}_0^T (\mathbf{A}_0^\dagger)^{-1} \mathbf{R}_0) \mathbf{D}_k \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N \mathbf{R}_\ell^T \mathbf{A}_\ell^{-1} \mathbf{R}_\ell \right) (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A} \mathbf{R}_0^T \mathbf{A}_0^{-1} \mathbf{R}_0); \quad (1.12)$$

we also consider a related right preconditioner for \mathbf{A} , denoted by \mathbf{B}_R^{-1} and defined by (3.8) below.

1.5 Informal statement of the main results

These informal statements use the notation $a \sim b$ to mean that there exist C_1, C_2 , independent of h, k and L , such that $C_1 b \leq a \leq C_2 b$.

Theorem 1.5 (Informal statement of the main result with piecewise-polynomial coarse spaces). *Suppose that*

- *the fine space consists of degree- p_f Lagrange finite elements on a shape-regular mesh of diameter h and*
- *the subdomains have generous overlap; i.e., δ (the parameter related to the minimum overlap of the subdomains) $\sim H_{\text{sub}}$ (the maximum subdomain diameter),*
- *the boundaries of the subdomains are resolved by the fine mesh, and*
- *the coarse mesh elements are resolved by the fine mesh.*

(a) **(Coarse and fine degrees are fixed and equal.)** *Let kH_{sub} be sufficiently small. Given a coarsening factor $C_{\text{coarse}} > 1$, let the coarse space consist of degree $p_c = p_f$ piecewise polynomials on a mesh of size*

$$H = C_{\text{coarse}} h, \quad \text{with } (kH)^{p_c} C_{\text{sol}} \text{ a sufficiently small constant.}$$

Then

$$\frac{\text{coarse-space dimension}}{\text{fine-space dimension}} \sim \left(\frac{hp_c}{H p_f} \right)^d \sim \left(\frac{1}{C_{\text{coarse}}} \right)^d \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

and GMRES applied to either $B_L^{-1}A$ in the D_k inner product or AB_R^{-1} in the D_k^{-1} inner product converges in a k -independent number of iterations.

(b) (**Coarse degree > fine degree, both fixed.**) Let

$$kH_{\text{sub}} \text{ and } (kh)^{p_f} C_{\text{sol}} \text{ be sufficiently small, and let } p_c > p_f.$$

Let the coarse space be created by interpolating degree- p_c Lagrange finite elements on a mesh with meshwidth $H(> h)$ onto the fine space, where

$$(kH)^{p_c} C_{\text{sol}} \text{ is a sufficiently small constant.}$$

Then

$$\frac{\text{coarse-space dimension}}{\text{fine-space dimension}} \sim (C_{\text{sol}})^{d(p_f - p_c)/(p_f p_c)} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

and GMRES applied to either $B_L^{-1}A$ in the D_k inner product or AB_R^{-1} in the D_k^{-1} inner product converges in a k -independent number of iterations.

(c) (**Coarse and fine degrees are equal and $\sim \log k$**) Suppose that C_{sol} is bounded polynomially in kL , the meshes are quasi-uniform, and the coarse mesh elements are resolved by the fine mesh. Then given $C_{\text{deg},f} > 0$ there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that if $C_{\text{coarse}} > 1$,

$$p_c = p_f = 1 + C_{\text{deg},f} \log(kL), \quad H = \frac{c_1}{k}, \quad h = \frac{c_1}{C_{\text{coarse}} k \log(kL) (1 + C_{\text{deg},f} \log(kL))},$$

$$\text{and } H_{\text{sub}} = \frac{c_2}{k(1 + C_{\text{deg},f} \log(kL))}$$

(i.e., $H \sim k^{-1}, h \sim k^{-1}(\log(kL))^{-2}$, and $H_{\text{sub}} \sim k^{-1} \log(kL)^{-1}$), then

$$\frac{\text{coarse-space dimension}}{\text{fine-space dimension}} \sim \left(\frac{1}{C_{\text{coarse}} \log(kL) (1 + C_{\text{deg},f} \log(kL))} \right)^d \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

and, when GMRES is applied to either $B_L^{-1}A$ in the D_k inner product or AB_R^{-1} in the D_k^{-1} inner product,

$$\text{the number of iterations grows at most like } (1 + C_{\text{deg},f} \log(kL))^2 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

(d) (**Coarse mesh equals the fine mesh, coarse degree < fine degree, both $\sim \log k$**) Suppose that C_{sol} is bounded polynomially in kL , the meshes are quasi-uniform, Then given $C_{\text{deg},f} > C_{\text{deg},c} > 0$ there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$p_f = 1 + C_{\text{deg},f} \log(kL), \quad p_c = 1 + C_{\text{deg},c} \log(kL), \quad H = h = \frac{c_1}{k \log(kL) (1 + C_{\text{deg},f} \log(kL))},$$

$$\text{and } H_{\text{sub}} = \frac{c_2}{k(1 + C_{\text{deg},f} \log(kL))}$$

(i.e., $H = h \sim k^{-1}(\log(kL))^{-2}$, and $H_{\text{sub}} \sim k^{-1} \log(kL)^{-1}$), then

$$\frac{\text{coarse-space dimension}}{\text{fine-space dimension}} \sim \left(\frac{C_{\text{deg},c}}{C_{\text{deg},f}} \right)^d \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

and, when GMRES is applied to either $B_L^{-1}A$ in the D_k inner product or AB_R^{-1} in the D_k^{-1} inner product,

$$\text{the number of iterations grows at most like } (1 + C_{\text{deg},f} \log(kL))^2 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

We highlight immediately that $C_{\text{deg},f}$ and $C_{\text{deg},c}$ in Cases (c) and (d) are arbitrary, but as $C_{\text{deg},f}, C_{\text{deg},c}$ decreases, then c_1 and c_2 decrease; i.e., the smaller $p_f/\log(kL)$ or $p_c/\log(kL)$ are, the more restrictive the conditions on H , h , and H_{sub} are.

The precise statement of Cases (a) and (b) is Theorem 8.3 below, and the precise statement of Cases (c) and (d) is Theorem 8.1.

Theorem 1.5 is a special case of the following abstract theorem (whose precise statement is Theorem 3.1 below).

Theorem 1.6 (Informal statement of the main abstract result). *Suppose that the following three assumptions hold.*

(i) *If the Helmholtz problem is solved using the Galerkin method in the coarse space, then*

- *the H^1 Galerkin error is bounded (independently of k) by the solution, and*
- *the L^2 Galerkin error is bounded by a sufficiently-small (independent of k) multiple of the solution*

(both these bounds hold if the sequence of Galerkin solutions is proved to be quasi-optimal via the Schatz argument – see Lemma 2.9 below).

(ii) *The maximum subdomain diameter, H_{sub} , satisfies $kH_{\text{sub}}p_f \sim 1$ and the subdomains have generous overlap (so that $k\delta p_f \sim 1$).*

(iii) *If p_f increases with k , then $h \sim H_{\text{sub}}/\log(kL)$.*

Then

- *$\|\mathbf{B}_L^{-1}\mathbf{A}\|_{\mathbf{D}_k}$ is bounded above independently of k , p_f , and h , and*
- *the distance from the origin of the field of values of $\mathbf{B}_L^{-1}\mathbf{A}$ in the \mathbf{D}_k inner product $\sim p_f^{-2}$.*

Thus (by the variant [5] of the Elman estimate [28, 27]), when GMRES is applied to $\mathbf{B}_L^{-1}\mathbf{A}$ in the \mathbf{D}_k inner product, it converges (in the sense that the relative residual becomes arbitrarily small) in a number of iterations that grows at most like $(p_f)^2$.

Furthermore, if Assumption (i) also holds for the adjoint sesquilinear form, then, by (3.11), an analogous result holds for GMRES applied to $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}_R^{-1}$ in the \mathbf{D}_k^{-1} inner product.

1.6 Discussion of Theorems 1.5 and 1.6

The size of the subdomains. Recall that keeping the number of degrees of freedom in each subdomain ($\sim (H_{\text{sub}}/h)^d$) constant, and then increasing the number of subdomains is a popular strategy to seek parallel scalability as the total number of degrees of freedom of the problem increases. In Cases (c) and (d) of Theorem 1.5, the number of degrees of freedom in each subdomain $\sim (\log(kL))^d$, and so we are close to the ideal situation. In Cases (a) and (b) of Theorem 1.5, the number of degrees of freedom in each subdomain $\sim C_{\text{sol}}^{d/p_f}$, which becomes closer to the ideal situation as p_f increases.

The coarse space needs to resolve the propagative behaviour of the solution. One expects that a one-level DD method with subdomains of size $\sim k^{-1}$ needs at least $\sim k$ iterations to see the propagation of the Helmholtz solution operator at length scales independent of k (and this is borne out in numerical experiments; see, e.g., [42, Table 4]). To obtain a k -independent number of iterations, the coarse space must therefore resolve this propagation, with this requirement encoded in Theorem 1.6 as Assumption (i); note that this is the same requirement on the coarse space as in [38], although the arguments in [38] are very different to the arguments used to prove Theorem 1.6 (as discussed at the end of §1.1).

In Theorem 1.5 we satisfy Assumption (i) of Theorem 1.6 by the piecewise-polynomial coarse space being quasi-optimal (discussed more in the next paragraph). For piecewise-polynomial

coarse spaces, one might hope to prove a result under the weaker requirement that the relative error is controllably small for oscillatory data (1.7). We note, however, that the multiscale coarse spaces of [46, 50, 52, 31] all satisfy Assumption (i) (see the discussion in [38, §5.2]); the results of [46, 50, 52, 31], [38], and Theorem 1.6 are therefore all conceptually working in the same regime.

Quasi-optimality of the fine-space and coarse-space problems. In all the cases in Theorem 1.5, both the fine- and coarse-space problems are quasi-optimal (by (1.5) and (1.8)).

Case (a), (c), and (d) of Theorem 1.5 follow immediately from Theorem 1.6: indeed, once the coarse problem satisfies the bounds (1.5)/(1.6) (for fixed p_c in Case (a)) and (1.8)/(1.9) (for $p_c \sim \log k$ in Case (c)), then the quasi-optimality bound (1.5)/(1.8) implies that the first bullet point in Assumption (i) of Theorem 1.6 is satisfied (by taking $v_h = 0$ in (1.5)/(1.8)), and then this combined with the bound on the L^2 Galerkin error in (1.6)/(1.9) shows that the second bullet point in Assumption (i) is satisfied.

In Case (b) of Theorem 1.5, our route to ensuring that this particular coarse space (formed by interpolation) is quasi-optimal is to require that *both* the original coarse space being interpolated *and* the fine space are quasi-optimal (see the proof of Theorem 8.3 below). We note that the rationale behind this case, i.e., having $p_c > p_f$, is the same rationale behind using coarse spaces with problem-adapted basis functions: namely, to use a coarse space that suffers from the pollution effect less than the fine space, and hence has smaller dimension (as $k \rightarrow \infty$).

We note that (given the current state-of-the-art h -FEM convergence theory) the analyses [46, 50, 52, 31] also implicitly assume that the fine-space problem is (at least) quasi-optimal – see Remark 7.11 below.

Near-pollution-free fine and coarse spaces when p_f and $p_c \sim \log k$. In Case (c) of Theorem 1.5, the fine space has dimension $\sim (kL)^d (\log(kL))^{3d}$, the coarse space has dimension $\sim (kL)^d (\log(kL))^d$ (i.e., both spaces are pollution free up to logarithmic factors), the degrees of freedom per subdomain $(H_{\text{sub}}/h)^d \sim (\log(kL))^d$, GMRES converges in at most $(\log(kL))^2$ iterations, and no problem-adapted basis functions need to be precomputed. Case (d) is similar, except that here both the fine and coarse spaces have dimension $\sim (kL)^d (\log(kL))^{3d}$.

Therefore, up to logarithmic factors, these scenarios are, in some sense, optimal, modulo the important question of how to efficiently solve the coarse problem. While this question is not explored in the present paper, we note that solving the coarse problem with a one-level method is investigated numerically in [70], [8, §6].

Relation to the numerical experiments in [10]. The fine and coarse space combinations given in Theorem 1.5 will be investigated computationally elsewhere. However, the experiments in [10], which consider $p_c = p_f = 2$, albeit using an additive Schwarz preconditioner rather than a hybrid preconditioner, show that the number of GMRES iterations

- grows slowly with k when the number of degrees of freedom per subdomain is kept constant (which is consistent with Theorem 1.5), and
- grows with k if the coarse space does not resolve the oscillatory/propagative nature of the solution.

In more detail: the *grid coarse space method* of [10] involves FEM discretisations with $p_c = p_f = 2$, 10 points per wavelength in the fine space, and 5 points per wavelength in the coarse space (i.e., both h and $H \sim k^{-1}$) and GMRES is then applied with an additive Schwarz preconditioner with impedance boundary conditions on the subdomains and minimal overlap – we expect the hybrid preconditioner with generous overlap to have fewer GMRES iterations than in this set up. When k is doubled and the number of subdomains increases by 2^d (so that the number of degrees of freedom per subdomain is kept constant – i.e., close to the set up in Theorem 1.5),

the number of iterations goes from 41 ($f = 10, N = 40$) to 44 ($f = 20, N = 160$) in [10, Table 1] for the 2-d Marmousi model and from 11 ($k = 100, N = 20$) to 16 ($k = 200, N = 160$) [10, Table 7] for the 3-d cobra cavity. Furthermore, [10, Table 9] shows that the number of iterations is large if there are only 5 points per wavelength in the fine space, and 2.5 points per wavelength in the coarse space.

1.7 Plan of the paper

§2 states and discusses the assumptions needed to prove the main abstract result. §3 states the main abstract result (Theorem 3.1). §4 recaps results on polynomial interpolation. §5 gives auxiliary results needed for the proof of Theorem 3.1. §6 proves Theorem 3.1. §7 recaps results about the Helmholtz CAP problem. §8 applies Theorem 3.1 to piecewise-polynomial subspaces. §A gives the matrix form of the preconditioners. §B proves Theorems 7.2 and 7.3 (auxiliary results about the CAP problem).

2 Statement of the abstract assumptions

2.1 Assumptions on the finite-element space and domain decomposition

Assumption 2.1 (The fine space). Ω is a Lipschitz polyhedron and \mathcal{T}^h is a family of conforming simplicial meshes on Ω (with affine element maps) that are quasi-uniform (in the sense of, e.g., [11, Equation 4.4.15]) as the mesh diameter $h \rightarrow 0$. $\mathcal{V}_h \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$ consists of piecewise polynomials on \mathcal{T}^h of degree p_f .

We need to assume that the meshes are quasi-uniform, since a global inverse estimate is used in the proof of Lemma 5.4 below. However, some of our main results do not need quasi-uniformity: an analogue of the main result holds, without explicit dependence on p_f , if the meshes are shape-regular; see Remark 3.4 below.

Definition 2.2 (Characteristic length scale). A domain has characteristic length scale L if its diameter $\sim L$, its surface area $\sim L^{d-1}$, and its volume $\sim L^d$.

Assumption 2.3 (The subdomains). The subdomains $\{\Omega_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^N$ form an overlapping cover of Ω , with each Ω_ℓ a non-empty open polyhedron with characteristic length scale H_ℓ that is the union of elements of \mathcal{T}^h . Let $h_\ell := \max_{\tau \subset \overline{\Omega_\ell}} h_\tau$, where h_τ is the diameter of τ .

$\{\chi_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^N$ is a partition of unity subordinate to $\{\Omega_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^N$ that is continuous on Ω and piecewise linear on \mathcal{T}^h . Furthermore, there exists $C_{\text{PoU}} > 0$ such that for all $\ell = 1, \dots, N$, there exists $\delta_\ell \geq 2h_\ell > 0$

$$\|\nabla \chi_\ell\|_{L^\infty(\tau)} \leq C_{\text{PoU}} \delta_\ell^{-1} \quad \text{for all } \tau \in \mathcal{T}^h, \quad (2.1)$$

and $\text{supp} \chi_\ell$ is at least a distance δ_ℓ from $\partial\Omega_\ell$.

The quantities $\delta_\ell, \ell = 1, \dots, N$, are indicators of the size of the overlap of the subdomains Ω_ℓ (e.g., if the overlaps $\rightarrow 0$ then the $\delta_\ell \rightarrow 0$). We introduce δ_ℓ via (2.1), since this is the property that is actually used in the proofs (see Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4 below).

In [69, Section 3.2] there is an explicit construction of a partition of unity satisfying the conditions in Assumption 2.3 apart from the conditions that (i) $\delta_\ell \geq 2h_\ell$ and (ii) $\text{supp} \chi_\ell$ is at least a distance δ_ℓ from $\partial\Omega_\ell$; the construction in [69, Section 3.2] can be easily modified to satisfy these additional conditions.

Let

$$H_{\text{sub}} := \max_\ell H_\ell, \quad \delta := \min_\ell \delta_\ell, \quad (2.2)$$

and let

$$\Lambda := \max\{\#\Lambda(\ell) : \ell = 1, \dots, N\}, \quad \text{where } \Lambda(\ell) = \{\ell' : \Omega_\ell \cap \Omega_{\ell'} \neq \emptyset\}; \quad (2.3)$$

i.e., Λ is the maximum number of subdomains that can overlap any given subdomain.

Assumption 2.4 (The coarse space). $\mathcal{V}_0 \subset \mathcal{V}_h$.

The only requirement on the coarse space is that it is a subspace of the fine space (in particular, the coarse space does not need to be related to the subdomains).

2.2 Assumptions on the sesquilinear form

Let $A_{\text{scat}} \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ be a symmetric matrix-valued function on Ω that is uniformly bounded and uniformly positive-definite in Ω . Define the inner product and norm in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ by (1.3) and (1.4), respectively. The norm and inner product on subsets $D \subset \Omega$ are defined analogously.

Assumption 2.5 (The sesquilinear form). *There exists $\mu \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{C})$ such that*

$$a(u, v) = (u, v)_{H_k^1(\Omega)} + (\mu u, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}. \quad (2.4)$$

Observe that the sesquilinear form of the CAP problem of Definition 1.2 satisfies Assumption 2.5 with $\mu := (-c_{\text{scat}}^2 - iV - 1)$. Let

$$C_\mu := \|\mu\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}. \quad (2.5)$$

Assumption 2.5 implies that $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ is continuous on $H_k^1(\Omega)$ and satisfies a Gårding inequality; i.e., if $C_{\text{cont}} := 1 + C_\mu$ then, for all $u, v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$,

$$|a(u, v)| \leq C_{\text{cont}} \|u\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \|v\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \Re a(v, v) \geq \|v\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 - C_\mu \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (2.6)$$

Given $F \in (H_0^1(\Omega))^*$, let $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ be the solution of

$$a(u, v) = F(v) \quad \text{for all } v \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

The Galerkin method is then: find $u_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$ such that

$$a(u_h, v_h) = F(v_h) \quad \text{for all } v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h; \quad (2.7)$$

we assume that both u and u_h exist.

2.3 The coarse and subdomain operators Q_ℓ

2.3.1 Statement of the assumptions.

For $\ell = 0, \dots, N$, let $\mathcal{V}_\ell := \mathcal{V}_h \cap H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$ and let $Q_\ell : \mathcal{V}_h \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_\ell$, $\ell = 0, \dots, N$, be the standard projection operators defined by

$$a(Q_\ell v_h, w_{h,\ell}) = a(v_h, w_{h,\ell}) \quad \text{for all } w_{h,\ell} \in \mathcal{V}_\ell, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad a((I - Q_\ell)v_h, w_{h,\ell}) = 0 \quad \text{for all } w_{h,\ell} \in \mathcal{V}_\ell. \quad (2.8)$$

Assumption 2.6 (Bounds on coarse-space Galerkin error). $Q_0 : \mathcal{V}_h \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$ is well-defined and there exists $C_{Q_0}, \sigma > 0$ such that, for all $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$,

$$\|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq C_{Q_0} \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \sigma \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}. \quad (2.9)$$

Assumption 2.7 (Boundedness of the subdomain operators Q_ℓ). $Q_\ell : \mathcal{V}_h \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_\ell$ is well-defined and, given $k_0 > 0$, there exists $C_{\text{sub}} > 0$ such that, for all $k \geq k_0$, $\ell = 1, \dots, N$, and $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$,

$$\|Q_\ell v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \leq C_{\text{sub}} \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}. \quad (2.10)$$

Remark 2.8. Recall that, for the solution of a finite-dimensional linear system, proving uniqueness under the assumption of existence implies existence. Therefore, if, under the assumption that Q_0 exists, either of the bounds in (2.9) holds, then Q_0 is well-defined. Similarly, if, under the assumption that Q_ℓ exists, the bound (2.10) holds, then Q_ℓ is well-defined.

2.3.2 Discussion of Assumption 2.6

Lemma 2.9 (Sufficient conditions for Assumption 2.6 to hold). *Let*

$$\eta(\mathcal{V}_0) := \|(I - \Pi_0)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)}, \quad (2.11)$$

where $\Pi_0 : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$ is the orthogonal projection in the $H_k^1(\Omega)$ norm (1.4). If

$$\eta(\mathcal{V}_0) \leq (2C_\mu)^{-1/2}(1 + C_\mu)^{-1}, \quad (2.12)$$

then $Q_0 : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$ defined by

$$a(Q_0 v, w_0) = a(v, w_0) \quad \text{for all } w_0 \in \mathcal{V}_0, \quad (2.13)$$

is well-defined and satisfies

$$\|(I - Q_0)v\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq 2C_{\text{cont}} \|(I - \Pi_0)v\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}$$

and

$$\|(I - Q_0)v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \eta(\mathcal{V}_0)C_{\text{cont}} \|(I - Q_0)v\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. This follows from the Schatz argument [64, 65], [20, Theorem 3.2.4], [63]. \square

To see that Lemma 2.9 gives sufficient conditions for Assumption 2.6 to hold, observe that, since $\mathcal{V}_h \subset H_0^1(\Omega)$, the existence of $Q_0 : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$ defined by (2.13) shows the existence of $Q_0 : \mathcal{V}_h \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$ defined by (2.8). Furthermore, $\|I - \Pi_0\|_{H_k^1(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq 1$ (since $\Pi_0 : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$ is the orthogonal projection), and thus the first bound in (2.9) holds with $C = 2C_{\text{cont}}$ and the second bound in (2.9) holds with $\sigma = 2(C_{\text{cont}})^2\eta(\mathcal{V}_0)$.

2.3.3 Discussion of Assumption 2.7

One way to satisfy Assumption 2.7 is for Q_ℓ to be coercive on $H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$.

Lemma 2.10. *Suppose that $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies Assumption 2.5 and, in addition, $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ is coercive when restricted to $H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$, with coercivity constant independent of k . Then Assumption 2.7 holds.*

Proof. We prove the stronger result that $Q_\ell : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_\ell$ defined by

$$a(Q_\ell v, w_{h,\ell}) = a(v, w_{h,\ell}) \quad \text{for all } w_{h,\ell} \in \mathcal{V}_\ell \quad (2.14)$$

is well-defined and the bound (2.10) holds with $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$ replaced by $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Assumption 2.5 implies that $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ is continuous on $H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$ and, furthermore, for all $u, v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ with at least one of them in $H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$

$$|a(u, v)| \leq C_{\text{cont}} \|u\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \|v\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}. \quad (2.15)$$

By (2.15), for all $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, the map $w \mapsto a(v, w)$ is an anti-linear functional on $H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$. Continuity, coercivity, and the Lax–Milgram lemma applied with the Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}_\ell \subset H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$ imply the solution to (2.14) exists, i.e., $Q_\ell : H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_\ell$ is well-defined. (We have been careful here, because, since v is only in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and not necessarily in $H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$, $v|_{\Omega_\ell}$ is *not* the solution to the variational problem: find $\tilde{v} \in H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$ such that $a(\tilde{v}, w) = a(v, w)$ for all $w \in H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$, and thus $Q_\ell v \in \mathcal{V}_\ell$ is *not* the Galerkin approximation to $v|_{\Omega_\ell}$.)

By (in this order) coercivity on $H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$, the fact that $Q_\ell v \in \mathcal{V}_\ell$, the equation (2.14) defining Q_ℓ , the fact that $Q_\ell v \in H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$, and the property (2.15), for all $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$,

$$\|Q_\ell v\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \leq C|a(Q_\ell v, Q_\ell v)| = C|a(v, Q_\ell v)| \leq CC_{\text{cont}} \|v\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \|Q_\ell v\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)},$$

and the bound (2.10) follows. \square

Remark 2.11 (Satisfying Assumption 2.7 via a discrete inf-sup condition on \mathcal{V}_ℓ). Assumption 2.7 would also be satisfied if $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfied a discrete inf-sup condition on \mathcal{V}_ℓ (with then C in (2.10) the inverse of the discrete inf-sup constant) with this a weaker condition than coercivity. However, in the course of the proof of the main result (Theorem 3.1), kH_{sub} is made small (see (3.4) and (6.4)), and when kH_{sub} is sufficiently small, $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ is coercive on $H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$ by the Poincaré inequality (5.27). We therefore only seek to satisfy Assumption 2.7 via coercivity.

3 The main abstract result

Given $Q_\ell, \ell = 0, \dots, N$, defined by (2.8), let

$$Q := Q_0 + (I - Q_0)^* \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N Q_\ell \right) (I - Q_0), \quad (3.1)$$

where $*$ denotes the adjoint with respect to the $(\cdot, \cdot)_{H_k^1(\Omega)}$ inner product (1.3).

We prove two results about the norm and field of values of Q ; the first is explicit in p_f and requires the mesh \mathcal{T}^h to be quasi-uniform (as in Assumption 2.1), the second is not explicit in p_f and requires \mathcal{T}^h to be only shape regular. For simplicity, we state the first result in full, and then outline in Remark 3.4 the changes needed to obtain the second result.

The relevance of the operator Q is that, with \mathbf{B}_L given by (1.12),

$$(Qv_h, w_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)} = \langle \mathbf{B}_L^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} \rangle_{\mathbf{D}_k}, \quad (3.2)$$

for all $v_h, w_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$ with freedoms \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} ; see §A.

Theorem 3.1 (Upper and lower bounds on the field of values of Q). *There exists $C_{\text{width}} > 0$ such that the following is true. Suppose that the assumptions in §2 hold. Given the constants $C_{\text{PoU}}, C_\mu, C_{Q_0}$, and C_{sub} in these assumptions and $k_0, C_0 > 0$, there exists $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$ such that for all $\widetilde{C}_j, j = 1, 2, 3$, satisfying $0 < \widetilde{C}_1 < C_1$ and $\widetilde{C}_3 < \widetilde{C}_2 < \widetilde{C}_1$ there exists $\widetilde{C}_4 > 0$ such that the following holds. If $k \geq k_0$, $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $p_f \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $p_f \leq C_0 k L$,*

$$\frac{1}{C_0 k^2 L} \leq h \leq \frac{\delta}{C_{\text{width}} \log(kL)}, \quad (3.3)$$

$$\widetilde{C}_1 \Lambda^{-1} \leq k H_{\text{sub}} p_f \leq C_1 \Lambda^{-1}, \quad \widetilde{C}_3 \Lambda^{-1} \leq k \delta p_f \leq \widetilde{C}_2 \Lambda^{-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad (3.4)$$

$$\sigma \leq \frac{\widetilde{C}_4}{\Lambda p_f}, \quad (3.5)$$

then, for all $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$,

$$\|Qv_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq C_2 \Lambda \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|(v_h, Qv_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)}|}{\|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2} \geq C_3 \Lambda^{-1} p_f^{-2}. \quad (3.6)$$

Remark 3.2 (The significance of the order of quantifiers in Theorem 3.1). *By the order in which they appear, the quantities $C_1, C_2, C_3, \widetilde{C}_1, \widetilde{C}_2$, and \widetilde{C}_3 are allowed to depend on the constants in the assumptions in §2, C_{width}, k_0 , and C_0 , but are independent of k, N, Λ, h , and p_f . Furthermore, \widetilde{C}_1 and \widetilde{C}_2 are allowed to depend on C_1, \widetilde{C}_3 is allowed to depend on $\widetilde{C}_2, \widetilde{C}_3$, and \widetilde{C}_4 is allowed to depend on $\widetilde{C}_1, \widetilde{C}_2$, and \widetilde{C}_3 .*

The care regarding the quantifiers is needed since both $H_{\text{sub}} \sim k^{-1}$ and $\delta \sim k^{-1}$, but $\delta \leq H_{\text{sub}}$ (by definition); therefore the precise constants in the \sim relations matter (to avoid an impossible situation where $\delta > H_{\text{sub}}$). The requirements in Theorem 3.1 on these constants are, in words, first that kH_{sub} must be sufficiently small. Then, given an interval in which kH_{sub} varies, $k\delta$ is chosen in an interval so that $\delta < H_{\text{sub}}$. Then σ needs to be made sufficiently small, depending on all the constants given so far.

Remark 3.3 (The ideas in the proof of Theorem 3.1). *The proof of Theorem 3.1 uses ideas from [42] ([42, Theorems 4.3 and 4.17]), with coercivity of the sesquilinear form in [42] (because of complex-valued k studied there) replaced by boundedness of the subdomain operators (Assumption 2.7) and the Gårding inequality (2.6). The hybrid structure of the preconditioner is then crucial for the proof to work with these weakened assumptions; see Remark 5.6 for more discussion on this. We also highlight that the p_f -explicit stable splitting result of Lemma 5.4 crucially uses the recent results of [22] about the exponential decay away from the support of its argument of the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto finite-element spaces.*

Remark 3.4 (Quasi-uniform assumption replaced by shape regular). *The result of Theorem 3.1 also holds if (i) the assumption that \mathcal{T}^h is quasi-uniform (in Assumption 2.1) is replaced by the assumption that \mathcal{T}^h is shape-regular, (ii) the appearance of p_f in the statement of the theorem is moved earlier, next to the appearance of k_0 , and (iii) the condition (3.3) is removed.*

Observe that (ii) has the effect that all the quantities $C_1, C_2, C_2, C_3, \widetilde{C}_1, \widetilde{C}_2, \widetilde{C}_3$, and \widetilde{C}_4 then depend on p_f in an unspecified way.

Corollary 3.5 (Bound on the norm and field of values of $B_L^{-1}A$). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1,*

$$\|B_L^{-1}A\|_{D_k} \leq C_2\Lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|\langle \mathbf{V}, B_L^{-1}A\mathbf{V} \rangle_{D_k}|}{\|\mathbf{V}\|_{D_k}^2} \geq C_3\Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{C}^n.$$

By the Elman-type estimate [5] for weighted GMRES (see [8, Theorem 5.3]), Corollary 3.5 implies the following.

Corollary 3.6 (Convergence of GMRES). *There exists $C > 0$ such that the following is true. Given $\epsilon > 0$, under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, if*

$$m \geq C(C_3)^{-1}\Lambda p_f^2 \log\left(\frac{12}{\epsilon}\right), \quad (3.7)$$

then when GMRES is applied to $B_L^{-1}A$ in the D_k inner product, the m th relative residual is $\leq \epsilon$.

Remark 3.7 (Weighted vs unweighted GMRES). *[41, Corollary 5.8] showed (via an inverse estimate) that if the fine mesh sequence \mathcal{T}^h is quasiuniform then GMRES applied in the Euclidean inner product with the same initial residual takes at most an extra $C \log(kh)^{-1}$ iterations to ensure the same relative residual as if GMRES were applied in the D_k weighted inner product (see the last displayed equation in the proof of [41, Corollary 5.8]). The numerical experiments in [42, Experiment 1], [8, §6] showed little difference in the number of weighted/unweighted iterations.*

We consider the following right preconditioner for A :

$$B_R^{-1} = B_R^{-1}(A) := R_0^T A_0^{-1} R_0 + (I - R_0^T A_0^{-1} R_0 A) \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N R_\ell^T A_\ell^{-1} R_\ell \right) (I - D_k R_0^T (A_0^\dagger)^{-1} R_0 A^\dagger D_k^{-1}). \quad (3.8)$$

Corollary 3.8 (Results for right-preconditioning). *Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 hold, except that Assumptions 2.6 and 2.7 hold with the sesquilinear form $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ (1.2) replaced by its adjoint (i.e., $a^*(u, v) := a(v, u)$). Then*

$$\|AB_R^{-1}\|_{D_k^{-1}} \leq C_2\Lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|\langle AB_R^{-1}\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{W} \rangle_{D_k^{-1}}|}{\|\mathbf{W}\|_{D_k^{-1}}^2} \geq C_3\Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{C}^n.$$

Thus, given $\epsilon > 0$, if m satisfies (3.7), then when GMRES is applied to \mathbf{AB}_R^{-1} in the \mathbf{D}_k^{-1} inner product, the m th relative residual is $\leq \epsilon$.

Since the proof of Corollary 3.8 is short, we give it here.

Proof of Corollary 3.8. The whole point of the definition (3.8) of \mathbf{B}_R^{-1} is that $\mathbf{B}_R^{-1}(\mathbf{A}) = (\mathbf{B}_L^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^\dagger))^\dagger$, and a few lines of calculation show that if $\mathbf{W}_j = \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{V}_j$, for $j = 1, 2$, then

$$\langle \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{B}_L^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^\dagger) \mathbf{A}^\dagger \mathbf{V}_2 \rangle_{\mathbf{D}_k} = \langle \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{B}_L^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^\dagger))^\dagger \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2 \rangle_{\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}} = \langle \mathbf{AB}_R^{-1}(\mathbf{A}) \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2 \rangle_{\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}}. \quad (3.9)$$

In addition,

$$\langle \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2 \rangle_{\mathbf{D}_k} = \langle \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2 \rangle_{\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}}. \quad (3.10)$$

Therefore, (3.9) and (3.10) imply that

$$\frac{\langle \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{B}_L^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^\dagger) \mathbf{A}^\dagger \mathbf{V}_2 \rangle_{\mathbf{D}_k}}{\langle \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2 \rangle_{\mathbf{D}_k}} = \frac{\langle \mathbf{AB}_R^{-1}(\mathbf{A}) \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2 \rangle_{\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}}}{\langle \mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2 \rangle_{\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}}}. \quad (3.11)$$

The lower bound on the field of values of \mathbf{AB}_R^{-1} then follows from Corollary 3.5 by taking $\mathbf{V}_1 = \mathbf{V}_2$ (and hence $\mathbf{W}_1 = \mathbf{W}_2$). The upper bound on the norm of \mathbf{AB}_R^{-1} then follows from Corollary 3.5 by taking the maximum of (3.11) over both \mathbf{V}_1 and \mathbf{V}_2 (and hence over both \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2). \square

4 Recap of polynomial-approximation results

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that \mathcal{V}_h satisfies Assumption 2.1 except with the requirement that \mathcal{T}^h is quasi-uniform replaced by the requirement that \mathcal{T}^h is shape regular. Given $m \geq 2$ there exists $C > 0$ such that, for all $p \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $p_f \geq m - 1$, there exists a bounded linear operator $\mathcal{I}_h : H^m(\tau) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_h$ such that, for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h$ and $v \in H^m(\tau)$,*

$$\|(I - \mathcal{I}_h)v\|_{L^2(\tau)} + \frac{h_\tau}{p_f} |(I - \mathcal{I}_h)v|_{H^1(\tau)} + \left(\frac{h_\tau}{p_f}\right)^2 |(I - \mathcal{I}_h)v|_{H^2(\tau)} \leq C \left(\frac{h_\tau}{p_f}\right)^m |v|_{H^m(\tau)}; \quad (4.1)$$

furthermore $\mathcal{I}_h v_h = v_h$ for all $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$.

References for the proof of Theorem 4.1. The existence of \mathcal{I}_h satisfying the bound (4.1) follows from the results [55, Lemma B.3] on the reference element, plus a scaling argument (see, e.g., [55, Proof of Theorem 5.5]).

To see that $\mathcal{I}_h v_h = v_h$ for all $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$, first observe that, since the element maps are assumed to be affine, v_h is a polynomial of degree $p_f + 1$ on τ . Thus $|v_h|_{H^{p_f+1}(\tau)} = 0$ for all $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$ and the bound (4.1) with $m = p_f + 1$ then implies that $\mathcal{I}_h v_h = v_h$ for all $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$. \square

The proofs of our results about hp -FEM use the results from [55, Appendix C] about approximation of analytic functions. However, the details of these results are not required in the rest of the paper, and so we just cite these results directly in §7 (see the proof of Corollary 7.8).

5 Auxilliary results needed for the proof of Theorem 3.1

All the results in this section use the assumptions in Section 2. In all the proofs in this section, C , C' , and C'' denote quantities that depend on C_{PoU} , C_μ , C_{Q_0} , C_{sub} , k_0 , and $C_0 > 0$, and whose values may change from line to line.

Lemma 5.1 (Consequences of the definition of Λ). For all $v \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $w \in H^1(\Omega)$,

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \leq \Lambda \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|w\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \leq \Lambda \|w\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2. \quad (5.1)$$

Furthermore, given $v_\ell \in \mathcal{V}_\ell$,

$$\left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^N v_\ell \right\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq 2\Lambda \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_\ell\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2. \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. The bounds (5.1) follow immediately from the definition (2.3) of Λ . The bound (5.2) without an explicit expression for the constant is proved in [42, Lemma 4.2]. The definition of Λ implies that [42, Equation 4.8] holds with $\lesssim \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_\ell\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2$ at the end replaced by $\leq \Lambda \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_\ell\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2$. The result then follows, with the factor of 2 arising from use of the inequality $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ at the end of [42, Proof of Lemma 4.2] (with this constant hidden in the notation \lesssim in [42, Proof of Lemma 4.2]). \square

Lemma 5.2 (Non- p_f -explicit approximation of $\chi_\ell v_h$ in \mathcal{V}_h). Given p_f , let \mathfrak{J}_h be the interpolation operator given by the Lagrange basis for \mathcal{V}_h . There exists $C > 0$ such that, for $\ell = 1, \dots, N$ and for all $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$,

$$\|(I - \mathfrak{J}_h)(\chi_\ell v_h)\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \leq C(1 + kh_\ell) \left(\frac{h_\ell}{\delta_\ell} \right) \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \quad \text{where } h_\ell := \max_{\tau \subset \overline{\Omega_\ell}} h_\tau.$$

Reference for the proof of Lemma 5.2. The proof is given in [43, Lemma 3.3], and involves the standard approximation theory for \mathfrak{J}_h (see, e.g., [11, Theorem 4.4.20]) the product rule for differentiation, and an element-wise inverse estimate for shape-regular elements (see (5.11) below). Note that the p_f -dependence of the inverse estimate means that the constant C in the result grows rapidly as $p_f \rightarrow \infty$. \square

The following result is proved using Lemma 5.2, and is a variant of [43, Corollary 3.5].

Lemma 5.3 (Non- p_f -explicit stable splitting). Suppose that the assumptions in Section 2 hold, except with the condition in Assumption 2.1 that \mathcal{T}^h is quasi-uniform replaced by the condition that \mathcal{T}^h is shape regular. Given $p_f \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $C_{\text{ppw}} > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that if $kh \leq C_{\text{ppw}}$ then the following is true for all $N, \Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. For all $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$, there exist $v_{h,\ell} \in \mathcal{V}_\ell$, $\ell = 1, \dots, N$, such that

$$v_h = \sum_{\ell=1}^N v_{h,\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \leq C\Lambda \left(\|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + (k\delta)^{-2} \|v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right).$$

Proof. We first observe that, since $kh \leq C_{\text{ppw}}$, and $h_\ell/\delta_\ell \leq 1/2$ (from Assumption 2.3),

$$\|(I - \mathcal{I}_h)(\chi_\ell v_h)\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \leq C \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}. \quad (5.3)$$

Since $\sum_{\ell=1}^N \chi_\ell = 1$ on $\overline{\Omega}$ and \mathcal{I}_h is linear,

$$v_h = \mathcal{I}_h v_h = \mathcal{I}_h \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N \chi_\ell v_h \right) = \sum_{\ell=1}^N \mathcal{I}_h (\chi_\ell v_h).$$

Let $v_{h,\ell} := \mathcal{I}_h (\chi_\ell v_h)$ which is in \mathcal{V}_ℓ since $\text{supp } \chi_\ell \Subset \Omega_\ell$. By the triangle inequality, (2.1), and (5.3),

$$\|v_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \leq \|\chi_\ell v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} + \|(I - \mathcal{I}_h)(\chi_\ell v_h)\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \leq C(k^{-1}\delta_\ell^{-1} \|v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)} + \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}).$$

Therefore, by the definition (2.2) of δ ,

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \leq C \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 + \sum_{\ell=1}^N (k\delta)^{-2} \|v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \right);$$

the result then follows by applying (5.1) with $v = w = v_h$. \square

We now prove a stable-splitting result that is explicit in p_f , under stronger assumptions on the mesh than in Lemma 5.3. This result uses the recent results of [22] about the exponential decay away from the support of its argument of the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto finite-element spaces.

Lemma 5.4 (p_f -explicit stable splitting). *There exists $C_{\text{width}} > 0$ such that the following is true. Given C_{PoU} as in Assumption 2.3, there exists $C > 0$ such that if h , k , and δ satisfy*

$$hC_{\text{width}} \log(kL) \leq \delta, \quad (5.4)$$

then the following is true for all $p_f, N, \Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. For all $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$, there exist $v_{h,\ell} \in \mathcal{V}_\ell$, $\ell = 1, \dots, N$, such that

$$v_h = \sum_{\ell=1}^N v_{h,\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \leq Cp_f^2 \Lambda \left(\|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + \left((k\delta)^{-2} + E^2 \right) \|v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \quad (5.5)$$

where

$$E := (kL)^{-5} \left(\frac{p_f^3}{kh} + p_f^2 \right). \quad (5.6)$$

The condition (5.4) gives rise to the upper bound on h in (3.3) in Theorem 3.1 (with then δ restricted further via (3.4)).

Proof of Lemma 5.4. Let $\Pi_h^{L^2} : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_h$ be the L^2 -orthogonal projection; i.e.,

$$\left((I - \Pi_h^{L^2})v, w_h \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0 \quad \text{for all } w_h \in \mathcal{V}_h,$$

so that

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = \|\Pi_h^{L^2} v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|(I - \Pi_h^{L^2})v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \quad \text{for all } v \in L^2(\Omega),$$

and thus

$$\|\Pi_h^{L^2}\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)} = 1. \quad (5.7)$$

Since $\sum_{\ell=1}^N \chi_\ell = 1$ on $\bar{\Omega}$ and $\Pi_h^{L^2}$ is a linear projection,

$$v_h = \Pi_h^{L^2} v_h = \Pi_h^{L^2} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N \chi_\ell v_h \right) = \sum_{\ell=1}^N \Pi_h^{L^2} (\chi_\ell v_h).$$

Let

$$\tilde{v}_{h,\ell} := \Pi_h^{L^2} (\chi_\ell v_h). \quad (5.8)$$

Since $\text{supp } \tilde{v}_{h,\ell}$ is not necessarily a subset of Ω_ℓ , we cannot set $v_{h,\ell} := \tilde{v}_{h,\ell}$. However, the idea of the proof is to

(i) show that $\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}$ satisfies the bound

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^N \|\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \leq Cp_f^2 \Lambda \left(\|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + (k\delta)^{-2} \|v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) \quad (5.9)$$

(i.e., (5.5) with $v_{h,\ell}$ replaced by $\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}$ and no E^2), and then

(ii) find a $v_{h,\ell} \in \mathcal{V}_\ell$ close to $\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}$ (with the error controlled by the E^2 term in (5.5)).

We start with Point (i). We claim that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}|_{H^1(\Omega)} = |\Pi_h^{L^2}(\chi_\ell v_h)|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq Cp_f |\chi_\ell v_h|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \quad (5.10)$$

Observe that $\chi_\ell v_h$ is indeed in $H^1(\Omega)$ (so the right-hand side of (5.10) makes sense), since $\chi_\ell v_h|_\tau \in H^1(\tau)$ and $\chi_\ell v_h$ is continuous (since both χ_ℓ and v_h are continuous finite-element functions).

We assume that (5.10) holds, prove the bound (5.9), and then come back to prove (5.10). By (in this order) the bound (5.10), the property (5.7), the product rule, and the bound (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 &\leq \|\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq k^{-2} Cp_f^2 |\chi_\ell v_h|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|\chi_\ell v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\leq Cp_f^2 \left(\|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 + (k\delta_\ell)^{-2} \|v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the definition (2.2) of δ ,

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^N \|\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \leq Cp_f^2 \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 + (k\delta)^{-2} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \right).$$

The bound (5.9) then follows by applying (5.1) with $v = w = v_h$.

To complete Point (i), it therefore remains to prove (5.10). We note that an essentially equivalent argument (without the p_f -explicitness) to that we use to prove (5.10), appears in, e.g., [29, Proposition 22.21], with this argument going back to [3, Appendix].

By a standard inverse inequality (see, e.g., [66, Theorem 4.76, Page 208]), there exists $C > 0$ such that if w is a polynomial of degree q on τ , then

$$|w|_{H^1(\tau)} \leq Cq^2 h_\tau^{-1} \|w\|_{L^2(\tau)}. \quad (5.11)$$

By (in this order) the triangle inequality, the fact that $\mathcal{I}_h(\chi_\ell v_h) = \Pi_h^{L^2} \mathcal{I}_h(\chi_\ell v_h)$ (with \mathcal{I}_h as in Theorem 4.1), the fact that \mathcal{V}_h are piecewise polynomials of degree p_f , the inverse estimate (5.11), the fact that \mathcal{T}^h is quasi-uniform, the bound (5.7), and the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Pi_h^{L^2}(\chi_\ell v_h)|_{H^1(\Omega)} &\leq |\Pi_h^{L^2}(\chi_\ell v_h) - \mathcal{I}_h(\chi_\ell v_h)|_{H^1(\Omega)} + |\mathcal{I}_h(\chi_\ell v_h)|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &= |\Pi_h^{L^2}(I - \mathcal{I}_h)(\chi_\ell v_h)|_{H^1(\Omega)} + |\mathcal{I}_h(\chi_\ell v_h)|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq Cp_f^2 h^{-1} \|\Pi_h^{L^2}(I - \mathcal{I}_h)(\chi_\ell v_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + |\mathcal{I}_h(\chi_\ell v_h)|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq Cp_f^2 h^{-1} \|(I - \mathcal{I}_h)(\chi_\ell v_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + |\mathcal{I}_h(\chi_\ell v_h)|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq Cp_f^2 h^{-1} \|(I - \mathcal{I}_h)(\chi_\ell v_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + |(I - \mathcal{I}_h)(\chi_\ell v_h)|_{H^1(\Omega)} + |\chi_\ell v_h|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

Also, by Theorem 4.1 with $m = 1$,

$$\|(I - \mathcal{I}_h)(\chi_\ell v_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \left(\frac{h_\tau}{p_f} \right) |\chi_\ell v_h|_{H^1(\tau)} \leq C \left(\frac{h}{p_f} \right) |\chi_\ell v_h|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \quad (5.13)$$

Now, since χ_ℓ is continuous and piecewise linear (by Assumption 2.3), the first derivative of $\chi_\ell v_h$ on τ is a polynomial of degree p_f . Using this fact, the inverse estimate (5.11) applied with $w = \nabla(\chi_\ell v_h)$, and Theorem 4.1 with $m = 2$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} |(I - \mathcal{I}_h)(\chi_\ell v_h)|_{H^1(\tau)} &\leq C \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \left(\frac{h_\tau}{p_f} \right) |\chi_\ell v_h|_{H^2(\tau)} \leq C \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h} \left(\frac{h_\tau}{p_f} \right) \left(\frac{p_f^2}{h_\tau} \right) |\chi_\ell v_h|_{H^1(\tau)}, \\ &\leq Cp_f |\chi_\ell v_h|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

Using (5.13) and (5.14) in (5.12), we obtain (5.10) and we have completed Point (i).

For Point (ii), for $\ell = 1, \dots, N$, let ψ_ℓ be the piecewise-linear function on \mathcal{T}^h that equals zero on each node in the interior of Ω_ℓ and equals one on all other nodes, including those on $\partial\Omega$ (so that, in particular, $\psi_\ell = 1$ on all nodes on $\partial\Omega_\ell$ and thus $\psi_\ell = 1$ on $\partial\Omega_\ell$). Observe that this definition implies that, first, there exists $C > 0$ such that, for all $\ell = 1, \dots, N$ and for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^h$,

$$\|\nabla\psi_\ell\|_{L^\infty(\tau)} \leq Ch_\ell^{-1}, \quad (5.15)$$

and, second, by the assumption that $\delta_\ell \geq 2h_\ell$ (from Assumption 2.7) $\psi_\ell = 0$ in Ω_ℓ apart from in a $(\delta_\ell/2)$ -width neighbourhood of $\partial\Omega_\ell$. Let

$$v_{h,\ell} := \mathcal{I}_h((1 - \psi_\ell)\tilde{v}_{h,\ell})$$

where \mathcal{I}_h is the operator from Theorem 4.1. Since $\psi_\ell = 1$ on $\partial\Omega_\ell$, $v_{h,\ell} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_\ell$, and thus $v_{h,\ell} \in \mathcal{V}_\ell$. Furthermore, by the definition of $v_{h,\ell}$ and the fact that $\mathcal{I}_h\tilde{v}_{h,\ell} = \tilde{v}_{h,\ell}$,

$$v_{h,\ell} - \tilde{v}_{h,\ell} = -\mathcal{I}_h(\psi_\ell\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}) = (I - \mathcal{I}_h)(\psi_\ell\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}) - \psi_\ell\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}. \quad (5.16)$$

Let $\tilde{\Omega}_\ell := \Omega_\ell \cap \text{supp}\psi_\ell$. By (5.16), the definition (1.4) of $\|\cdot\|_{H_k^1}$, Theorem 4.1, the product rule, and (5.15),

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{h,\ell} - \tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} &\leq C \left(1 + \frac{kh_\ell}{p_f}\right) \left(\frac{kh_\ell}{p_f}\right) k^{-2} |\psi_\ell\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}|_{H^2(\tilde{\Omega}_\ell)} + Ck^{-1} |\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}|_{H^1(\tilde{\Omega}_\ell)} \\ &\quad + C(1 + (kh_\ell)^{-1}) \|\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_\ell)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

By the product rule, the bound (5.15), the fact that ψ_ℓ is piecewise linear, the inverse inequality (5.11), and the fact that $p_f \geq 1$, for $\tau \in \tilde{\Omega}_\ell$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_\ell\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}|_{H^2(\tau)} &\leq C \left(h_\ell^{-1} |\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}|_{H^1(\tau)} + |\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}|_{H^2(\tau)}\right) \\ &\leq C \left(h_\ell^{-1} p_f^2 h_\ell^{-1} + (p_f^2 h_\ell^{-1})^2\right) \|\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{L^2(\tau)} \leq C \left(\frac{p_f^2}{h_\ell}\right)^2 \|\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{L^2(\tau)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

Combining (5.17) and (5.18), and using the inverse inequality (5.11) again and the fact that $p_f \geq 1$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{h,\ell} - \tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} &\leq C \left[\left(1 + \frac{kh_\ell}{p_f}\right) \left(\frac{kh_\ell}{p_f}\right) \left(\frac{p_f^2}{kh_\ell}\right)^2 + p_f^2 (kh_\ell)^{-1} + 1 + (kh_\ell)^{-1} \right] \|\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_\ell)} \\ &\leq C \left(1 + \frac{kh_\ell}{p_f}\right) \left(\frac{p_f^3}{kh_\ell}\right) \|\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_\ell)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

Now, the condition (5.4) and the definitions of h_ℓ and δ_ℓ (from §2.1) imply that $h_\ell C_{\text{width}} \log(kL) \leq \delta_\ell$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, N$. Since $\text{supp}\chi_\ell$ is at least a distance δ_ℓ from $\partial\Omega_\ell$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, N$ (by the last part of Assumption 2.3), the construction of ψ_ℓ and the fact that $\delta_\ell/2 \geq h_\ell$ imply that $\text{supp}\chi_\ell$ is at least a distance $\delta_\ell/2$ from $\text{supp}\psi_\ell$. Therefore, there are at least $C_{\text{width}} \log(kL)/2$ elements of \mathcal{T}^h between $\text{supp}\chi_\ell$ and $\text{supp}\psi_\ell$. Thus, by the definition (5.8) $\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}$ and [22, §2.2, Proposition 2.2 and Remark 4.5] (and the notion of distance in [22, (C3)]), there exists $0 < q < 1$ such that

$$\|\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{L^2(\tilde{\Omega}_\ell)} \leq 2q^{C_{\text{width}} \log(kL)/2 - 1} \|\chi_\ell v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)} = 2q^{-1} (kL)^{-C_{\text{width}} \log(1/q)/2} \|\chi_\ell v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)}. \quad (5.20)$$

Note that a p_f -explicit formula for the rate of decay q is given in [22, Equation 4.5], but since this rate is always < 1 and tends to a limit that is < 1 as $p_f \rightarrow \infty$, we can take q in (5.20) to be < 1 independent of p_f . We now choose C_{width} such that $C_{\text{width}} \log(1/q)/2 \geq 5$ (note that

since $q < 1$ can be chosen to be independent of p_f , C_{width} is independent of p_f as claimed in the statement of the result). Combining (5.19) and (5.20) and using the quasi-uniformity of the mesh, we obtain that

$$\|v_{h,\ell} - \tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \leq C(kL)^{-5} \left(1 + \frac{kh_\ell}{p_f}\right) \left(\frac{p_f^3}{kh_\ell}\right) \|\chi_\ell v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)} \leq C'E \|\chi_\ell v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)},$$

where E is as in (5.6). Thus, by the triangle inequality,

$$\|v_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \leq \left(\|\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} + CE \|\chi_\ell v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)}\right)^2 \leq 2\left(\|\tilde{v}_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 + C^2 E^2 \|v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)}^2\right).$$

Summing this last inequality over ℓ , combining the result with (5.9), and then using the first bound in (5.1) (with $v = v_h$), we find the result (5.5). \square

We now prove the two crucial ingredients of the proof of Theorem 3.1 (Lemmas 5.5 and 5.7).

Lemma 5.5. *There exists $C_{\text{width}} > 0$ such that, given C_{PoU} as in Assumption 2.3 and C_μ (2.5), there exists $C > 0$ such that the following is true. If (5.4) holds, then, for all $k > 0$, $p_f, N, \Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and $w_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$, with E as in (5.6),*

$$\|w_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq C \left(p_f^2 \Lambda \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|Q_\ell w_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 + (1 + (k\delta)^{-2} + E^2) \|w_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right). \quad (5.21)$$

Lemma 5.5 is proved using the p_f -explicit stable splitting of Lemma 5.4. If Lemma 5.3 is used instead of Lemma 5.4, then the p_f^2 on the right-hand side of (5.21) can be removed, but then C depends (in an unspecified way) on p_f .

Proof of Lemma 5.5. By Lemma 5.4, there exists $w_{h,\ell} \in \mathcal{V}_\ell$, $\ell = 1, \dots, N$, such that $w_h = \sum_{\ell=1}^N w_{h,\ell}$. Then, by the Gårding inequality (2.6) and the definition (2.8) of Q_ℓ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 - C_\mu \|w_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq \Re a(w_h, w_h) = \Re a\left(w_h, \sum_{\ell=1}^N w_{h,\ell}\right) = \sum_{\ell=1}^N \Re a(w_h, w_{h,\ell}) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^N \Re a(Q_\ell w_h, w_{h,\ell}) \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^N |a(Q_\ell w_h, w_{h,\ell})|, \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

By the bound (2.15) (which holds since $w_{h,\ell}$ and $Q_\ell w_h \in \mathcal{V}_\ell$), the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and Lemma 5.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=1}^N |a(Q_\ell w_h, w_{h,\ell})| &\leq C_{\text{cont}} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|Q_\ell w_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \|w_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \\ &\leq C_{\text{cont}} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N \|Q_\ell w_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N \|w_{h,\ell}\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq CC_{\text{cont}} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N \|Q_\ell w_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \right)^{1/2} p_f \Lambda^{1/2} \left(\|w_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + ((k\delta)^{-2} + E^2) \|w_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

Therefore, by combining (5.22) and (5.23) and using the inequality

$$2ab \leq \epsilon a^2 + \epsilon^{-1} b^2 \quad \text{for all } a, b, \epsilon > 0, \quad (5.24)$$

we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 - C_\mu \|w_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq \epsilon^{-1} C p_f^2 \Lambda \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|Q_\ell w_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \\ &\quad + \epsilon \left(\|w_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + ((k\delta)^{-2} + E^2) \|w_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right); \end{aligned}$$

the result (5.21) follows by taking, e.g., $\epsilon = 1/2$. \square

Remark 5.6 (Discussion of Lemma 5.5 and the analogous results in [42, 50]). In the analysis in [42] of the additive Schwarz preconditioner applied to the Helmholtz equation with complex k , the result analogous to Lemma 5.5 is [42, Lemma 4.5]. Indeed, [42, Lemma 4.5] proves (5.21) without the L^2 term on the right-hand side, using coercivity of $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ when k is complex. In contrast, (5.21) is proved using the Gårding inequality (2.6), but the L^2 term is not a problem specifically because of the hybrid form of the preconditioner (3.1). Indeed, in the proof of the lower bound on the field of values of Q , the inequality (5.21) is applied with $w_h = (I - Q_0)v_h$. Then, by the second bound in (2.9), $\|w_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \sigma^2 \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2$, and the proof can be concluded provided that σ is sufficiently small.

The analogue of Lemma 5.5 in the two-level analysis in [50] (with a LOD coarse space) is [50, Lemma 4.4]. This result crucially relies on coercivity of the Helmholtz sesquilinear form on the kernel of a coarse-grid interpolation operator [50, Lemma 2.7]/[61, Lemma 4.2].

Lemma 5.7 (Bounding certain H_k^1 inner products by weaker norms). There exists $C > 0$ such that, for all $k > 0$ and $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$, with σ as in Assumption 2.6,

$$\left| ((I - Q_0)v_h, Q_0v_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \right| \leq C\sigma \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \|Q_0v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad (5.25)$$

and

$$\left| ((I - Q_\ell)v_h, Q_\ellv_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \right| \leq CkH_\ell \|(I - Q_\ell)v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)} \|Q_\ellv_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}. \quad (5.26)$$

The key point is that the quantities σ and kH_ℓ on the right-hand sides of (5.25) and (5.26) will be made sufficiently small (via (3.4) and (3.5) respectively) in the course of the proof of the lower bound on the field of values of Q (i.e., the second bound in (3.6)).

The proof of Lemma 5.7 requires the Poincaré inequality.

Theorem 5.8 (Poincaré inequality). Let D be a bounded Lipschitz domain with characteristic length scale L (in the sense of Definition 2.2). There exists $C_P > 0$ such that, for all $k > 0$ and $v \in H_0^1(D)$,

$$\|v\|_{L^2(D)} \leq C_P kL \|v\|_{H_k^1(D)}. \quad (5.27)$$

Proof. For domains of fixed size, the inequality $\|v\|_{L^2(D)} \leq C \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(D)}$ is proved in, e.g., [59, Theorem 1.9]. A scaling argument then yields that $\|v\|_{L^2(D)} \leq CL \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(D)}$ for domains of characteristic length scale L , and then (5.27) follows from the definition (1.4) of the H_k^1 norm. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.7. By the definition (2.8) of $Q_0 : \mathcal{V}_h \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$, $a((I - Q_0)v_h, Q_0v_h) = 0$. Therefore, by (2.4) and the definition of C_μ (2.5),

$$\left| ((I - Q_0)v_h, Q_0v_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \right| = \left| (\mu(I - Q_0)v_h, Q_0v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} \right| \leq C_\mu \|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|Q_0v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)};$$

the bound (5.25) then follows from the second bound in (2.9). Similarly, by the definition (2.8) of $Q_\ell : \mathcal{V}_h \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_\ell$, $a((I - Q_\ell)v_h, Q_\ellv_h) = 0$. Thus, by (2.4), the fact that $Q_\ellv_h \in \mathcal{V}_\ell \subset H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$, and (2.5),

$$\begin{aligned} \left| ((I - Q_\ell)v_h, Q_\ellv_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \right| &= \left| ((I - Q_\ell)v_h, Q_\ellv_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \right| = \left| (\mu(I - Q_\ell)v_h, Q_\ellv_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} \right| \\ &= \left| (\mu(I - Q_\ell)v_h, Q_\ellv_h)_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)} \right| \\ &\leq C_\mu \|(I - Q_\ell)v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)} \|Q_\ellv_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)}. \end{aligned}$$

The result (5.26) then follows from (5.27) applied with $D = \Omega_\ell$ (and hence $L = H_\ell$). \square

Remark 5.9 (Discussion of Lemma 5.7 and the analogous results in [13, 42]). *The idea behind the proof of Lemma 5.7 is that $((I - Q_\ell)v_h, Q_\ell v_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)} = (\mu(I - Q_\ell)v_h, Q_\ell v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)}$ via the Galerkin orthogonality $a((I - Q_\ell)v_h, Q_\ell v_h) = 0$ if the inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_{H_k^1(\Omega)}$ is defined so that (2.4) holds. This idea goes back to [13, Theorem 1], for the variable-coefficient Helmholtz equation and with the H^1 inner product then weighted by the coefficient in the highest-order term (as in (1.3)). This idea was also used in [42, Lemmas 4.15 and 4.16] for the constant-coefficient Helmholtz equation with complex k*

6 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Recall that C , C' , and C'' denote quantities that depend on C_{width} , C_{PoU} , C_μ , C_{Q_0} , C_{sub} , k_0 , and $C_0 > 0$, and whose values may change from line to line in the proofs.

6.1 Proof of the upper bound on the field of values (the first bound in (3.6))

We first claim that, for all $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$,

$$\|Q_0 v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq (1 + C_{Q_0}) \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|(I - Q_0)^* v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq C_{Q_0} \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}.$$

To see this, observe that the first bound follows directly from (2.9) and the triangle inequality, and the second bound follows from (2.9) since

$$\|(I - Q_0)^* v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 = ((I - Q_0)(I - Q_0)^* v_h, v_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq C_{Q_0} \|(I - Q_0)^* v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}.$$

These bounds, combined with the definition (3.1) of Q , imply that, for all $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 &\leq 2 \|Q_0 v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + 2 \left\| (I - Q_0)^* \sum_{\ell=1}^N Q_\ell (I - Q_0) v_h \right\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\leq 2(1 + C_{Q_0})^2 \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + 2(C_{Q_0})^2 \left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^N Q_\ell (I - Q_0) v_h \right\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by the fact that $Q_\ell : \mathcal{V}_h \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_\ell$ combined with the overlap property (5.2), the bound (2.10), the second bound in (5.1) (with $w = (I - Q_0)v_h$), and (2.9),

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^N Q_\ell (I - Q_0) v_h \right\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 &\leq \left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^N Q_\ell (I - Q_0) v_h \right\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq 2\Lambda \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|Q_\ell (I - Q_0) v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \\ &\leq 2\Lambda (C_{\text{sub}})^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|(I - Q_0) v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \\ &\leq 2\Lambda^2 (C_{\text{sub}})^2 \|(I - Q_0) v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq 2\Lambda^2 (C_{Q_0})^2 (C_{\text{sub}})^2 \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows.

6.2 Proof of the lower bound on the field of values (the second bound in (3.6))

With Lemmas 5.7 and 5.5 in hand, the argument is now similar to the proof of [42, Theorem 4.17]. Let $v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$. By the definition (3.1) of Q and then the fact that $Q_\ell (I - Q_0) v_h$ is supported

in Ω_ℓ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
(v_h, Qv_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)} &= (v_h, Q_0v_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)} + \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left((I - Q_0)v_h, Q_\ell(I - Q_0)v_h \right)_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \\
&= \|Q_0v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|Q_\ell(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 + ((I - Q_0)v_h, Q_0v_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left((I - Q_\ell)(I - Q_0)v_h, Q_\ell(I - Q_0)v_h \right)_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 5.7, the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, the definition (2.2) of H_{sub} , and the inequality (5.24),

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(v_h, Qv_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)}| \\
& \geq \|Q_0v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|Q_\ell(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 - C\sigma \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \|Q_0v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
& \quad - C \sum_{\ell=1}^N kH_\ell \|(I - Q_\ell)(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)} \|Q_\ell(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \\
& \geq \|Q_0v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|Q_\ell(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 - C\sigma \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \|Q_0v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
& \quad - C(kH_{\text{sub}}) \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N \|(I - Q_\ell)(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N \|Q_\ell(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& \geq \|Q_0v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|Q_\ell(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 - \epsilon \left(\|Q_0v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|Q_\ell(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \right) \\
& \quad - \epsilon^{-1}C' \left(\sigma^2 \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + (kH_{\text{sub}})^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|(I - Q_\ell)(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing ϵ sufficiently small, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
|(v_h, Qv_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)}| &\geq C \left(\|Q_0v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|Q_\ell(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \right) \\
&\quad - C' \left(\sigma^2 \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + (kH_{\text{sub}})^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|(I - Q_\ell)(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \right). \quad (6.1)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, by (1.4) and (2.10),

$$\|(I - Q_\ell)(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)} \leq \|(I - Q_\ell)(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)} \leq C \|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}.$$

Therefore, by the second bound in (5.1),

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^N \|(I - Q_\ell)(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \leq C \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \leq C\Lambda \|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2. \quad (6.2)$$

The combination of (6.1) and (6.2) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
|(v_h, Qv_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)}| &\geq C \left(\|Q_0v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|Q_\ell(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega_\ell)}^2 \right) \\
&\quad - C'(kH_{\text{sub}})^2\Lambda \|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 - C'\sigma^2 \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We now apply Lemma 5.5 with $w_h := (I - Q_0)v_h$. Observe that the upper bound on h in (5.4), required to apply Lemma 5.5, is satisfied by the upper bound in (3.3). By (5.21),

$$\begin{aligned} |(v_h, Qv_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)}| &\geq C \|Q_0v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + C'\Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2} \|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad - C''\Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2}(1 + (k\delta)^{-2} + E^2) \|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad - C''(kH_{\text{sub}})^2\Lambda \|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 - C''\sigma^2 \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where E is as in (5.6). By the second bound in (2.9),

$$\begin{aligned} |(v_h, Qv_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)}| &\geq C \|Q_0v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + C'\Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2} \|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad - C''(kH_{\text{sub}})^2\Lambda \|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad - C''\sigma^2 \left(1 + \Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2}(1 + (k\delta)^{-2} + E^2)\right) \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

Now, if

$$kH_{\text{sub}} \leq C_1\Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-1} \quad (6.4)$$

for C_1 sufficiently small, then the term involving $(kH_{\text{sub}})^2$ on the right-hand side of (6.3) can be absorbed into the positive multiple of $\|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2$ on the right-hand side; this results in

$$\begin{aligned} |(v_h, Qv_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)}| &\geq C \|Q_0v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + C'\Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2} \|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\quad - C''\sigma^2 \left(1 + \Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2}(1 + (k\delta)^{-2} + E^2)\right) \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

with the condition (6.4) then becoming the upper bound on kH_{sub} in (3.4). By the triangle inequality,

$$\|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq 2 \left(\|Q_0v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 \right).$$

Since $\Lambda, p_f \geq 1$, we have $\Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2} \leq 1$, and thus

$$\frac{1}{2}\Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2} \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq \|Q_0v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 + \Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2} \|(I - Q_0)v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2. \quad (6.6)$$

Using (6.6) in (6.5), we obtain that

$$|(v_h, Qv_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)}| \geq \left[C\Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2} - C'\sigma^2 \left(1 + \Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2}(1 + (k\delta)^{-2} + E^2)\right) \right] \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2. \quad (6.7)$$

We now constrain $k\delta$ (via the condition (3.4)) to bound the term in (6.7) involving $(k\delta)^{-2}$, being careful to maintain the inequality $\delta \leq \delta_\ell \leq H_\ell \leq H_{\text{sub}}$. Suppose that $\widetilde{C}_j > 0$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, are such that $0 < \widetilde{C}_1 < C_1$ and $\widetilde{C}_3 < \widetilde{C}_2 < \widetilde{C}_1$. We constrain H_{sub} and δ to vary as in (3.4), noting that the inequalities in (3.4) and the conditions on $\widetilde{C}_j > 0$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, imply that $\delta < H_{\text{sub}}$. Using the bound $(k\delta)^{-2} \leq p_f^2\Lambda^2(\widetilde{C}_3)^{-2}$ (from (3.4)) in (6.7), we obtain that

$$|(v_h, Qv_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)}| \geq \left[C\Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2} - C'\sigma^2 \left(1 + (\widetilde{C}_3)^{-2}\Lambda + \Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2}(1 + E^2)\right) \right] \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2.$$

By the definition (5.6) of E , the lower bound on h in (3.3), and the assumption that $p_f \leq C_0kL$,

$$E \leq C(kL)^{-5}((kL)^3kL + (kL)^2) \leq C(kL)^{-1} \leq C(k_0L)^{-1},$$

so that

$$|(v_h, Qv_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)}| \geq \left[C\Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2} - C'\sigma^2 \left(1 + (\widetilde{C}_3)^{-2}\Lambda + \Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2}(1 + (k_0L)^{-2})\right) \right] \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2,$$

Now, since $\Lambda, p_f \geq 1$,

$$\left(1 + (\widetilde{C}_3)^{-2}\Lambda + \Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2}(1 + (k_0L)^{-2})\right) \leq 2 + (\widetilde{C}_3)^{-2}\Lambda + (k_0L)^{-2} \leq \Lambda\left(2 + (\widetilde{C}_3)^{-2} + (k_0L)^{-2}\right).$$

Therefore, if

$$\sigma^2\Lambda\left(2 + (\widetilde{C}_3)^{-2} + (k_0L)^{-2}\right) \leq c\Lambda^{-1}p_f^{-2} \quad (6.8)$$

for c sufficiently small, then the lower bound in (3.6) holds. Observe that (6.8) becomes the condition (3.5) with $\widetilde{C}_4 := c^{1/2}(2 + (\widetilde{C}_3)^{-2} + (k_0L)^{-2})^{-1/2}$ (and note that this dependence of \widetilde{C}_4 on \widetilde{C}_3 is implied by the order of quantifiers in the statement of the theorem).

7 Results about the Helmholtz CAP problem

7.1 Results on the PDE level

The CAP sesquilinear form (1.2) satisfies Assumption 2.5 with $(\cdot, \cdot)_{H_k^1(\Omega)}$ defined by (1.3).

Theorem 7.1. *The solution of the CAP problem of Definition 1.2 exists and is unique.*

Proof. Since $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies the Gårding inequality (2.6), by Fredholm theory (see, e.g., [53, Theorem 2.33]) it is sufficient to prove uniqueness. Multiplying the PDE (1.1), integrating by parts, and then taking the imaginary part of the resulting expression, we see that if $f = 0$, then $u = 0$ on $\text{supp}V$. Thus $u = 0$ on Ω by the unique continuation principle (see [14, 1] for the case $d = 2$ and, e.g., [47] for the case $d = 3$). \square

The next two results (Theorems 7.2 and 7.3) motivate the use of the CAP problem as an approximation to the Helmholtz scattering problem, but are not used in the rest of the paper. The proofs of these results are therefore relegated to Appendix B.

With u the solution of the CAP problem of Definition 1.2, let

$$C_{\text{sol}} := \sup_{f \in (H_0^1(\Omega))^*} \frac{\|u\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}}{\|f\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*}} \quad \text{where} \quad \|f\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*} := \sup_{v \in H_0^1(\Omega)} \frac{|\langle f, v \rangle_{(H_0^1(\Omega))^* \times H_0^1(\Omega)}|}{\|v\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}}. \quad (7.1)$$

We highlight that C_{sol} is bounded from above and below (independently of k) by the $L^2 \rightarrow H_k^1$ norm of the CAP solution operator – the bound from below follows since $\|f\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*} \leq \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ if $f \in L^2(\Omega)$; the bound from above follows from arguing as in, e.g., [15, Proof of Lemma 3.4].

Theorem 7.2 (CAP problem inherits the nontrapping bound). *Suppose that A_{scat} and c_{scat} are as in Definition 1.1 and Ω_{int} and Ω are as in Definition 1.2. Suppose that Ω has characteristic length scale L . Suppose that A_{scat} and c_{scat} are C^∞ and nontrapping (in the sense of, e.g., [25, Definition 4.42]). Then, given $k_0 > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that, for all $k \geq k_0$, $C_{\text{sol}} \leq CkL$.*

Theorem 7.3. (The error in CAP's approximation of the radiation condition is smooth and superalgebraically small in k) *Given $A_{\text{scat}}, c_{\text{scat}}, \Omega_{\text{int}}, \Omega$, and V as in Definition 1.2, suppose that either the Helmholtz scattering problem of Definition 1.1 is nontrapping or both C_{sol} and the solution operator of the Helmholtz scattering problem of Definition 1.1 are polynomially bounded in kL , where L is the characteristic length scale of Ω . Then, for all $s, M > 0$ and $\chi \in C_{\text{comp}}^\infty(\Omega_{\text{int}})$, there exists $C > 0$ such that the following is true for all $k \geq k_0$.*

Given $f \in (H_k^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}))^$, let v be the solution of the Helmholtz scattering problem (as in Definition 1.1) and let u be the solution of the CAP problem (as in Definition 1.2). Then*

$$\sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} k^{-s} \|\partial^\alpha(\chi(u - v))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C(kL)^{-M} \|f\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}))^*}, \quad (7.2)$$

where the $(H_k^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}))^$ norm is defined via the $H_k^1(\Omega_{\text{int}})$ norm (1.4) and duality (as in (7.1)).*

Remark 7.4 (The key difference between CAP and PML). *If PML scaling is applied to the scattering problem of Definition 1.1, the solution on \mathbb{R}^d (i.e., without truncation on Ω) restricted to the non-scaled region coincides with the solution of the scattering problem – this is a consequence of analyticity; see [25, Theorem 4.37]. Using this, [34, Theorem 1.7] showed that the PML solution operator (i.e., including truncation on Ω) inherits the bound on the solution operator of the scattering problem. Theorem 7.2 gives the analogous result for CAP when the problem is nontrapping, but the analogous result for trapping problems has not yet been proved.*

7.2 h - and hp -FEM convergence results

We now adapt the results in [37] (about the radial PML problem) to the CAP problem considered here. To do this, we assume that the function V in the CAP is radial, but analogous results would also hold for a non-radial V (although more work would be required in adapting such results from [37]).

Theorem 7.5 (Decomposition of the CAP solution). *Suppose that Ω , A_{scat} , c_{scat} , Ω_{int} , and V are as in Definition 1.2. Suppose further that*

- $\Omega_{\text{int}} = B(0, R_1)$,
- Ω is a convex polygon/polyhedron containing $B(0, R_{\text{tr}})$ for some $R_{\text{tr}} > R_1$,
- V is a radial function such that $\{r : V(r) = 0\} = \{r : V'(r) = 0\} = B(0, R_1)$ and $V'(r) \geq 0$ for all r , and
- $K \subset [k_0, \infty)$ is such that there exists $C, P > 0$ such that $C_{\text{sol}} \leq C(kL)^P$ for $k \in K$.

Given $\epsilon, k_1 > 0$, there exist $C_j, j = 1, 2, 3$, such that the following is true. For all $R_{\text{tr}} > R_1 + \epsilon$, given $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, the solution u of the CAP problem of (1.1) is such that

$$u = u_{H^2} + u_{\mathcal{A}} + u_{\text{residual}},$$

where $u_{\mathcal{A}}, u_{H^2}$, and u_{residual} satisfy the following. The component $u_{H^2} \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ satisfies

$$k^{-|\alpha|} \|\partial^\alpha u_{H^2}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } k \in K \cap [k_1, \infty) \text{ and for all multiindices } |\alpha| \leq 2.$$

The component $u_{\mathcal{A}}$ satisfies

$$k^{-|\alpha|} \|\partial^\alpha u_{\mathcal{A}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_2 (C_3)^{|\alpha|} C_{\text{sol}} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } k \in K \cap [k_1, \infty) \text{ and for all } \alpha$$

and is negligible in the CAP region in the sense that for any $M, m > 0$ there exists $C_{M,m} > 0$ such that

$$\|u_{\mathcal{A}}\|_{H^m(\Omega \setminus \overline{B(0, R_1(1+\epsilon)}))} \leq C_{M,m} (kL)^{-M} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } k \in K \cap [k_1, \infty).$$

Finally, the component u_{residual} is negligible in the sense that for any $M, m > 0$ there exists $C_{M,m} > 0$ so that

$$\|u_{\text{residual}}\|_{H^m(\Omega)} \leq C_{M,m} (kL)^{-M} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } k \in K \cap [k_1, \infty).$$

The proof of Theorem 7.5 requires the following lemma (proved by integrating by parts).

Lemma 7.6 (Bound on the solution of the CAP problem near the boundary). *Suppose that $\Omega, \Omega_{\text{int}}$, and V are as in Definition 1.2. Given $a > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that the following is true. Suppose that $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ is such that $\text{supp } \phi \cap \Omega \subset \{x : V(x) \geq a > 0\}$. Let $\mathcal{P} := -k^{-2}\Delta - 1 - iV$. If $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, then*

$$\|\phi u\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|\mathcal{P}(\phi u)\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*}. \quad (7.3)$$

Proof. By integrating by parts/Green's identity, since $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$,

$$\langle \mathcal{P}(\phi u), \phi u \rangle = k^{-2} \|\nabla(\phi u)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \|\phi u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - i \|V^{1/2} \phi u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (7.4)$$

Taking the imaginary part of (7.4) and using the assumption on $\text{supp } \phi \cap \Omega$, we obtain that

$$a \|\phi u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \|V^{1/2} \phi u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = -\Im \langle \mathcal{P}(\phi u), \phi u \rangle \leq \|\mathcal{P}(\phi u)\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*} \|\phi u\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}$$

so that, by (5.24), for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$2a \|\phi u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \epsilon^{-1} \|\mathcal{P}(\phi u)\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*}^2 + \epsilon \|\phi u\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2. \quad (7.5)$$

Taking the real part of (7.4), we obtain that

$$\|\phi u\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 := k^{-2} \|\nabla(\phi u)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\phi u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \|\mathcal{P}(\phi u)\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*} \|\phi u\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} + 2 \|\phi u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

so that, by (5.24) again,

$$\|\phi u\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq C \left(\|\mathcal{P}(\phi u)\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*}^2 + \|\phi u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right). \quad (7.6)$$

The result (7.3) then follows from the combination of (7.5) and (7.6). \square

Proof of Theorem 7.5. The radial PML analogue of Theorem 7.5 is [37, Theorem 1.5]. The only changes in the statement of Theorem 7.5 compared to [37, Theorem 1.5] are that (i) Theorem 7.5 is valid for $k \in K \cap [k_1, \infty)$ with $k_1 > 0$ arbitrary, whereas [37, Theorem 1.5] is valid with k_1 sufficiently large, and (ii) [37, Theorem 1.5] holds when Ω is $C^{1,1}$, but Theorem 7.5 holds when Ω is only a convex polygon/polyhedron.

Regarding (i): the difference here is because the PML solution is only proved to exist (for fixed width and scaling function) for k sufficiently large, whereas the CAP solution exists for all $k > 0$ by the UCP (as in Theorem 7.1). Regarding (ii): this is because the requirement that Ω is $C^{1,1}$ was used in [37] to ensure that the PML solution is in $H^2(\Omega)$. However, since the highest-order term in (1.1) is $-k^{-2}\Delta$ when the CAP is active (i.e., on the support of V), the CAP solution is in $H^2(\Omega)$ for Ω convex by elliptic regularity for the Laplacian; see, e.g., [44, §8.2 and Equation 8.2.2].

To prove Theorem 7.5, we need to make the following small changes to the arguments in [37]. All but one of the changes occur in [37, Section 5.2], which deals with the PML region. The exception is that, since V appears only in the lowest-order term in (1.1), one can take operator $\tilde{Q}_{h,\theta}$ defined in [37, Equation 3.10] to just be Q_h .

The three changes required in [37, Section 5.2] are the following.

(i) [37, Theorem 5.1] is the statement (recalled in Remark 7.4) that the radial PML problem inherits the bound on the solution operator from the scattering problem, and so if the latter is polynomially bounded in kL , then so is the former. It has not yet been proved that the CAP problem has this property, but Theorem 7.5 assumes independently that the solution operator to the CAP problem is polynomially bounded.

(ii) The CAP analogue of [37, Lemma 5.2] is given by Lemma 7.6 and the bound $\|P(\phi u)\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*} \leq \|P(\phi u)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ (from the definition (7.1) of $\|\cdot\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*}$).

(iii) Finally, the Carleman estimate of [37, Lemma 5.3] (a simplified version of [34, §4.1]) holds for the CAP problem. This is because, in polar coordinates (r, ω) with $r \in [0, \infty)$ and $\omega \in S^{d-1}$, the semiclassical principal symbol of

$$e^{k\psi}(-k^{-2}\Delta - 1 - iV)e^{-k\psi} \quad \text{is} \quad (\xi_r + i\psi')^2 + |\xi_\omega|_{S^{d-1}}^2 - (1 + iV).$$

Comparing this to [34, Displayed equation after (4.1)], we see that $1 + iV$ now plays the role of $1 + if'_\theta(r)$ in the PML case, where $f_\theta(r)$ is the PML scaling function. Note that [34, §4.1] is focused on designing the function $\psi(r)$ to obtain the optimal exponential decay rate in the Carleman estimate (as in [34, §4.1]), but this is not needed for simplified version of [37, Lemma 5.3], and hence not for the CAP problem. \square

We now give two corollaries of Theorem 7.5. Given $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, let $\mathcal{S}^*f \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ be the solution of the variational problem

$$a(v, \mathcal{S}^*f) = \int_{\Omega} v \bar{f} \quad \text{for all } v \in H_0^1(\Omega). \quad (7.7)$$

In analogy with (2.11), let

$$\eta(\mathcal{V}_h) := \|(I - \Pi_h)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)} \quad (7.8)$$

where Π_h is H_k^1 -orthogonal projection $H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_h$.

Corollary 7.7 (Bound on $\eta(\mathcal{V}_h)$ explicit in p_f). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 7.5, given $k_1 > 0$, there exists $\mathcal{C}, \sigma > 0$ such that, for all $M \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ there exists $\mathcal{C}_M > 0$ such that, for all $k \in K \cap [k_1, \infty)$, $h > 0$, and $p_f \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, with \mathcal{I}_h the operator from Theorem 4.1,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(I - \mathcal{I}_h)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)} \\ & \leq \mathcal{C} \left[\frac{kh}{p_f} \left(1 + \frac{kh}{p_f} \right) + \frac{C_{\text{sol}}}{kL} \left(\left(\frac{h/L}{h/L + \sigma} \right)^{p_f} + kL \left(\frac{kh}{\sigma p_f} \right)^{p_f} \right) \right] + \mathcal{C}_M (kL)^{-M}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.9)$$

We have described (7.9) as a bound on $\eta(\mathcal{V}_h)$, since, by (7.8), $\eta(\mathcal{V}_h) \leq \|(I - \mathcal{I}_h)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)}$.

Corollary 7.8 (Bound on $\eta(\mathcal{V}_h)$ not explicit in p_f). *Suppose that \mathcal{V}_h satisfies Assumption 2.1 except with the requirement that \mathcal{T}^h is quasi-uniform weakened to the requirement that \mathcal{T}^h is shape regular. Under the assumptions of Theorem 7.5, given $p_f \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $k_1 > 0$, there exists $\mathcal{C} > 0$ such that, for all $M \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ there exists $\mathcal{C}_M > 0$ such that, for all $k \in K \cap [k_1, \infty)$ and $h > 0$, with \mathfrak{J}_h the interpolation operator on \mathcal{V}_h (discussed in §1.4),*

$$\|(I - \mathfrak{J}_h)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq \mathcal{C} \left[kh(1 + kh) + C_{\text{sol}}(kh)^{p_f} \right] + \mathcal{C}_M (kL)^{-M},$$

Proofs of Corollaries 7.7 and 7.8. Let $\mathcal{S} : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_0^1(\Omega)$ denote the solution operator of the CAP problem; i.e., given $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\mathcal{S}f \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ satisfies

$$a(\mathcal{S}f, v) = \int_{\Omega} f \bar{v} \quad \text{for all } v \in H_0^1(\Omega). \quad (7.10)$$

Since A_{scat} is symmetric positive-definite, $a(\bar{v}, w) = a(\overline{\overline{w}}, v)$ for all $v, w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. This fact, combined with (7.7) and (7.10), implies that $\mathcal{S}^*f = \overline{\overline{\mathcal{S}f}}$. Therefore, given $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ the decomposition of $\mathcal{S}f$ in Theorem 7.5 holds equally for \mathcal{S}^*f , and thus $\mathcal{S}^*f = u_{H^2} + u_{\mathcal{A}} + u_{\text{residual}}$.

To prove Corollary 7.8, we first recall that by, e.g., [11, Theorem 4.4.20], \mathfrak{J}_h satisfies the bound (4.1), but with C depending in an unspecified way on p_f . We then apply this bound with $m = 2$ to u_{H^2} , with $m = p_f + 1$ (i.e., the highest regularity allowed) to $u_{\mathcal{A}}$, and with $m = 1$ to u_{residual} .

The proof of Corollary 7.7 is almost identical to the proof of [36, Lemma 5.5]. The strategy is to apply Theorem 4.1 with $m = 2$ to u_{H^2} , but then apply approximation results for analytic functions from [55, Appendix C] to $u_{\mathcal{A}}$. We highlight that the assumption that \mathcal{T}^h is quasi-uniform with simplicial elements means that [55, Assumption 5.2] holds with all the maps R_K equal to the identity (i.e., all the element maps $F_K = R_K \circ A_K$ are affine). The fact that the interpolant in the results of [55, Appendix C] can be taken to be the same as that in Theorem 4.1 is shown in [6, Proposition 4.5]. \square

We now use Corollary 7.7 to prove an hp -FEM convergence result.

Corollary 7.9 (*hp-FEM convergence for the CAP problem on convex polyhedra*). Suppose that \mathcal{V}_h satisfies Assumption 2.1 and that the assumptions of Theorem 7.5 hold. Given $C_{\text{deg,f}}, \epsilon, k_1 > 0$ there exists $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for all $k \in K \cap [k_1, \infty)$, $h > 0$, and $p_f \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, if

$$\frac{kh}{p_f} \leq C_1 \quad \text{and} \quad p_f \geq (1 + C_{\text{deg,f}} \log k), \quad (7.11)$$

then the Galerkin solution (2.7) exists, is unique, and satisfies

$$\|u - u_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq 2C_{\text{cont}} \min_{v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h} \|u - v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon \|u - v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}. \quad (7.12)$$

Furthermore, the following bound on the discrete inf-sup constant holds

$$\inf_{u_h \in \mathcal{V}_h} \sup_{v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h} \frac{|a(u_h, v_h)|}{\|u_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \|v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}} \geq (C_2 C_{\text{sol}})^{-1}. \quad (7.13)$$

Proof. If we can show that $\eta(\mathcal{V}_h) \leq \epsilon/C_{\text{cont}}$, then the bounds (7.12) follow from the combination of Corollaries 7.7 and 7.8 with the Schatz argument (see, e.g., the recap in [38, Appendix B]). The bound (7.13) then holds by [55, Theorem 4.2] and the fact that $C_{\text{sol}} \geq CkL$ (this lower bound on C_{sol} can be proved by considering $u(x) = \exp(ikx_1)\chi(x)$ where $\chi \in C_{\text{comp}}^\infty(\Omega_{\text{int}})$ is supported where $A_{\text{scat}} = I$ and $c_{\text{scat}} = 1$; see, e.g., [15, Lemma 3.10]).

To bound $\eta(\mathcal{V}_h)$, suppose that $kh/p_f \leq C_1$ (from (7.11)) with $C_1 = c\sigma$ for $0 < c < 1$, and with σ as in Corollary 7.7. Since $C_{\text{sol}} \leq C(kL)^P$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\text{sol}} \left(\frac{kh}{\sigma p_f} \right)^{p_f} &\leq C \exp \left(P \log(kL) - (1 + C_{\text{deg,f}} \log(kL)) \log(c^{-1}) \right) \\ &\leq C \exp \left(-\log(c^{-1}) \right) (kL)^{P - C_{\text{deg,f}} \log(c^{-1})}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $0 < c < 1$ is sufficiently small so that $C_{\text{deg,f}} \log(c^{-1}) \geq P + 1$, then the left-hand side of this last displayed inequality is $\leq C'(kL)^{-1}$. Furthermore, with $kh/p_f \leq c\sigma$,

$$\frac{h/L}{h/L + \sigma} \leq \frac{h}{L\sigma} \leq \frac{p_f c}{kL},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{C_{\text{sol}}}{kL} \left(\frac{h/L}{h/L + \sigma} \right)^{p_f} &\leq C(kL)^{P-1-p_f} (p_f c)^{p_f} \\ &\leq C(kL)^{P-2-C_{\text{deg,f}} \log(kL)} (1 + C_{\text{deg,f}} \log(kL))^{1+C_{\text{deg,f}} \log(kL)} \leq C'(kL)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

(where C' depends on k_1). In summary, if C_1 in (7.11) is sufficiently small (depending on $C_{\text{deg,f}}$, P , and σ), then

$$\|(I - \mathcal{I}_h)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq \mathcal{C} \left[C_1(1 + C_1) + C'(kL)^{-1} \right] + \mathcal{C}_M(kL)^{-M},$$

and the result follows. \square

Corollary 7.10 (*h-FEM convergence result for CAP problem on convex polyhedra*).

Suppose that \mathcal{V}_h satisfies Assumption 2.1, except with the requirement that \mathcal{T}^h is quasi-uniform replaced by the requirement that \mathcal{T}^h is shape regular. Under the assumptions of Theorem 7.5, given $p_f \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $k_1 > 0$, and $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for all $k \in K \cap [k_1, \infty)$, $h > 0$, if

$$(kh)^{p_f} C_{\text{sol}} \leq C_1,$$

then the Galerkin solution (2.7) exists, is unique, and satisfies (7.12). Furthermore, the bound (7.13) on the discrete inf-sup constant holds.

The proof of Corollary 7.10 is analogous to that of Corollary 7.9 (and indeed simpler).

Remark 7.11 (Corollary 7.10 verifies a certain assumption in [46, 50, 52, 31]). *The analyses of two-level Schwarz preconditioners in [46, 50, 52] work on a Lipschitz polygon/polyhedron and assume that the discrete inf-sup constant $\geq (CC_{\text{sol}})^{-1}$ (i.e., the bound (7.13)); see [46, Lemma 2.4], [50, Remark 2.10], [52, Assumption 2.4 and Remark 2.5], [31, Theorem 2.2 and Remark 2.1]. Corollary 7.10 proves this assumed bound on the discrete inf-sup constant for the CAP problem when Ω is a convex polyhedron and $(kh)^{p_f} C_{\text{sol}}$ is sufficiently small, with $p_f \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ arbitrary.*

To our knowledge, the only other instances where such a bound on the discrete inf-sup constant has been proved – all under the condition “ $(kh)^{p_f} C_{\text{sol}}$ sufficiently small” – are the following:

- $p_f = 1$, $d = 2$, Ω is convex, $\partial\Omega$ has an impedance boundary condition [54, §8].
- $p_f \sim \log k$, $d = 2$, Ω is a polygon and the mesh is geometrically-refined close to singular corners [30, Theorem 4.2].
- $p_f = 1$, $d = 2$, Ω is a polygon [16, Theorem 5.3].
- $p_f = 1$, $d = 3$, $\partial\Omega$ is $C^{1,1}$ except at a finite set of cone points [17, Theorem 5.3].

The difficulty in obtaining the bound (7.13) on the the discrete inf-sup constant for $p_f > 1$ is that both the standard ways of bounding $\eta(\mathcal{V}_h)$ (going back to [55, 56]) and the duality arguments of [24, 39] require (at least) that $\partial\Omega$ be $C^{p_f,1}$. In this paper, the splitting in Theorem 7.5 avoids these regularity assumptions on $\partial\Omega$ by showing that $u_{\mathcal{A}}$ is negligible near the boundary thanks to the CAP, with only H^2 regularity of the solution required.

8 Theorem 3.1 applied with piecewise-polynomial subspaces

8.1 hp -FEM fine and coarse spaces

The following theorem (Theorem 8.1) is the rigorous statement of Theorem 1.5 (c) and (d). The conclusion of Theorem 8.1 is that the bounds on Q in (3.6) hold. For brevity, the corollaries about GMRES are not explicitly written out, but follow from Corollaries 3.5, 3.6, and 3.8.

Theorem 8.1 (Rigorous statement of Theorem 1.5 (c) and (d)). *Suppose that $\Omega, A_{\text{scat}}, c_{\text{scat}}, \Omega_{\text{int}},$ and V are as in Definition 1.2. Suppose further that the assumptions of Theorem 7.5 (i.e., the four bullet points) hold. Suppose that the assumptions in §2.1 hold, and, additionally, \mathcal{V}_0 consists of piecewise polynomials on a simplicial mesh \mathcal{T}^H , with diameter H , such that each element of \mathcal{T}^H is the union of a set of elements of \mathcal{T}^h (allowing the case $\mathcal{T}^H = \mathcal{T}^h$).*

Given $C, \epsilon, C_0, k_1 > 0$ and $C_{\text{deg,f}} \geq C_{\text{deg,c}} > 0$, there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$ such that for all \widetilde{C}_j , $j = 1, 2, 3$, satisfying $0 < \widetilde{C}_1 < C_1$ and $\widetilde{C}_3 < \widetilde{C}_2 < \widetilde{C}_1$ there exists $\widetilde{C}_4, \widetilde{C}_5$, such that the following holds. If $k \geq k_1$, $R_{\text{tr}} > R_1 + \epsilon$, $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, as well as

$$(1 + C_{\text{deg,f}} \log(kL)) \leq p_f \leq C (1 + C_{\text{deg,f}} \log(kL)), \quad (8.1)$$

$$p_c \geq 1 + C_{\text{deg,c}} \log(kL) \quad (8.2)$$

$$\Lambda^{-1} \widetilde{C}_1 \leq kH_{\text{sub}} (1 + C_{\text{deg,f}} \log(kL)) \leq C_1 \Lambda^{-1}, \quad \widetilde{C}_3 \Lambda^{-1} \leq k\delta (1 + C_{\text{deg,f}} \log(kL)) \leq \widetilde{C}_2 \Lambda^{-1}, \quad (8.3)$$

$$H \leq \frac{\widetilde{C}_4}{k\Lambda}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{C_0 k^2 L} \leq h \leq \frac{\widetilde{C}_5}{k(\log(kL)(1 + C_{\text{deg,f}} \log(kL))\Lambda)}, \quad (8.4)$$

then the Galerkin solution in the fine space exists, is unique, and satisfies

$$\|u - u_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq 2C_{\text{cont}} \min_{v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h} \|u - v_h\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}, \quad (8.5)$$

and the bounds in (3.6) (on the norm and field of values of Q) hold.

Note that the conditions (8.1) and (8.2) allow p_f to equal p_c .

Remark 8.2 (The order of quantifiers in Theorem 8.1). *The comments in Remark 3.2 about constants in Theorem 3.1, and the order in which they appear, hold here. We now discuss (in the order they appear) the constants in Theorem 8.1 that do not appear in Theorem 3.1.*

- The constants $C_{\text{deg},f}$ and $C_{\text{deg},c}$ in the bounds on p_f and p_c are arbitrary.
- The constant \mathcal{C} is arbitrary, and controls how big p_f can be; we need to constrain p_f in this way since p_f enters the conditions on H_{sub} and δ in (3.4) in Theorem 3.1 (which become (8.3) here).
- The constant ϵ controlling the width of the CAP is arbitrary.

Proof of Theorem 8.1. We first show that Assumptions 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7 are satisfied. Assumption 2.5 holds immediately by the definition of the CAP sesquilinear form $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ (1.2). By Lemma 2.9, Assumption 2.6 holds with $\sigma = 2(C_{\text{cont}})^2\eta(\mathcal{V}_0)$, provided that $\eta(\mathcal{V}_0)$ defined by (2.11) satisfies (2.12). The condition (2.12) turns out to be less restrictive than the condition on $\eta(\mathcal{V}_0)$ that will be imposed in (8.6) below to ensure that the bound (3.5) on σ holds. Finally, we claim that Assumption 2.7 holds by Lemma 2.10. To see this, observe that, by the Gårding inequality (2.6) and the Poincaré inequality (5.27) (applied with $D = \Omega_\ell$ and $L = H_{\text{sub}}$), $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ is coercive on $H_0^1(\Omega_\ell)$ if kH_{sub} is sufficiently small – this follows from the first bound in (8.3), if necessary by reducing C_1 .

We now need to verify that (3.3), (3.4), and (3.5) hold. With p_f satisfying (8.1), the conditions H_{sub} and δ in (3.4) are immediate consequences of (8.3), and then the condition on h in (3.3) is a consequence of (8.4). It therefore remains to show that the bound on σ in (3.5) is satisfied when H satisfies the first bound in (8.4). By Lemma 2.9, the second bound in (2.9) holds with $\sigma = 2(C_{\text{cont}})^2\eta(\mathcal{V}_0)$. Therefore, to obtain (3.5), it is sufficient to show that

$$\eta(\mathcal{V}_0) \leq \frac{\widetilde{C}_4}{2\Lambda p_f (C_{\text{cont}})^2}. \quad (8.6)$$

Observe that, as claimed above, since p_f grows with k , the requirement (8.6) on $\eta(\mathcal{V}_0)$ is indeed more restrictive than the condition (2.12) when k is sufficiently large.

We now use the bound on $\eta(\mathcal{V}_0)$ implied by Corollary 7.7 – with p_f replaced by p_c and h replaced by H . Since p_f appears in the conditions (3.4) on H_{sub} and δ , we need to be careful (as we were in Corollary 7.7) to fix the polynomial degrees at the start of the proof (this is achieved via (8.1) and (8.2), with $C_{\text{deg},f}$, $C_{\text{deg},c}$, and \mathcal{C} appearing before the constants in the conditions (3.4) and (3.5), as discussed in Remark 8.2). By Corollary 7.7, to prove (8.6), it is sufficient to prove that, with p_c satisfying (8.2), the condition on H in (8.4) makes

$$\Lambda p_f \left[\frac{kH}{p_c} \left(1 + \frac{kH}{p_c} \right) + \frac{C_{\text{sol}}}{kL} \left(\left(\frac{H/L}{H/L + \sigma} \right)^{p_c} + kL \left(\frac{kH}{\sigma p_c} \right)^{p_c} \right) \right] + \Lambda p_f \mathcal{C}_M (kL)^{-M} \quad (8.7)$$

sufficiently small. The first term in the square brackets in (8.7) is made small by making ΛkH small (as in (8.4), where \widetilde{C}_4 depends on $C_{\text{deg},f}/C_{\text{deg},c}$). The rest of the terms are then made small in a similar manner to that in the proof of Corollary 7.9, with the factor of p_f outside the square brackets making no difference (since p_f grows like $\log(kL)$ by (8.1)). \square

8.2 Fine and coarse spaces of fixed polynomial degree.

Theorem 8.3 (Rigorous statement of Theorem 1.5 (a) and (b)). *Suppose that Ω , A_{scat} , c_{scat} , Ω_{int} , and V are as in Definition 1.2. Suppose further that the assumptions of Theorem 7.5 (i.e., the four bullet points) hold. Suppose that the assumptions in §2.1 hold except that in Assumption 2.1 the requirement that \mathcal{T}^h is quasi-uniform is weakened to \mathcal{T}^h being shape regular.*

Given $p_f \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, assume that $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_0$ consists of Lagrange finite elements of degree $p_c \geq p_f$ on a simplicial mesh \mathcal{T}^H , chosen such that every element of \mathcal{T}^H is the union of fine grid elements. If $p_c = p_f$, set $\mathcal{V}_0 := \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_0$ (since $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_0 \subset \mathcal{V}_h$). If $p_c > p_f$, set $\mathcal{V}_0 := \mathfrak{I}_h \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_0$, where \mathfrak{I}_h is the interpolation operator on \mathcal{V}_h (discussed in §1.4).

Given $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$ such that for all $\widetilde{C}_j, j = 1, 2, 3$, satisfying $0 < \widetilde{C}_1 < C_1$ and $\widetilde{C}_3 < \widetilde{C}_2 < \widetilde{C}_1$ there exists $\widetilde{C}_4, \widetilde{C}_5$ and $k_1 > 0$ such that the following holds. If $k \geq k_1$, $R_{\text{tr}} > R_1 + \epsilon$, $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^{-1} \widetilde{C}_1 &\leq kH_{\text{sub}} \leq C_1 \Lambda^{-1}, & \widetilde{C}_3 \Lambda^{-1} &\leq k\delta \leq \widetilde{C}_2 \Lambda^{-1}, \\ (kH)^{p_c} C_{\text{sol}} &\leq \widetilde{C}_4 & \text{and} & & (kh)^{p_f} C_{\text{sol}} &\leq \widetilde{C}_5, \end{aligned} \quad (8.8)$$

then the Galerkin solution in the fine space exists, is unique, and satisfies (8.5). Furthermore Q is well defined and satisfies the bounds in (3.6).

Proof. When $p_c = p_f$, the proof is essentially identical to (and slightly simpler than) the proof of Theorem 8.1; indeed, we use Lemma 5.3 instead of Lemma 5.4 and Corollary 7.10 instead of Corollary 7.9.

When $p_c > p_f$, the proof is identical to the case $p_c = p_f$, except that we need to show that the coarse space $\mathcal{V}_0 := \mathfrak{I}_h \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_0$ satisfies Assumption 2.6. We do this by bounding $\eta(\mathcal{V}_0)$ and then using Lemma 2.9. Let Π_0 denote the H_k^1 -orthogonal projection $H_k^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$, and let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{I}}_0$ denote the nodal interpolant of continuous functions onto $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_0$. Since $\mathcal{V}_0 := \mathfrak{I}_h \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_0$, the operator $\mathfrak{I}_h \widetilde{\mathfrak{I}}_0$ maps into \mathcal{V}_0 , and thus

$$\eta(\mathcal{V}_0) := \|(I - \Pi_0)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq \|(I - \mathfrak{I}_h \widetilde{\mathfrak{I}}_0)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)}. \quad (8.9)$$

Now

$$(I - \mathfrak{I}_h \widetilde{\mathfrak{I}}_0)\mathcal{S}^* = (I - \widetilde{\mathfrak{I}}_0)\mathcal{S}^* + (I - \mathfrak{I}_h)\widetilde{\mathfrak{I}}_0\mathcal{S}^* = (I - \widetilde{\mathfrak{I}}_0)\mathcal{S}^* + (I - \mathfrak{I}_h)\mathcal{S}^* - (I - \mathfrak{I}_h)(I - \widetilde{\mathfrak{I}}_0)\mathcal{S}^*,$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(I - \mathfrak{I}_h \widetilde{\mathfrak{I}}_0)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)} &\leq \|(I - \widetilde{\mathfrak{I}}_0)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)} + \|(I - \mathfrak{I}_h)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)} \\ &\quad + \|I - \mathfrak{I}_h\|_{H_k^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)} \|(I - \widetilde{\mathfrak{I}}_0)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.10)$$

Now, by, e.g., [11, Theorem 4.4.20], \mathfrak{I}_h satisfies the bound (4.1), but with C depending in an unspecified way on p_f . The bound with $m = 2$ combined with the fact that $kh \leq C$ imply that

$$\|I - \mathfrak{I}_h\|_{H_k^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq C' kh \quad (8.11)$$

where C, C' (and all further constants in the proof) depend on p_f . We now claim that the decomposition of the solution operator from Theorem 7.5 combined with Theorem 4.1 implies that, for any $M > 0$,

$$\|(I - \widetilde{\mathfrak{I}}_0)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^2(\Omega)} \leq C(1 + (kH)^{p_c-1} C_{\text{sol}} + (kL)^{-M}). \quad (8.12)$$

To show this, recall from the proofs of Corollaries 7.7 and 7.8 that, for all $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\mathcal{S}^* f = \overline{\mathcal{S}f}$. Therefore, Theorem 7.5 implies that $\mathcal{S}^* f$ can be written as $u_{H^2} + u_{\mathcal{A}} + u_{\text{residual}}$, with $u_{H^2}, u_{\mathcal{A}}$, and u_{residual} satisfying the corresponding bounds. We then apply the bound (4.1) with $m = 2$ to u_{H^2} , with $m = p_c + 1$ to $u_{\mathcal{A}}$, and with $m = 2$ to u_{residual} , and obtain (8.12). Finally, Corollary 7.8 implies that

$$\|(I - \mathfrak{I}_h)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq C(kh + (kh)^{p_f} C_{\text{sol}} + (kL)^{-M}) \quad (8.13)$$

and

$$\|(I - \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_0)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq C(kH + (kH)^{p_c}C_{\text{sol}} + (kL)^{-M}). \quad (8.14)$$

Inputting (8.11), (8.12), (8.13), and (8.14) into (8.10), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(I - \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_h \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_0)\mathcal{S}^*\|_{L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H_k^1(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C(kH + (kH)^{p_c}C_{\text{sol}} + (kL)^{-M}) + C(kh + (kh)^{p_f}C_{\text{sol}} + (kL)^{-M}) \\ & \quad + CkH(1 + (kH)^{p_c-1}C_{\text{sol}} + (kL)^{-M}) \\ & \leq C(kh + (kh)^{p_f}C_{\text{sol}} + (kL)^{-M}) + C(kH + (kH)^{p_c}C_{\text{sol}} + (kL)^{-(M-1)}), \end{aligned} \quad (8.15)$$

where we have used $h \leq H \leq L$ in the last step. The bounds on h and H in (8.8) combined with (8.9) and (8.15) imply that $\eta(\mathcal{V}_0)$ is small; Assumption 2.6 then holds by Lemma 2.9, and the result then follows. \square

A The matrix form of the operator Q (3.1)

The fact that the matrix form of Q is (3.2) is a consequence of the following theorem combined with the fact that, with $C^\dagger = \bar{C}^T$,

$$\langle \mathbf{V}, C\mathbf{W} \rangle_{D_k} = \langle D_k^{-1}C^\dagger D_k \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} \rangle_{D_k} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}.$$

Theorem A.1. ([42, Theorem 5.4].) *Let $v_h = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_h} V_j \phi_j$ and $w_h = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_h} W_j \phi_j$ be arbitrary elements of \mathcal{V}_h . Then, for $\ell = 0, \dots, N$,*

$$(Q_\ell v_h, w_h)_{H_k^1(\Omega)} = \langle \mathbf{R}_\ell^\top \mathbf{A}_\ell^{-1} \mathbf{R}_\ell \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W} \rangle_{D_k}.$$

Proof. By (1.11), it is sufficient to prove that, for $\ell = 0, \dots, N$,

$$Q_\ell v_h = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_h} (\mathbf{R}_\ell^\top \mathbf{A}_\ell^{-1} \mathbf{R}_\ell \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V})_j \phi_j. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

(Note that, by proving (A.1), we correct typographical errors in the statement of the result in [42, Theorem 5.4(ii)].)

We first prove (A.1) for $\ell = 0$. On the one hand, since $\{\Phi_p\}_{p \in \mathcal{J}_0}$ is a basis for \mathcal{V}_0 , $Q_0 v_h = \sum_{q \in \mathcal{J}_0} Z_q \Phi_q$, for some coefficient vector \mathbf{Z} . By (1.10), $Q_0 v_h$ can then be written in terms of the basis $\{\phi_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}_h}$ by

$$Q_0 v_h = \sum_{q \in \mathcal{J}_0} Z_q \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_h} (\mathbf{R}_0)_{q,j} \phi_j = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_h} (\mathbf{R}_0^\top \mathbf{Z})_j \phi_j. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

On the other hand, the definition (2.8) of Q_0 and (1.10) imply that, for all $p \in \mathcal{J}_0$,

$$\sum_{q \in \mathcal{J}_0} a(\Phi_q, \Phi_p) Z_q = a(Q_0 v_h, \Phi_p) = a(v_h, \Phi_p) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_h} V_j a(\phi_j, \Phi_p) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_h} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_h} (\mathbf{R}_0)_{p,i} a(\phi_j, \phi_i) V_j. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Recall that $a(\phi_i, \phi_j) = A_{ij}$ and $a(\Phi_q, \Phi_p) = (A_0)_{pq}$ (i.e., A_0 is the Galerkin matrix of $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ using the basis $\{\Phi_p : p \in \mathcal{J}_0\}$ of \mathcal{V}_0). The expression (A.3) then becomes that $A_0 \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V}$; i.e., $\mathbf{Z} = A_0^{-1} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V}$, and inserting this into (A.2) gives (A.1) for $\ell = 0$.

We now prove (A.1) for $\ell \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Let $\mathcal{J}_h(\Omega_\ell)$ denote the index set for the freedoms of a function in \mathcal{V}_ℓ . In analogue with the case $\ell = 0$, we write $Q_\ell v_h$ in two different ways: first

$$Q_\ell v_h = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_h(\Omega_\ell)} Y_j \phi_j = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_h} (\mathbf{R}_\ell^\top \mathbf{Y})_j \phi_j, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

for some coefficient vector \mathbf{Y} . Then, by the definition of Q_ℓ , for all $i \in \mathcal{J}_h(\Omega_\ell)$,

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}(\Omega_\ell)} a(\phi_j, \phi_i) Y_j = a(Q_\ell v_h, \phi_i) = a(v_h, \phi_i) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_h} a(\phi_j, \phi_i) V_j. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

It is straightforward to show that $\mathbf{A}_\ell := \mathbf{R}_\ell \mathbf{A} \mathbf{R}_\ell^T$ is such that $(\mathbf{A}_\ell)_{ij} = a(\phi_j, \phi_i)$ for $i, j \in \mathcal{J}_h(\Omega_\ell)$. Therefore (A.5) implies that $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{A}_\ell^{-1} \mathbf{R}_\ell \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V}$, and inserting this into (A.4) gives (A.1) for $\ell \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. \square

B Proofs of Theorems 7.2 and 7.3

The proofs of Theorems 7.2 and 7.3 are small modifications of the proofs of [33, Lemma 4.5] and [33, Theorem A.2], respectively, where we use Lemma 7.6 to deal with the boundary.

The key difference is that the results of [33] assume that (i) both Ω and Ω_{int} are hypercubes and (ii) the coefficients of the PDE are constant in a neighbourhood of Ω . Both of these assumptions are because [33] is focused on the case when the radiation condition is approximated by a Cartesian PML, with (i) then necessary for the definition of a cartesian PML, and (ii) allowing one use a reflection argument near $\partial\Omega$ to avoid considering propagation of singularities up to the boundary (see [33, Remark 2.5]).

Neither nor (i) and (ii) are needed for CAP. Indeed, CAP is defined for both Ω and Ω_{int} bounded Lipschitz domains, avoiding (i), and the semiclassical principal symbol of the PDE is uniformly semiclassical elliptic near $\partial\Omega$ (in contrast to a cartesian PML, which is only semiclassically elliptic in the coordinate direction in which the scaling occurs), avoiding (ii).

Proof of Theorem 7.2. The result of Theorem 7.2 follows from [33, Lemma 4.5] and Lemma 7.6 in the following way: the contradiction argument in [33, Lemma 4.5] is set up in exactly the same way; i.e., we obtain a sequence $v_n \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $\|\mathcal{P}v_n\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. To complete the proof, we need to show that $\|v_n\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$.

In contrast to the proof of [33, Lemma 4.5], we do not extend v_n by reflection to an extended domain (denoted by $\tilde{\Omega}$ in [33]), but instead work with an arbitrary $\chi \in C_{\text{comp}}^\infty(\Omega)$ (instead of $\chi \in C_{\text{comp}}^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})$). The propagation argument in [33, Lemma 4.5] (which uses the ellipticity of the operator in the CAP region and the nontrapping assumption) then shows that both $\|\chi v_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ and $\|\chi v_n\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

To complete the proof, we need to show that, for some $\chi \in C_{\text{comp}}^\infty(\Omega)$, $\|(1 - \chi)v_n\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (to get that $\|v_n\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$). Choose $\chi \in C_{\text{comp}}^\infty(\Omega; [0, 1])$ such that $\text{supp}(1 - \chi) \subset \{V \geq a > 0\}$ and choose $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\phi = 1$ on $\text{supp}(1 - \chi)$ and $\text{supp} \phi \subset \{V \geq a > 0\}$; observe that such a ϕ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 7.6. Therefore, by the support properties of $1 - \chi$ and ϕ , and Lemma 7.6,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1 - \chi)v_n\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} &\leq C \|\phi v_n\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|\mathcal{P}(\phi v_n)\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*} \\ &\leq C \left(\|\phi \mathcal{P}v_n\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*} + \|(\mathcal{P}\phi - \phi \mathcal{P})v_n\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*} \right) \\ &\leq C' \left(\|\mathcal{P}v_n\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*} + \|\tilde{\chi} v_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for some $\tilde{\chi} \in C_{\text{comp}}^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\tilde{\chi} = 1$ on $\text{supp} \nabla \phi$. The propagation argument from the proof of [33, Lemma 4.5] shows that $\|\tilde{\chi} v_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$, and $\|\mathcal{P}v_n\|_{(H_k^1(\Omega))^*} \rightarrow 0$ by construction. Therefore $\|(1 - \chi)v_n\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and the result follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 7.3. The proof of Theorem 7.3 is then exactly the same as the proof of [33, Theorem A.2] (with Theorem 7.2 used in place of [33, Lemma 4.5]), noting that the propagation result of [33, Lemma 4.1] is only used on compact subsets of Ω (i.e., there is no propagation up to the boundary), since the norms on the left-hand side of (7.2) all involve $\chi \in C_{\text{comp}}^\infty(\Omega_{\text{int}})$. \square

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Martin Averseng (CNRS, Angers), Théophile Chaumont-Frelet (INRIA, Lille), David Lafontaine (CNRS Toulouse), Guanglian Li (University of Hong Kong), Chupeng Ma (Green Bay University), Daniel Peterseim (Universität Augsburg), Pierre-Henri Tournier (CNRS Paris), and particularly Jeffrey Galkowski (University College London), for useful discussions. The authors acknowledge the hospitality of the Tsinghua Sanya International Mathematics Forum at the workshop “Advanced solvers for frequency-domain wave problems and applications” in January 2025, where this research was completed.

References

- [1] G. Alessandrini. Strong unique continuation for general elliptic equations in 2D. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 386(2):669–676, 2012.
- [2] I. M. Babuška and S. A. Sauter. Is the pollution effect of the FEM avoidable for the Helmholtz equation considering high wave numbers? *SIAM Review*, pages 451–484, 2000.
- [3] R. E. Bank and T. Dupont. An optimal order process for solving finite element equations. *Mathematics of Computation*, 36(153):35–51, 1981.
- [4] R. E. Bank and H. Yserentant. On the H^1 -stability of the L^2 -projection onto finite element spaces. *Numerische Mathematik*, 126:361–381, 2014.
- [5] B. Beckermann, S. A. Goreinov, and E. E. Tyrtyshnikov. Some remarks on the Elman estimate for GMRES. *SIAM journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 27(3):772–778, 2006.
- [6] M Bernkopf, T Chaumont-Frelet, and J Melenk. Wavenumber-explicit stability and convergence analysis of hp finite element discretizations of Helmholtz problems in piecewise smooth media. *Mathematics of Computation*, 2024.
- [7] M. Bernkopf, S. Sauter, C. Torres, and A. Veit. Solvability of discrete Helmholtz equations. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 43(3):1802–1830, 2023.
- [8] M. Bonazzoli, V. Dolean, I. G. Graham, E. A. Spence, and P.-H. Tournier. Domain decomposition preconditioning for the high-frequency time-harmonic Maxwell equations with absorption. *Mathematics of Computation*, 88(320):2559–2604, 2019.
- [9] N. Bootland, V. Dolean, I. G. Graham, C. Ma, and R. Scheichl. Overlapping Schwarz methods with GenEO coarse spaces for indefinite and nonself-adjoint problems. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 43(4):1899–1936, 2023.
- [10] N. Bootland, V. Dolean, P. Jolivet, and P.-H. Tournier. A comparison of coarse spaces for Helmholtz problems in the high frequency regime. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 98:239–253, 2021.
- [11] S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott. *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, volume 15 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer Science+Business Media, New York, 3rd edition, 2008.
- [12] D. L. Brown, D. Gallistl, and D. Peterseim. Multiscale Petrov-Galerkin method for high-frequency heterogeneous Helmholtz equations. In *Meshfree methods for partial differential equations VIII*, pages 85–115. Springer, 2017.
- [13] X-C. Cai and O. B. Widlund. Domain decomposition algorithms for indefinite elliptic problems. *SIAM J. Sci. Comp.*, 13(1):243–258, 1992.
- [14] T. Carleman. Sur un problème d’unicité pour les systèmes d’équations aux dérivées partielles à deux variables indépendantes. *Ark. Mat., Astr. Fys.*, 26(17), 1939.
- [15] S. N. Chandler-Wilde and P. Monk. Wave-number-explicit bounds in time-harmonic scattering. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 39(5):1428–1455, 2008.
- [16] T. Chaumont-Frelet and S. Nicaise. High-frequency behaviour of corner singularities in Helmholtz problems. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, 52(5):1803–1845, 2018.
- [17] T. Chaumont-Frelet and S. Nicaise. An Analysis of High-Frequency Helmholtz Problems in Domains with Conical Points and Their Finite Element Discretisation. *Comp. Meth. Appl. Math.*, 23(4):899–916, 2023.
- [18] T. Chaumont-Frelet and F. Valentin. A multiscale hybrid-mixed method for the Helmholtz equation in heterogeneous domains. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 58(2):1029–1067, 2020.
- [19] Yi. Chen, T. Y. Hou, and Y. Wang. Exponentially convergent multiscale methods for 2D high frequency heterogeneous Helmholtz equations. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation*, 21(3):849–883, 2023.
- [20] P. G. Ciarlet. *The Finite Element Method For Elliptic Problems*. SIAM, 2002.

- [21] L. Conen, V. Dolean, R. Krause, and F. Nataf. A coarse space for heterogeneous Helmholtz problems based on the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 271:83–99, 2014.
- [22] L. Diening, J. Storn, and T. Tschierpel. On the Sobolev and L^p -Stability of the L^2 -Projection. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 59(5):2571–2607, 2021.
- [23] V. Dolean, P. Jolivet, and F. Nataf. *An introduction to domain decomposition methods: algorithms, theory, and parallel implementation*. SIAM, 2015.
- [24] Y. Du and H. Wu. Preasymptotic error analysis of higher order FEM and CIP-FEM for Helmholtz equation with high wavenumber. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 53:782–804, 2015.
- [25] S. Dyatlov and M. Zworski. *Mathematical theory of scattering resonances*, volume 200. AMS, 2019.
- [26] Y. Efendiev and T. Hou. *Multiscale finite element methods: theory and applications*. Springer, 2009.
- [27] S. C. Eisenstat, H. C. Elman, and M. H. Schultz. Variational iterative methods for nonsymmetric systems of linear equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, pages 345–357, 1983.
- [28] H. C. Elman. *Iterative Methods for Sparse Nonsymmetric Systems of Linear Equations*. PhD thesis, Yale University, 1982.
- [29] A. Ern and J.-L. Guermond. *Finite elements I: Approximation and interpolation*, volume 72 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer Nature, 2021.
- [30] S. Esterhazy and J. M. Melenk. On stability of discretizations of the Helmholtz equation. In I. G. Graham, T. Y. Hou, O. Lakkis, and R. Scheichl, editors, *Numerical Analysis of Multiscale Problems*, volume 83 of *Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering*, pages 285–324. Springer, 2012.
- [31] S. Fu, S. Gong, G. Li, and Y. Wang. On Edge Multiscale Space based Hybrid Schwarz Preconditioner for Helmholtz Problems with Large Wavenumbers. *arXiv:2408.08198*, 2024.
- [32] S. Fu, G. Li, R. Craster, and S. Guenneau. Wavelet-based edge multiscale finite element method for Helmholtz problems in perforated domains. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation*, 19(4):1684–1709, 2021.
- [33] J. Galkowski, S. Gong, I. G. Graham, D. Lafontaine, and E. A. Spence. Convergence of overlapping domain decomposition methods with PML transmission conditions applied to nontrapping Helmholtz problems. *arXiv:2404.02156*, 2024.
- [34] J. Galkowski, D. Lafontaine, and E. A. Spence. Perfectly-matched-layer truncation is exponentially accurate at high frequency. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 55(4):3344–3394, 2023.
- [35] J. Galkowski, D. Lafontaine, and E. A. Spence. Local absorbing boundary conditions on fixed domains give order-one errors for high-frequency waves. *IMA J. Num. Anal.*, 44(4):1946–2069, 2024.
- [36] J. Galkowski, D. Lafontaine, E. A. Spence, and J. Wunsch. Decompositions of high-frequency Helmholtz solutions via functional calculus, and application to the finite element method. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 55(4):3903–3958, 2023.
- [37] J. Galkowski, D. Lafontaine, E. A. Spence, and J. Wunsch. The hp -FEM applied to the Helmholtz equation with PML truncation does not suffer from the pollution effect. *Comm. Math. Sci.*, 22(7):1761–1816, 2024.
- [38] J. Galkowski and E. A. Spence. Convergence theory for two-level hybrid Schwarz preconditioners for high-frequency Helmholtz problems. *arXiv 2501.11060*, 2025.
- [39] J. Galkowski and E. A. Spence. Sharp preasymptotic error bounds for the Helmholtz h -FEM. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 63(1):1–23, 2025.
- [40] D. Gallistl and D. Peterseim. Stable multiscale Petrov–Galerkin finite element method for high frequency acoustic scattering. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 295:1–17, 2015.
- [41] S. Gong, I. G. Graham, and E. A. Spence. Domain decomposition preconditioners for high-order discretisations of the heterogeneous Helmholtz equation. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 41(3):2139–2185, 2021.
- [42] I. G. Graham, E. A. Spence, and E. Vainikko. Domain decomposition preconditioning for high-frequency Helmholtz problems with absorption. *Math. Comp.*, 86(307):2089–2127, 2017.
- [43] I. G. Graham, E. A. Spence, and J. Zou. Domain Decomposition with local impedance conditions for the Helmholtz equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 58(5):2515–2543, 2020.
- [44] P. Grisvard. *Elliptic Problems in Nonsmooth Domains*. Pitman, Boston, 1985.
- [45] T. Y. Hou and X.-H. Wu. A multiscale finite element method for elliptic problems in composite materials and porous media. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 134(1):169–189, 1997.
- [46] Q. Hu and Z. Li. A novel coarse space applying to the weighted Schwarz method for Helmholtz equations. *arXiv:2402.06905*, 2024.
- [47] J. L. Kazdan. Unique continuation in geometry. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math*, 41(5):667–681, 1988.
- [48] D. Lafontaine, E. A. Spence, and J. Wunsch. For most frequencies, strong trapping has a weak effect in frequency-domain scattering. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 74(10):2025–2063, 2021.

- [49] D. Lafontaine, E.A. Spence, and J. Wunsch. Wavenumber-explicit convergence of the hp -FEM for the full-space heterogeneous Helmholtz equation with smooth coefficients. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 113:59–69, 2022.
- [50] P. Lu, X. Xu, B. Zheng, and J. Zou. Two-level hybrid Schwarz Preconditioners for the Helmholtz Equation with high wave number. *arXiv:2408.07669*, 2024.
- [51] C. Ma, C. Alber, and R. Scheichl. Wavenumber explicit convergence of a multiscale generalized finite element method for heterogeneous Helmholtz problems. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 61(3):1546–1584, 2023.
- [52] C. Ma, C. Alber, and R. Scheichl. Two-level Restricted Additive Schwarz preconditioner based on Multiscale Spectral Generalized FEM for Heterogeneous Helmholtz Problems. *arXiv:2409.06533*, 2024.
- [53] W. McLean. *Strongly Elliptic Systems and Boundary Integral Equations*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [54] J. M. Melenk. *On generalized finite element methods*. PhD thesis, The University of Maryland, 1995.
- [55] J. M. Melenk and S. Sauter. Convergence analysis for finite element discretizations of the Helmholtz equation with Dirichlet-to-Neumann boundary conditions. *Math. Comp*, 79(272):1871–1914, 2010.
- [56] J. M. Melenk and S. Sauter. Wavenumber explicit convergence analysis for Galerkin discretizations of the Helmholtz equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 49:1210–1243, 2011.
- [57] F. Nataf and E. Parolin. Coarse spaces for non-symmetric two-level preconditioners based on local generalized eigenproblems. *arXiv:2404.02758*, 2024.
- [58] F. Nataf, H. Xiang, V. Dolean, and N. Spillane. A coarse space construction based on local Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 33(4):1623–1642, 2011.
- [59] J. Nečas. *Les méthodes directes en théorie des équations elliptiques*. Masson, 1967.
- [60] M. Ohlberger and B. Verfurth. A new heterogeneous multiscale method for the Helmholtz equation with high contrast. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation*, 16(1):385–411, 2018.
- [61] D. Peterseim. Eliminating the pollution effect in Helmholtz problems by local subscale correction. *Mathematics of Computation*, 86(305):1005–1036, 2017.
- [62] U. V. Riss and H.-D. Meyer. Calculation of resonance energies and widths using the complex absorbing potential method. *Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics*, 26(23):4503, 1993.
- [63] S. A. Sauter. A refined finite element convergence theory for highly indefinite Helmholtz problems. *Computing*, 78(2):101–115, 2006.
- [64] A. H. Schatz. An observation concerning Ritz-Galerkin methods with indefinite bilinear forms. *Math. Comp*, 28(128):959–962, 1974.
- [65] A. H. Schatz and J. Wang. Some new error estimates for Ritz-Galerkin methods with minimal regularity assumptions. *Mathematics of Computation*, 65(213):19–27, 1996.
- [66] C. Schwab. *p - and hp - Finite Element Methods. Theory and Applications in Solid and Fluid Mechanics*. Numerical Mathematics and Scientific Computation. Clarendon Press. Oxford., 1998.
- [67] N. Spillane, V. Dolean, P. Hauret, F. Nataf, C. Pechstein, and R. Scheichl. Abstract robust coarse spaces for systems of PDEs via generalized eigenproblems in the overlaps. *Numerische Mathematik*, 126:741–770, 2014.
- [68] P. Stefanov. Approximating resonances with the complex absorbing potential method. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 30(12):1843–1862, 2005.
- [69] A. Toselli and O. Widlund. *Domain Decomposition Methods: Algorithms and Theory*. Springer, 2005.
- [70] P.-H. Tournier, P. Jolivet, V. Dolean, H. S. Aghamiry, S. Operto, and S. Rizzo. 3D finite-difference and finite-element frequency-domain wave simulation with multilevel optimized additive Schwarz domain-decomposition preconditioner: A tool for full-waveform inversion of sparse node data sets. *Geophysics*, 87(5):T381–T402, 2022.
- [71] O. B. Widlund. The development of coarse spaces for domain decomposition algorithms. In *Domain Decomposition methods in science and engineering XVIII*, pages 241–248. Springer, 2009.