

First order operators on shrinking graph-like spaces

Pavel Exner and Olaf Post

Department of Theoretical Physics, NPI, Academy of Sciences, 25068 Řež near Prague, and Doppler Institute, Czech Technical University, Břehová 7, 11519 Prague, Czechia
Email address: exner@ujf.cas.cz

Fachbereich 4 – Mathematik, Universität Trier, 54286 Trier, Germany
Email address: olaf.post@uni-trier.de

Abstract. In this article we discuss the convergence of first order operators on a thickened graph (a graph-like space) towards a similar operator on the underlying metric graph. On the graph-like space, the first order operator is of the form exterior derivative (the gradient) on functions and its adjoint (the negative divergence) on closed 1-forms (irrotational vector fields). Under the assumption that each cross section of the tubular edge neighbourhood is convex, that each vertex neighbourhood is simply connected and under suitable uniformity assumptions (which hold in particular, if the spaces are compact) we establish generalised norm resolvent convergence of the first order operator on the graph-like space towards the one on the metric graph. The square of the first order operator is of Laplace type; on the metric graph, the function (0-form) component is the usual standard (Kirchhoff) Laplacian. A key ingredient in the proof is a uniform Gaffney estimate: such an estimate follows from an equality relating here the divergence operator with all (weak) partial derivatives and a curvature term, together with a (localised) Sobolev trace estimate.

1. Introduction

The problem of relations between the dynamics of a graph and on its ‘fattened’ version has a long history reaching back to the 1950s when Ruedenberg and Scher [RS53] provided a heuristic justification of Pauling’s model of aromatic hydrocarbon molecules [Pau36]. While the idea of a ‘fat graph’ shrinking to its skeleton was intuitively appealing, mathematically the problem appeared to be challenging and it took time before rigorous versions of the Ruedenberg and Scher argument were worked out [KuZ01, RuS01, EP05]; namely the convergence of eigenvalues of the Neumann Laplacian towards the standard Laplacian on the metric graph. A sort of weak resolvent convergence on weighted trees was shown in [Sai00]. Later, the second author developed a concept of generalised norm resolvent convergence in [P06] and applied it to the setting of fattened graphs; these results were extended and generalised into spectral analysis on graph-like spaces and into convergence of operators acting in different Hilbert spaces [P12]. As a consequence of the generalised norm resolvent convergence, one has spectral convergence, see Appendix A for a brief overview. Later, we managed to treat graph dynamics going beyond the simplest (Kirchhoff) vertex coupling (the standard Laplacian) in graphs [EP07, EP09, EP13].

In contrast to the Schrödinger case, Dirac operators on graphs were first considered as a purely mathematical problem [BuT90]. This changed with the advent of graphene in which the electron dynamics, albeit non-relativistic, is effectively described by the massless Dirac equation; for discussion of physical effects like quantum chaos exhibited by Dirac particles on metric graphs see, e.g. [BH03, HW12] and for the non-relativistic limit of such systems [BCT21].

On the other hand, thin tubes supporting Dirac operators which can model, for instance, graphene ribbons have been studied [BBKOB22, BKOB23, EH22], with the particular attention paid to the situation when their perpendicular size shrinks to zero. Little is known, however, about the squeezing limit when the tubes are a part of network with non-trivial branching segments. The problem of convergence (or divergence) of the differential form *spectrum* has been considered in [EgP17], and this article can also be seen as a continuation, showing the convergence of the corresponding *operators*.

The aim of the present note is to analyse such a limit when a network collapses on its graph skeleton. We suppose that the structure supports an abstract Dirac-type operator defined in terms of the exterior derivative and its adjoint; in this framework we establish norm resolvent convergence and estimate the convergence rate. We define formally a metric graph X_0 in Definition 2.2. If X_0 is embedded in \mathbb{R}^m with straight edges (see Figure 1), we may think of a shrinking family of graph-like spaces $(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in]0, \varepsilon_0]}$ for some $\varepsilon_0 \in]0, 1]$ as a (smoothened) $\varepsilon/2$ -neighbourhood of X_0 . Here, “smoothened” means that near the vertices we modify the boundary such that $\partial\tilde{X}_\varepsilon$ is of class C^2 . A graph-like space is basically such a set where each vertex v corresponds to a so-called *vertex neighbourhood* $X_{\varepsilon, v}$ and each edge $e \in E$ to




Figure 1. A metric graph X_0 embedded in \mathbb{R}^2 with a coordinate map $\Psi_e: I_e \rightarrow X$ (cf. Definition 2.2), an edge $X_{0,e}$ of finite length $\ell_e \in]0, \infty[$ and a semi-infinite edge $X_{0,e'}$. The arrows indicate an harmonic vector field \vec{f} ($d_0^* \vec{f} = 0$) on one loop.




Figure 2. *Left:* An embedded associated graph-like space \tilde{X}_ε with an (embedded) edge neighbourhood $\tilde{X}_{\varepsilon,e} \cong [0, (1 - \varepsilon\tilde{\tau})\ell_e] \times [-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2]$ and vertex neighbourhood $X_{\varepsilon,v}$ (cf. Definition 2.11 for the unscaled version describing the decomposition, Definition 2.12 for the shrinking parameter, Definition 2.14 for some uniformity assumptions including the existence of a collar neighbourhood $X_{\varepsilon,v,e}$ of $X_{\varepsilon,v}$ near the touching boundary $\partial_v \tilde{X}_{\varepsilon,e} = \partial_e X_{\varepsilon,v}$ and Definition 2.20 for the embedded case). We also have drawn a harmonic 1-form (vector field). *Right:* the abstract vertex neighbourhood $X_{\varepsilon,e}$ of original length ℓ_e .

an *edge neighbourhood* $\tilde{X}_{\varepsilon,e}$ (see Definition 2.11 and Definition 2.12 for the version with the shrinking parameter ε). The decomposition is made in such a way that a vertex neighbourhood is ε -homothetic with a fixed set $X_{1,v}$, symbolically written as $X_{\varepsilon,v} = \varepsilon X_{1,v}$. The embedded case is easier explained, but technically more complicated; for our main result, we work with edge neighbourhoods $X_{\varepsilon,e}$ of *full* length ℓ_e . Moreover, as we do not assume that our spaces are compact, we need some uniformity assumptions given in Definition 2.14; they are automatically fulfilled if the graph-like space is compact.

Our first main result is as follows:

Theorem A (generalised norm resolvent convergence of first order operators on abstract graph-like spaces). *Let X_0 be a connected metric graph and $(X_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in]0,1]}$ an associated uniform family of graph-like spaces as in Definitions 2.11, 2.12 and 2.14. Moreover, assume that the graph-like space is convex, i.e., that the boundary of the cross sections of the edge parts is convex and each vertex neighbourhood $X_{\varepsilon,v}$ is simply connected (Definition 2.18), then the first order operator D_ε on the graph-like space (restricted to closed 1-forms, i.e., irrotational vector fields) converges in generalised norm resolvent sense to the first order operator D_0 on the metric graph. The convergence rate is of order $O(\varepsilon^{1/2})$.*

Next, we consider a graph-like space \tilde{X}_ε embedded in \mathbb{R}^m as in Figure 2: Let X_0 be a metric graph embedded in \mathbb{R}^m such that the edges correspond to straight line segments. We think of \tilde{X}_ε as being a smoothed version of the $\varepsilon/2$ -neighbourhood of X_0 (for details see Definition 2.20). Our second main

result states that we can consider a “real world” example of an embedded graph-like space as perturbation of the abstract graph-like space:

Theorem B (embedded graph-like space is perturbation of abstract one). *Let X_0 be a connected metric graph embedded in \mathbb{R}^m and let $(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in]0,1]}$ an associated uniform family of embedded convex graph-like spaces. Then the corresponding first order operator \tilde{D}_ε is δ_ε -quasi-unitarily equivalent with the first order operator D_ε on the abstract graph-like space as in the previous theorem.*

As a consequence of Theorems A and B we obtain

Corollary C (generalised norm resolvent convergence of first order operators on embedded spaces). *Under the above assumptions, the first order operator \tilde{D}_ε on the embedded graph-like space converges in generalised norm resolvent sense to the first order operator D_0 on the embedded metric graph.*

Another corollary of our first order convergence is the convergence of the associated Laplacians on 0- and 1-forms $D_\varepsilon^2 = \Delta_\varepsilon = \Delta_\varepsilon^0 \oplus \Delta_\varepsilon^1$ on the graph-like space towards the Laplacian $D_0^2 = \Delta_0 = \Delta_0^0 \oplus \Delta_0^1$ on the metric graph. Here, $\Delta_\varepsilon^0 \geq 0$ is the Neumann Laplacian on X_ε while $\Delta_0^0 \geq 0$ is the standard (“Kirchhoff”) Laplacian on the metric graph X_0 :

Corollary D (generalised norm resolvent convergence of corresponding Laplacians). *Under the above assumption the associated p -form Laplacians on the graph-like space (embedded or not) converge in generalised norm resolvent sense to the p -form Laplacian on the metric graph with convergence rate of order $O(\varepsilon^{1/2})$ for $p = 0$ or $p = 1$.*

As a consequence of generalised norm resolvent convergence we mention convergence of the spectrum and of suitable operator functions such as the heat operators or spectral projections, see Appendix A for more details.

The assumption on the (edge) cross sectional spaces $Y_{\varepsilon,e}$ to be convex implies that $Y_{\varepsilon,e}$ is simply connected; moreover for the vertex neighbourhoods $X_{\varepsilon,v}$ we assume that they are also simply connected. This assumption is very natural, as then, the limit metric graph X_0 is a deformation retract of each graph-like space X_ε for all $\varepsilon > 0$. In particular, the homology groups $H_p(X_\varepsilon)$ of order $p \in \{0, 1\}$ agree for all $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, and in particular, the p -th Betti numbers (dimension of $H_p(X_\varepsilon)$) agree and are given by

$$\dim H_0(X_\varepsilon) = 1, \quad \dim H_1(X_\varepsilon) = |E| - |V| + 1. \quad (1.1)$$

Moreover the indices of D_ε agree for all $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, namely

$$\chi(X_\varepsilon) = \dim H_0(X_\varepsilon) - \dim H_1(X_\varepsilon) = |V| - |E|. \quad (1.2)$$

Note that we have restricted the forms on the graph-like space to closed 1-forms, hence no higher dimensional Betti numbers are involved.

Whether elements in the domain of a first order operator like the divergence fulfil additional regularity, for example being in H^1 , is usually referred to as *regularity*. Even for piecewise smooth domains, the divergence operator restricted to vector fields in H^1 might not be self-adjoint, in particular, if the domain has “reentrant edges” (cf. [BiS87]). A key argument in our analysis is a formula by Grisvard [Gr85, Thm. 3.1.1.1] relating the divergence operator with all weak derivatives and a curvature term (see (2.29a)) for domains with C^2 -boundary. A similar formula is shown in [GaM88] for the form Laplacian on general Riemannian manifolds with boundary. Form Laplacians on convex domains in Riemannian manifolds have also been treated by Mitrea in [Mi01]; and more generally for “almost” convex Lipschitz domains in [TMV05]. Recently, Prokhorov and Filonov [PrF15] proved H^1 -regularity for “weak” convex domains in \mathbb{R}^3 (“weak” here means that the domain is weakly $W_3^2 \cap W_\infty^1$ -diffeomorphic to a convex domain) Lamberti and Zaccaron [LZ23] proved uniform Gaffney estimates in a different spirit: they control the boundary being locally a graph of a function under uniform control. Such estimates are used to get spectral stability of certain Maxwell operators [LZ23]. In [LZ21] they analysed the behaviour of such eigenvalues under domain perturbation (see also the references therein).

It would be natural to consider also Lipschitz domains as for proper ε -neighbourhoods of metric graphs embedded for example in \mathbb{R}^2 , but for any vertex neighbourhood of a vertex of degree larger than 2, there would be an obtuse angle (“reentrant edge” according to [BiS87], see also [Bi87]), and for such angles the Gaffney estimates no longer holds; the domain is only a subset of $H^{1/2}$, see also Costabel and Dauge for examples [CD00].

Structure of the article

In Section 2 we describe the necessary notation (abstract Dirac operators, metric graphs). Moreover, we recall some facts on first order operators on (flat) manifolds; including Kato’s inequality (Lemma 2.6) and the important Gaffney estimate Proposition 2.9 and the key ingredient in our proof, a uniform Gaffney estimate (Theorem 2.10). In Subsection 2.5, we then define the various kinds of graph-like manifolds and recall some known estimates on them. Section 3 contains the proofs of our main results. In Appendix A,

we briefly recall the notion of quasi-unitary equivalence and generalised norm resolvent convergence; as well as a new result suited to first order operators (Proposition A.3).

Acknowledgements

The research was supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 873071. We would like to thank Gilles Carron for pointing our attention to [GaM88] for the geometric meaning of elliptic estimates and Pier Domenico Lamberti and Michele Zaccaron for providing us with further literature and a helpful discussion concerning uniform Gaffney estimates.

2. First order operators on metric graphs and graph-like spaces

2.1. First order operators abstractly

We now recall the notion of exterior derivative in an abstract Hilbert space setting following [P09, Sec. 1.2]

2.1. Definition (abstract exterior derivative and associated first order operator). Assume that

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^0 \oplus \mathcal{H}^1 \quad (2.1)$$

is a Hilbert space. Here, $F = (f, \vec{f}) \in \mathcal{H}$ consists of the 0-form (function) component $f \in \mathcal{H}^0$ resp. the 1-form (vector field) component $\vec{f} \in \mathcal{H}^1$.

Let $\mathcal{D}^0 \subset \mathcal{H}^0$. An operator $d: \mathcal{D}^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^1$ is called an *exterior derivative* if \mathcal{D}^0 is dense in \mathcal{H}^0 and if it is closed as operator $\mathcal{H}^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^1$, i.e., if \mathcal{D}^0 with norm given by $\|f\|_{\mathcal{D}^0}^2 := \|df\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2$ is a Hilbert space.

The associated *first order operator* is defined by

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^0 \oplus \mathcal{D}^1, \quad D: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \quad (2.2)$$

with action in matrix notation (with respect to the decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^0 \oplus \mathcal{H}^1$)

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d^* \\ d & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad DF = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d^* \\ d & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f \\ \vec{f} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} d^* \vec{f} \\ df \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.3)$$

Here, $\mathcal{D}^1 = \text{dom } d^* \subset \mathcal{H}^1$ with norm given by $\|\vec{f}\|_{\mathcal{D}^1}^2 := \|d^* \vec{f}\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|\vec{f}\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2$ is again a Hilbert space.

It is easily seen that D is self-adjoint and that \mathcal{D} becomes a Hilbert space with norm defined by $\|F\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 := \|DF\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \|F\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$. Note that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|F\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 &= \|DF\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \|F\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \\ &= \langle (D^2 + 1)F, F \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle (D \mp i)(D \mp i)F, F \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \|(D \mp i)F\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \quad \text{and} \end{aligned} \quad (2.4a)$$

$$\|F\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2 = \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|\vec{f}\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|d^* \vec{f}\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|df\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 = \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}^0}^2 + \|\vec{f}\|_{\mathcal{D}^1}^2 \quad (2.4b)$$

We define the *Laplacian* associated with D by $\Delta := D^2$.

Also Δ is self-adjoint and acts as

$$\Delta = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta^0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta^1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad \Delta^0 = d^* d \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta^1 = dd^*. \quad (2.5)$$

Moreover, Δ^0 and Δ^1 have the same spectrum (except in 0) including multiplicity (see e.g. [P09, Prop. 1.2]). Recalling the analogy with the usual Dirac operator, one can think of D as of an *abstract Dirac-type operator*. Moreover, $\ker \Delta^0 = \ker d$ and $\ker \Delta^1 = \ker d^*$.

We have the abstract Hodge decomposition

$$\mathcal{H} = \ker D \oplus \overline{\text{ran } d^*} \oplus \overline{\text{ran } d}, \quad \mathcal{H}^0 = \ker d \oplus \overline{\text{ran } d^*} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}^1 = \ker d^* \oplus \overline{\text{ran } d} \quad (2.6)$$

If 0 is isolated in $\sigma(D)$ then the ranges $\text{ran } d$ and $\text{ran } d^*$ are closed in \mathcal{H}^1 and \mathcal{H}^0 and we can omit the closures for the ranges $\text{ran } d^*$ and $\text{ran } d$. An equivalent condition for 0 to be isolated in $\sigma(D)$ is that 0 is isolated in $\sigma(\Delta^0)$ or $\sigma(\Delta^1)$, or in other words

$$\inf(\sigma(\Delta^0) \setminus \{0\}) > 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \inf(\sigma(\Delta^1) \setminus \{0\}) > 0 \quad (2.7)$$

(see [P09, Prop. 1.3]). The *index* of a Dirac operator D is defined once $\dim \ker d$ and $\dim \ker d^*$ are finite, and is given by

$$\text{ind } D := \dim \ker d - \dim \ker d^*. \quad (2.8)$$

2.2. Metric graphs, related Hilbert spaces and operators

As a simple example of how to implement the abstract theory of the preceding subsection we start with first order operators on a metric graph.

2.2. Definition (metric graph). Let X_0 be a connected metric space and E an at most countable set. We say that X_0 is a *metric graph* if

- (a) there is a map $\ell: E \rightarrow [\ell_0, \infty]$ for some $\ell_0 > 0$, called *length function*; without loss of generality, we assume that $\ell_0 = \inf_{e \in E} \ell_e$;
- (b) for each $e \in E$ there is an isometry $\Psi_e: I_e \rightarrow X$ from $I_e := [0, \ell_e]$ (or $I_e := [0, \infty[$ if $\ell_e = \infty$) onto $X_{0,e} := \Psi_e(I_e)$, called (*edge*) *coordinate*; $X_{0,e}$ is called (*metric*) *edge*; the edge coordinate introduces an *orientation* on $X_{0,e}$;
- (c) if $\ell_e < \infty$ we assume that $|\partial X_{0,e}| = 2$ (there are no loop-shaped edges); edges with $\ell_e = \infty$ are called *semi-infinite* edge;
- (d) the coordinates cover X_0 , i.e., $X_0 = \bigcup_{e \in E} X_{0,e}$; and $\overset{\circ}{X}_{0,e} \cap \overset{\circ}{X}_{0,e'} = \emptyset$ whenever $e \neq e'$;
- (e) $V := \bigcup_{e \in E} \partial X_{0,e}$ is discrete in X_0 , called the *vertex set*;
- (f) $E_v := \{e \in E \mid v \in X_{0,e}\}$ is the set of edges *adjacent* with the vertex v ; and $\deg v := |E_v|$ is called the *degree* of v ; we assume here that $\deg v$ is finite (i.e., the graph is locally finite);
- (g) X_0 is endowed with a measure λ such that $\lambda(B) = \sum_{e \in E} \lambda_e(\Psi_e^{-1}(B))$ for all Borel subsets $B \subset X$; here λ_e denotes the Lebesgue measure on $I_e \subset \mathbb{R}$.

We need a positive uniform lower bound on the edge lengths (in case the graph is infinite):

2.3. Definition (uniform metric graph). We say that a metric graph X_0 has *uniformly separated vertices* if

$$\ell_0 := \inf_{e \in E} \ell_e > 0. \quad (2.9)$$

For the sake of brevity we will call such graphs simply *uniform*.

A function $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is entirely determined by its values $f_e := f \circ \Psi_e$ ($e \in E$) and we often simply identify f with the family $(f_e)_{e \in E}$.

According to the edge coordinates, we have a natural (unitary) identification of the Hilbert space

$$\mathbf{L}_2(X_0, \lambda) \cong \bigoplus_{e \in E} \mathbf{L}_2(I_e, \lambda_e) \quad (2.10)$$

via $f \mapsto (f_e)_{e \in E}$. In the sequel, we omit the measure in the \mathbf{L}_2 -spaces, i.e., we simply write $\mathbf{L}_2(X_0)$ instead of $\mathbf{L}_2(X_0, \lambda)$ or $\mathbf{L}_2(I_e)$ instead of $\mathbf{L}_2(I_e, \lambda_e)$.

We now consider the space of square-integrable *forms* on a metric graph given by

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}_0^0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_0^1 \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{H}_0^0 = \mathbf{L}_2(X_0) \quad \text{resp.} \quad \mathcal{H}_0^1 = \mathbf{L}_2(X_0). \quad (2.11)$$

Here, $F = (f, \vec{f}) \in \mathcal{H}_0$ consists of the 0-form (function) component $f \in \mathcal{H}_0^0$ resp. 1-form (vector field) component $\vec{f} \in \mathcal{H}_0^1$. Note that 0- and 1-forms on a metric graph are formally the same due to the one-dimensional character of the edges, they differ in their interpretation (and also in their vertex evaluation).

In order to make a difference in notation we add ds to a 0-form to turn it into a 1-form, i.e., we define

$$(\cdot) ds: \mathcal{H}_0^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0^1, \quad f = (f_e)_e \mapsto f ds = (f_e ds_e)_e \quad (2.12)$$

with inverse given by $\vec{f} \mapsto \vec{f} \cdot ds = (\vec{f}_e \cdot ds_e)_e$. In particular, we have $\vec{f} = (\vec{f} \cdot ds) ds$. We also define the following Sobolev spaces $\mathbf{H}_{\text{dec}}^1(X_0) := \bigoplus_{e \in E} \mathbf{H}^1(I_e)$ of (decoupled) square-integrable functions and first weak derivatives with norm defined by

$$\|f\|_{\mathbf{H}_{\text{dec}}^1(X_0)}^2 := \sum_{e \in E} \|f_e\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(I_e)}^2 = \sum_{e \in E} \left(\int_{I_e} |f'_e(s_e)|^2 ds_e + \int_{I_e} |f_e(s_e)|^2 ds_e \right), \quad (2.13)$$

where ds_e denotes integration with respect to the Lebesgue measure λ (we often omit the subscript $(\cdot)_e$ and simply write s or ds). A function in $\mathbf{H}^1(I_e)$ is continuous, hence it makes sense to speak about function values. Moreover, we define

$$\mathbf{H}^1(X_0) = \{ (f_e)_e \in \mathbf{H}_{\text{dec}}^1(X_0) \mid f \in \mathbf{C}(X_0) \} \quad \text{and} \quad (2.14a)$$

$$\mathbf{H}_{\Sigma}^1(X_0) = \{ (\vec{f}_e)_e \in \mathbf{H}_{\text{dec}}^1(X_0) \mid \sum_{e \in E_v} \vec{f}_e(v) = 0 \}. \quad (2.14b)$$

Here, for functions, each component f_e has the same value $f_e(v)$ at a vertex $v \in X_{0,e}$ for all $e \in E_v$ we denote it $f(v)$. For 1-forms, we define the *oriented evaluation* by

$$\vec{f}_e(v) = \begin{cases} \vec{f}_e(\ell_e) & \text{if } v = \Phi_e(\ell_e), \\ -\vec{f}_e(0) & \text{if } v = \Phi_e(0), \end{cases} \quad (2.15)$$

hence 1-forms see the orientation of a graph when their values at a vertex are evaluated; it “flows” out of the edge at a terminal vertex ($v = \Phi_e(\ell_e)$) and “flows” into the edge at an initial vertex ($v = \Phi_e(0)$).¹

We now define the *exterior derivative* on a metric graph by

$$d_0: \mathcal{D}_0^0 = \mathbf{H}^1(X_0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_0^1 = \mathbf{L}_2(X_0), \quad f \mapsto d_0 f = (f'_e \, ds_e)_{e \in E}. \quad (2.16)$$

2.4. Lemma. *The operator d_0 with domain $\text{dom } d_0 = \mathcal{D}_0^0 = \mathbf{H}^1(X_0)$ is closed as operator in $\mathcal{H}_0^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0^1$. In particular, it is an exterior derivative in the sense of Definition 2.1. Its adjoint is given by*

$$d_0^*: \mathbf{H}_\Sigma^1(X_0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_0^0, \quad \vec{f} \mapsto d_0^* \vec{f} = (-\vec{f}'_e \cdot ds_e)_{e \in E} \quad (2.17)$$

with domain $\text{dom } d_0^* = \mathcal{D}_0^1 = \mathbf{H}_\Sigma^1(X_0)$ given in (2.14b). The index of the associated Dirac-type operator D_0 is the Euler characteristic, i.e., $\text{ind } D_0 = |V| - |E|$.

Proof. The spaces $\mathbf{H}^1(X_0)$ and $\mathbf{H}_\Sigma^1(X_0)$ are both closed subspaces of $\mathbf{H}_{\text{dec}}^1(X_0)$ as the evaluation maps

$$f \mapsto f(v) \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{f} \mapsto \vec{f}'_e(v)$$

are bounded from $\mathbf{H}_\Sigma^1(X_0)$ with norm bounded by $\cosh(\ell_0/2)^{1/2}$ (see e.g. [P16, Sec. 6.1]). The statement about the adjoint follows by a straightforward calculation. The index of D_0 was calculated e.g. in [P09, Sec. 6]. \square

Note that the corresponding Laplace operator on 0-forms is the usual standard (also called Kirchhoff) Laplacian on a metric graph.

2.3. First order operators on Euclidean spaces with boundary

Before fixing the corresponding setting of first order operators on graph-like spaces, we briefly review some general facts about 1-forms and first order operators. Let X be a flat Riemannian manifold of dimension $m \geq 2$ with boundary ∂X of class C^2 (or $C^{1,1}$); an example is a closed subset of \mathbb{R}^m with smooth boundary. We use the language of manifolds here and employ the symbol g for the flat metric on X (i.e., g is locally Euclidean) for fixing some scaling arguments later. The main reason is that restricting to subsets of \mathbb{R}^m would require some technical details for graph-like spaces arising as neighbourhoods of metric graphs X_0 embedded in \mathbb{R}^m , hence we formulate this case as a perturbation of the abstract one, see Theorem B.

We write \mathring{X} for the interior of X , hence $X = \mathring{X} \cup \partial X$. Moreover, for a subset X' of X , we define the *internal* boundary (i.e., the boundary in the topology of X) by

$$\mathring{\partial} X' := \overline{X'} \cap \overline{X} \setminus \overline{X'} \quad (2.18)$$

where $\overline{(\cdot)}$ is the closure in X .

For integration with respect to the induced measure (Lebesgue measure resp. hypersurface measure) we write dX resp. $d\partial X$. The space of square-integrable (classes of) functions is denoted by $\mathbf{L}_2(X)$. Moreover, let $TX := X \times (\mathbb{C}^n)^*$ the (complexified) cotangent bundle; a 1-form is now a section $\vec{u}: X \rightarrow T^*X$

For some aspects of abstract boundary value theory with examples on manifolds, see also [P07].

We write dX resp. $d\partial X$ for the measure with respect to the corresponding natural measure on X resp. ∂X . Denote by

$$d: \mathbf{H}^1(X) \longrightarrow \mathbf{L}_2(T^*X) \quad (2.19)$$

the exterior derivative, where $\mathbf{H}^1(X)$ is the space of weakly differentiable functions with derivative in \mathbf{L}_2 with norm (of Sobolev-type) defined by $\|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(X)}^2 := \|du\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*X)}^2 + \|u\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(X)}^2$. The formal adjoint of d is the (negative) divergence operator

$$\delta: \mathbf{H}^\delta(T^*X) \longrightarrow \mathbf{L}_2(X), \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{H}^\delta(T^*X) := \{ \vec{w} \in \mathbf{L}_2(T^*X) \mid \delta \vec{w} \in \mathbf{L}_2(X) \}. \quad (2.20)$$

Here, $w = \delta \vec{w} \in \mathbf{L}_2(X)$ if

$$\int_X w \bar{\varphi} \, dX = \int_X \langle \vec{w}, d\varphi \rangle_{T^*X} \, dX$$

holds for all smooth functions $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(X)$ with compact support in \mathring{X} . From the divergence theorem (for weakly differentiable functions) and

$$\delta(u\vec{w}) = u(\delta \vec{w}) - \langle du, \vec{w} \rangle_{T^*X}$$

¹We use a different sign convention for forms (or for derivatives $f'_e(v)$, see later) than in [BeK13] or [Ku04]. One reason is that with this convention, an integration by parts formula holds with the same signs as on intervals or manifolds, see e.g. [P12, Eq. (2.11)]; also we prefer to have the Robin term on metric graphs to have the “correct” (+)-sign, cf. [Ku04, Thm. 9].

we conclude the following partial integration formula

$$\int_X \langle du, \vec{w} \rangle_{T^*X} dX = \int_X u(\delta \vec{w}) dX + \int_{\partial X} u(\vec{w} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\partial X}) d\partial X \quad (2.21)$$

for all $u \in H^1(X)$ and $\vec{w} \in H^\delta(T^*X)$ in the distributional sense, where $\mathbf{n}_{\partial X}$ denotes the outwards normal vector on ∂X and $\vec{w} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\partial X}$ the normal component of \vec{w} on ∂X . Here, $\vec{w}(\mathbf{n}_{\partial X}) \in H^{-1/2}(\partial X)$. Now, from partial integration one can see that

$$\text{dom } d^* = \{ \vec{w} \in H^\delta(T^*X) \mid \vec{w}(\mathbf{n}_{\partial X}) = 0 \}, \quad (2.22)$$

i.e., the 1-form has only tangential components on ∂X .

Restriction to irrotational vector fields. As on a metric graph there is no counterpart of a 2-form, it turns out that we have to restrict ourselves to 1-forms with vanishing exterior derivative. In the language of three-dimensional vector fields, the exterior derivative is the curl operator and such vector fields are called *irrotational*.

Denote by $d\vec{w} = d^1\vec{w}: X \rightarrow \wedge^2 T^*X$ the exterior derivative of the 1-form \vec{w} . We assume that $d^1\vec{w} \in L_2(\wedge^2 T^*X)$, i.e., there is $\beta = d^1\vec{w} \in L_2(\wedge^2 T^*X)$ such that

$$\int_X \langle \beta, \eta \rangle_{\wedge^2 T^*X} dX = \int_X \langle \vec{w}, \delta^1 \eta \rangle_{T^*X} dX$$

holds for all smooth 2-forms $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\wedge^2 T^*X)$ with compact support in $\overset{\circ}{X}$, where δ^1 denotes the formal adjoint of d^1 . For $m \in \{2, 3\}$ and $X \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, the results are stated in [GR86, Ch. I] but the generalisation to arbitrary $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is straightforward (note that $\dim \wedge^2 T_x^*X = \binom{m}{2} = m(m-1)/2$). Denote by

$$H^{d^1}(T^*X) = \{ \vec{w} \in L_2(T^*X) \mid d^1\vec{w} \in L_2(\wedge^2 T^*X) \} \quad (2.23)$$

the largest space on which d^1 is defined in the L_2 -sense. We now define the Hilbert space of 1-forms on which we perform our abstract analysis as in Subsection 2.1: We set

$$\mathcal{H}^1 := H^{d^1=0}(T^*X) := \{ \vec{w} \in H^{d^1}(T^*X) \mid d^1\vec{w} = 0 \}. \quad (2.24)$$

It can be seen that \mathcal{H}^1 is indeed a closed subspace of $L_2(T^*X)$. Its orthogonal complement consists of “fluxless knots” (in the terminology of [CDG02]); they belong to $\ker \delta$ as they are “divergence free”.

Regularity of first order operator domains. We now turn to some delicate facts about the space

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\delta, d^1}(T^*X) &:= H^\delta(T^*X) \cap H^{d^1}(T^*X) \\ &= \{ \vec{w} \in L_2(T^*X) \mid \delta \vec{w} \in L_2(X), d^1\vec{w} \in L_2(\wedge^2 T^*X) \} \end{aligned}$$

and its restriction

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\delta, d^1=0}(T^*X) &:= H^\delta(T^*X) \cap H^{d^1=0}(T^*X) \\ &= \{ \vec{w} \in L_2(T^*X) \mid \delta \vec{w} \in L_2(X), d^1\vec{w} = 0 \} \subset \mathcal{H}^1. \end{aligned}$$

What is now vital for our analysis is that if $\partial X \neq \emptyset$ then none of the above spaces is a subset of $H^1(T^*X)$, where $H^1(T^*X)$ consists of $\vec{w} \in L_2(T^*X)$ such that its covariant derivative $\nabla \vec{w}$ is in $L_2(T^*X^{\otimes 2})$ (for the sake of brevity, $T^*X^{\otimes 2} = T^*X \otimes T^*X$) with norm given by

$$\|\vec{w}\|_{H^1(T^*X)}^2 := \|\nabla \vec{w}\|_{L_2(T^*X^{\otimes 2})}^2 + \|\vec{w}\|_{L_2(T^*X)}^2 \quad (2.25)$$

If $X \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, then $\|\vec{w}\|_{H^1(T^*X)}^2$ is just the component-wise H^1 -norm of \vec{w} .

2.5. Lemma. *We have*

$$\|\delta \vec{w}\|_{L_2(X)}^2 \leq m \sum_{j=1}^m m \|\partial_j \vec{w}_j\|_{L_2(X)}^2 \leq m \|\nabla \vec{w}\|_{L_2(T^*X^{\otimes 2})}^2$$

where $m = \dim X$ and $\vec{w} = \sum_{j=1}^m \vec{w}_j dx_j$. In particular, $H^\delta(T^*X) \subset H^1(T^*X)$.

Proof. Fix an orthonormal frame in X (as X is globally flat, such an orthonormal frame exists globally). Let $(\vec{w}_j)_{j=1, \dots, m}$ be the coordinates of \vec{w} with respect to this orthonormal frame. Then we have $\delta \vec{w} = -\sum_{j=1}^m \partial_j \vec{w}_j$ hence

$$|\delta \vec{w}|^2 = \left| \sum_{j=1}^m (-1) \cdot \partial_j \vec{w}_j \right|^2 \leq m \sum_{j=1}^m |\partial_j \vec{w}_j|^2$$

using Cauchy-Schwarz and the result follows by integrating over X . \square

Kato's inequality. We state a useful estimate (and give its simple proof) in order to “recycle” our scalar estimates already done on graph-like spaces (see e.g. [P12, Ch. 6]); it is sometimes also called Kato's inequality, it was already used in [AP21, Prop. 3.9]:

2.6. Lemma (Kato's inequality). *Let E be a complex vector bundle over X with a (sesquilinear bundle) metric h and a metric covariant derivative ∇ . Let $\omega \in \mathbf{H}^1(T^*X)$ then $|\omega|_h \in \mathbf{H}^1(X)$ and*

$$|d|\omega|_h|_g \leq |\nabla\omega|_h, \quad (2.26)$$

where $|\omega|_h = \sqrt{h(\omega, \omega)}: X \rightarrow [0, \infty[$ and where $|\cdot|_g$ is the induced norm on T^*X from the metric on X .

Proof. Let $\xi \in T_x X$ be a tangent vector. As ∇ is a metric covariant derivative, we have

$$d(h(\omega, \omega))(\xi) = h(\nabla_\xi \omega, \omega) + h(\omega, \nabla_\xi \omega) = 2 \operatorname{Re} h(\nabla_\xi \omega, \omega),$$

hence we have

$$d|\omega|_h(\xi) = d\sqrt{h(\omega, \omega)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{h(\omega, \omega)}} \operatorname{Re} h(\nabla_\xi \omega, \omega) \leq |\nabla_\xi \omega|_h$$

using Cauchy-Schwarz for the inequality. Taking now the pointwise operator norm in T^*X (denoted by $|\cdot|_g$) we obtain the desired inequality. \square

The Kato inequality can be used as follows:

2.7. Corollary. *Let E , h and ∇ be as before. Suppose that $X_1 \subset X_2 \subset X$ and that there are $C, C' \geq 0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(X_1, g)}^2 \leq C' \|du\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*X_2, g)}^2 + C \|u\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(X_2, g)}^2$$

holds for all $u \in \mathbf{H}^1(X_2)$, then we have

$$\|\omega\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(E|_{X_1}, h)}^2 \leq C' \|\nabla\omega\|_{\mathbf{L}_2((T^*X \otimes E)|_{X_2}, g \otimes h)}^2 + C \|\omega\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(E|_{X_2}, g)}^2$$

for all $\omega \in \mathbf{H}^1(E, h)$.

2.4. Regularity and Gaffney estimates

Second fundamental form. For the Gaffney estimates, we need to define the second fundamental form $\Pi_{\partial X}$ of ∂X in X : recall that $n_{\partial X}: \partial X \rightarrow TX$ is the normal vector field, and that $T_x X = T_x \partial X \oplus \mathbf{C}n_{\partial X}(x)$. We define now the second fundamental form $\Pi_{\partial X}: T\partial X \times T\partial X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by²

$$x \mapsto \Pi_{\partial X, x}(\xi, \eta) = g_x(\nabla_\xi n_{\partial X, x}, \eta) \quad (2.27)$$

for $\xi, \eta \in T_x \partial X$, where ∇ is the (Levi-Civita) covariant derivative on TX . It can be seen that $\nabla_\xi n_{\partial X} \in T\partial X$; actually, $\Pi_{\partial X}$ is symmetric, hence it is real-valued. In the next definition, we extend the second fundamental form to 1-forms on ∂X .

We also define the integral over the fundamental form on the boundary as

$$S_{\partial X}(\vec{u}, \vec{w}) := \int_{\partial X} \Pi_{\partial X}(\iota^* \vec{u}, \iota^* \vec{w}) \, d\partial X \quad (2.28)$$

for $\vec{u}, \vec{w} \in \mathbf{H}^1(T^*X)$, where $\iota: \partial X \hookrightarrow X$ is the canonical embedding.

We need a statement on the fundamental form on spaces which are (locally) a product:

2.8. Lemma. *Assume that X in a neighbourhood of $x \in \partial X$ is isometric to a neighbourhood of (s, y) in $]0, \ell_0[\times Y$, where $y \in \partial Y$, and where Y is a compact convex manifold, i.e., we have $\Pi_{\partial Y} \geq 0$ on ∂Y then $\Pi_{\partial X, x} \geq 0$.*

Proof. The claim follows from a straightforward calculation using definition (2.27). \square

Gaffney estimates. We now state the following result following from [Gr85, Thm. 3.1.1.1] adapted to our needs:

2.9. Proposition. *Denote by $d: \mathbf{H}^1(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^1$ the exterior derivative on functions into the closed forms (irrotational vector fields, cf. (2.24)), then we have*

(a) *for $\vec{w} \in \mathbf{H}^1(T^*X)$ with $d^1 w = 0$ and $\vec{w}(n_{\partial X}) = 0$ on ∂X we have*

$$\|d^* \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(X)}^2 = \|\nabla \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*X \otimes \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + S_{\partial X}(\vec{w}, \vec{w}), \quad (2.29a)$$

where $S_{\partial X}$ is the integral over the second fundamental form of ∂X in X , cf. (2.28).

²We use the sign convention that characterises convexity of ∂X in X by $\Pi_{\partial X} \geq 0$.

$$(b) \quad \mathcal{D}^1 := \text{dom } d^* = \{ \vec{w} \in \mathbf{L}_2(T^*X) \mid \delta \vec{w} \in \mathbf{L}_2(X), d^1 \vec{w} = 0, \vec{w}|_{\partial X} = 0 \} \quad (2.29b)$$

is a subset of $\mathbf{H}^1(T^*X)$. Moreover, the so-called Gaffney estimate holds, i.e.

$$\|\nabla \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*X^{\otimes 2})}^2 \leq C_{\text{Gaffney}} \|\vec{w}\|_{\mathcal{D}^1}^2 \quad (2.29c)$$

holds for all $\vec{w} \in \mathcal{D}^1$, where

$$C_{\text{Gaffney}} = \begin{cases} 1, & \partial X \text{ is convex in } X, \text{ i.e., } \Pi_{\partial X} \geq 0, \\ \max\{2, 8(\kappa_{\partial X}^-)^2\}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2.29d)$$

and where $\kappa_{\partial X}^-$ is the supremum of the absolute value of the minimal negative principal curvature of ∂X , i.e., we have

$$\kappa_{\partial X}^- := \sup_{x \in \partial X} \sup_{\xi \in T_x^* X \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\max\{-\Pi_{\partial X}(\xi, \xi), 0\}}{|\vec{w}|_g^2}. \quad (2.29e)$$

Proof. (a) is stated in [Gr85, Thm. 3.1.1.1] (with opposite sign convention for the second fundamental form); here we adapted the equality to the case when $d^1 \vec{w} = 0$ (this gives the term $\|\nabla \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(T^*X^{\otimes 2})}^2$), and the boundary term simplifies to the integral over the second fundamental form as $\vec{w}|_{\partial X} = 0$ on ∂X .

(b) now follows from a trace estimate. Let Z be a submanifold of ∂X of dimension $m - 1$ such that $\Pi_{\partial Z} \upharpoonright_{\partial X \setminus Z} \leq 0$, and let X' be a collar neighbourhood of Z in X of width $a_0 > 0$; such a neighbourhood exists as long as a_0 is smaller than the inverse of the maximal curvature $\kappa_{\partial X}^-$ on Z . In this case we have

$$\|u\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(Z)}^2 \leq a \|du\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*X')}^2 + \frac{2}{a} \|u\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(X')}^2.$$

for all $a \in]0, a_0]$ and $u \in \mathbf{H}^1(X')$. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*X^{\otimes 2})}^2 &= \|d^* \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(X)}^2 - S_{\partial X}(\vec{w}, \vec{w}) \\ &\leq \|d^* \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(X)}^2 + \kappa_{\partial X}^- \|\vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*Z)}^2 \\ &\leq \|d^* \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(X)}^2 + \kappa_{\partial X}^- a \|\nabla \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2((T^*X')^{\otimes 2})}^2 + \frac{2\kappa_{\partial X}^-}{a} \|v\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*X')}^2 \\ &\leq \|d^* \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(X)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2((T^*X')^{\otimes 2})}^2 + 4(\kappa_{\partial X}^-)^2 \|\vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*X')}^2 \end{aligned}$$

using the previous scalar Sobolev trace estimate together with Corollary 2.7 and choosing $a = \min\{a_0, 1/(2\kappa_{\partial X}^-)\}$ for the last estimate. Now, we can bring the 1/2-term on the left hand side, and the result follows from multiplying the inequality by 2. \square

Homothetically scaling spaces. We now provide some scaling arguments: For a manifold X with Riemannian metric g , we write

$$\varepsilon X \quad \text{for the Riemannian manifold } (X, \varepsilon^2 g), \quad (2.30)$$

i.e., we change the length scale by a global factor $\varepsilon > 0$. We call εX the ε -scaled space. Here, ε can be thought of as a *length scale parameter*, so the integration with respect to the volume form scale with ε^m , and derivatives scale with ε^{-1} . In particular, one can check that the following scaling properties hold:

$$\|u\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(\varepsilon X)}^2 = \varepsilon^m \|u\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(X)}^2, \quad \|\vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*(\varepsilon X))}^2 = \varepsilon^{m-2} \|\vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*X)}^2 \quad (2.31a)$$

$$\|du\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*(\varepsilon X))}^2 = \varepsilon^{m-2} \|du\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*X)}^2, \quad \|\delta_\varepsilon \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(\varepsilon X)}^2 = \varepsilon^{m-2} \|\delta \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(X)}^2 \quad (2.31b)$$

$$\|\nabla \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*X^{\otimes 2})}^2 = \varepsilon^{m-2} \|\nabla \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2(T^*X^{\otimes 2})}^2, \quad (2.31c)$$

Here, δ_ε is the formal adjoint of d with respect to the metric $\varepsilon^2 g$. For the second fundamental form and its integral term we have

$$\Pi_{\varepsilon X} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \Pi_{\partial X} \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\varepsilon X}(\vec{w}, \vec{w}) = \varepsilon^{m-2} S_{\partial X}(\vec{w}, \vec{w}) \quad (2.32)$$

i.e., the second fundamental form scales as the inverted length, while the integrated term scales with the factor ε^{m-2} . Note that (2.29a) tells us that all three terms therein for a homothetic space εX scale with the same factor ε^{m-2} , a key observation for the proof of the next result:

2.10. Theorem (a uniform Gaffney estimate). *Assume that X_ε is a closed subset of \mathbb{R}^m with C^2 -boundary ∂X_ε such that the second fundamental form is non-positive only on a subset $Z_\varepsilon := \partial X'_\varepsilon \cap \partial X_\varepsilon$ of ∂X_ε (i.e., $\Pi_{\partial X_\varepsilon} \upharpoonright_{Z_\varepsilon} \leq 0$) where $X'_\varepsilon \subset X_\varepsilon$ is an ε -homothetic closed subset ($X'_\varepsilon = \varepsilon X'_1$), then*

$$\|\nabla \vec{w}\|_{\mathbf{L}_2((T^*X_\varepsilon)^{\otimes 2})}^2 \leq C_{\text{Gaffney}} \|\vec{w}\|_{\mathcal{D}^1}^2 \quad (2.33)$$

holds for all $\vec{w} \in \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^1$, where C_{Gaffney} is as in (2.29d) with $\kappa_{\partial X_1}^-$ being the supremum of the absolute value of the negative principal curvatures of the unscaled boundary part $Z_1 \subset \partial X_1$ of X_1 .

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla \vec{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}_2((T^*X_\varepsilon)^{\otimes 2})}^2 &= \|d^* \vec{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}_2(X_\varepsilon)}^2 - S_{\partial X_\varepsilon}(\vec{w}, \vec{w}) \\ &\leq \|d^* \vec{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}_2(X_\varepsilon)}^2 - S_{Z_\varepsilon}(\vec{w}, \vec{w}) = \|d^* \vec{w}\|_{\mathbb{L}_2(X_\varepsilon)}^2 - \varepsilon^{m-2} S_{Z_1}(\vec{w}, \vec{w}). \end{aligned}$$

using only the parts of the second fundamental form which are positive in the estimate and the scaling behaviour (2.32). Now, we estimate the last unscaled boundary integral $S_{Z_1}(\vec{w}, \vec{w})$ as in the proof of Proposition 2.9 (b) and then use the scaling (2.31b)–(2.31c) in order to obtain the desired estimate. \square

2.5. Graph-like spaces, related Hilbert spaces and operators

Let us first define graph-like spaces abstractly. One reason is that a specific model we have in mind, a smoothened ε -neighbourhood of a metric graph X_0 embedded in \mathbb{R}^m will have edge neighbourhoods $X_{\varepsilon,e}$ not of full edge length ℓ_e of the underlying metric edge $X_{0,e}$, as the vertex neighbourhoods $X_{\varepsilon,v}$ need some space, see also Figure 2. We consider this case as a perturbation of an abstractly defined graph-like space, where the edge neighbourhoods have full edge length ℓ_e , see Theorem B.

Having the above in mind, we define a family of ε -dependent spaces X_ε abstractly as Riemannian manifolds and assume that it is flat, i.e., the metric as map from a coordinate patch into the space of positive sesquilinear forms on TX is constant. In order to simplify the model, we also assume that the parameter ε only enters in the metric, i.e., we think of X_ε as (X, g_ε) . We have given a similar metric description of a graph-like space in [PS21, Def. 4.1]:

2.11. Definition (graph-like space). Let X_0 be a connected metric graph as in Definition 2.2. We say that an m -dimensional Riemannian manifold X_1 ($m \geq 2$) is an (abstract) graph-like space associated with X_0 if

- (a) there is a decomposition $X_1 = \bigcup_{e \in E} X_{1,e} \cup \bigcup_{v \in V} X_{1,v}$, and

$$\partial_e X_{1,v} = \partial_v X_{1,e} := X_{1,e} \cap X_{1,v} \neq \emptyset$$

if and only if $e \in E_v$, and all other sets $X_{1,e}$ and $X_{1,v}$ are disjoint;

- (b) each $X_{1,e}$ is isometric with $I_e \times Y_{1,e}$ where $I_e = [0, \ell_e]$ as in the metric graph and where $Y_{1,e}$ is a compact and connected Riemannian manifold of dimension $m - 1$, called (edge) cross sectional or (edge) transversal space;
- (c) the boundary ∂X_1 is of class C^2 ;
- (d) as measure on a graph-like space X_ε we choose the natural volume measure of the Riemannian manifold.

We denote by $\overset{\circ}{X}_1$ the interior of X_1 and by ∂X_1 its boundary.

2.12. Definition (shrinking family of graph-like spaces). Let X_1 be a graph-like space associated with a metric graph X_0 . We say that $(X_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon$ ($\varepsilon \in]0, 1]$) is a shrinking family of graph-like spaces associated with X_0 if

- (a) each X_ε is a graph-like space associated with X_0 in the sense of Definition 2.11; we call X_1 the unscaled version of the family;
- (b) each vertex neighbourhood $X_{\varepsilon,v}$ and each cross section $Y_{\varepsilon,e}$ is ε -homothetic, i.e., $X_{\varepsilon,v} = \varepsilon X_{1,v}$ and $Y_{\varepsilon,e} = \varepsilon Y_{1,e}$ (see (2.30) for the notation).

From the space decomposition (disjoint up to sets of measure zero) we conclude the following decomposition

$$\mathbb{L}_2(X_\varepsilon) = \bigoplus_{e \in E} \mathbb{L}_2(X_{\varepsilon,e}) \oplus \bigoplus_{v \in V} \mathbb{L}_2(X_{\varepsilon,v}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{L}_2(X_{\varepsilon,e}) \cong \mathbb{L}_2(I_e, \mathbb{L}_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})) \cong \mathbb{L}_2(I_e) \otimes \mathbb{L}_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e}) \quad (2.34)$$

of the space of functions $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon = \mathbb{L}_2(X_\varepsilon)$, so the squared norm of the latter space can be written as

$$\|u\|_{\mathbb{L}_2(X_{\varepsilon,e})}^2 = \int_{I_e} \|u_e(s, \cdot)\|_{\mathbb{L}_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})}^2 ds. \quad (2.35)$$

For $u \in \mathbb{L}_2(X_\varepsilon)$, we write u_e and u_v for the component on (restriction onto) $X_{\varepsilon,e}$ and $X_{\varepsilon,v}$.

Let $\mathbf{H}^1(X_\varepsilon)$ be the space of (classes of) functions which are square-integrable with square-integrable weak derivatives. As exterior derivative, we choose

$$d_\varepsilon: \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^0 = \mathbf{H}^1(X_\varepsilon) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^1 = \mathbf{H}^{d^1=0}(T^*X_\varepsilon) \quad u \mapsto d_\varepsilon u, \quad (2.36)$$

where $d_\varepsilon u$ is the usual exterior derivative with values in the cotangent bundle T^*X_ε . Here, the exterior derivative maps into the closed subspace $\mathbf{H}^{d^1=0}(T^*X_\varepsilon)$ of $\mathbb{L}_2(T^*X_\varepsilon)$, consisting of closed forms (irrotational vector fields, see (2.24)).

We have

$$d_\varepsilon u_e = u'_e ds_e + d_\varepsilon^\perp u_e, \quad (2.37)$$

where, u'_e denotes the derivative with respect to the first (longitudinal) variable. Moreover, denote by $\mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}$ the normalised (constant) eigenfunction of the Neumann Laplacian $(d^\perp)^* d^\perp$ on $Y_{\varepsilon,e}$.

For the 1-forms, we need a subspace $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^1$ of $L_2(T^* X_\varepsilon)$: We also have

$$\vec{u}_e = \vec{u}_e^\parallel ds_e + \vec{u}_e^\perp \quad \text{where} \quad \vec{u}_e^\parallel := \vec{u}_e \cdot ds_e \quad (2.38)$$

is the longitudinal part of \vec{u}_e . Moreover, we have

$$d_\varepsilon^* \vec{u}_e = -(\vec{u}_e^\parallel)' + (d_\varepsilon^\perp)^* \vec{u}_e^\perp. \quad (2.39)$$

On the boundary of X_ε , the normal component of \vec{u} vanishes; in particular, on $X_{\varepsilon,e}$, the normal component is \vec{u}_e^\perp and hence it vanishes.

2.13. Lemma. *The operator d_ε defined in (2.36) is an abstract exterior derivative in the sense of Definition 2.1. We call the associated Dirac-type operator D_ε with domain*

$$\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^0 \oplus \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^1 = L_2(X_\varepsilon) \oplus \text{dom } d_\varepsilon^* \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^1 = L_2(X_\varepsilon) \oplus \mathbf{H}^{d^1=0}(T^* X_\varepsilon).$$

The index of the associated Dirac operator is the Euler characteristic of the underlying graph, i.e., $\text{ind } D_\varepsilon = |V| - |E|$.

Proof. For the index, note that X_ε is homotopy equivalent with the underlying metric graph X_0 , hence their indices agree. \square

We later need some uniformity assumptions in our analysis; we state it for the unscaled graph-like space X_1 :

2.14. Definition (uniform (family of) graph-like space(s)). We say that a graph-like space X_1 associated with a metric graph X_0 is *uniform* if the underlying metric graph is uniform (i.e. (2.9) holds) and if

- (a) the $(m-1)$ -dimensional volume

$$|Y_{1,e}| = |Y_1| \quad (2.40a)$$

is independent of $e \in E$, where Y_1 is some prototypic³ cross sectional space;

- (b) there is $\tau \in]0, 1]$ such that $\partial_e X_{1,v}$ (isometric with $Y_{1,e}$ by Definition 2.11 (b)) has an $\tau \ell_e$ -collar neighbourhood $X_{1,v,e}$ inside $X_{1,v}$, i.e., $X_{1,v,e}$ is isometric with $[0, \tau \ell_e] \times Y_{1,e}$ (see Figure 2 for the ε -scaled version);

- (c) the inverse isoperimetric constant⁴

$$C_{\text{isoper}} := \sup_{v \in V} \frac{|X_{1,v}|_m}{|\overset{\circ}{\partial} X_{1,v}|_{m-1}} < \infty \quad (2.40b)$$

of the vertex neighbourhoods is uniformly bounded from above (where $|\cdot|_m$ denotes the m -dimensional Hausdorff measure);

- (d) we have

$$\lambda_2^{\text{vx}} := \inf_{v \in V} \lambda_2(\Delta_{X_{1,v}}) > 0, \quad (2.40c)$$

where $\lambda_2(\Delta_{X_{1,v}})$ is the second (first non-zero) eigenvalue of the Neumann Laplacian on $X_{1,v}$;

- (e) the negative curvature of $\partial X_{1,v}$ is uniformly bounded, i.e.,

$$\kappa_{\max} := \sup_{v \in V} \max\{-\Pi_{\partial X_{1,v}}, 0\} < \infty; \quad (2.40d)$$

- (f) we have

$$\lambda_2^{\text{ed}} := \inf_{e \in E} \lambda_2(\Delta_{Y_{1,e}}) > 0, \quad (2.40e)$$

where $\lambda_2(\Delta_{Y_{1,e}})$ is the second (first non-zero) eigenvalue of the Neumann Laplacian on $Y_{1,e}$.

We say that a shrinking family of graph-like spaces $(X_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in]0, 1]}$ associated with X_0 is *uniform* if the unscaled version X_1 of the graph-like family is uniform in the above sense.

³We make this assumption in order to avoid technical complications with *weighted* Kirchhoff conditions used e.g. in [EP09].

⁴Note that $\overset{\circ}{\partial} X_{1,v} = \partial X_{1,v} \cap \overset{\circ}{X}_\varepsilon$, consists of $\deg v$ many boundary parts of $\partial X_{1,v}$ *not* belonging to ∂X_1 , i.e., we only consider the boundary of ∂X_1 in $\overset{\circ}{X}_\varepsilon$. In particular, we have $|\overset{\circ}{\partial} X_{1,v}|_{m-1} = (\deg v)|Y_1|_{m-1}$ due to (2.40a).

Some estimates on uniform families of shrinking graph-like spaces. We now state some results from [P12, Ch. 6]. We first use the following decomposition for finite length edges: Denote by $X_{\varepsilon,e,v}$ the subset of $X_{\varepsilon,e}$ isometric with $[0, \ell_e/2] \times Y_{\varepsilon,e}$ touching $X_{\varepsilon,v}$ (we cut the edge neighbourhood $X_{\varepsilon,e}$ into two halves). For semi-infinite edges we just set $X_{\varepsilon,e,v} = X_{\varepsilon,e}$. Then we have the decomposition

$$X_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{v \in V} X_{\varepsilon,v}^\#, \quad \text{where} \quad X_{\varepsilon,v}^\# = X_{\varepsilon,v} \cup \bigcup_{e \in E_v} X_{\varepsilon,e,v} \quad (2.41)$$

into star-shaped *enlarged* vertex neighbourhoods $X_{\varepsilon,v}^\#$; we also set $u_{v^\#} := u|_{X_{\varepsilon,v}^\#}$.

For a Riemannian manifold M , we denote by

$$\int_M u = \frac{1}{|M|} \int_M u \, dM \quad (2.42)$$

the *average value* of u on M . Note that for ε -homothetic manifolds we have $\int_{\varepsilon M} u = \int_M u$ (used for the two average values in the following lemma):

The next lemma is [P12, Prop. 5.1.3]:

2.15. Lemma. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in E_v} |\partial_\varepsilon X_{\varepsilon,v}| \left| \int_{\partial_\varepsilon X_{1,v}} u_v - \int_{X_{1,v}} u_v \right|^2 &\leq \varepsilon \sum_{v \in V} \left(\tau \min\{\ell_0, 1\} + \frac{2}{\tau \ell_0 \lambda_2(X_{1,v})} \right) \|d_\varepsilon u_v\|_{L_2(T^*X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon C_{\text{vx col}} \sum_{v \in V} \|d_\varepsilon u_v\|_{L_2(T^*X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_{\text{vx col}} := \tau + \frac{2}{\tau \ell_0 \lambda_2^{\text{yx}}}. \quad (2.43)$$

A proof of the next lemma can be found in [P12, Lem. 6.3.6] (using here alternatively the optimal estimate for the Sobolev trace estimate $\mathbf{H}^1(X_{\varepsilon,e,v}) \rightarrow L_2(\partial_\varepsilon X_{\varepsilon,e})$; the squared norm of the corresponding operator is $\coth(\ell_e/2)$).

2.16. Lemma. *For a uniformly shrinking family of graph-like spaces we have*

$$\|u_v\|_{L_2(X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2 \leq C_{\text{vx}}(v, \varepsilon) \|u_{v^\#}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(X_{\varepsilon,v}^\#)}^2,$$

for all $u \in \mathbf{H}^1(X_{\varepsilon,v}^\#)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\text{vx}}(v, \varepsilon) := 4 \max_{e \in E_v} \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\lambda_2(X_{1,v})} + \frac{\varepsilon^2 |X_{1,v}|_m}{|\partial X_{1,v}|_{m-1}} \left(\tau \min\{\ell_e, 1\} + \frac{2}{\tau \ell_e \lambda_2(X_{1,v})} \right) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\varepsilon |X_{1,v}|_m}{|\partial X_{1,v}|_{m-1}} \coth(\ell_e/2) \right) \quad (2.44a) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $C_{\text{vx}}(v, \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon C_{\text{vx}}$ for $\varepsilon \in]0, 1]$ where

$$C_{\text{vx}} := 4 \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_2^{\text{yx}}} + C_{\text{isoper}}(C_{\text{vx col}} + \coth(\ell_0/2)) \right) \quad (2.44b)$$

Note that the convergence rate of $C_{\text{vx}}(\varepsilon, v)$ in Lemma 2.16 cannot be better than ε as $u_{v^\#} = \mathbb{1}_{X_{\varepsilon,v}^\#}$ shows:

$$\frac{\|u_v\|_{L_2(X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2}{\|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(X_{\varepsilon,v}^\#)}^2} = \frac{|X_{\varepsilon,v}|_m}{|X_{\varepsilon,v}|_m + \sum_{e \in E_v} |X_{\varepsilon,e,v}|_m} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon + \sum_{e \in E_v} \ell_e / (2|X_{1,v}|_m)}.$$

The next lemma follows easily by noting that $\varphi_e - \langle \varphi_e, \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} \rangle_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})} \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}$ is the projection onto the orthogonal complement of $\mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}$ on the cross sectional space:

2.17. Lemma. *For a uniformly shrinking family of graph-like spaces we have*

$$\int_{I_e} \|u_e(s, \cdot) - \langle u_e(s, \cdot), \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} \rangle_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})} \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}\|_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})}^2 \, ds \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}} \int_{I_e} \|d_\varepsilon^\perp u_e(s, \cdot)\|_{L_2(T^*Y_{\varepsilon,e})}^2 \, ds$$

for all $u \in \mathbf{H}^1(X_{\varepsilon,e})$.

2.18. Definition (convex graph-like space). We say that a graph-like space X_1 is *convex* if

- (a) each cross-sectional boundary $\partial Y_{1,e}$ is convex in $Y_{1,e}$, i.e., the second fundamental form fulfils $\mathbb{I}_{\partial Y_{1,e}} \geq 0$ for all $e \in E$;
- (b) and if each vertex neighbourhood $X_{1,v}$ is simply connected for all $v \in V$.

2.19. Lemma. *For a convex uniformly shrinking family of graph-like spaces we have*

$$\|\bar{\varphi}\|_{L_2(T^*Y_{\varepsilon,e})}^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2(m-1)}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}} \|\nabla^\perp \bar{\varphi}\|_{L_2((T^*Y_{\varepsilon,e})^{\otimes 2})}^2$$

where ∇^\perp is the covariant derivative on the bundle $T^*Y_{\varepsilon,e}$.

Proof. Note that if $\partial Y_{1,e}$ is convex then $Y_{1,e}$ is convex and hence simply connected. In particular, $\dim \ker(d_\varepsilon^\perp)^* = \{0\}$ and therefore also $\dim \ker(d_\varepsilon^\perp(d_\varepsilon^\perp)^*) = \{0\}$. Moreover,

$$0 \notin \sigma(d_\varepsilon^\perp(d_\varepsilon^\perp)^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \inf \sigma(d_\varepsilon^\perp(d_\varepsilon^\perp)^*) = \lambda_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e}) = \frac{\lambda_2(Y_{1,e})}{\varepsilon^2} > 0$$

as $Y_{\varepsilon,e} = \varepsilon Y_{1,e}$ is compact and connected. From the min-max characterisation of eigenvalues we conclude

$$\|\bar{\varphi}\|_{L_2(T^*Y_{\varepsilon,e})}^2 \leq \frac{1}{\inf \sigma(d_\varepsilon^\perp(d_\varepsilon^\perp)^*)} \|(d_\varepsilon^\perp)^* \bar{\varphi}\|_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})}^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2(m-1)}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}} \|\nabla^\perp \bar{\varphi}\|_{L_2((T^*Y_{\varepsilon,e})^{\otimes 2})}^2 \quad (2.45)$$

together with Lemma 2.5. \square

For the estimate in Lemma 2.19 it suffices that $Y_{\varepsilon,e}$ is simply connected, so that $\dim \ker(d_\varepsilon^\perp)^* = \{0\}$.

Graph-like spaces arising as neighbourhoods of embedded metric graphs. We now consider a “real world” example as a perturbation of our abstract graph-like space, see also Figure 2:

2.20. Definition (embedded graph-like space). We say that \tilde{X}_1 is an *embedded (uniform) graph-like space* if the following holds:

- the underlying metric graph X_0 is embedded in \mathbb{R}^m such that its edges correspond to straight line segments in \mathbb{R}^m ;
- we require Definitions 2.11 and 2.14 to hold (with the obvious notation for the vertex and edge neighbourhoods) except for Definition 2.11 (b): each edge neighbourhood $\tilde{X}_{1,e}$ is isometric with $[0, \ell_e(1 - \tilde{\tau})]$ for some $\tilde{\tau} \in]0, 1]$;
- we assume that the boundary $\partial \tilde{X}$ on the vertex neighbourhood $\tilde{X}_{1,v}$ is of class C^2 .⁵

We say that a uniform family of graph-like spaces $(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in]0,1]}$ is *embedded* if \tilde{X}_1 is embedded in the sense above and if additionally, the conditions of Definition 2.12 hold. In this case $\tilde{\tau}$ becomes $\varepsilon \tilde{\tau}$.

3. Proof of the main results

We now prepare the proof of Theorem A, i.e., we show that D_0 and D_ε are δ -quasi unitarily equivalent (see Definition A.1).

3.1. Identification operators for Theorem A

We now define

$$J_\varepsilon: \mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}_0^0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_0^1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^1 \quad F = (f, \vec{f}) \mapsto J_\varepsilon F = (J_\varepsilon^0 f, J_\varepsilon^1 \vec{f}). \quad (3.1)$$

For brevity, we write $J_\varepsilon = J_\varepsilon^0 \oplus J_\varepsilon^1$. We define

$$(J_\varepsilon^0 f)_e := f_e \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}, \quad (J_\varepsilon^0 \vec{f})_v := 0, \quad (3.2a)$$

$$(J_\varepsilon^1 \vec{f})_e := \vec{f}_e \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}, \quad (J_\varepsilon^1 \vec{f})_v := 0. \quad (3.2b)$$

Here, we think of \vec{f}_e as having ds_e already inside, and we interpret ds_e also as an element of $T^*X_{\varepsilon,e}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle J_\varepsilon^0 f, u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^0} &= \sum_{e \in E} \int_{I_e} f_e(s) \langle \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}, u_e(s, \cdot) \rangle_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})} ds = \langle f, (J_\varepsilon^0)^* u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0^0}, \\ ((J_\varepsilon^0)^* u)_e(s, \cdot) &= \langle u_e(s, \cdot), \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} \rangle_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle J_\varepsilon^1 \vec{f}, \vec{u} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^1} &= \sum_{e \in E} \int_{I_e} \vec{f}_e(s) \cdot ds_e \langle \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}, \vec{u}_e(s, \cdot) \cdot ds_e \rangle_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})} ds \\ &= \sum_{e \in E} \int_{I_e} \vec{f}_e(s) \cdot \langle \vec{u}_e^\parallel(s, \cdot), \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} \rangle_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})} ds_e ds = \langle \vec{f}, (J_\varepsilon^1)^* \vec{u} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_0^1}, \\ ((J_\varepsilon^1)^* \vec{u})_e(s, \cdot) &= \langle \vec{u}_e^\parallel(s, \cdot), \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} \rangle_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})} \end{aligned} \quad (3.3b)$$

⁵This condition is already included in Definition 2.11 (c), but we repeat it here as if one starts with an $\varepsilon/2$ -neighbourhood of an embedded metric graph X_0 , then a vertex neighbourhood of a vertex of degree larger than 2 will have non-convex non-smooth parts.

for any $U = (u, \vec{u}) \in \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon$ using (2.38). It is easily seen that

$$(J_\varepsilon^0)^* J_\varepsilon^0 = \text{id}_{\mathcal{H}_0^0}, \quad (J_\varepsilon^1)^* J_\varepsilon^1 = \text{id}_{\mathcal{H}_0^1}, \quad \text{hence} \quad J_\varepsilon^* J_\varepsilon = \text{id}_{\mathcal{H}_0}. \quad (3.4)$$

3.1. Lemma. *For the function identification operator, we have*

$$\|u - J_\varepsilon^0 (J_\varepsilon^0)^* u\|_{L_2(X_\varepsilon)}^2 \leq \left(\varepsilon C_{\text{vx}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}} \right) \|u\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(X)}^2$$

for all $u \in \mathbf{H}^1(X)$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - J_\varepsilon^0 (J_\varepsilon^0)^* u\|_{L_2(X_\varepsilon)}^2 &= \sum_{v \in V} \|u_v\|_{L_2(X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2 + \sum_{e \in E} \int_{I_e} \|u_e(s, \cdot) - \langle u_e(s, \cdot), \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} \rangle_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})} \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}\|_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})}^2 ds \\ &\leq \varepsilon C_{\text{vx}} \sum_{v \in V} \|u_{v\#}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1(X_{\varepsilon,v}^\#)}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}} \sum_{e \in E} \|d_\varepsilon u_e\|_{L_2(T^* X_{\varepsilon,e})}^2 \\ &\leq \left(\varepsilon C_{\text{vx}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}} \right) \|du\|_{L_2(T^* X_\varepsilon)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

by Lemmata 2.16 and 2.17. Note that $\int_{I_e} \|d_\varepsilon^\perp u_e(s, \cdot)\|_{L_2(T^* Y_{\varepsilon,e})}^2 ds \leq \|d_\varepsilon u_e\|_{L_2(T^* X_{\varepsilon,e})}^2$. \square

3.2. Lemma. *For the 1-form identification operator, we have*

$$\|\vec{u} - J_\varepsilon^1 (J_\varepsilon^1)^* \vec{u}\|_{L_2(T^* X_\varepsilon)}^2 \leq \left(\varepsilon C_{\text{vx}} + \frac{m\varepsilon^2}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}} \right) C_{\text{Gaffney}} (\|\vec{u}\|_{L_2(T^* X_\varepsilon)}^2 + \|d_\varepsilon^* \vec{u}\|_{L_2(X_\varepsilon)}^2)$$

for all $\vec{u} \in \mathbf{H}^1(T^* X_\varepsilon) = \text{dom } d_\varepsilon^* = \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^1$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\vec{u} - J_\varepsilon^1 (J_\varepsilon^1)^* \vec{u}\|_{L_2(T^* X_\varepsilon)}^2 &= \sum_{v \in V} \|\vec{u}_v\|_{L_2(X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2 + \sum_{e \in E} \int_{I_e} \|\vec{u}_e^\parallel(s, \cdot) - \langle \vec{u}_e^\parallel(s, \cdot), \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} \rangle_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})} \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}\|_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})}^2 ds \\ &\quad + \sum_{e \in E} \int_{I_e} \|\vec{u}_e^\perp(s, \cdot)\|_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})}^2 ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

For the first term, we use the 0-form estimate, Lemma 2.16, together with Kato's inequality Corollary 2.7 and obtain

$$\sum_{v \in V} \|\vec{u}_v\|_{L_2(X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2 \leq \varepsilon C_{\text{vx}} \sum_{v \in V} \|\vec{u}_{v\#}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1((T^* X_{\varepsilon,v}^\#)^{\otimes 2})}^2 = \varepsilon C_{\text{vx}} \|\vec{u}\|_{\mathbf{H}^1((T^* X_\varepsilon)^{\otimes 2})}^2$$

(recall the definition of the enlarged vertex neighbourhood (2.41)).

For the second term, we use the 0-form estimate Lemma 2.17, together with Lemma 2.6 and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e \in E} \int_{I_e} \|\vec{u}_e^\parallel(s, \cdot) - \langle \vec{u}_e^\parallel(s, \cdot), \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} \rangle_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})} \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}\|_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})}^2 ds &\leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}} \sum_{e \in E} \int_{I_e} \|\nabla^\perp \vec{u}_e(s, \cdot)\|_{L_2((T^* Y_{\varepsilon,e})^{\otimes 2})}^2 ds \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}} \|\nabla \vec{u}\|_{L_2((T^* Y_{\varepsilon,e})^{\otimes 2})}^2, \end{aligned}$$

For the third term we use Lemma 2.19 and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e \in E} \int_{I_e} \|\vec{u}_e^\perp(s, \cdot)\|_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})}^2 ds &\leq \frac{\varepsilon^2(m-1)}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}} \sum_{e \in E} \int_{I_e} \|\nabla^\perp \vec{u}(s, \cdot)\|_{L_2((T^* Y_{\varepsilon,e})^{\otimes 2})}^2 ds \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon^2(m-1)}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}} \|\nabla \vec{u}\|_{L_2((T^* X_\varepsilon)^{\otimes 2})}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summing the three contributions we get the first factor of the right hand side of (3.5). Finally, note that for a uniformly shrinking family of graph-like space we can apply the uniform Gaffney estimate can be used: only the vertex neighbourhoods

$$X'_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{v \in V} X_{\varepsilon,v}$$

have negative principal curvatures on $\partial X'_\varepsilon \cap \partial X_\varepsilon$, the principal curvature on $X_\varepsilon \setminus X'_\varepsilon$ is given by the curvature of $Y_{\varepsilon,e}$ and hence non-negative (cf. Lemma 2.8). In particular, we can apply Theorem 2.10. \square

3.3. Remark. Note that J_ε^1 maps into the correct space. If there were any harmonic form \vec{u} arising from a non-simply-connected vertex neighbourhood $X_{\varepsilon,v}$ (note that we have excluded this case in Definition 2.18), then any cross-sectional integral over $(\{s\} \times Y_{\varepsilon,e} \subset X_{\varepsilon,e})$ on an edge neighbourhood vanishes: Note first that such an integral depends only on the homology class of $(\{s\} \times Y_{\varepsilon,e}, \{s\} \times \partial Y_{\varepsilon,e})$ in $(X_\varepsilon, \partial X_\varepsilon)$ (see e.g. [CDG02] for the three-dimensional case). Second, for a harmonic form \vec{u} enclosing a hole in $X_{\varepsilon,v}$, the flux through the internal boundary $\partial X_{\varepsilon,v}$ vanishes, hence all cross-sectional integrals as above vanish also. In particular, $J_\varepsilon^1 \vec{f}$ is orthogonal to \vec{u} , as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle J_\varepsilon \vec{f}, \vec{u} \rangle_{L_2(T^*X_\varepsilon)} &= \sum \int_{I_\varepsilon} \vec{f}_e(s) \cdot ds_e \langle \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}, \vec{u}_e(s, \cdot) ds_e \rangle_{L_2(Y_{\varepsilon,e})} ds_e \\ &= \sum \int_{I_\varepsilon} \vec{f}_e(s) \mathbb{1}_\varepsilon \int_{Y_{\varepsilon,e}} \vec{u}_e^\parallel(s, \cdot) ds_e = 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $\int_{Y_{\varepsilon,e}} \vec{u}_e^\parallel(s, \cdot) ds_e$ is the flux through $\{s\} \times Y_{\varepsilon,e}$ of \vec{u} .

The operators of interest are the resolvents

$$R_0^\pm := (D_0 \mp i)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad R_\varepsilon^\pm := (D_\varepsilon \mp i)^{-1}. \quad (3.6)$$

Denote by $\ell_2(V, \text{deg})$ the Hilbert space of functions $a: V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\|a\|_{\ell_2(V, \text{deg})}^2 := \sum_{v \in V} |a(v)|^2 \text{deg } v < \infty. \quad (3.7)$$

3.4. Lemma. *We have*

$$R_\varepsilon^\pm J_\varepsilon - J_\varepsilon R_0^\pm = A_\varepsilon^* A_0 + B_\varepsilon^* B_0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_0: \mathcal{H}_0 &\longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^0 := \ell_2(V, \text{deg}), & A_0 G &:= (f(v))_{v \in V}, \\ B_0: \mathcal{H}_0 &\longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^1 := \bigoplus_{v \in V} \mathbb{C}^{E_v}, & B_0 G &:= ((f_e(v))_{e \in E_v})_{v \in V} \end{aligned}$$

for $(f, \vec{f}) = F = R_0^\pm G$ and

$$\begin{aligned} A_\varepsilon: \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon &\longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^0, & A_\varepsilon W &:= \left(\frac{1}{\text{deg } v} \langle d_\varepsilon^* \vec{u}, \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon,v}^0} \right)_{v \in V} \\ B_\varepsilon: \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon &\longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^1, & B_\varepsilon W &:= \left(\langle u_v, \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} \rangle_{L_2(\partial_e X_{\varepsilon,v})} - C_v u \right)_{e \in E_v} \end{aligned}$$

for $(u, \vec{u}) = U = R_\varepsilon^\mp W$, where

$$C_v u = \left(\frac{|Y_1|}{\varepsilon |X_{1,v}|} \right)^{1/2} \langle u, \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,v} \rangle_{L_2(X_{\varepsilon,v})} = (\varepsilon^{m-1} |Y_1|)^{1/2} \int_{X_{1,v}} u.$$

Here, $\int_{X_{\varepsilon,v}} u$ is the average value of u on $X_{\varepsilon,v}$ (defined in (2.42)) and $\mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,v}$ is the normalised constant eigenfunction on $X_{\varepsilon,v}$ (with value $|X_{\varepsilon,v}|^{-1/2}$).

Proof. For $F = R_0^\pm G$ and $U = R_\varepsilon^\mp W$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (J_\varepsilon R_0^\pm - R_\varepsilon^\pm J_\varepsilon) G, W \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon} &= \langle J_\varepsilon F, D_\varepsilon U \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon} - \langle J_\varepsilon D_0 F, U \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon} \\ &= \left(\langle J_\varepsilon^0 f, d_\varepsilon^* \vec{u} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^0} - \langle J_\varepsilon^1 d_0 f, \vec{u} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^1} \right) + \left(\langle J_\varepsilon^1 \vec{f}, d_\varepsilon u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^1} - \langle J_\varepsilon^0 d_0^* \vec{f}, u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^0} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the first difference, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle J_\varepsilon^0 f, d_\varepsilon^* \vec{u} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^0} - \langle J_\varepsilon^1 d_0 f, \vec{u} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^1} &= \sum_{e \in E} \left(\langle f_e \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}, d_\varepsilon^* \vec{u}_e \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon,e}^0} - \langle f'_e \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} ds_e, \vec{u}_e \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon,e}^1} \right) \\ &= - \sum_{e \in E} \langle f_e \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}, \vec{u}_e \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\partial X_{\varepsilon,e}} \rangle_{L_2(\partial X_{\varepsilon,e})} \\ &= \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in E_v} f_e(v) \langle \mathbb{1}_\varepsilon, \vec{u}_v \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\partial_e X_{\varepsilon,v}} \rangle_{L_2(\partial_e X_{\varepsilon,v})} \\ &= \sum_{v \in V} f(v) \langle \mathbb{1}_\varepsilon, \vec{u}_v \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\partial X_{\varepsilon,v}} \rangle_{L_2(\partial X_{\varepsilon,v})} \\ &= \sum_{v \in V} f(v) \langle \mathbb{1}_\varepsilon, d_\varepsilon^* \vec{u}_v \rangle_{L_2(X_{\varepsilon,v})} = \langle A_0 G, A_\varepsilon W \rangle_{\mathcal{G}^0} \end{aligned}$$

using $(d_0 f)_e = f'_e ds_e$ for the first equality, partial integration (2.21) and $d_\varepsilon(f_e \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}) = f'_e \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} ds_e$ for the second, a reordering and the fact that $\vec{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\partial X_\varepsilon} = 0$ for the third, $f_e(v) = f(v)$ for the fourth and

the divergence theorem for the last equality. We have also employed the assumption that $|Y_{1,e}| = |Y_1|$ is independent of $e \in E$, hence $\mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} = \mathbb{1}_\varepsilon$ has a common value by (2.40a).

For the second difference, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle J_\varepsilon^1 \vec{f}, d_\varepsilon u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^1} - \langle J_\varepsilon^0 d_0^* \vec{f}, u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^0} &= \sum_{e \in E} (\langle \vec{f}_e \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}, d_\varepsilon u_e \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon,e}^1} - \langle -\vec{f}_e \cdot ds_e \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}, u_e \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon,e}^0}) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E} \langle (\vec{f}_e \cdot ds_e) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} ds_e \cdot n_{\partial X_{\varepsilon,e}}, u_e \rangle_{L_2(\partial X_{\varepsilon,e})} \\ &= \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in E_v} \vec{f}_e(v) \langle \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}, u_v \rangle_{L_2(\partial_e X_{\varepsilon,v})} \\ &= \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in E_v} \vec{f}_e(v) (\langle \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}, u_v \rangle_{L_2(\partial_e X_{\varepsilon,v})} - \overline{C_v u}) \\ &= \langle B_0 G, B_\varepsilon W \rangle_{\mathcal{G}^1} \end{aligned}$$

using $(d_0^* \vec{f})_e = -\vec{f}_e \cdot ds_e$ for the first equality, partial integration (2.21) again and $d_\varepsilon (f_e \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}) = f'_e \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} ds_e$ for the second, a reordering and the sign convention of the oriented evaluation (2.15) for the third, $\sum_{e \in E_v} \vec{f}_e(v) = 0$ for the fourth. \square

3.5. Lemma. *The operators A_0 and B_0 introduced in Lemma 3.4 fulfil $\|A_0\|^2 \leq \coth(\ell_0/2)$ and $\|B_0\|^2 \leq \coth(\ell_0/2)$.*

Proof. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_0 G\|_{\ell_2(V, \deg)}^2 &= \sum_{v \in V} |f(v)|^2 \deg v = \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in E_v} |f_e(v)|^2 = \sum_{e \in E} (|f_e(0)|^2 + |f_e(\ell_e)|^2) \\ &\leq \sum_{v \in V} \coth(\ell_e/2) \|f_e\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(I_e)}^2 \leq \coth(\ell_0/2) \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(X_0)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used a reordering in the third equality and an optimal trace estimate in the first inequality (see e.g. [P16, Sec. 6.1]). Moreover,

$$\|f\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(X_0)}^2 = \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_0^0}^2 + \|d_0 f\|_{\mathcal{H}_0^1}^2 \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_0}^2 = \|G\|_{\mathcal{H}_0}^2$$

using (2.4b) The argument for B_0 is similar. \square

3.6. Lemma. *The operator A_ε defined in Lemma 3.4 fulfils*

$$\|A_\varepsilon\|^2 \leq \varepsilon C_{\text{isoper}},$$

where the inverse isoperimetric constant is defined in (2.40b).

Proof. We estimate

$$\|A_\varepsilon W\|_{\ell_2(V, \deg)}^2 = \sum_{v \in V} \frac{1}{\deg v} |\langle d_\varepsilon^* \vec{u}, \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon,v}^0}|^2 \leq \sum_{v \in V} \frac{\|\mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}\|_{L_2(X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2}{\deg v} \|d_\varepsilon^* \vec{u}\|_{L_2(X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2$$

using Cauchy-Schwarz. The result follows from the fact that $\|\mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e}\|_{L_2(X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2 = |X_{\varepsilon,v}|/|Y_{\varepsilon,e}|$ and (2.40a) together with

$$\|d_\varepsilon^* \vec{u}\|_{L_2(X_\varepsilon)}^2 = \|d_\varepsilon^* \vec{u}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^0}^2 \leq \|U\|_{\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon}^2 = \|W\|_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon}^2$$

using (2.4b) \square

3.7. Lemma. *The operator B_ε defined in Lemma 3.4 fulfils*

$$\|B_\varepsilon\|^2 \leq \varepsilon C_{\text{vxcoll}},$$

where C_{vxcoll} is defined in (2.43).

Proof. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_\varepsilon W\|_{\mathcal{G}^1}^2 &= \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in E_v} |\langle u_v, \mathbb{1}_{\varepsilon,e} \rangle_{L_2(\partial_e X_{\varepsilon,v})} - C_v u|^2 = \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in E_v} |\partial_e X_{\varepsilon,v}| \left| \int_{\partial_e X_{\varepsilon,v}} u_v - \int_{X_{\varepsilon,v}} u_v \right|^2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon C_{\text{vxcoll}} \sum_{v \in V} \|d_\varepsilon u_v\|_{L_2(T^* X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2 \end{aligned}$$

using Lemma 2.15. The result follows from

$$\|d_\varepsilon u\|_{L_2(T^* X_\varepsilon)}^2 = \|d_\varepsilon u\|_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^1}^2 \leq \|U\|_{\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon}^2 = \|W\|_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon}^2$$

using again (2.4b). \square

Proof of Theorem A. First, the identification operator J_ε is an isometry, hence the first condition of (A.1a) is fulfilled with $\delta = 0$. For the second one, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon} - J_\varepsilon J_\varepsilon^*) R_\varepsilon^\pm W\|_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon}^2 &= \|(\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon} - J_\varepsilon J_\varepsilon^*) U\|_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon}^2 \\ &= \|(\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^0} - J_\varepsilon^0 (J_\varepsilon^0)^*) u\|_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^0}^2 + \|(\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^1} - J_\varepsilon^1 (J_\varepsilon^1)^*) \vec{u}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^1}^2 \\ &= \left(\varepsilon C_{\text{vx}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}}\right) \|u\|_{\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^0}^2 + \left(\varepsilon C_{\text{vx}} + \frac{m\varepsilon^2}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}}\right) C_{\text{Gaffney}} \|\vec{u}\|_{\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^1}^2 \\ &\leq \left(\varepsilon C_{\text{vx}} + \frac{m\varepsilon^2}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}}\right) C_{\text{Gaffney}} \|U\|_{\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon}^2 = \left(\varepsilon C_{\text{vx}} + \frac{m\varepsilon^2}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}}\right) C_{\text{Gaffney}} \|W\|_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for $(u, \vec{u}) = U = R_\varepsilon^\pm W$ using Lemmata 3.1 and 3.2 together with (2.4a) for the last equality. Note that

$$\|u\|_{\text{H}^1(X)}^2 = \|u\|_{\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^0}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\vec{u}\|_{\text{L}_2(T^*X_\varepsilon)}^2 + \|d_\varepsilon^* \vec{u}\|_{\text{L}_2(X_\varepsilon)}^2 = \|\vec{u}\|_{\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^1}^2;$$

moreover $C_{\text{Gaffney}} \geq 1$.

For the resolvent difference (A.1b) we use Lemmata 3.4–3.7 and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_\varepsilon^\pm J_\varepsilon - J_\varepsilon R_0^\pm\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon)} &\leq \|A_\varepsilon^* A_0\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon)} + \|B_\varepsilon^* B_0\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon)} \\ &= \|A_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}^0)} \|A_0\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{G}^0)} + \|B_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}^1)} \|B_0\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{G}^1)} \\ &\leq \varepsilon (C_{\text{isoper}} + C_{\text{vx col}}) \coth(\ell_0/2). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we can put

$$\delta_\varepsilon := \varepsilon^{1/2} \max \left\{ \left(C_{\text{vx}} + \frac{m\varepsilon}{\lambda_2^{\text{ed}}} \right) C_{\text{Gaffney}}, (C_{\text{isoper}} + C_{\text{vx col}}) \coth(\ell_0/2) \right\}^{1/2} \quad (3.8)$$

which concludes the proof. \square

3.2. Proof of the remaining results

Proof of Theorem B. We define now the identification operators for Theorem B. Note that for a shrinking family of embedded graph-like spaces the parameter $\tilde{\tau}$ becomes $\varepsilon\tilde{\tau}$. For each $e \in E$, we define the coordinate transform

$$\Phi_e: \tilde{X}_{\varepsilon, e} = \tilde{I}_e \times Y_{\varepsilon, e} \longrightarrow X_{\varepsilon, e} = I_e \times Y_{\varepsilon, e}, \quad \Phi_e(\tilde{s}, y) = ((1 - \varepsilon\tilde{\tau})\tilde{s}, y),$$

where $\tilde{I}_e := [0, (1 - \varepsilon\tilde{\tau})\ell_e]$. We define an identification operator $J_\varepsilon: \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon := \text{L}_2(X_\varepsilon) \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon := \text{L}_2(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon)$ by

$$(J_\varepsilon U)_v := U_v \quad \text{and} \quad (J_\varepsilon U)_e := U_e \circ \Phi_e.$$

Then from integration by substitution we obtain $J_\varepsilon^* W = (1 - \tilde{\tau})W$, and hence

$$\|\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon} - J_\varepsilon^* J_\varepsilon\| = \varepsilon\tilde{\tau} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\text{id}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon} - J_\varepsilon J_\varepsilon^*\| = \varepsilon\tilde{\tau}.$$

For the resolvent difference we argue similarly as in Lemma 3.4: For $K \in \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon$ and $L \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon$, we set $U = R_\varepsilon^\pm K$ and $W = \tilde{R}_\varepsilon^\pm L$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (J_\varepsilon R_\varepsilon^\pm - \tilde{R}_\varepsilon^\pm J_\varepsilon) K, L \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon} &= \langle J_\varepsilon U, D_\varepsilon W \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon} - \langle J_\varepsilon D_0 U, W \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon} \\ &= \langle J_\varepsilon^0 u, d_\varepsilon^* \vec{w} \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon^0} - \langle J_\varepsilon^1 d_0 u, \vec{w} \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon^1} + \langle J_\varepsilon^1 \vec{u}, d_\varepsilon w \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^1} - \langle J_\varepsilon^0 d_0^* \vec{u}, w \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon^0}. \end{aligned}$$

For the first difference, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle J_\varepsilon^0 u, d_\varepsilon^* \vec{w} \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon^0} - \langle J_\varepsilon^1 d_0 u, \vec{w} \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon^1} &= - \sum_{e \in E} \int_{\partial X_{\varepsilon, e}} u \vec{w} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\partial X_{\varepsilon, e}} \, d\partial X_{\varepsilon, e} \\ &= \sum_{v \in V} \int_{\partial X_{\varepsilon, v}} u \vec{w} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\partial X_{\varepsilon, v}} \, d\partial X_{\varepsilon, v} \\ &= \sum_{v \in V} \int_{X_{\varepsilon, v}} \delta(u \vec{w}) \, dX_{\varepsilon, v} \\ &= \sum_{v \in V} \int_{X_{\varepsilon, v}} (u \overline{d^* \vec{w}} - \langle du, \vec{w} \rangle_g) \, dX_{\varepsilon, v} \end{aligned}$$

using partial integration for the first and the divergence theorem for the second last equality. For the second difference, we have similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle J_\varepsilon^1 \bar{u}, d_\varepsilon w \rangle_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon^1} - \langle J_\varepsilon^0 d_0^* \bar{u}, w \rangle_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon^0} &= \sum_{e \in E} \int_{\partial X_{\varepsilon,e}} \bar{w} \bar{u} \cdot n_{\partial X_{\varepsilon,e}} d\partial X_{\varepsilon,e} \\
&= - \sum_{v \in V} \int_{\partial X_{\varepsilon,v}} \bar{w} \bar{u} \cdot n_{\partial X_{\varepsilon,v}} d\partial X_{\varepsilon,v} \\
&= - \sum_{v \in V} \int_{X_{\varepsilon,v}} \delta(\bar{w} \bar{u}) dX_{\varepsilon,v} \\
&= - \sum_{v \in V} \int_{X_{\varepsilon,v}} (d^* \bar{u} \bar{w} - \langle \bar{u}, dw \rangle_g) dX_{\varepsilon,v}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}
| \langle (J_\varepsilon R_\varepsilon^\pm - \widetilde{R}_\varepsilon^\pm J_\varepsilon) K, L \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon} |^2 &\leq \sum_{v \in V} \|u_v\|_{L_2(X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2 \|\tilde{d}^* \bar{w}\|_{L_2(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon)}^2 + \|d\bar{u}\|_{L_2(T^* X_\varepsilon)}^2 \sum_{v \in V} \|\bar{w}_v\|_{L_2(T^* X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2 \\
&\quad + \|d^* \bar{u}\|_{L_2(X_\varepsilon)}^2 \sum_{v \in V} \|w_v\|_{L_2(X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2 + \sum_{v \in V} \|\bar{u}_v\|_{L_2(T^* X_{\varepsilon,v})}^2 \|\tilde{d}w\|_{L_2(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon)}^2 \\
&\leq C_{\text{vx}} \varepsilon (\|u\|_{H^1(X_\varepsilon)}^2 \|\tilde{d}^* \bar{w}\|_{L_2(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon)}^2 + \|d^* \bar{u}\|_{L_2(X_\varepsilon)}^2 \|w\|_{H^1(X_\varepsilon)}^2) \\
&\quad + C_{\text{vx}} C_{\text{Gaffney}} \varepsilon (\|d\bar{u}\|_{L_2(T^* X_\varepsilon)}^2 \|\bar{w}\|_{\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^1}^2 + \|\bar{u}\|_{\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon^1}^2 \|\tilde{d}w\|_{L_2(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon)}^2) \\
&\leq C_{\text{vx}} (1 + C_{\text{Gaffney}}) \varepsilon \|K\|_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon}^2 \|L\|_{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon}^2
\end{aligned}$$

using Lemma 2.16, Corollary 2.7 and Theorem 2.10. In particular, we have

$$\|J_\varepsilon R_\varepsilon^\pm - \widetilde{R}_\varepsilon^\pm J_\varepsilon\|^2 \leq C_{\text{vx}} (1 + C_{\text{Gaffney}}) \varepsilon.$$

In particular, we can put here

$$\delta'_\varepsilon := \varepsilon^{1/2} \max \left\{ \widetilde{\tau}, C_{\text{vx}} (1 + C_{\text{Gaffney}}) \right\}^{1/2} \quad (3.9)$$

and the theorem is proven. \square

Proof of Corollary C. The result follows from Theorems A and B, and the transitivity of quasi-unitary equivalence (see e.g. [PS20, Lem. 2.11 (c)]). \square

Proof of Corollary D. The result follows from Theorem A resp. Corollary C and Proposition A.3. \square

Appendix A. Quasi-unitary equivalence and generalised norm resolvent convergence

Let us briefly review the concept of quasi-unitary equivalence which can be used to define a *distance* between two bounded operators acting in different Hilbert spaces (see [PZ24] for more details on this viewpoint). This distance then gives rise to a natural convergence. As the operators under consideration here are unbounded, we use their resolvents.

Let D resp. \widetilde{D} denote two self-adjoint operators acting in Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H} and $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}$.

A.1. Definition (quasi-unitary equivalence). Let $\delta > 0$. We say that D and \widetilde{D} are δ -quasi-unitary equivalent if there is a bounded operator $J: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}$ with $\|J\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}})} \leq 1$ such that

$$\|(\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}} - J^* J) R^\pm\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})} \leq \delta, \quad \|(\text{id}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}} - J J^*) \widetilde{R}^\pm\|_{\mathcal{L}(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}})} \leq \delta, \quad (\text{A.1a})$$

$$\|J R^\pm - \widetilde{R}^\pm J\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \widetilde{\mathcal{H}})} \leq \delta \quad (\text{A.1b})$$

where

$$R^\pm := (D \mp i)^{-1}, \quad \widetilde{R}^\pm := (\widetilde{D} \mp i)^{-1} \quad (\text{A.1c})$$

are the resolvents of D resp. \widetilde{D} .

Here and in the sequel, one has to choose either the upper or the lower sign in one formula.

We can turn the above concept into a convergence as follows: Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon$ and $D = D_0$ and $\widetilde{D} = D_\varepsilon$.

A.2. Definition. We say that D_ε converges to D_0 in *generalised norm resolvent sense* if D_ε and D_0 are δ_ε -quasi-unitarily equivalent with $\delta_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We refer to δ_ε as *convergence rate*.

This convergence is equivalent with a similar one defined by Weidmann [W00, Sec. 9.3], which he also called “generalised norm resolvent convergence”, cf. [PZ22] for details.

If both spaces \mathcal{H} and $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}$ split into 0- and 1-forms as in (2.1) and if D and \widetilde{D} are of the form (2.3) then we have the following abstract result:

A.3. Proposition. *Assume that D and \widetilde{D} are δ -quasi-unitarily equivalent such that the identification operator respects the form structure, i.e. such that*

$$J = J^0 \oplus J^1: \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^0 \oplus \mathcal{H}^1 \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{H}} = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^0 \oplus \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1, \quad F = (f, \vec{f}) \mapsto (J^0 f, J^1 \vec{f}),$$

then the corresponding Laplacians $\Delta = \Delta^0 \oplus \Delta^1$ and $\widetilde{\Delta} = \widetilde{\Delta}^0 \oplus \widetilde{\Delta}^1$ are 2δ -quasi-unitarily equivalent.

Proof. Note first that

$$R^\pm R^\mp = (D^2 + 1)^{-1} = (\Delta + 1)^{-1}$$

and similarly for $\widetilde{\Delta}$. Now, the Laplace resolvent difference is

$$\begin{aligned} \|J(\Delta + 1)^{-1} - (\widetilde{\Delta} + 1)^{-1}J\| &= \|JR^\pm R^\mp - \widetilde{R}^\pm \widetilde{R}^\mp J\| \\ &\leq \|(JR^\pm - \widetilde{R}^\pm J)R^\mp\| + \|\widetilde{R}^\pm(JR^\mp - \widetilde{R}^\mp J)\| \\ &\leq \|JR^\pm - \widetilde{R}^\pm J\| + \|JR^\mp - \widetilde{R}^\mp J\| \leq 2\delta \end{aligned}$$

and, as J and Δ resp. $\widetilde{\Delta}$ preserve the splitting into 0- and 1-forms, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \|J(\Delta + 1)^{-1} - (\widetilde{\Delta} + 1)^{-1}J\| \\ = \max\{\|J^0(\Delta^0 + 1)^{-1} - (\widetilde{\Delta}^0 + 1)^{-1}J^0\|, \|J^1(\Delta^1 + 1)^{-1} - (\widetilde{\Delta}^1 + 1)^{-1}J^1\|\}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., also Δ^0 and $\widetilde{\Delta}^0$ resp. Δ^1 and $\widetilde{\Delta}^1$ are 2δ -quasi-unitarily equivalent. \square

One can also show that other functions of the operator such as the heat operator or spectral projections sandwiched suitably with J and J^* fulfil similar operator norm estimates as above; for details we refer to [P12, Ch. 4] or [PS20, Sec. 2.3], where weaker versions of spectral estimates are shown; we conclude the appendix with a brief recall of the current state of the art in this area.

If the identification operator J is a (partial) isometry, then the definition of quasi-unitary equivalence given here is equivalent with

$$\|R^\mp(\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}} - J^*J)R^\pm\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})}^{1/2} \leq \delta, \quad \|R^\mp(\text{id}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}} - J^*J)\widetilde{R}^\pm\|_{\mathcal{L}(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}})}^{1/2} \leq \delta \quad (\text{A.1a}')$$

used in [PZ24]. A proof relies on the fact that J is a partial isometry ($JJ^*J = J$) if and only if the (squared) so-called *defect operator* $\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}} - J^*J$ is an orthogonal projection (cf. [PZ22, Thm. 3.9], the explanation for the need for the new version is given in [PZ24, Rem. 5.2]).

In [PZ24] we defined different distances between D and \widetilde{D} and showed, among other results, that they are all equivalent and imply in particular that

$$d_{\text{Hausd}}(\sigma((D \mp i)^{-1}), \sigma((\widetilde{D} \mp i)^{-1})) \leq \sqrt{3}\delta \quad (\text{A.2})$$

(cf. [PZ24, Thm. A, Cor. D]), where $d_{\text{Hausd}}(\Sigma, \widetilde{\Sigma})$ is the usual Hausdorff distance. There is a finer version respecting multiplicities of discrete eigenvalues giving the same upper estimate $\sqrt{3}\delta$; we refer again to [PZ24] and references therein for further details.

References

- [AP21] C. Anné and O. Post, *Wildly perturbed manifolds: norm resolvent and spectral convergence*, J. Spectr. Theory **11** (2021), 229–279.
- [BBKOB22] W. Borrelli, P. Briet, D. Krejčířík, and T. Ourmières-Bonafos, *Spectral properties of relativistic quantum waveguides*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **23** (2022), 4069–4114.
- [BCT21] W. Borrelli, R. Carlone, and L. Tentarelli, *A note on the Dirac operator with Kirchoff-type vertex conditions on metric graphs*, Mathematical challenges of zero-range physics—models, methods, rigorous results, open problems, Springer INdAM Ser., vol. 42, Springer, Cham, 2021, pp. 81–104.
- [BH03] J. Bolte and J. Harrison, *Spectral statistics for the Dirac operator on graphs*, J. Phys. A **36** (2003), 2747–2769.
- [Bi87] M. S. Birman, *The Maxwell operator in domains with edges*, J. Sov. Math. **37** (1987), 793–797 (English).
- [BeK13] G. Berkolaiko and P. Kuchment, *Introduction to quantum graphs*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 186, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2013.
- [BKOB23] W. Borrelli, N. Kerraoui, and T. Ourmières-Bonafos, *Spectral asymptotics for two-dimensional Dirac operators in thin waveguides*, Quantum mathematics I, Springer INdAM Ser., vol. 57, Springer, Singapore, 2023, pp. 165–182.
- [BiS87] M. S. Birman and M. Z. Solomyak, *The Maxwell operator in domains with a nonsmooth boundary*, Sibirsk. Mat. Zh. **28** (1987), i, 12–24.
- [BuT90] W. Bulla and T. Trenkler, *The free Dirac operator on compact and noncompact graphs*, J. Math. Phys. **31** (1990), 1157–1163.

- [CD00] M. Costabel and M. Dauge, *Singularities of electromagnetic fields in polyhedral domains*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **151** (2000), 221–276.
- [CDG02] J. Cantarella, D. DeTurck, and H. Gluck, *Vector calculus and the topology of domains in 3-space*, Amer. Math. Monthly **109** (2002), 409–442.
- [EH22] P. Exner and M. Holzmam, *Dirac operator spectrum in tubes and layers with a zigzag-type boundary*, Lett. Math. Phys. **112** (2022), Paper No. 102, 23.
- [EgP17] M. Egidi and O. Post, *Asymptotic behaviour of the Hodge Laplacian spectrum on graph-like manifolds*, J. Spectr. Theory **7** (2017), 433–469.
- [EP05] P. Exner and O. Post, *Convergence of spectra of graph-like thin manifolds*, Journal of Geometry and Physics **54** (2005), 77–115.
- [EP07] ———, *Convergence of resonances on thin branched quantum wave guides*, J. Math. Phys. **48** (2007), 092104 (43pp).
- [EP09] ———, *Approximation of quantum graph vertex couplings by scaled Schrödinger operators on thin branched manifolds*, J. Phys. A **42** (2009), 415305 (22pp).
- [EP13] ———, *A general approximation of quantum graph vertex couplings by scaled Schrödinger operators on thin branched manifolds*, Comm. Math. Phys. **322** (2013), 207–227.
- [GaM88] S. Gallot and D. Meyer, *D'un résultat hilbertien à un principe de comparaison entre spectres. Applications*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **21** (1988), 561–591.
- [GR86] V. Girault and P.-A. Raviart, *Finite element methods for Navier-Stokes equations*, Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, vol. 5, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986, Theory and algorithms.
- [Gr85] P. Grisvard, *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*, Monographs and Studies in Mathematics, vol. 24, Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, MA, 1985.
- [HW12] J. M. Harrison and B. Winn, *Intermediate statistics for a system with symplectic symmetry: the Dirac rose graph*, J. Phys. A **45** (2012), 435101, 23.
- [Ku04] P. Kuchment, *Quantum graphs: I. Some basic structures*, Waves Random Media **14** (2004), S107–S128.
- [KuZ01] P. Kuchment and H. Zeng, *Convergence of spectra of mesoscopic systems collapsing onto a graph*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **258** (2001), 671–700.
- [LZ21] P. D. Lamberti and M. Zaccaron, *Shape sensitivity analysis for electromagnetic cavities*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **44** (2021), 10477–10500.
- [LZ23] ———, *Spectral stability of the curlcurl operator via uniform Gaffney inequalities on perturbed electromagnetic cavities*, Math. Eng. **5** (2023), Paper No. 018, 31.
- [Mi01] M. Mitrea, *Dirichlet integrals and Gaffney-Friedrichs inequalities in convex domains*, Forum Math. **13** (2001), 531–567.
- [Pau36] L. Pauling, *The diamagnetic anisotropy of aromatic molecules*, J. Chem. Phys. **4** (1936), 673–677.
- [PrF15] A. Prokhorov and N. Filonov, *Regularity of electromagnetic fields in convex domains*, J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.) **210** (2015), 793–813.
- [P06] O. Post, *Spectral convergence of quasi-one-dimensional spaces*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **7** (2006), 933–973.
- [P07] ———, *First order operators and boundary triples*, Russ. J. Math. Phys. **14** (2007), 482–492.
- [P09] ———, *First order approach and index theorems for discrete and metric graphs*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **10** (2009), 823–866.
- [P12] ———, *Spectral analysis on graph-like spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 2039, Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.
- [P16] ———, *Boundary pairs associated with quadratic forms*, Math. Nachr. **289** (2016), 1052–1099.
- [PS20] O. Post and J. Simmer, *Approximation of magnetic Laplacians on the Sierpinski gasket by discrete magnetic Laplacians*, Analysis, probability and mathematical physics on fractals, Fractals Dyn. Math. Sci. Arts Theory Appl., vol. 5, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2020, pp. 451–475.
- [PS21] ———, *Graph-like spaces approximated by discrete graphs and applications*, Math. Nachr. **294** (2021), 2237–2278.
- [PZ22] O. Post and S. Zimmer, *Generalised norm resolvent convergence: comparison of different concepts*, J. Spectr. Theory **12** (2022), 1459–1506.
- [PZ24] ———, *Distances between operators acting on different Hilbert spaces*, arXiv:2412.13165 (2024), 32 pages.
- [RS53] K. Ruedenberg and C. W. Scherr, *Free-electron network model for conjugated systems, I. Theory*, J. Chem. Phys. **21** (1953), 1565–1581.
- [RuS01] J. Rubinstein and M. Schatzman, *Variational problems on multiply connected thin strips. I. Basic estimates and convergence of the Laplacian spectrum*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **160** (2001), 271–308.
- [Sai00] Y. Saito, *The limiting equation for Neumann Laplacians on shrinking domains.*, Electron. J. Differ. Equ. **31** (2000), 25 p.
- [TMV05] M. Taylor, M. Mitrea, and A. Vasy, *Lipschitz domains, domains with corners, and the Hodge Laplacian*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **30** (2005), 1445–1462.
- [W00] J. Weidmann, *Lineare Operatoren in Hilberträumen. Teil 1*, Mathematische Leitfäden., B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart, 2000, Grundlehren.