

Analytic and Gevrey class regularity for parametric semilinear reaction-diffusion problems and applications in uncertainty quantification

Alexey Chernov^a, Tùng Lê^a

^a *Institut für Mathematik, Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, Oldenburg, 26129, Germany*

Abstract

We investigate a class of parametric elliptic semilinear partial differential equations of second order with homogeneous essential boundary conditions, where the coefficients and the right-hand side (and hence the solution) may depend on a parameter. This model can be seen as a reaction-diffusion problem with a polynomial nonlinearity in the reaction term. The efficiency of various numerical approximations across the entire parameter space is closely related to the regularity of the solution with respect to the parameter. We show that if the coefficients and the right-hand side are analytic or Gevrey class regular with respect to the parameter, the same type of parametric regularity is valid for the solution. The key ingredient of the proof is the combination of the alternative-to-factorial technique from our previous work [1] with a novel argument for the treatment of the power-type nonlinearity in the reaction term. As an application of this abstract result, we obtain rigorous convergence estimates for numerical integration of semilinear reaction-diffusion problems with random coefficients using Gaussian and Quasi-Monte Carlo quadrature. Our theoretical findings are confirmed in numerical experiments.

Keywords: semilinear problems, reaction-diffusion, parametric regularity analysis, numerical integration, Quasi-Monte Carlo methods

2023 MSC: 65N25, 65C30, 65D30, 65D32, 65N30

1. Introduction

Elliptic semilinear problems arise in numerous applications in natural sciences and engineering. Prominent examples are reaction-diffusion-type problems with nonlinear reaction (reproduction) terms for modelling of various processes such as phase separation, combustion, soil-moisture-physics, biological population genetics, etc. For analysis of parametric semilinear problems we refer to works by Hansen and Schwab [2], where the particular case of a stochastic parameter perturbation has been addressed, see also the recent work [3] for semilinear eigenvalue problems under uncertainty. The regularity of the solution of the problem with respect to the parameter is important for construction of efficient numerical approximations in the parameter domain. For example, if the quantity of interest is solution's average value over a prescribed parameter domain, Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo methods can be applied for the numerical integration. However, the use of Quasi-Monte Carlo integration does only pay off if the solution features certain higher regularity properties. In this paper we first theoretically address these regularity considerations and then demonstrate their implications in a series of numerical experiments.

Let us consider a prototypic real second-order elliptic semilinear partial differential equation of the general form

$$\begin{aligned} -C_m^2 \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \nabla u(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) + b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) [u(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^m &= C_m f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) & (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in D \times U, \\ u(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= 0 & (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \partial D \times U, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the derivative operator ∇ acts in the physical variable $\mathbf{x} \in D$, where D is a bounded Lipschitz domain in \mathbb{R}^d . The above semilinear problem could be reduced to linear by choosing $b \equiv 0$ or $m = 1$. The vector of parameters

Email addresses: alexey.chernov@uni-oldenburg.de (Alexey Chernov), tung.le@uni-oldenburg.de (Tùng Lê)

$\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots) \in U$ has either finitely many or countably many components. For example, if \mathbf{y} is a random parameter, the model with $U := [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in U$ being a countably-dimensional vector of independently and identically distributed uniform random variables has been frequently used in the literature [4, 5, 6, 7]. The necessary restrictions on the power $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the dimension d of the domain D are in this range throughout this paper and denote the corresponding set of parameters (d, m) by \mathcal{M} as following, cf. [2]

$$\begin{aligned}
d = 1 \text{ or } d = 2 : & \quad m \in \mathbb{N} \\
d = 3 : & \quad H_0^1(D) \hookrightarrow L^6(D) \quad \text{hence } 1 \leq m \leq 5 \\
d = 4 : & \quad H_0^1(D) \hookrightarrow L^4(D) \quad \text{hence } 1 \leq m \leq 3 \\
d = 5 : & \quad H_0^1(D) \hookrightarrow L^{10/3}(D) \quad \text{hence } 1 \leq m \leq 2 \\
d = 6 : & \quad H_0^1(D) \hookrightarrow L^3(D) \quad \text{hence } 1 \leq m \leq 2 \\
d \geq 7 : & \quad m = 1,
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

and C_m is the constant of Sobolev embedding $H_0^1(D) \hookrightarrow L^m(D)$, see e.g. [8]. Without loss of generality, in the following we assume that the coefficients $a(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$, $b(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ and $\|f(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H^{-1}(D)}$ admit the uniform bounds

$$1 \leq a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \bar{a}, \quad |b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| \leq \bar{b}, \quad \|f(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H^{-1}(D)} \leq \bar{f} \tag{3}$$

for all $\mathbf{y} \in U$ and almost all $\mathbf{x} \in D$. Thus, for every fixed $\mathbf{y} \in U$ and under a reasonable assumption, the problem (1) is well-posed, for example [2]. Since the coefficients depend on the parameters \mathbf{y} , the solution u will depend on \mathbf{y} as well. Particularly, if \mathbf{y} is random, then $u(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ will be random too.

In this paper we present a rigorous regularity analysis for the solution u with respect to the parameter \mathbf{y} in the general case where the given data a , b and f are infinitely differentiable functions of \mathbf{y} belonging to the Gevrey class G^δ for some fixed $\delta \geq 1$. The scale of Gevrey classes is a nested scale of the parameter δ that fills the gap between analytic and C^∞ functions

$$G^\delta \subset G^{\delta'} \subset C^\infty, \quad 1 \leq \delta < \delta'. \tag{4}$$

The case of analytic functions (i.e. Gevrey- δ -class function with $\delta = 1$) is the simplest and arguably most important of this scale and has been addressed for parametric/stochastic semilinear problem before, see [2]. The above mentioned work considers the coefficient of the type of the affine parametrization and prove the analyticity of the solution using elegant complex analysis arguments. [3] for the

Besides complex argument, the real-variable argument is also has been used as a powerful tool to achieve analytic regularity. For the analysis of the eigenvalue problems we refer to [5, 9]. However, the direct application of the real-variable argument typically leads to suboptimal estimates. To overcome this, in [1], we suggest a modified argument, namely *alternative-to-factorial technique*, and obtain optimal regularity for the eigenvalue problem. The aim of this paper is to introduce this approach and enhance it in the example of the parametric semilinear problems.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2.1 we introduce the falling factor notation, which is the main tool for our *alternative-to-factorial technique* first introduced in [1]. In Section 2.3 we introduce Gevrey-class function and formulate the regularity assumptions on the coefficients of the semilinear problem (1). In Section 3 we summarize the properties of elliptic semilinear problems needed for the forthcoming regularity analysis. In Section 4 we present the proof of the main result. The meaning and validity of the main regularity result is illustrated by the applications and numerical experiments in Section 5.

2. Preliminary

2.1. The falling factorial estimates

The deficiency of the real-variable inductive argument for nonlinear problems is a consequence of the Leibniz product rule and the triangle inequality. It can be seen already in one-dimensional case and eigenvalue problem, see [1, Section 2.1] and [10, Chapter 1]. To overcome these difficulties, we would use *alternative-to-factorial technique* as introduced in [1, Section 2.2]. To summarize this we collect some elementary results on falling factorial as following.

For a given $q \in \mathbb{R}$ and a non-negative integer $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ the *falling factorial* is defined as

$$(q)_n := \begin{cases} 1, & n = 0, \\ q(q-1)\dots(q-n+1), & n \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

For $q < 1$ the falling factorial $(q)_n$ is a sign-alternating sequence of n . To further simplify the notation and avoid keeping track of the sign alteration, we denote the *absolute value of the falling factorial of $\frac{1}{2}$* by

$$\left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_n := \left| \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)_n \right|.$$

This notation appears somewhat non-standard, but quite convenient, as we will see in the forthcoming analysis. The two sided-estimate

$$\left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_n \leq n! \leq 2 \cdot 2^n \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_n, \quad (6)$$

is rather crude but sufficient for our analysis, see [1, Section 2.1] for a refined version.

The following combinatorial identities are remarkable properties of the falling factorial. The first and the second estimates in (7) are stated here for a shifted summation range, cf. [1, Lemma 2.3], and, thus, require a new proof given below.

Lemma 2.1. *For all integers $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 2$ the following identities hold*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \binom{n}{i} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_i \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{n+1-i} = \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{n+1}, \quad \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n}{i} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_i \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{n+1-i} = 2 \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{n+1}, \quad \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{k}{i} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_i \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{k-i} = 4 \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_k. \quad (7)$$

Proof. We choose the function $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sqrt{1-x})$ and

$$g(x) = f(x)f'(x) = \left(\frac{1}{2}(1 - \sqrt{1-x})\right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x}}\right) = \frac{1}{8} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x}} - 1\right) = \frac{1}{2}f'(x) - \frac{1}{8}. \quad (8)$$

From [1, Section 2.2], we know that $f^{(n)}(0) = \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, on the one hand, for all $n \geq 1$ we have

$$g^{(n)}(0) = \frac{1}{2}f^{(n+1)}(0) = \frac{1}{4} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{n+1}.$$

On the other hand, by Leibniz product rule and since $f(0) = 0$, we have

$$g^{(n)}(0) = \sum_{i=1}^n \binom{n}{i} f^{(i)}(0)f^{(n+1-i)}(0) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^n \binom{n}{i} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_i \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{n+1-i}.$$

This shows the first identity in (7). Increasing both sides of this identity by $\left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{n+1}$, we observe that the second identity in (7) is also valid. The third identity follows for $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sqrt{1-x})$ and $g = f^2$, see e.g. [1, Lemma 2.3]. \square

Corollary 2.2. *With the convention that the empty sum equals zero, the Lemma 2.1 extends to all non-negative integers $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ as*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \binom{n}{i} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_i \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{n+1-i} \leq \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{n+1}, \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n}{i} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_i \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{n+1-i} \leq 2 \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{n+1}, \quad (10)$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n}{i} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_i \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{n-i} \leq 4 \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_n. \quad (11)$$

2.2. Multiindex notation

The following standard multiindex notations will be used in what follows, see e.g. [11, 4]. We denote the countable set of finitely supported sequences of nonnegative integers by

$$\mathcal{F} := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots) : \nu_j \in \mathbb{N}_0, \text{ and } \nu_j \neq 0 \text{ for only a finite number of } j \right\} \subset \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}, \quad (12)$$

where the summation $\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\beta}$ and the partial order relations $\boldsymbol{\alpha} < \boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \leq \boldsymbol{\beta}$ of elements in $\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{F}$ are understood componentwise. We write

$$|\boldsymbol{\nu}| := \sum_{j \geq 1} \nu_j, \quad \boldsymbol{\nu}! := \prod_{j \geq 1} \nu_j!, \quad \mathbf{R}^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = \prod_{j \geq 1} R_j^{\nu_j}$$

for the absolute value, the multifactorial and the power with the multi-index $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ and a sequence $\mathbf{R} = \{R_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ of positive real numbers. Notice that $|\boldsymbol{\nu}|$ is finite if and only if $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathcal{F}$. For $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathcal{F}$ supported in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we define the partial derivative with respect to the variables \mathbf{y}

$$\partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} u = \frac{\partial^{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|} u}{\partial y_1^{\nu_1} \partial y_2^{\nu_2} \dots \partial y_n^{\nu_n}}.$$

For two multiindices $\boldsymbol{\nu}, \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{F}$ we define the binomial coefficient by

$$\binom{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \prod_{j \geq 1} \binom{\nu_j}{\eta_j}.$$

The above multiindex notations are handy for treatment of multiparametric objects. The following technical Lemma is instrumental for the forthcoming analysis.

Lemma 2.3. *For two multiindices $\boldsymbol{\nu}, \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \boldsymbol{\nu}$, a unit multi-index \mathbf{e} and $\delta \geq 1$ we have*

$$(|\boldsymbol{\nu} - \boldsymbol{\eta}|!)^{\delta-1} (|\boldsymbol{\eta}|!)^{\delta-1} \leq (|\boldsymbol{\nu}|!)^{\delta-1}, \quad (13)$$

$$\sum_{0 \leq \boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \boldsymbol{\nu}} \binom{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\eta}|} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\nu} - \boldsymbol{\eta}|} \leq 4 \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|}, \quad (14)$$

$$\sum_{0 < \boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \boldsymbol{\nu}} \binom{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{e} - \boldsymbol{\eta}|} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\eta}|} \leq \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{e}|}, \quad (15)$$

$$\sum_{0 \leq \boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \boldsymbol{\nu}} \binom{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{e} - \boldsymbol{\eta}|} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\eta}|} \leq 2 \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{e}|}, \quad (16)$$

$$\sum_{0 < \boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \boldsymbol{\nu}} \sum_{0 \leq \boldsymbol{\ell} \leq \boldsymbol{\nu} - \boldsymbol{\eta}} \binom{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \binom{\boldsymbol{\eta}}{\boldsymbol{\ell}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\ell}|} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\ell}|} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{e} - \boldsymbol{\eta}|} \leq 4 \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{e}|}. \quad (17)$$

Proof. Notice that for two non-negative integers $n! \cdot m! \leq (n + m)!$ and therefore

$$|\boldsymbol{\nu} - \boldsymbol{\eta}|! |\boldsymbol{\eta}|! \leq (|\boldsymbol{\nu} - \boldsymbol{\eta}| + |\boldsymbol{\eta}|)! = |\boldsymbol{\nu}|!$$

Since $(\cdot)^{\delta-1}$ is an increasing function for $\delta \geq 1$, the estimate (13) follows. According to [1, Lemma 7.1], we have

$$\sum_{\substack{|\boldsymbol{\eta}|=r \\ \boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \boldsymbol{\nu}}} \binom{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \binom{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|}{r}, \quad (18)$$

which is sometimes called generalized Vandermonde or Chu-Vandermonde identity. This together with (11) imply the estimate

$$\sum_{0 \leq \boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \boldsymbol{\nu}} \binom{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\nu} - \boldsymbol{\eta}|} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\eta}|} = \sum_{r=0}^{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|} \sum_{\substack{|\boldsymbol{\eta}|=r \\ \boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \boldsymbol{\nu}}} \binom{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\nu} - r|} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_r = \sum_{r=0}^{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|} \binom{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|}{r} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\nu} - r|} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_r \leq 4 \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|}.$$

It shows inequality (14). Similarly, we derive bounds (15) and (16) by applying (18) to (9) and (11), respectively. The final estimate (17) follows by consecutive application of (14) and (15). \square

2.3. Gevrey-class and Analytic function

The following definition of Gevrey- δ functions with countably many parameters will be used in our regularity analysis in Section 4.

Definition 2.4. Let $\delta \geq 1$, B be a Banach space, $I \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be an open domain and a function $f : I \rightarrow B$ be such that its \mathbf{y} -derivatives $\partial^{\mathbf{v}} f : I \rightarrow B$ are continuous for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}$. We say that the function f is of class Gevrey- δ if for each $\mathbf{y}_0 \in I$ there exist an open set $J \subseteq I$, and strictly positive constants $\mathbf{R} = (R_1, R_2, \dots) \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ that the derivatives of f satisfy the bounds

$$\|\partial^{\mathbf{v}} f(\mathbf{y})\|_B \leq \frac{C}{\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{v}}} (|\mathbf{v}|!)^{\delta}, \quad \forall \mathbf{y} \in J, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}. \quad (19)$$

In this case we write $f \in G^{\delta}(U, B)$.

Definition 2.4 is also suitable for the case of finitely many parameters \mathbf{y} . In particular, when $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_M)$, $B = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} and $\delta = 1$, the bound (19) guarantees convergence of the power series of f and therefore characterizes the class of analytic functions of M variables, see e.g. [10, Section 2.2] and [1, Remark 2.6]. This property follows from the bound $|\mathbf{v}|! \leq M^{|\mathbf{v}|} \mathbf{v}!$ that is valid for a multiindex \mathbf{v} with M nonzero components. Notice that otherwise estimate (19) does not guarantee convergence of the power series of f . Moreover, the scale G^{δ} grows monotonously with δ in the sense of (4).

We now make an assumption on the coefficients, which, in particular, ensure that the solution of the semilinear problem (1) is Gevrey-class regular.

Assumption 2.5. For all fixed values $\mathbf{y} \in U \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $m < \infty$, the coefficients $a(\mathbf{y}), b(\mathbf{y}) \in L^{\infty}(D)$ and $f(\mathbf{y}) \in V^*$. The functions $a(\mathbf{y}), b(\mathbf{y})$ are of Gevrey class $G^{\delta}(U, L^{\infty}(D))$ and $f(\mathbf{y})$ is of Gevrey class $G^{\delta}(U, V^*)$, i.e. for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^s$ there exist \mathbf{R} independent of s such that

$$\|\partial^{\mathbf{v}} a(\mathbf{y})\|_{L^{\infty}(D)} \leq \frac{\bar{a}}{2} \frac{(|\mathbf{v}|!)^{\delta}}{(2\mathbf{R})^{\mathbf{v}}}, \quad \|\partial^{\mathbf{v}} b(\mathbf{y})\|_{L^{\infty}(D)} \leq \frac{\bar{b}}{2} \frac{(|\mathbf{v}|!)^{\delta}}{(2\mathbf{R})^{\mathbf{v}}}, \quad \|\partial^{\mathbf{v}} f(\mathbf{y})\|_{V^*} \leq \frac{\bar{f}}{2} \frac{(|\mathbf{v}|!)^{\delta}}{(2\mathbf{R})^{\mathbf{v}}}.$$

Notice that for $\mathbf{v} = 0$ Assumption 2.5 agrees with the upper bounds in (3). Notice also that the components of \mathbf{R} are readily scaled by the factor of 2. This leads to no loss of generality, but helps to shorten the forthcoming expressions. For example, in view of (6) Assumption 2.5 immediately implies

$$\|\partial^{\mathbf{v}} a(\mathbf{y})\|_{L^{\infty}(D)} \leq \frac{\bar{a}}{\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{v}}} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]^{|\mathbf{v}|} (|\mathbf{v}|!)^{\delta-1}, \quad \|\partial^{\mathbf{v}} b(\mathbf{y})\|_{L^{\infty}(D)} \leq \frac{\bar{b}}{\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{v}}} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]^{|\mathbf{v}|} (|\mathbf{v}|!)^{\delta-1}, \quad \|\partial^{\mathbf{v}} f(\mathbf{y})\|_{V^*} \leq \frac{\bar{f}}{\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{v}}} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]^{|\mathbf{v}|} (|\mathbf{v}|!)^{\delta-1}. \quad (20)$$

The definition of the norms used above is standard will be recalled in the beginning of the next section.

3. Elliptic Semilinear PDEs with countably many parameters

For a fixed $\mathbf{y} \in U$ the variational formulation of (1) reads

$$C_m^2 \int_D a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \nabla u(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \cdot \nabla v(\mathbf{x}) + \int_D b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) [u(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]^m v(\mathbf{x}) = C_m \int_D f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) v(\mathbf{x}). \quad (21)$$

The Hölder inequality imply that the second integral is well-defined for $u(\cdot, \mathbf{y}), v(\cdot) \in L^{m+1}(D)$. By the Sobolev embedding theorem this is guaranteed for $H_0^1(D)$ functions under restrictions on the range of m as readily announced in (2). We now collect the required notations and facts from the theory of variational semilinear problems. By $L^p(D)$ and $L^{\infty}(D)$ we denote the spaces of p -power integrable and bounded functions equipped with standard norms.

Throughout the paper, when it is unambiguous we will drop the \mathbf{x} -dependence when referring to a function defined on D at a parameter value \mathbf{y} . We introduce the Sobolev spaces $V := H_0^1(D)$, its dual $V^* := H^{-1}(D)$ equipped the following norms

$$\|u\|_V := C_m \|u\|_{H_0^1(D)}, \quad \|f\|_{V^*} := \|f\|_{H^{-1}(D)} = \sup_{\substack{v \in V \\ v \neq 0}} \frac{\int_D f v}{\|v\|_{H_0^1(D)}} = \sup_{\substack{v \in V \\ v \neq 0}} \frac{\langle f, v \rangle}{\|v\|_V},$$

where the duality pairing on $V \times V^*$ is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ as

$$\langle g, v \rangle := C_m \int_D g v, \quad \forall g \in V^* \text{ and } \forall v \in V. \quad (22)$$

In purpose of simpler calculus, we introduce rescaled Lebesgue spaces $\mathcal{L}_k = L^{\frac{m+1}{k}}(D)$ for a fixed m and $1 \leq k \leq m+1$ and equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_k} := \|u\|_{L^{\frac{m+1}{k}}(D)}.$$

The following Lemma shows a Hölder-type inequalities for Lebesgue spaces \mathcal{L}_k , which has an important role in the proof of regularity in Section 4.

Lemma 3.1. *For a fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$ recall that $\mathcal{L}_k = L^{\frac{m+1}{k}}(D)$ and let $p, q \geq 1$. Then for any $w \in \mathcal{L}_p$ and $v \in \mathcal{L}_q$ with $p+q \leq m+1$ it holds that*

$$\|wv\|_{\mathcal{L}_{p+q}} \leq \|w\|_{\mathcal{L}_p} \|v\|_{\mathcal{L}_q}. \quad (23)$$

Moreover, for all $k \leq m+1$ and $u \in \mathcal{L}_1$, we have

$$\|u^k\|_{\mathcal{L}_k} \leq \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_1}^k. \quad (24)$$

Proof. The definition of \mathcal{L}_{p+q} and the Hölder inequality imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|wv\|_{\mathcal{L}_{p+q}} &= \left(\int_D (wv)^{\frac{m+1}{p+q}} \right)^{\frac{p+q}{m+1}} \leq \left(\left(\int_D (w^{\frac{m+1}{p+q}})^{\frac{p}{p+q}} \right)^{\frac{p+q}{p}} \left(\int_D (v^{\frac{m+1}{p+q}})^{\frac{q}{p+q}} \right)^{\frac{q}{p+q}} \right)^{\frac{p+q}{m+1}} \\ &= \|w\|_{L^{\frac{m+1}{p}}(D)} \|v\|_{L^{\frac{m+1}{q}}(D)} = \|w\|_{\mathcal{L}_p} \|v\|_{\mathcal{L}_q}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows the first inequality (23). The second inequality (24) follows from (23) by induction, since for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\|u^{n+1}\|_{\mathcal{L}_{n+1}} = \|u^n u\|_{\mathcal{L}_{n+1}} \leq \|u^n\|_{\mathcal{L}_n} \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_1} \leq \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_1}^n \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_1} = \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_1}^{n+1}.$$

This finishes the proof. \square

From Sobolev embedding theorem, for every $v \in V$ and $f \in V^*$ we have

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_1} = \|u\|_{L^{m+1}(D)} \leq C_m \|u\|_{H_0^1(D)} = \|u\|_V, \quad (25)$$

where the Sobolev embedding constant C_m could be calculated explicitly as in [8]. Moreover, we have

$$\langle f, v \rangle \leq C_m \|f\|_{H^{-1}(D)} \|v\|_{H_0^1(D)} = \|f\|_{V^*} \|v\|_V. \quad (26)$$

For a fixed \mathbf{y} we define the bilinear form $A_{\mathbf{y}} : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a nonlinear operator $T_{\mathbf{y}}(w, v) : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$A_{\mathbf{y}}(w, v) := C_m^2 \int_D a(\mathbf{y}) \nabla u \cdot \nabla v, \quad T_{\mathbf{y}}(w, v) := \int_D b(\mathbf{y}) w^m v. \quad (27)$$

In the view of bounds (3) and Lemma 3.1, we have

$$A_{\mathbf{y}}(w, w) \geq \|w\|_V^2, \quad A_{\mathbf{y}}(w, v) \leq \frac{\bar{a}}{2} \|w\|_V \|v\|_V, \quad w, v \in V, \quad (28)$$

$$T_{\mathbf{y}}(w, v) \leq \frac{\bar{b}}{2} \|w\|_V^m \|v\|_V, \quad w, v \in V. \quad (29)$$

Thus, for every $\mathbf{y} \in U$, the variational equivalent of (1) is the problem of finding a solution $u \in V$ such that

$$A_{\mathbf{y}}(u(\mathbf{y}), v) + T_{\mathbf{y}}(u(\mathbf{y}), v) = \langle f(\mathbf{y}), v \rangle \quad \forall v \in V. \quad (30)$$

Note that the uniqueness of the solution for (30) generally fails. For instance, the (real-valued) problem for $a \equiv b \equiv 1$ with certain restriction on m even has infinitely many solutions with arbitrarily large norms, see [12, Theorem 7.2 and Remark 7.3] and [2].

In the following we introduce two different assumptions (Assumption 3.2 and Assumption 3.4) that are sufficient to guarantee the existence and uniqueness of the solution of (21). Roughly speaking, Assumption 3.2 admits indefinite reaction term T_y , but requires that \bar{b} and \bar{f} cannot be large simultaneously. If, however, T_y is nonnegative, no further restrictions are required, see Assumption 3.4. In both cases the unique solution is bounded

$$\|u\|_V \leq \bar{u}, \quad (31)$$

where the upper bound \bar{u} will be determined below.

We now give the details of the argument. The following assumption naturally extends the result in [2].

Assumption 3.2. *For a fixed integer $m \geq 1$, there exists a positive constant $\gamma < 1$ such that \bar{b} and \bar{f} satisfying*

$$\frac{\bar{b}}{2} = \frac{\gamma}{m \bar{f}^{m-1}}.$$

For the case $m = 1$, the problem in (21) turns into a linear reaction-diffusion problem. The bilinear form for this problem is V -coercive for $\frac{\bar{b}}{2} < 1$

$$C_m^2 \int_D a(\mathbf{y}) |\nabla w|^2 + \int_D b(\mathbf{y}) w^2 \geq \|w\|_V^2 - \frac{\bar{b}}{2} \|w\|_{L^2(D)}^2 \geq \left(1 - \frac{\bar{b}}{2}\right) \|w\|_V^2. \quad (32)$$

This property is guaranteed by Assumption 3.2 for $m = 1$.

We now show that Assumption 3.2 also guarantee that (21) has a unique solution by means of the Banach fixed-point theorem. Let $u_0(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ and define $u_{n+1}(\mathbf{y})$ as the unique solution of

$$A_y(u_{n+1}(\mathbf{y}), v) = \langle f(\mathbf{y}), v \rangle - T_y(u_n(\mathbf{y}), v) \quad \forall v \in V. \quad (33)$$

The following Lemma shows that the sequence $\{u_n\}$ never leaves the closed set

$$\mathcal{B}(0, \bar{f}) := \left\{v \in V : \|v\|_V \leq \bar{f}\right\}$$

and converges a limit in $\mathcal{B}(0, \bar{f})$. Obviously, when the sequence $\{u_n(\mathbf{y})\}$ admits a limit point, it would be a solution of (21). Indeed, the following Lemma proves the above statement.

Lemma 3.3. *For every $\mathbf{y} \in U$ and $m \geq 2$ be an even or odd integer, the sequence $\{\|u_n(\mathbf{y})\|_V\}$ is bounded by \bar{f} and converges to a fixed point in $\mathcal{B}(0, \bar{f})$.*

Proof. We will prove boundedness of the sequence by induction with respect to n . The Lax-Milgram Lemma and (3) imply

$$\|u_1\|_V \leq \|f\|_{V^*} \leq \frac{\bar{f}}{2}$$

and hence $u_1 \in \mathcal{B}(0, \bar{f})$. Assume now that all u_1, \dots, u_n belong to this neighbourhood and prove that the same holds for u_{n+1} . For this, we substitute $v = u_{n+1}(\mathbf{y})$ into (33) and recall (26), (3), (29) and Assumption 3.2 to obtain

$$\|u_{n+1}(\mathbf{y})\|_V \leq \frac{\bar{f}}{2} + \frac{\bar{b}}{2} \|u_n(\mathbf{y})\|_V^m \leq \frac{\bar{f}}{2} + \frac{\gamma}{m \bar{f}^{m-1}} \bar{f}^m \leq \bar{f},$$

where in the last step we have used that $\gamma < 1$ and $m \geq 2$. This shows that $u_n \in \mathcal{B}(0, \bar{f})$ for all n . We now prove that the sequence converges to a limit in V . We have that $u_n(\mathbf{y})$ is the solution of

$$A_y(u_n(\mathbf{y}), v) = \langle f(\mathbf{y}), v \rangle - T_y(u_{n-1}(\mathbf{y}), v) \quad \forall v \in V.$$

Subtract both sides of the above equation from (33) and set $v = u_{n+1}(\mathbf{y}) - u_n(\mathbf{y})$ to obtain

$$C_m^2 \int_D a(\mathbf{y}) |\nabla u_{n+1}(\mathbf{y}) - \nabla u_n(\mathbf{y})|^2 = \int_D b(\mathbf{y}) ([u_{n-1}(\mathbf{y})]^m - [u_n(\mathbf{y})]^m) (u_{n+1}(\mathbf{y}) - u_n(\mathbf{y})).$$

The left-hand side is bounded by $\|u_{n+1} - u_n\|_V^2$ from below. To obtain an upper bound for the right-hand side, recall the elementary identity $a^m - b^m = (a - b) \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} a^{m-1-j} b^j$ and Lemma 3.1. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{n+1}(\mathbf{y}) - u_n(\mathbf{y})\|_V^2 &\leq \frac{\bar{b}}{2} \|u_{n+1}(\mathbf{y}) - u_n(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathcal{L}_1} \|u_n(\mathbf{y}) - u_{n-1}(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathcal{L}_1} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|u_n(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathcal{L}_1}^{m-1-j} \|u_{n-1}(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathcal{L}_1}^j \\ &\leq \frac{\bar{b}}{2} \|u_{n+1}(\mathbf{y}) - u_n(\mathbf{y})\|_V \|u_n(\mathbf{y}) - u_{n-1}(\mathbf{y})\|_V \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|u_n(\mathbf{y})\|_V^{m-1-j} \|u_{n-1}(\mathbf{y})\|_V^j, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where (25) has been used in the last step. Since $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{B}(0, \bar{f})$ for all n , the sum in the right-hand side of (34) is bounded by $m\bar{f}^{m-1}$. This and Assumption 3.2 imply the contraction property

$$\|u_{n+1}(\mathbf{y}) - u_n(\mathbf{y})\|_V \leq \gamma \|u_n(\mathbf{y}) - u_{n-1}(\mathbf{y})\|_V.$$

Since $\gamma < 1$, the sequence $\{u_n(\mathbf{y})\}$ converges to a fixed point in $\mathcal{B}(0, \bar{f})$ by the Banach fixed point theorem. \square

Estimate (32) and Lemma 3.3 imply (31) with

$$\bar{u} := \begin{cases} \frac{\bar{f}}{1-\gamma} & \text{if } m = 1 \\ \bar{f} & \text{if } m \geq 2 \end{cases}. \quad (35)$$

According to the Assumption 3.2, the magnitude of b will decrease as m and \bar{f} grow. As an alternative, we consider Assumption 3.4, which helps to relax this, when T_y is nonnegative.

Assumption 3.4. *The function $b(\mathbf{y})$ is non-negative for almost $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in D \times U$ and m is an odd positive integer such that $(d, m) \in \mathcal{M}$.*

In case Assumption 3.4 is satisfied, we choose the operator $\mathcal{S}_y : V \rightarrow V^*$ such that $\langle \mathcal{S}_y(u), v \rangle = A_y(u, v) + T_y(u, v)$. As an immediate consequence of (28) and (29), the operator \mathcal{S}_y is continuous and bounded. Moreover, \mathcal{S}_y is strictly monotone operator, since $b(\mathbf{y}) \geq 0$ and $(\cdot)^m$ is a monotonously increasing function when m is an odd number. Indeed, for every $w, v \in V$ such that $w \neq v$, we have

$$\langle \mathcal{S}_y(w) - \mathcal{S}_y(v), w - v \rangle = C_m^2 \int_D a(\mathbf{y}) |\nabla w - \nabla v|^2 + \int_D b(\mathbf{y}) (w^m - v^m)(w - v) \geq \|w - v\|_V^2 > 0.$$

Substitute $v = 0$ in the above inequality and notice that $\mathcal{S}_y(0) = 0$ to arrive at

$$\langle \mathcal{S}_y(w), w \rangle = A_y(w, w) + T_y(w, w) \geq \|w\|_V^2 \quad \forall w \in V, \quad (36)$$

and thus \mathcal{S}_y is coercive. By the Minty-Browder Theorem, the operator \mathcal{S}_y is bijective, and hence the problem (21) has uniquely determined solution in V . In this case (36) gives

$$\|u\|_V^2 \leq \langle \mathcal{S}_y(u), u \rangle = \langle f, u \rangle \leq \|f\|_{V^*} \|u\|_V$$

and hence, by (3), we may choose $\bar{u} = \frac{\bar{f}}{2}$ for the upper bound (31).

For each $\mathbf{y} \in U$, we denote by $\tilde{A}_y(u, w, v)$ the linearization of (30) mapping from $V \times V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\tilde{A}_y(u, w, v) = C_m^2 \int_D a(\mathbf{y}) \nabla w \cdot \nabla v + m \int_D b(\mathbf{y}) u^{m-1} w v. \quad (37)$$

The following Lemma shows the coercivity of \tilde{A}_y , which is required for the regularity proof in Section 4.

Lemma 3.5. *Let a, b and f satisfy Assumption 3.2 or Assumption 3.4. The operator \tilde{A}_y is uniformly coercive in y , i.e.*

$$\tilde{A}_y(u, v, v) \geq C_A \|v\|_V^2, \quad \forall v \in V \text{ and } \forall u \in \mathcal{B}(0, \bar{f}) \quad (38)$$

where $C_A := 1$ if Assumption 3.4 holds and $C_A := 1 - \gamma$ if Assumption 3.2 holds.

Proof. Assumption 3.4 sets b non-negative and m an odd number. This implies that $b(y)u^{m-1}$ is nonnegative and

$$\tilde{A}_y(u, v, v) \geq C_m^2 \|v\|_{H_0^1(D)}^2 + m \int_D b(y) u^{m-1} v^2 \geq \|v\|_V^2.$$

This shows that $C_A = 1$ in this case. If, instead, Assumption 3.2 is valid, analogous considerations imply

$$\tilde{A}_y(u, v, v) \geq \left(1 - m \frac{\bar{b}}{2} \|u\|_V^{m-1}\right) \|v\|_V^2.$$

For $m = 1$, we have $\bar{b}/2 = \gamma$, and therefore $C_A = 1 - \gamma$. In case $m \geq 2$, notice that $u \in \mathcal{B}(0, \bar{f})$, we obtain

$$\tilde{A}_y(u, v, v) \geq \left(1 - m \left(\frac{\gamma}{m \bar{f}^{m-1}}\right) \bar{f}^{m-1}\right) \|v\|_V^2 \geq (1 - \gamma) \|v\|_V^2.$$

It also shows that $C_A = 1 - \gamma$ and finishes the proof. \square

4. Parametric regularity and the formulation of main result

The following theorem is the main regularity result of this paper.

Theorem 4.1. *Let the coefficients a, b and the right-hand side f of (21) satisfy Assumption 2.5 for some $\delta \geq 1$ and suppose moreover that either Assumption 3.2 or Assumption 3.4 hold. Then the solution u of (21) is of class Gevrey- δ . more precisely, the following estimates are valid for all $v \in \mathcal{F}$ and $y \in U$*

$$\|\partial^v u(y)\|_V \leq \frac{C_u \rho^{|v|} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]^{|v|}}{\mathbf{R}^v} (|v|!)^{\delta-1} \quad (39)$$

and

$$\|\partial^v u(y)\|_{H_0^1(D)} \leq \frac{C_u \rho^{|v|} (|v|!)^\delta}{C_m \mathbf{R}^v}. \quad (40)$$

The constants in the above bounds are explicitly determined as

$$C_u := \bar{u} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho := C_A^{-1} (3\bar{a} + 3(4\bar{u})^{m-1} \bar{b} + 1). \quad (41)$$

To prove the above Theorem, we require auxiliary upper bounds for derivatives of the solution from Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3 below.

Lemma 4.2. *For sufficiently regular solutions of (30) there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} C_A \|\partial^{v+e} u\|_V &\leq \sum_{0 \leq \eta \leq v} \binom{v}{\eta} \|\partial^{v+e-\eta} a\|_{L^\infty(D)} \|\partial^\eta u\|_V + \sum_{0 \leq \eta \leq v} \binom{v}{\eta} \|\partial^{v+e-\eta} b\|_{L^\infty(D)} \|\partial^\eta (u^m)\|_{\mathcal{L}_m} \\ &+ \|\partial^{v+e} f\|_{V^*} + \sum_{0 < \eta \leq v} \binom{v}{\eta} \|\partial^\eta a\|_{L^\infty(D)} \|\partial^{v+e-\eta} u\|_V \\ &+ \sum_{0 < \eta \leq v} \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq \eta} \binom{v}{\eta} \binom{\eta}{\ell} \|\partial^{\eta-\ell} b\|_{L^\infty(D)} \|\partial^\ell (u^{m-1})\|_{\mathcal{L}_{m-1}} \|\partial^{v+e-\eta} u\|_V, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where e is a unit multi-index in \mathcal{F} , i.e. $|e| = 1$.

Proof. We recall the variational formulation (21) and take the e -th derivative its both sides with respect to \mathbf{y} . Collecting the terms with $\partial^\ell u$ on the left-hand side we obtain

$$C_m^2 \int_D a \partial^e \nabla u \cdot \nabla v + m \int_D b u^{m-1} \partial^e u v = -C_m^2 \int_D \partial^e a \nabla u \cdot \nabla v - \int_D \partial^e b u^m v + C_m \int_D \partial^e f v. \quad (43)$$

Observe that the left-hand side can be expressed as $\tilde{A}_y(u, \partial^e u, v)$, where the linearized form \tilde{A}_y has been introduced in (37). Notice that the first and the second argument of this expression depend on \mathbf{y} . Therefore, if we take higher ν -th order derivatives of (43), both the first and the second argument of \tilde{A}_y will generate further terms by the Leibniz product rule. But the highest order derivative $\partial^{\nu+e} u$ will only appear in the term $\tilde{A}_y(u, \partial^{\nu+e} u, v)$. Isolating this term on the left-hand side, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}_y(u, \partial^{\nu+e} u, v) &= -C_m^2 \sum_{0 \leq \eta \leq \nu} \binom{\nu}{\eta} \int_D \partial^{\nu+e-\eta} a \partial^\eta \nabla u \cdot \nabla v - \sum_{0 \leq \eta \leq \nu} \binom{\nu}{\eta} \int_D \partial^{\nu+e-\eta} b \partial^\eta (u^m) v + C_m \int_D \partial^{\nu+e} f v \\ &\quad - C_m^2 \sum_{0 < \eta \leq \nu} \binom{\nu}{\eta} \int_D \partial^\eta a \partial^{\nu+e-\eta} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v - m \sum_{0 < \eta \leq \nu} \binom{\nu}{\eta} \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq \eta} \binom{\eta}{\ell} \int_D \partial^{\eta-\ell} b \partial^\ell (u^{m-1}) \partial^{\nu+e-\eta} u v. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Since (44) is valid for all $v \in V$ we may select specifically $v = \partial^{\nu+e} u$. According to Lemma 3.5, the left-hand side admits the bound $\tilde{A}_y(u, \partial^{\nu+e} u, \partial^{\nu+e} u) \geq C_A \|\partial^\nu u\|_V^2$. Applying the triangle and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} C_A \|\partial^\nu u\|_V &\leq \sum_{0 \leq \eta \leq \nu} \binom{\nu}{\eta} \|\partial^{\nu+e-\eta} a\|_{L^\infty(D)} \|\partial^\eta \nabla u\|_V + \sum_{0 \leq \eta \leq \nu} \binom{\nu}{\eta} \|\partial^{\nu+e-\eta} b\|_{L^\infty(D)} \|\partial^\eta (u^m)\|_{\mathcal{L}_m} + \|\partial^{\nu+e} f\|_{V^*} \\ &\quad + \sum_{0 < \eta \leq \nu} \binom{\nu}{\eta} \|\partial^\eta a\|_{L^\infty(D)} \|\partial^{\nu+e-\eta} \nabla u\|_V + m \sum_{0 < \eta \leq \nu} \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq \eta} \binom{\nu}{\eta} \binom{\eta}{\ell} \|\partial^{\eta-\ell} b\|_{L^\infty(D)} \|\partial^\ell (u^{m-1})\|_{\mathcal{L}_{m-1}} \|\partial^{\nu+e-\eta} u\|_{\mathcal{L}_1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have applied the Hölder inequality (23) and the Sobolev embedding estimate (25) for the terms on the right-hand side. Notice that $\|\partial^\nu u\|_V$ is cancelled on the both sides. Finally, observe that the Sobolev embedding also yields $\|\partial^{\nu+e-\eta} u\|_{\mathcal{L}_1} \leq \|\partial^{\nu+e-\eta} u\|_V$ and, hence, the statement of the Lemma. \square

The right-hand side of (42) contains the terms of the type $\|\partial^\mu (u^k)\|_{\mathcal{L}_k}$, where $k = m-1$ or m and $\mu \in \mathcal{F}$. The following Lemma determines explicit upper bounds for these powers of u , if corresponding bounds for u itself are available. This result together with Lemma 4.2 is the key ingredient in the inductive proof of Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{F}$, suppose that (39) holds for all multi index $\ell \leq \mu$, i.e.*

$$\|\partial^\ell u(\mathbf{y})\|_V \leq \frac{C_u \rho^{|\ell|} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\ell|}}{R^\ell} (|\ell|!)^{\delta-1} \quad \forall \ell \leq \mu. \quad (45)$$

Then, for all $k \leq m$ the following estimates are valid

$$\|\partial^\mu (u(\mathbf{y})^k)\|_{\mathcal{L}_k} \leq \frac{4^{k-1} C_u^k \rho^{|\mu|} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\mu|}}{R^\mu} (|\mu|!)^{\delta-1}. \quad (46)$$

Proof. We will prove the above Lemma by induction with respect to m . The basis of induction, the case $m = 1$, follows from the assumption (45) and the Sobolev embedding (25). For the inductive step, we now assume that (46) holds for all number $k \leq m$ and prove that this implies the same bound for $k = m+1$. Applying Leibniz general product rule to $u^{m+1} = u^m u$ and the triangle inequality, we arrive at

$$\|\partial^\mu (u^{m+1})\|_{\mathcal{L}_{m+1}} = \left\| \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq \mu} \binom{\mu}{\ell} \partial^\ell (u^m) \partial^{\mu-\ell} u \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_{m+1}} \leq \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq \mu} \binom{\mu}{\ell} \|\partial^\ell (u^m) \partial^{\mu-\ell} u\|_{\mathcal{L}_{m+1}}.$$

By the Hölder inequality (23) with $w = \partial^\ell(u^m)$, $v = \partial^{\mu-\ell}u$, $p = m$, $q = 1$ and recalling the inductive assumption for the individual terms we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial^\mu(u^{m+1})\|_{\mathcal{L}_{m+1}} &\leq \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq \mu} \binom{\mu}{\ell} \|\partial^\ell(u^m)\|_{\mathcal{L}_m} \|\partial^{\mu-\ell}u\|_{\mathcal{L}_1} \\
&\leq \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq \mu} \binom{\mu}{\ell} \left(\frac{4^{m-1} C_u^m \rho^{|\ell|} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\ell|}}{\mathbf{R}^\ell} (|\ell|!)^{\delta-1} \right) \left(\frac{C_u \rho^{|\mu-\ell|} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\mu-\ell|}}{\mathbf{R}^{\mu-\ell}} (|\mu-\ell|!)^{\delta-1} \right) \\
&= \frac{4^{m-1} C_u^{m+1} \rho^{|\mu|}}{\mathbf{R}^\mu} \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq \mu} \binom{\mu}{\ell} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\ell|} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\mu-\ell|} |\ell|!^{\delta-1} |\mu-\ell|!^{\delta-1} \\
&\leq \frac{4^m C_u^{m+1} \rho^{|\mu|}}{\mathbf{R}^\mu} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\mu|} |\mu|!^{\delta-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (13) and (14) in the last step. This finishes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Observe that (40) is a simple corollary from (39) by changing from the V -norm to the $H_0^1(D)$ -norm and the trivial bound $\left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_n \leq n!$. Therefore it remains to prove (39). Here we argue by induction with respect to the order of the derivative ν . For the first-order derivatives we use (42) with $\nu = \mathbf{0}$ and get

$$C_A \|\partial^\nu u\|_V \leq \|\partial^\nu a\|_{L^\infty(D)} \|u\|_V + \|\partial^\nu b\|_{L^\infty(D)} \|u^m\|_{\mathcal{L}_m} + \|\partial^\nu f\|_{V^*}.$$

For the term with u^m we recall the Hölder estimate (24), the Sobolev embedding (25), and (31) to obtain the upper bound $\|u^m\|_{\mathcal{L}_m} \leq \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_1}^m \leq \bar{u}^m$. Using this and the regularity assumption (20), we derive

$$\|\partial^\nu u\|_V \leq \frac{\bar{a} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_1}{C_A \mathbf{R}^e} \bar{u} + \frac{\bar{b} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_1}{C_A \mathbf{R}^e} \bar{u}^m + \frac{\bar{f} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_1}{C_A \mathbf{R}^e} = \bar{u} (\bar{a} + \bar{b} \bar{u}^{m-1} + 1) \frac{\left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_1}{C_A \mathbf{R}^e} \leq C_u \rho \frac{\left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_1}{\mathbf{R}^e}$$

Thus, the base of induction is satisfied for the constants C_u and ρ defined in (41). Suppose now that (39) is valid for the ν -th derivative. Our aim is to show that the same bound holds for the $(\nu + e)$ -th order derivative, where e is a unit multiindex. For this we combine (42) with regularity assumptions (20), the inductive assumption, and (46) for $\mu \leq \nu$ (this is valid by Lemma 4.3 and the inductive assumption) to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
C_A \|\partial^{\nu+e} u\|_V &\leq \sum_{0 \leq \eta \leq \nu} \binom{\nu}{\eta} \frac{\bar{a} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\nu+e-\eta|}}{\mathbf{R}^{|\nu+e-\eta|}} (|\nu+e-\eta|!)^{\delta-1} \frac{C_u \rho^{|\eta|} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\eta|}}{\mathbf{R}^\eta} (|\eta|!)^{\delta-1} \\
&\quad + \sum_{0 \leq \eta \leq \nu} \binom{\nu}{\eta} \frac{\bar{b} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\nu+e-\eta|}}{\mathbf{R}^{|\nu+e-\eta|}} (|\nu+e-\eta|!)^{\delta-1} \frac{4^{m-1} C_u^m \rho^{|\eta|} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\eta|}}{\mathbf{R}^\eta} (|\eta|!)^{\delta-1} + \frac{\bar{f} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\nu+e|}}{\mathbf{R}^{|\nu+e|}} (|\nu+e|!)^{\delta-1} \\
&\quad + \sum_{0 < \eta \leq \nu} \binom{\nu}{\eta} \frac{\bar{a} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\eta|}}{\mathbf{R}^\eta} (|\eta|!)^{\delta-1} \frac{C_u \rho^{|\nu+e-\eta|} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\nu+e-\eta|}}{\mathbf{R}^{|\nu+e-\eta|}} (|\nu+e-\eta|!)^{\delta-1} \\
&\quad + \sum_{0 < \eta \leq \nu} \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq \eta} \binom{\nu}{\eta} \binom{\eta}{\ell} \frac{\bar{b} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\eta-\ell|}}{\mathbf{R}^{\eta-\ell}} (|\eta-\ell|!)^{\delta-1} \frac{4^{m-2} C_u^{m-1} \rho^{|\ell|} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\ell|}}{\mathbf{R}^\ell} (|\ell|!)^{\delta-1} \frac{C_u \rho^{|\nu+e-\eta|} \left[\frac{1}{2}\right]_{|\nu+e-\eta|}}{\mathbf{R}^{|\nu+e-\eta|}} (|\nu+e-\eta|!)^{\delta-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Bound (13) yields estimates for products of the factorial terms. Observe that $0 < C_A \leq 1$ and therefore $\rho \geq 1$. This

helps to extract common factors on the right-hand side and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
C_A \|\partial^{v+e} u\|_V &\leq \frac{\rho^{|\mathbf{v}|}(|\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{e}|!)^{\delta-1}}{\mathbf{R}^{v+e}} \left(\bar{a} C_u \sum_{\mathbf{0} \leq \boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \mathbf{v}} \binom{\mathbf{v}}{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\mathbf{v}+e-\boldsymbol{\eta}|} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\eta}|} \right. \\
&\quad + \bar{b} 4^{m-1} C_u^m \sum_{\mathbf{0} \leq \boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \mathbf{v}} \binom{\mathbf{v}}{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\mathbf{v}+e-\boldsymbol{\eta}|} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\eta}|} + \bar{f} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\mathbf{v}+e|} \\
&\quad + \bar{a} C_u \sum_{\mathbf{0} < \boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \mathbf{v}} \binom{\mathbf{v}}{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\mathbf{v}+e-\boldsymbol{\eta}|} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\eta}|} \\
&\quad \left. + \bar{b} 4^{m-2} C_u^m \sum_{\mathbf{0} < \boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \mathbf{v}} \sum_{\mathbf{0} \leq \boldsymbol{\ell} \leq \boldsymbol{\eta}} \binom{\mathbf{v}}{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \binom{\boldsymbol{\eta}}{\boldsymbol{\ell}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\eta}-\boldsymbol{\ell}|} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\boldsymbol{\ell}|} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\mathbf{v}+e-\boldsymbol{\eta}|} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

According to (15)-(17), the bound for first and second sums is $2 \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\mathbf{v}+e|}$, the bound for fourth term is $\left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\mathbf{v}+e|}$, the last sum bounded by $4 \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\mathbf{v}+e|}$. Recalling that $\bar{f} \leq \bar{u} = C_u$ we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial^{v+e} u\|_V &\leq C_u C_A^{-1} \left(2\bar{a} + 2\bar{b}(4C_u)^{m-1} + 1 + \bar{a} + \bar{b}(4C_u)^{m-1} \right) \frac{\rho^{|\mathbf{v}|}(|\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{e}|!)^{\delta-1}}{\mathbf{R}^{v+e}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\mathbf{v}+e|} \\
&\leq C_u \frac{\rho^{|\mathbf{v}+e|}(|\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{e}|!)^{\delta-1}}{\mathbf{R}^{v+e}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \right]_{|\mathbf{v}+e|},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the definition (41) of ρ in the last step. We completes the inductive argument and thereby the proof of the theorem. \square

5. Applications and numerical experiments

In this section we give two numerical examples that demonstrate how the abstract regularity result of Theorem 4.1 can be applied to mathematically analyse convergence of numerical methods for nonlinear reaction-diffusion problems under uncertainty.

5.1. Gauss-Legendre quadrature

Let the domain $D = (0, 1)^2$ and consider the problem (1) with $a \equiv 1$, $f = 3(\cos(2\pi x_1) + 1)(\cos(3\pi x_2) + 1)$, $m = 3$ and b is one of following functions

$$b^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}, y) = 50(\cos^2(15\pi x_1 + y^{10}) + 1)(\cos^2(17\pi x_2 + y^{25}) + 1), \quad (47)$$

$$b^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}, y) = \left(\exp\left(-\frac{x_1^2 + x_2^2}{y+1}\right) + 1 \right) (\cos^2(15\pi x_1) + 1)(\cos^2(17\pi x_2) + 1). \quad (48)$$

Here y is a scalar real parameter with the range $[-1, 1]$. Since m is odd and both $b^{(1)}$ and $b^{(2)}$ are nonnegative, Assumption 3.4 is valid and therefore corresponding solutions $u^{(1)}$ and $u^{(2)}$ of (21) are uniquely determined in V for every $y \in [-1, 1]$. Consider the functional $\mathcal{G}(u)(y) := u(\mathbf{x}_0, y)$, $\mathbf{x}_0 = (0.5, 0.5)$, i.e. the point evaluation in the center of the computational domain D . Our goal is to compute numerically the (rescaled) expectation of $\mathcal{G}(u)(y)$ if y is a scalar real random variable uniformly distributed in $[-1, 1]$

$$I(\mathcal{G}(u)) := \int_{-1}^1 u(\mathbf{x}_0, y) dy. \quad (49)$$

Since the solution u is not available in closed form, the integral (49) can be approximated by numerical quadrature, e.g. the Gauss-Legendre quadrature, which is a reasonable choice for the case of a single real-valued parameter y . Let $\{\xi_i, w_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be the nodes and weights of the n -point Gauss-Legendre quadrature

$$Q_n[\mathcal{G}(u)] := \sum_{i=1}^n w_i u(\mathbf{x}_0, \xi_i). \quad (50)$$

We are interested in the behaviour of the quadrature error

$$\varepsilon_n = |I(\mathcal{G}(u)) - Q_n[\mathcal{G}(u)]| \quad (51)$$

with increasing n . It is known that the convergence of ε_n is strongly related to the regularity of u with respect to y . In particular [13, Theorem 5.2] implies that

$$\varepsilon_n \leq C \exp(-rn^{1/\delta}). \quad (52)$$

with positive constants C and r independent of n if u is of class Gevrey- δ .

- (1) In the case of the analytic diffusion coefficient $b^{(1)}$ as in (47) Theorem 4.1 implies that u is analytic in y , i.e. $\delta = 1$, and therefore we expect

$$\varepsilon_n^{(1)} \leq C \exp(-rn). \quad (53)$$

- (2) The diffusion coefficient $b^{(2)}$ is not analytic near $y = -1$, but is Gevrey- δ uniformly for all $y \in [-1, 1]$ with $\delta \geq 2$, see [14] and [13, Section 6]. Theorem 4.1 implies that u is Gevrey- δ with the same $\delta = 2$ and hence we expect

$$\varepsilon_n^{(2)} \leq C \exp(-rn^{1/2}). \quad (54)$$




Figure 1: Quadrature error $\varepsilon_n^{(1)}$ (left) with respect to the number n of quadrature points and Quadrature error $\varepsilon_n^{(2)}$ (right) with respect to $N = n^{1/2}$.

In order to observe the behaviour predicted in (53) and (54) we solve deterministic equations (21) in every quadrature point $y = \xi_i$ on a very fine finite element grid having 16.129 degrees of freedom. Since $I(\mathcal{G}(u))$ is not available in closed form, we approximate it by a very fine Gauss-Legendre quadrature $Q_{n^*}[\mathcal{G}(u)]$ with $n^* = 50$ quadrature nodes for $b^{(1)}$ and $n^* = 150$ quadrature nodes for $b^{(2)}$. As a solver for the nonlinear problem (21) we use the fixed-point iteration method (33) with an absolute error tolerance of 10^{-14} with respect to the $H_0^1(D)$ -seminorm.

In Figure 1, we plot the relative error $\varepsilon_n^{(1)}$ against the number of quadrature points n in the semi-logarithmic scale. The reference line clearly shows the linear trend of the type $-rn + \log C$ and thereby confirms (53).

In Figure 2, we plot the relative error $\varepsilon_n^{(2)}$ with respect to the square root of the number of quadrature points $N := n^{1/2}$ in the semi-logarithmic scale. Here we can also observe the linear trend of the type $-rN + \log C$. This confirms (54) and thereby demonstrates the meaning and validity of Theorem 4.1.

5.2. Quasi-Monte Carlo method for Gevrey functions

Let $Y = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$, for any given $s \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $\mathbf{y}_s = (y_1, \dots, y_s, 0, 0, \dots)$ the s -dimensional truncation of $\mathbf{y} \in U = Y^{\mathbb{N}}$. For a function $F : Y^{\mathbb{N}} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, our quantity of interest is the integral of the form

$$I(F) = \int_{Y^{\mathbb{N}}} F(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} \quad (55)$$

In this section we apply our main regularity result in Theorem 4.1 to analyse the convergence rate of Quasi-Monte Carlo (QMC) method for $F := \mathcal{G}(u)$, where $\mathcal{G}(u)(\mathbf{y}) := u(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y})$ is the point evaluation at the center of the computational domain D , i.e. the same linear functional introduced in Section 5.1. The QMC approximation reads

$$Q_{s,n}^{\Delta}(F) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F\left(\left\{\frac{i\mathbf{z}_s}{n} + \Delta\right\} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \quad (56)$$

which is a randomly shifted lattice rule with the generating vector $\mathbf{z}_s \in \mathbb{N}^s$, Δ is a random shift which is uniformly distributed over the cube $(0, 1)^s$, and n is the number of quadrature points. The braces in (56) indicate the fractional part of each component of the argument vector. Notice that $Q_{s,n}^{\Delta}(F)$ is a random variable itself. A popular measure of accuracy is the root mean square error

$$\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|I(F) - Q_{s,n}^{\Delta}(F)|^2},$$

where \mathbb{E} is the expectation with respect to the random shifts Δ . Moreover, $Q_{s,n}^{\Delta}(F)$ approximates only in the first s components, therefore it is natural to introduce the truncation

$$I_s(F) = \int_{Y^s} F(\mathbf{y}_s) dy_1 \dots dy_s \quad (57)$$

and use the triangle inequality to get the error decomposition

$$\text{RMSE} \leq |I(F) - I_s(F)| + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left(|I_s(F) - Q_{s,n}^{\Delta}(F)|^2\right)} \quad (58)$$

Assume from now on that the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 are valid. The first summand on the right-hand side of (58), the truncation error, can only converge to zero, if F becomes ‘‘less dependent’’ on y_s as $s \rightarrow \infty$. A sufficient condition that rigorously implies the desired behaviour is

$$\|\beta\|_{\ell^p} := \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \beta_j^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty \quad (59)$$

for some $p \in (0, 1]$ and $\beta_j := R_j^{-1}$, i.e. R_j in Theorem 4.1 grows sufficiently fast with j . Following closely the arguments in [9, Theorem 4.1] and [1, Lemma 7.3], this implies

$$|I(F) - I_s(F)| \leq C_1 s^{-2\left(\frac{1}{p}-1\right)}, \quad (60)$$

where C_1 depends on $\delta \geq 1$, but is independent of s .

The estimate for the second summand in the right-hand side of (58), the quadrature error, can be analysed for $\delta \geq 1$ following the arguments of [1, Lemma 7.4], [9, Theorem 4.2] and [15, Theorem 6.4]. As a corollary of these results, for a fixed integer s and n being a power of 2, a QMC quadrature rule $Q_{s,n}^{\Delta}$ can be explicitly constructed, so that

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left(|I_s(F) - Q_{s,n}^{\Delta}(F)|^2\right)} \leq C_2 n^{-\frac{1}{2\delta}}, \quad (61)$$

where C_2 is independent of n and

$$\vartheta = \begin{cases} \omega & \text{for some } \omega \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1) & \text{when } p \in (0, \frac{2}{3\delta}] \\ \frac{\delta p}{2-\delta p} & & \text{when } p \in (\frac{2}{3\delta}, \frac{1}{\delta}] \end{cases}$$

This result requires assumptions of Theorem 4.1 and (59) in the reduced range $p \in (0, \delta^{-1})$. The result is still valid for $p = \delta^{-1}$ if (59) is replaced with $\|\beta\|_{\ell^p} < \sqrt{6}$. In this case the convergence rate deteriorates to the rate of the plain Monte Carlo estimator, that is

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left(|I_s(F) - Q_{s,n}^\Delta(F)|^2 \right)} \leq C_3 n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (62)$$

and the Monte Carlo sample average

$$Q_{s,n}^{MC}(F) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^k F(\mathbf{y}_s^{(i)}) \quad (63)$$

with independent samples $\mathbf{y}_s^{(i)}$ from the uniform distribution in Y^s . The constant C_3 is determined by the variance of $F(\mathbf{y}_s)$ and thereby is independent of n .

Observe that the Gevrey- δ non-analytic regularity (i.e., $\delta > 1$) has a more significant effect on the QMC error (61) rather than on the truncation error (60). For this reason in the forthcoming example we concentrate specifically on this contribution. Let $D = (0, 1)^2$ and consider the problem (1) with $a \equiv 1$ and $f \equiv 1$, $m = 5$ and b being one of following functions

$$b^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 2 + 2 \exp \left(-\zeta(5) + \sum_{j=1}^{100} j^{-5} \sin(j\pi x_1) \sin(j\pi x_2) y_j \right), \quad (64)$$

$$b^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 3 + \frac{1}{\zeta(5)} \sum_{j=1}^{100} j^{-5} \sin(j\pi x_1) \sin(j\pi x_2) \exp \left(-\frac{1}{y_j + \frac{1}{2}} \right), \quad (65)$$

Here y_j are scalar real random variables uniformly distributed in $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $\beta^{(k)} \in \ell^p$ with any $p > \frac{1}{5}$ for both test cases $k = 1$ and $k = 2$. Moreover, $a^{(1)}$ is analytic in \mathbf{y} ($\delta^{(1)} = 1$), whereas $a^{(2)}$ is Gevrey- δ with $\delta^{(2)} = 2$. From Theorem 4.1 we know that this regularity carries over to the solution $u^{(1)}$ and $u^{(2)}$ with the same δ . The point values $u(x_0, \cdot)$ are computed on a very fine uniform finite element mesh having 16.129 degrees of freedom, so that the effect of the finite element discretization is negligible. As in Section 5.1, we use the fixed-point iteration (33) with an absolute error tolerance of 10^{-14} with respect to the $H_0^1(D)$ -seminorm. The outer expectation is approximated by the empirical mean of $R = 8$ runs, i.e., for $\Delta^{(j)}$, $1 \leq j \leq R$ being an independent sample from the uniform distribution from the unit cube $(0, 1)^s$ and $Q_{s,n}^{(j)}(F^{(k)})$ the corresponding QMC quadrature, we approximate the relative QMC error by

$$\varepsilon_n^{\text{QMC},(k)} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{R} \sum_{j=1}^R \left(\left| \frac{I_s^*(F^{(k)}) - Q_{s,n}^{(j)}(F^{(k)})}{I_s^*(F^{(k)})} \right|^2 \right)}, \quad (66)$$

and analogously for the plain Monte Carlo approximation $\varepsilon_n^{\text{MC},(k)}$. In the above notation, $k = 1$ corresponds to the test case with $b = b^{(1)}$ and $k = 2$ corresponds to the test case with $b = b^{(2)}$. In both cases the reference value $I_s^*(F^{(k)})$ is the highest level of the QMC approximation.

Since $p \in (0, \frac{2}{3\delta^{(2)}}) \subset (0, \frac{2}{3\delta^{(1)}})$, we expect from the above theory that $\varepsilon_n^{\text{QMC},(k)}$ is approximately proportional to n^{-1} and $\varepsilon_n^{\text{MC},(k)}$ to $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. In Figure 3 we clearly observe that this convergence behaviour is reproduced.

References

- [1] A. Chernov, T. Le, Analytic and gevrey class regularity for parametric elliptic eigenvalue problems and applications, 2023. [arXiv:2306.07010](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.07010).
- [2] M. Hansen, C. Schwab, Analytic regularity and nonlinear approximation of a class of parametric semilinear elliptic PDEs, Math. Nachr. 286 (2013) 832–860. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/mana.201100131>. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/mana.201100131>.
- [3] B.-H. Bahn, Semilinear elliptic eigenvalue problem: Parametric analyticity and the uncertainty quantification, 2023. [arXiv:2308.03159](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.03159).
- [4] A. Cohen, R. DeVore, C. Schwab, Convergence rates of best n-term galerkin approximations for a class of elliptic sPDEs, Foundations of Computational Mathematics 10 (2010) 615–646. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-010-9072-2>. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10208-010-9072-2>.
- [5] A. Cohen, R. Devore, C. Schwab, Analytic regularity and polynomial approximation of parametric and stochastic elliptic PDE's, Anal. Appl. (Singap.) 9 (2011) 11–47. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219530511001728>. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S0219530511001728>.




Figure 2: Convergence of the quadrature error with respect to the number of samples n for four methods: QMC analytic ($\varepsilon_n^{\text{QMC}(1)}$), QMC Gevrey ($\varepsilon_n^{\text{QMC}(2)}$), MC analytic ($\varepsilon_n^{\text{MC}(1)}$), MC Gevrey ($\varepsilon_n^{\text{MC}(2)}$).

- [6] F. Y. Kuo, C. Schwab, I. H. Sloan, Quasi-Monte Carlo methods for high-dimensional integration: the standard (weighted Hilbert space) setting and beyond, ANZIAM J. 53 (2011) 1–37. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1446181112000077>. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1446181112000077>.
- [7] F. Y. Kuo, D. Nuyens, Application of quasi-Monte Carlo methods to elliptic PDEs with random diffusion coefficients: a survey of analysis and implementation, Found. Comput. Math. 16 (2016) 1631–1696. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-016-9329-5>. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10208-016-9329-5>.
- [8] M. Mizuguchi, K. Tanaka, K. Sekine, S. Oishi, Estimation of Sobolev embedding constant on a domain dividable into bounded convex domains, J. Inequal. Appl. (2017) Paper No. 299, 18. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13660-017-1571-0>. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13660-017-1571-0>.
- [9] A. D. Gilbert, I. G. Graham, F. Y. Kuo, R. Scheichl, I. H. Sloan, Analysis of quasi-monte carlo methods for elliptic eigenvalue problems with stochastic coefficients, Numerische Mathematik 142 (2019) 863–915. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-019-01046-6>. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00211-019-01046-6>.
- [10] S. G. Krantz, H. R. Parks, A Primer of Real Analytic Functions, Birkhäuser Boston, 2002. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-8176-8134-0>. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-0-8176-8134-0>.
- [11] L. B. D. Monvel, P. Krée, Pseudo-differential operators and gevrey classes, Annales de l’institut Fourier 17 (1967) 295–323. URL: <https://doi.org/10.5802/aif.258>. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5802/aif.258>.
- [12] M. Struwe, Variational methods, volume 34 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*, fourth ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008. Applications to nonlinear partial differential equations and Hamiltonian systems.
- [13] A. Chernov, C. Schwab, Exponential convergence of Gauss-Jacobi quadratures for singular integrals over simplices in arbitrary dimension, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 50 (2012) 1433–1455. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/100812574>. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/100812574>.
- [14] H. Chen, L. Rodino, General theory of PDE and Gevrey classes, in: General theory of partial differential equations and microlocal analysis (Trieste, 1995), volume 349 of *Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser.*, Longman, Harlow, 1996, pp. 6–81.
- [15] F. Y. Kuo, C. Schwab, I. H. Sloan, Quasi-monte carlo finite element methods for a class of elliptic partial differential equations with random coefficients, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis 50 (2012) 3351–3374. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41820107>.