

ADAPTIVE STOCHASTIC GALERKIN FINITE ELEMENT METHODS: OPTIMALITY AND NON-AFFINE COEFFICIENTS

MARKUS BACHMAYR¹, HENRIK EISENMANN¹, AND IGOR VOULIS²

ABSTRACT. Near-optimal computational complexity of an adaptive stochastic Galerkin method with independently refined spatial meshes for elliptic partial differential equations is shown. The method takes advantage of multilevel structure in expansions of random diffusion coefficients and combines operator compression in the stochastic variables with error estimation using finite element frames in space. A new operator compression strategy is introduced for nonlinear coefficient expansions, such as diffusion coefficients with log-affine structure.

Keywords. stochastic Galerkin method, finite elements, frame-based error estimation, multilevel expansions of random fields, optimality

Mathematics Subject Classification. 35J25, 35R60, 41A10, 41A63, 42C10, 65N50, 65N30

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper deals with adaptive numerical methods for parameter-dependent or random elliptic partial differential equations (PDEs) based on a joint variational formulation in spatial and parametric variables, where the latter can be interpreted as random variables on which the data and thus the solutions of the considered PDE depend. We treat here the case of infinitely many parameters, which is common when random fields are represented in series expansions.

We analyze the optimality properties of the adaptive stochastic Galerkin finite element method that was proposed and shown to converge in [5] for problems with parametric diffusion coefficients. This method generates sparse expansions in terms of product Legendre polynomials in the stochastic variables, where each Legendre coefficient is a spatial finite element function on an individually refined mesh. We extend the method from [5], which is designed for affine coefficient parametrizations, to more general smooth nonlinear parametrizations by a new operator compression scheme. For both cases, we show optimality with respect to the total number of degrees of freedom of the generated approximations and, provided that an expansion with multilevel structure is chosen for the parametric coefficient, near-optimal computational costs of the method.

1.1. Uniformly elliptic parametric PDEs. On a polygonal domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, where typically $d \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we consider the elliptic model problem

$$(1.1) \quad -\nabla \cdot (a \nabla u) = f \quad \text{on } D, \quad u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial D,$$

in weak formulation with $f \in L_2(D)$. Assuming \mathcal{M}_0 to be a countable index set with $0 \in \mathcal{M}_0$ and taking $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_0 \setminus \{0\}$, the parameter-dependent coefficient a is specified by a function series in terms of given $\theta_\mu \in L_\infty(D)$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0$, parametrized by vectors of scalar coefficients $y = (y_\mu)_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} \in Y$ with the parameter domain $Y = [-1, 1]^{\mathcal{M}}$.

¹ INSTITUT FÜR GEOMETRIE UND PRAKTISCHE MATHEMATIK, RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY, TEMPLERGRABEN 55, 52062 AACHEN, GERMANY

² INSTITUTE FOR NUMERICAL AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF GÖTTINGEN, LOTZESTR. 16-18, 37083 GÖTTINGEN, GERMANY

E-mail addresses: bachmayr@igpm.rwth-aachen.de, eisenmann@igpm.rwth-aachen.de, i.voulis@math.uni-goettingen.de.

Date: March 25, 2025.

M.B. acknowledges funding by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – project numbers 442047500, 501389786. The work of H.E. was funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft – project number 501389786.

A standard test case is the affine parametrization

$$(1.2) \quad a(y) = \theta_0 + \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} y_\mu \theta_\mu, \quad y = (y_\mu)_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} \in Y.$$

Nonlinear parametrizations are also of frequent interest; one example is the log-affine parametrization

$$(1.3) \quad a(y) = \exp\left(\theta_0 + \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} y_\mu \theta_\mu\right) = \exp(\theta_0) \prod_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} \exp(y_\mu \theta_\mu), \quad y \in Y,$$

but in the method developed in this work, we also admit more general smooth nonlinearities.

For any such choice of parametrization, we write

$$c_B = \inf_{y \in Y} \operatorname{ess\,inf}_D a(y).$$

In the case of (1.2), well-posedness of (1.1) uniformly for all $y \in Y$ is ensured by the *uniform ellipticity condition* [11]

$$c_B = \operatorname{ess\,inf}_D \left\{ \theta_0 - \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} |\theta_\mu| \right\} > 0,$$

which entails the requirement $\operatorname{ess\,inf}_D \theta_0 > 0$. In the log-affine case (1.3), it suffices to require

$$\log(c_B) = \operatorname{ess\,inf}_D \left\{ \theta_0 - \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} |\theta_\mu| \right\} > -\infty.$$

For $C_B = \sup_{y \in Y} \|a(y)\|_{L_\infty(D)}$, we obtain

$$(1.4) \quad C_B \leq \begin{cases} 2\|\theta_0\|_{L_\infty(D)} - c_B, & \text{assuming (1.2),} \\ c_B^{-1} \exp(2\|\theta_0\|_{L_\infty(D)}), & \text{assuming (1.3).} \end{cases}$$

1.2. Stochastic Galerkin methods. We consider the solution map $y \mapsto u(y)$ as an element

$$\mathcal{V} = L_2(Y, V, \sigma) \simeq V \otimes L_2(Y, \sigma),$$

with $V = H_0^1(\Omega)$ and where for simplicity, we take σ to be the uniform measure on Y . This corresponds to assuming the scalar random coefficients y_μ to be independently uniformly distributed; however, other product distributions on Y could be treated in a completely analogous manner.

The variational formulation of (1.1) in both spatial and stochastic variables on the space \mathcal{V} reads: find $u \in \mathcal{V}$ such that for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$(1.5) \quad \langle Bu, v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}} = \int_Y \int_D a(y) \nabla u(y) \cdot \nabla v(y) \, dx \, d\sigma(y) = \int_Y \int_D f v(y) \, dx \, d\sigma(y).$$

Under uniform ellipticity, we have the equivalence of norms

$$(1.6) \quad c_B \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 \leq \langle Bv, v \rangle = \|v\|_B^2 \leq C_B \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2.$$

As a consequence, there is a unique solution of (1.5) that continuously depends on f , and this solution agrees with the solution of (1.1) pointwise in $y \in Y$.

We consider approximation spaces of the form

$$(1.7) \quad \mathcal{V}_N = \left\{ \sum_{\nu \in F} v_\nu \otimes L_\nu : v_\nu \in V_\nu, \nu \in F \right\} \subset \mathcal{V}$$

with a finite index set F , product Legendre polynomials L_ν , $\nu \in F$, and finite-dimensional subspaces $V_\nu \subset V$ for each $\nu \in F$. It is important to stress that the spaces V_ν are allowed to differ for each ν . This is especially beneficial if the functions θ_μ have local supports. Then also the functions u_ν in an expansion of u have local features, that can only be effectively captured by individual spatial discretizations.

The method analysed in this work is based on the stochastic Galerkin variational formulation for $u_N \in \mathcal{V}_N$,

$$\langle Bu_N, v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}} = \int_Y \int_D f v(y) \, dx \, d\sigma(y) \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{V}_N.$$

By Céa's lemma, the best approximation u_N to the solution u in the energy norm is also a quasi-best approximation in the \mathcal{V} -norm.

1.3. A convergent adaptive method. In [5], we introduced an adaptive Galerkin method for solving (1.1) in the formulation (1.5) using finite elements as spatial approximation spaces in (1.7). This method ensures energy norm error reduction by a uniform factor in each step, which is also known as *saturation property*, and thus convergence in \mathcal{V} -norm.

As discussed in detail in [5, Sec. 1.3], the best possible convergence rates of approximations with respect to the total number of degrees of freedom can be achieved when coefficient parametrization functions θ_μ , $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$, with multilevel structure are combined with independently refined adaptive meshes for the Legendre coefficients. This complicates adaptive error estimation and mesh refinement. The task amounts to extracting spatially localized error information from the coupled elliptic systems of equations for the individual Legendre coefficients that result from stochastic Galerkin discretization. Here standard techniques for error estimation are infeasible due to the impracticality of ensuring Galerkin orthogonality. Moreover, due to the interaction of independently refined meshes for the different Legendre coefficients, the residual involves facet functionals on potentially strongly varying levels of refinement. As a consequence, a standard cycle of marking elements followed by a single mesh refinement cannot guarantee uniform error reduction [10].

In [5], we overcome these issues by error estimation based on coefficients with respect to *finite element frames* [21, 22], that is, families of hat functions on all levels of a refinement hierarchy. This approach does not require Galerkin orthogonality and provides a natural handling of edge terms. Uniform error reduction is ensured by allowing for several steps of mesh refinement in each iteration of the method by on a tree coarsening procedure [6, 8].

The relevant subset of interactions between different Legendre coefficients under the action of the operator B for which this spatial error estimation and refinement is carried out is determined by a semi-discrete operator compression in the parametric variables. That this can be realized efficiently depends strongly on the multilevel structure of the coefficient parametrization. This strategy, adapted from our previous work [6] (where it was used with wavelet-based spatial discretizations), in [5] was applied only to affine parametrizations (1.2). In the present work, we make use of the flexibility that this approach offers to also apply it to nonlinear coefficient parametrizations.

1.4. Relation to previous work and novelty. The results on adaptive approximability of solutions with multilevel coefficient representations that are relevant for the present work have been obtained in [3] for the affine case (1.2), as summarized in [5, 6]. Polynomial approximations for problems with nonlinear coefficient parametrizations have been analyzed under similar assumptions in [26], but in a semi-discrete setting without spatial discretization.

Previous work on the complexity analysis of adaptive stochastic Galerkin methods focused on wavelet-based spatial discretizations. While the methods analyzed in [2, 18] are not of optimal complexity, optimal convergence with near-optimal computational costs was shown for the method in [6], which can be regarded as a precursor to the method using finite elements in [5] that we analyze in the present work. Here, we thus close the gap to the wavelet-based method in [6] in that we obtain analogous optimality properties, but with the additional flexibility of finite element discretizations, for example in the much simpler treatment of nontrivial domain geometries.

In the case of stochastic Galerkin FEM, we are not aware of any previous complete analysis of the complete computational complexity of such a method. For the method in [19], which also used a type of operator compression in the parametric variables, a semidiscrete analysis is performed that does not fully account for spatial discretizations. In [15], a method using the same mesh for all Legendre coefficients is shown to yield quasi-optimal mesh cardinalities, but without control on the overall costs. Methods using independent meshes have been considered in [7, 12, 14]. The convergence analysis in [7, 12], however, starts from assuming the saturation property, and no analysis of the computational costs is available.

While nonlinear coefficient parametrizations can in certain cases such as (1.3) be reduced to advection-diffusion problems with affine coefficients [25], a direct treatment as done here has the advantage of preserving the structure of the elliptic problem in the construction of

adaptive methods. For a single spatial mesh, convergence with uniform error reduction is shown for uniformly elliptic and bounded coefficients in [16], but without complexity estimates. To the best of our knowledge, the scheme analyzed here is the first adaptive method to guarantee convergence and optimal approximations for such nonlinear parametrizations with independent meshes for the Legendre coefficients.

Our assumptions lend themselves to an extension of the method considered here to problems with domain uncertainty, where a family of parameter-dependent domains is transformed to a reference domain [20, 26]. This results in matrix-valued parametric diffusion tensors, which that are rational functions with respect to each scalar parameter y_μ . Although the results of the present work are formulated for scalar-valued diffusion coefficients, we expect that they can be extended to this case.

1.5. Outline. In Section 2, we review the adaptive stochastic Galerkin finite element method introduced in [5] and formulate our main results concerning nonlinear coefficient parametrizations and the optimality properties of the method. The construction of new operator compression methods for the nonlinear parametrizations is carried out in Section 3. The computational costs of these new approximations are investigated in Section 4. We then prove our main results in Section 5 and summarize our findings in Section 6.

2. ADAPTIVE GALERKIN METHOD

2.1. Notation. We consider the problem (1.1) in variational form on $\mathcal{V} = L_2(Y, V, \sigma)$ as in (1.5). For the discretization of V , we consider conforming simplicial finite element meshes that are generated from an initial conforming mesh $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_0$ for $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ by bisection, as analyzed for general d in [23]. We write $\mathcal{T} \geq \hat{\mathcal{T}}$ if \mathcal{T} (which need not be conforming) can be generated from $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ by bisection. On such conforming meshes, we consider the standard Lagrange finite element spaces

$$(2.1) \quad V(\mathcal{T}) = \mathbb{P}_1(\mathcal{T}) \cap V,$$

where $\mathbb{P}_1(\mathcal{T})$ denotes the functions on D that are piecewise affine on each element of \mathcal{T} . For $L_2(Y, \sigma)$ we use the orthonormal basis of product Legendre polynomials

$$L_\nu(y) = \prod_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} L_{\nu_\mu}(y_\mu), \quad \nu \in \mathcal{F} = \{\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0^{\mathcal{M}} : \#\text{supp } \nu < \infty\}.$$

We now assume a family of simplicial meshes $\mathbb{T} = (\mathcal{T}_\nu)_{\nu \in F}$ with finite $F \subset \mathcal{F}$ and conforming $\mathcal{T}_\nu \geq \hat{\mathcal{T}}_0$ for each $\nu \in F$. Then we consider the stochastic Galerkin discretization subspaces $\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{T})$ given by

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{T}) = \left\{ \sum_{\nu \in F} v_\nu L_\nu : v_\nu \in V(\mathcal{T}_\nu), \nu \in F \right\} \subset \mathcal{V}.$$

The total number of degrees of freedom for representing each element of $\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{T})$ is then $\dim \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{T}) = \sum_{\nu \in F} \dim V(\mathcal{T}_\nu)$. We use the abbreviation

$$(2.3) \quad N(\mathbb{T}) = \sum_{\nu \in F} \#\mathcal{T}_\nu,$$

so that $N(\mathbb{T}) \approx \dim \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{T})$.

With the initial mesh $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_0$, for $j \geq 1$, let $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j$ be a refinement of $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{j-1}$ such that each element is bisected d times, meaning that each edge is bisected once [23]. We use the nodal basis functions $\psi_{j,k} \in V(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j) = \mathbb{P}_1(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j) \cap V$ with the property

$$(2.4) \quad \|\psi_{j,k}\|_V = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_{j,k}(x_{k'}) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if } k = k',$$

where $x_{k'}$ are the vertices of $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j$. We denote the set of corresponding indices by

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{N}_j = \{k : x_k \text{ is a node in } \hat{\mathcal{T}}_j\},$$

so that $\mathcal{N}_j \supset \mathcal{N}_{j-1} \supset \dots \supset \mathcal{N}_0$. Finally, let

$$(2.6) \quad \Theta = \{\lambda = (j, k) : j \in \mathbb{N}_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_j\}$$

be the index set for the functions ψ_λ .

We define $\text{level}(E)$, for each edge E , as the unique j such that the uniform mesh $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j$ contains E , and $\text{level}(T)$, for each simplicial element or face T , as the smallest j such that T can be resolved by $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j$. Similarly, for the indices $\lambda = (j, k) \in \Theta$, we define $|\lambda| = j$.

Moreover, we introduce the following notation for Legendre coefficients: for $\nu \in \mathcal{F}$ and $v \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$[v]_\nu = \int_Y v(y) L_\nu(y) \, d\sigma(y),$$

and similarly, for functionals $\xi \in \mathcal{V}' = L_2(Y, V', \sigma)$,

$$(2.7) \quad [\xi]_\nu = \int_Y \xi(y) L_\nu(y) \, d\sigma(y),$$

so that

$$\langle \xi, v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}', \mathcal{V}} = \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \langle [\xi]_\nu, [v]_\nu \rangle_{V', V}.$$

We also define the stochastic components $[B]_{\nu\nu'} : V \rightarrow V'$ of the operator B by its diffusion coefficient

$$[a]_{\nu\nu'}(x) = \int_Y a(x, y) L_\nu(y) L_{\nu'}(y) \, d\sigma(y),$$

and

$$(2.8) \quad \langle [B]_{\nu\nu'} v, w \rangle = \int_D [a]_{\nu\nu'}(x) \nabla v(x) \cdot \nabla w(x) \, dx.$$

2.2. Assumptions. For stochastic Galerkin methods based on multilevel expansions of random fields, the following assumptions on the functions θ_μ are natural; see [1] for an overview of expansions of this type and their applications.

Assumption 1. *We assume $\theta_\mu \in L_\infty(D)$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0$ such that the following conditions hold for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$:*

- (i) $\text{diam supp } \theta_\mu \approx 2^{-|\mu|}$,
- (ii) $\#\{\mu \in \mathcal{M} : |\mu| = \ell, \text{supp } \theta_\mu \cap B(x, r)\} \lesssim \max\{1, 2^{d\ell} r^d\}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r > 0$, where $B(x, r)$ is the ball of radius r with center x ,
- (iii) for some $\alpha > 0$, we have $\|\theta_\mu\|_{L_\infty(D)} \lesssim 2^{-\alpha|\mu|}$.

As a consequence of Assumption 1(ii) we also have the bound $\#\{\mu \in \mathcal{M} : |\mu| = \ell\} \lesssim 2^{d\ell}$.

Remark 2.1. Under similar assumptions, approximation rates for the resulting solutions u have been shown in [3]. In particular, under more general conditions on the θ_μ (which are implied by Assumption 1), but additionally assuming H^2 -regularity of the corresponding Poisson problem, the results in [3] yield for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $d \geq 2$ the existence of families of meshes \mathbb{T} with $N(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow \infty$ such that for any $s < \alpha/d$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$(2.9) \quad \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{T})} \|u - v\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq CN(\mathbb{T})^{-s}.$$

As the numerical tests in [6] indicate, with spatial approximations of sufficiently high order, this holds also for $\alpha > 1$. As discussed further also in [1, 6] and the survey [1], the limiting rate α/d is the same rate as the best possible rate for semidiscrete sparse polynomial approximation [4] and for finite element approximation of a single randomly chosen (spatial) realization of the solution $u(y)$ with $y \sim \sigma$. In the present context, optimality thus means achieving rates arbitrarily close to α/d .

To arrive at a method with controlled computational complexity, we also require the functions θ_μ to be piecewise polynomial on suitable simplicial meshes as follows.

Assumption 2. *There exists $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$, $\theta_\mu \in \mathbb{P}_m(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{|\mu|+\tau})$ and $\#\{T \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{|\mu|+k} : \text{supp } \theta_\mu \cap T \neq \emptyset\} \leq K$.*

In what follows, we restrict ourselves to piecewise linear finite elements as in (2.1) for convenience, but higher-order finite elements could be used in an entirely analogous manner. However, in the case of rough input random fields corresponding to $\alpha < 1$ in Assumption 1(iii), piecewise linear elements already yield the best possible convergence rate.

We consider the more general scenario that the diffusion coefficient is given by

$$(2.10) \quad a(x, y) = f\left(\sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} y_\mu \theta_\mu(x)\right)$$

with an analytic function f . For the approximation analysis we require Lemma 3.4 and knowledge of the analytic continuation of f to a rectangle in the complex plane.

Assumption 3. *The function f has a uniformly bounded analytic continuation to the open the rectangle*

$$\mathcal{R}_0 = \frac{1}{2}(-r_1 - r_2, r_1 + r_2) + \frac{i}{2}(-r_1 + r_2, r_1 - r_2)$$

with

$$r_1 = \frac{C\rho}{1 - 2^{-(\alpha - \alpha')}} \quad \text{and} \quad r_2 = \frac{C\rho^{-1}}{1 - 2^{-(\alpha + \alpha')}}.$$

Here, C is the hidden constant from Lemma 3.4(iv), $\rho > 1$, $\alpha' < \alpha$ and $|f(z)| \leq M$ for $z \in \mathcal{R}_0$.

We may assume the constant C in Assumption 3 to be one, by replacing the functions θ_μ with $\frac{1}{C}\theta_\mu$ and $f(z)$ by $f(Cz)$.

2.3. Semi-discrete residual approximation. We now describe the residual approximation in an adaptive solver when in contrast to [5, 6], the diffusion coefficient is not affine linear as in (1.2), but of the form (1.3) or the more general form (2.10). To this end, we first need a notion of costs for an approximated operator. For an approximation \tilde{B} of B we define the costs as

$$\text{cost}(\tilde{B}) = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \#\{\nu' \in \mathcal{F} : [\tilde{B}]_{\nu\nu'} \neq 0\} = \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}, \nu \in \mathcal{F}} \#\text{supp}([\tilde{B}(v \otimes L_\nu)]_{\nu'})_{\nu' \in \mathcal{F}}.$$

Then for any $v \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$\#\text{supp}([\tilde{B}v]_\nu)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \leq \text{cost}(\tilde{B}) \#\text{supp}([v]_\nu)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}}$$

For computing residual estimates and for approximately solving Galerkin systems, we require a sequence of such approximate operators $(B_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ satisfying

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \|B - B_n\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'} &\leq C_{\text{compr}} 2^{-\alpha' n}, \\ \text{cost}(B_n) &\leq C_{\text{cost}} 2^{dn} \end{aligned}$$

with α' possibly differing from α in Assumption 1(iii). In the affine linear case (1.2) such compressions are given by truncation, as for example used in [5, 6] with $\alpha = \alpha'$. This relies on the three term recursion of Legendre polynomials, which yield

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_Y \int_D y_\mu \theta_\mu L_\nu(y) \nabla v \cdot L_{\nu'}(y) \nabla w \, dx \, d\sigma(y) \\ = \left(\sqrt{\beta_{\nu_\mu+1}} \delta_{\nu+e_\nu, \nu'} + \sqrt{\beta_{\nu_\mu}} \delta_{\nu-e_\nu, \nu'} \right) \int_D \theta_\mu \nabla v \cdot \nabla w \, dx \end{aligned}$$

with $\beta_k = (4 - k^{-2})^{-1}$.

In Section 3, we provide approximations of operators for the log-uniform problem (1.3) in Theorem 3.10 and for more general diffusion coefficients in Theorem 3.12, at the price that constants deteriorate for smaller values of $\alpha - \alpha'$. With this machinery at hand, we can derive the same properties as for the affine case treated in [5, 6] of the routine APPLY given in Algorithm 2.1. Under our general assumptions on approximations of operators, we have the following result, where for sequences \mathbf{a} on arbitrary index sets and $s > 0$, we use the quasi-norms

$$\|\mathbf{a}\|_{\mathcal{A}^s} = \max_{N \geq 0} (N + 1)^s \min_{\#\text{supp } \mathbf{z} \leq N} \|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{z}\|_{\ell_2}$$

that characterize best N -term approximability with rate s .

Algorithm 2.1 $(F_i, n_i)_{i=0}^I = \text{APPLY}(v; \eta)$, for $N := \#\text{supp}([v]_\nu)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} < \infty$, $\eta > 0$.

- (i) If $\|B\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'} \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \eta$, return the empty tuple with $F = \emptyset$; otherwise, with $\bar{I} = \lceil \log_2 N \rceil$, for $i = 0, \dots, \bar{I}$, determine $F_i \subset \mathcal{F}$ such that $\#F_i \leq 2^i$ and $P_{F_i} v = \sum_{\nu \in F_i} [v]_\nu L_\nu$ satisfies

$$\|v - P_{F_i} v\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq C \min_{\#F \leq 2^i} \|v - P_F v\|_{\mathcal{V}}$$

with an absolute constant $C > 0$. Choose I as the minimal integer such that

$$\delta = \|B\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'} \|v - P_{F_I} v\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \frac{\eta}{2}.$$

- (ii) With $d_0 = P_{F_0} v$, $d_i = (P_{F_i} - P_{F_{i-1}})v$, $i = 1, \dots, \bar{I}$, and $N_i = \#F_i$, set

$$n_i = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\alpha'} \log_2 \left(\frac{C_{\text{compr}}}{\eta - \delta} \left(\frac{\|d_i\|_{\mathcal{V}}}{N_i} \right)^{\frac{\alpha'}{\alpha'+d}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^I \|d_k\|_{\mathcal{V}}^{\frac{d}{\alpha'+d}} N_k^{\frac{\alpha'}{\alpha'+d}} \right) \right) \right\rceil, \quad i = 0, \dots, I$$

and return $(F_i, n_i)_{i=0}^I$.

Algorithm 2.2 Adaptive Galerkin Method

Set the parameters $n, \zeta, \omega_0 < \omega_1$ and relative accuracy ρ , set initial $u^0 = 0$ and formally, $\|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^{-1}\|_{\ell_2} = C_\Psi \|f\|_{\mathcal{V}'}$. Let $k = 0$;

- (i) $(\Lambda^+, \hat{\mathbf{r}}^k, ([r^k]_\nu)_\nu, \eta_k, b_k) = \text{RESESTIMATE}(u^k; \zeta, \frac{\zeta}{1+\zeta} \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^{k-1}\|_{\ell_2}, \varepsilon)$
(ii) If $b_k \leq \varepsilon$, return u^k .
(iii) $\Lambda^{k+1} = \text{TREEAPPROX}(\Lambda^k, \Lambda^+, \hat{\mathbf{r}}^k, (1 - \omega_0^2) \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k\|_{\ell_2}^2)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k|_{\Lambda^{k+1}}\|_{\ell_2} &\geq \omega_0 \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k\|_{\ell_2}, \\ \#(\Lambda^{k+1} \setminus \Lambda(\mathbb{T}^k)) &\lesssim \#(\tilde{\Lambda} \setminus \Lambda(\mathbb{T}^k)) \quad \text{for any } \tilde{\Lambda} \supset \Lambda(\mathbb{T}) \text{ with tree structure} \\ &\text{such that } \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k|_{\tilde{\Lambda}}\|_{\ell_2} \geq \omega_1 \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k\|_{\ell_2}; \end{aligned}$$

- (iv) $\mathbb{T}^{k+1} = \text{MESH}(\Lambda^{k+1})$;
(v) $u^{k+1} = \text{GALERKINSOLVE}(\mathbb{T}^{k+1}, u^k, r^k, n, \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_P}} \frac{\rho}{c_\Psi} \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k\|_{\ell_2})$
(vi) $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go to (i);
-

Proposition 2.2. Let $s > 0$ with $s < \frac{\alpha'}{d}$, let B and the sequence $(B_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ satisfy (2.11), let v satisfy $\#\text{supp}([v]_\nu)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} < \infty$, and let n_i and d_i , $i = 0, \dots, I$, be as defined in Algorithm 2.1. Then

$$(2.13) \quad \max_{i=0, \dots, I} n_i \lesssim 1 + |\log \eta| + \log \left\| \left(\| [v]_\nu \|_{\mathcal{V}} \right)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \right\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}.$$

Moreover, for $g = \sum_{i=0}^I B_{n_i} d_i$ and $F^+ = \text{supp}([g]_\nu)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}}$, we have

$$(2.14) \quad \|Bv - g\|_{\mathcal{V}'} \leq \sum_{i=0}^I \|(B - B_{n_i})d_i\|_{\mathcal{V}'} \leq \eta$$

and

$$(2.15) \quad \#F^+ \lesssim \sum_{i=0}^I 2^{dn_i} \#F_i \lesssim \eta^{-\frac{1}{s}} \left\| \left(\| [v]_\nu \|_{\mathcal{V}} \right)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \right\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{\frac{1}{s}}.$$

The constants in the inequalities depend on C as in Algorithm 2.1, on C_B , d , α' , s , C_{compr} , and on C_{cost} from (2.11).

2.4. Adaptive Galerkin method. We now recapitulate the adaptive Galerkin method Algorithm 2.2 from [5]. While we follow the standard strategy of adaptive finite element schemes in iteratively refining discretizations by computing error estimates from approximate Galerkin solutions, the particular realization of error estimation and refinement differs in some crucial aspects.

The method `RESESTIMATE` (Algorithm 4.1, following [5, Alg. 3.4]) in Algorithm 2.2(i) generates localized residual error estimates and is the most involved routine. It first utilizes

APPLY in Algorithm 2.1 to produce a residual approximation $r^k \in \mathcal{V}'$ with $\text{supp}([r^k]_\nu) = F^+ \subset \mathcal{F}$ with

$$\left(\sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \|[f - Bu^k]_\nu - [r^k]_\nu\|_{V'}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \eta,$$

where $[r^k]_\nu = 0$ for $\nu \notin F$. Here each $[r^k]_\nu$ is piecewise polynomial on some $\mathcal{T}_\nu \geq \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_0$. Then for any J and for each $\nu \in F^+$ we can produce a finite set $\Theta_\nu^+ \subset \Theta$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Theta_\nu^+} \langle [r^k]_\nu, \psi_\lambda \rangle_{V',V}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C2^{-J} \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Theta} \langle [r^k]_\nu, \psi_\lambda \rangle_{V',V}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

utilizing that $[r^k]_\nu$ is piecewise polynomial. Then with

$$\Lambda^+ = \{(\nu, \lambda) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta : \nu \in F^+, \lambda \in \Theta_\nu^+\}$$

we set

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\nu,\lambda}^k = \langle [r^k]_\nu, \psi_\lambda \rangle_{L^2(D)}$$

for $(\nu, \lambda) \in \Lambda^+$, and $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\nu,\lambda}^k = 0$ otherwise. The method RESESTIMATE now finds a suitable Λ^+ such that with

$$\mathbf{z}_{\nu,\lambda}^k = \langle [f_B u^k]_\nu, \psi_\lambda \rangle_{V',V}$$

for any $(\nu, \lambda) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta$, we have the estimate

$$b_k - \eta_k \leq \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k - \mathbf{z}^k\|_{\ell_2(\mathcal{F} \times \Theta)} \leq \zeta \|\mathbf{z}^k\|_{\ell_2(\mathcal{F} \times \Theta)} \leq b_k.$$

The method [5, Alg. 3.4] is tailored to the case of affine coefficients (1.2). We adapt this method in Algorithm 4.1 to accommodate the use of more general operator approximations introduced in Section 3.

The discretization refinement is carried out in Algorithm 2.2(iii) and (iv) by the methods TREEAPPROX [6, Alg. 4.4] and MESH as described in [5, Sec. 3.2], generating a suitable family of meshes \mathbb{T}^{k+1} . Finally, in Algorithm 2.2(v) an approximate Galerkin solution in $\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{T}^{k+1})$ is computed with the method GALERKINSOLVE [5, Alg. 3.5].

2.5. Convergence and optimality. In [5, Thm. 4.3] we have shown the error reduction by a uniform factor of the iterates generated by Algorithm 2.2. The requirements on the parameters to achieve $\delta < 1$ and hence also achieve error reduction are

$$(2.16) \quad 0 < (C_{B,\Psi} + 2)\zeta < 1 \quad \text{with} \quad C_{B,\Psi} = \frac{C_\Psi^2 c_B}{c_\Psi^2 c_B}$$

and

$$(2.17) \quad \omega_0 > (C_{B,\Psi} + 1) \frac{\zeta}{1 - \zeta}.$$

Then it is possible to also find parameters n , ρ and \hat{J} such that $\gamma = \gamma(\zeta, n, \rho, \hat{J})$ satisfies

$$(2.18) \quad \gamma < \frac{\omega_0 - (1 + \omega_0)\zeta}{(1 + \zeta)\sqrt{C_{B,\Psi} C_B C_\Psi}}.$$

The main result of [5] is the following theorem on error reduction.

Theorem 2.3 (see [5, Thm. 4.3]). *Let (2.16) and (2.17) hold. Then there exist parameters n, ρ, \hat{J} such that (2.18) is satisfied, and the adaptive algorithm achieves the error reduction*

$$(2.19) \quad \|u - u^{k+1}\|_B \leq \delta \|u - u^k\|_B,$$

where

$$(2.20) \quad \delta = \left(1 - \frac{(\omega_0 - (1 + \omega_0)\zeta)^2}{C_{B,\Psi}} + \gamma^2 (1 + \zeta)^2 C_\Psi^2 C_B \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

One of the main results of the present work is that the iterates in Algorithm 2.2 are also quasi-optimal approximations to the solution whenever $u \in \mathcal{A}^s$ with $s > 0$, where $\mathcal{A}^s \subset \mathcal{V}$ is the class of solutions that can be approximated at rate s with respect to the total number of degrees of freedom, that is,

$$\mathcal{A}^s = \{v \in \mathcal{V} : |v|_{\mathcal{A}^s} < \infty\}, \quad |v|_{\mathcal{A}^s} = \sup_{N>0} N^s \min_{N(\mathbb{T}) \leq N} \min_{v_N \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{T})} \|v - v_N\|_{\mathcal{V}} < \infty.$$

Moreover, we show that for $s < \alpha/d$, the computational costs have scaling arbitrarily close to the optimal rate.

We obtain these optimality results under the additional condition

$$(2.21) \quad \omega_1(1 - \zeta) + \zeta < (1 - 2\zeta) \frac{c_{\text{stable}} \sqrt{c_B}}{C_\Psi \sqrt{C_B}},$$

where c_{stable} is a constant only dependent on $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_0$ introduced in Section 5.1. We prove the following result in Section 5.2.

Theorem 2.4. *Let the parameters of Algorithm 2.2 satisfy (2.16), (2.17), (2.18), and (2.21), and let the solution u of (1.1) satisfy $u \in \mathcal{A}^s$. Then we have the following:*

- (i) Quasi-optimal approximations to u : The iterates u^k of Algorithm 2.2 satisfy

$$N(\mathbb{T}^k) - N(\mathbb{T}^0) \leq C_1 C_2^{\frac{1}{s}} (1 - \delta^{\frac{1}{s}})^{-1} \|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}}^{-\frac{1}{s}} \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{\frac{1}{s}},$$

where $C_1 > 0$ depends only on shape regularity, $C_2 \geq 1$ is independent of u , k and s , and $\delta < 1$ is given by (2.20).

- (ii) Optimal computational complexity in the affine case up to logarithmic factor: If the diffusion coefficient is affine linear as in (1.2) and Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, then if $s < \frac{\alpha}{d}$, the number of elementary operations in the algorithm is bounded by

$$C_3 (1 + |\log \|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}}| + \log \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s})^3 \|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}}^{-\frac{1}{s}} \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{\frac{1}{s}},$$

with C_3 independent of k .

- (iii) Almost optimal computational complexity in the non-affine case: If the diffusion coefficient is given by (2.10) and if Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 hold, then there exist sequences of operator approximations B_n so that for any $s' < s < \frac{\alpha}{d}$, the number of elementary operations in the algorithm is bounded by

$$C_4 (1 + |\log \|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}}| + \log \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s})^r \|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}}^{-\frac{1}{s'}} \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{\frac{1}{s'}},$$

where $C_4 > 0$ is independent of k , and $r > 0$ is independent of s' , s and k .

3. COMPRESSIBLE INFINITE ELLIPTIC SYSTEMS OF PDES

As a first step in the adaptive scheme, we require a semidiscrete adaptive compression of the operator $B: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$. In the affine linear case (1.2) a suitable compression is given by the truncated operators B_n by

$$(3.1) \quad \langle B_n v, w \rangle = \int_Y \int_D \left(\theta_0 + \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \mathcal{M} \\ |\mu| < n}} y_\mu \theta_\mu \right) \nabla v(y) \cdot \nabla w(y) \, dx \, d\sigma(y) \quad \text{for all } v, w \in \mathcal{V}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A similar truncated operator can also be defined for the log-affine case

$$(3.2) \quad \langle B_n v, w \rangle = \int_Y \int_D \exp\left(\theta_0 + \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \mathcal{M} \\ |\mu| < n}} y_\mu \theta_\mu\right) \nabla v(y) \cdot \nabla w(y) \, dx \, d\sigma(y) \quad \text{for all } v, w \in \mathcal{V}.$$

In both cases, we get exponential decay with respect to n of the approximation error as long as the coefficients decay themselves, that is,

$$(3.3) \quad \sum_{|\mu|=n} |\theta_\mu| \leq C_2 2^{-\alpha n} \quad \text{a.e. in } D.$$

Proposition 3.1. *There is a constant $C_3 > 0$ depending on C_2 , α , and in the case of (3.2) on C_B , such that for all $n \geq 0$,*

$$\|B - B_n\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'} \leq C_3 2^{-\alpha n}.$$

Proof. For (3.1) this is [5, Prop. 3.1] or [6, Prop. 3.2]. In the case of (3.2), we have an additional factor given by the Lipschitz constant of \exp , which equals C_B . \square

3.1. Stochastic compression by stochastic truncation. The truncated operator B_n results from B by replacing $[B]_{\nu\nu'}$ by 0 if $\nu_\mu \neq \nu'_\mu$ with $|\mu| \geq n$. In the affine linear case (1.2), this truncation already suffices, as the stochastic components $[B]_{\nu\nu'}$ are given by the three term recursion (2.12) so that only 2^{2n} stochastic components of B_n are nonzero. In the log-affine case (1.3) however, $[B]_{\nu\nu'}$ vanishes only if ν and ν' differs at entries at μ and μ' and $\theta_\mu \theta_{\mu'} = 0$ in D , as will be seen later in Lemma 3.7. Therefore, applying the truncated operator B_n still leads to infinitely many stochastic components. This makes a more involved compression essential.

We first analyse the situation when only a collection of $A_{\nu\nu'}$ is applied. We make use of the following modification of Schur's lemma to estimate the truncation error. The proof is given in Appendix A.

Lemma 3.2. *Let the operator $B: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$ be given by*

$$\langle Bv, w \rangle = \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{\nu' \in \mathcal{F}} \int_D [a]_{\nu\nu'} \nabla[v]_{\nu'} \cdot \nabla[w]_{\nu} \, dx$$

with $[a]_{\nu\nu'} = [a]_{\nu'\nu}$. Then

$$\|B\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'} \leq \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \sum_{\nu' \in \mathcal{F}} |[a]_{\nu\nu'}| \right\|_{L^\infty(D)}.$$

We make use of the following approximation result.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $f: \mathcal{E}_\rho \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be holomorphic in the ellipse $\mathcal{E}_\rho = \{\frac{1}{2}(z + z^{-1}) \in \mathbb{C}: |z| < \rho\}$ and continuous up to its boundary. Let σ_1 be the uniform measure $d\sigma_1(y) = \frac{dy}{2}$. Then for $k > k'$,*

$$\left| \int_{-1}^1 f(y) L_k(y) L_{k'}(y) \, d\sigma_1(y) \right| \leq 2 \max_{z \in \mathcal{E}_\rho} |f(z)| \frac{\rho^2}{\rho^2 - 1} \rho^{-(k-k')}$$

and

$$\left| \int_{-1}^1 f(y) L_k(y) L_k(y) \, d\sigma_1(y) \right| \leq \max_{z \in [-1, 1]} |f(z)|.$$

Proof. Since f is holomorphic in \mathcal{E}_ρ , we can expand $f = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} f_\ell T_\ell$ as a sum of Chebyshev polynomials with $|f_\ell| \leq 2 \max_{z \in \mathcal{E}_\rho} |f(z)| \rho^{-\ell}$; see e.g., [24, Thm. 8.1]. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{-1}^1 f(y) L_k(y) L_{k'}(y) \, d\sigma_1(y) \right| &= \left| \int_{-1}^1 \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} f_\ell T_\ell(y) L_k(y) L_{k'}(y) \, d\sigma_1(y) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{-1}^1 \sum_{\ell=k-k'}^{\infty} f_\ell T_\ell(y) L_k(y) L_{k'}(y) \, d\sigma_1(y) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that L_k is orthogonal to polynomials of degree less than k . Moreover, as the integral of an odd function vanishes and by the decay of Chebyshev coefficients,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{-1}^1 f(y) L_k(y) L_{k'}(y) \, d\sigma_1(y) \right| &= \left| \int_{-1}^1 \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} f_{k-k'+2\ell} T_{k-k'+2\ell}(y) L_k(y) L_{k'}(y) \, d\sigma_1(y) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} |f_{k-k'+2\ell}| \leq 2 \max_{z \in \mathcal{E}_\rho} |f(z)| \frac{\rho^2}{\rho^2 - 1} \rho^{-(k-k')}. \end{aligned}$$

To obtain the second statement, we observe that

$$\left| \int_{-1}^1 f(y) L_k(y) L_k(y) \, d\sigma_1(y) \right| \leq \max_{z \in [-1, 1]} |f(z)| \int_{-1}^1 L_k(y)^2 \, d\sigma_1(y) = \max_{z \in [-1, 1]} |f(z)|. \quad \square$$

For further analysis, we show the following disjointness of supports of the functions θ_μ .

Lemma 3.4. *Let Assumption 1 be satisfied. Then there exists a number Q dependent on d and the hidden constants in Assumption 1 and a level assignment $|\cdot|_Q: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ satisfying*

- (i) *if $|\mu|_Q = |\mu'|_Q$ and $\mu \neq \mu'$, then $\theta_\mu \theta_{\mu'} = 0$ in $L_\infty(D)$,*
- (ii) *for all $\ell < |\mu|_Q$ there is at most one μ' with $|\mu'|_Q = \ell$ and $\theta_\mu \theta_{\mu'} \neq 0$ in $L_\infty(D)$,*
- (iii) *$\#\{\mu: |\mu|_Q = \ell\} \lesssim 2^{\frac{d}{Q}\ell}$,*
- (iv) *$\sum_{|\mu|=\ell} |\theta_\mu|_Q \lesssim 2^{-\frac{\alpha}{Q}\ell}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $\text{diam supp } \theta_\mu \leq 2^{-|\mu|}$. Let $r_\ell = 2^{-\ell}\sqrt{d}$. Then

$$D = \bigcup_{x \in 2^{-\ell}\mathbb{Z}^d} B(x, r_\ell) \cap D.$$

Also, for $x, y \in 2^{-\ell}\mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\|x - y\| \geq 3r_\ell$ and $|\mu| = |\mu'| = \ell$ with $\text{supp } \theta_\mu \cap B(x, r_j) \neq \emptyset$, $\text{supp } \theta_{\mu'} \cap B(y, r_j) \neq \emptyset$ we have $\theta_\mu \theta_{\mu'} = 0$. This condition is satisfied for $x, y \in 2^{-\ell}(3d\mathbb{Z})^d$, and thus we can achieve (i) with $3^d d^d$ sublevels. The point (ii) is also achieved similarly. \square

Remark 3.5. We provide convergence rates that depend only on the ratio α/d . Thus, for the asymptotic rate, the value of Q in Lemma 3.4 does not enter. It does, however, enter into the corresponding constants.

For further approximation and complexity estimation, it makes sense to further categorize the differences $\nu - \nu'$.

Definition 3.6. Let

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0) = \{\mathbf{k} = (k_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} : k_\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ and } k_\ell = 0 \text{ for all but finitely many } \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$$

be the set of sequences with values in the natural numbers with only finitely many nonzero entries. Then we define the set-valued functions

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\nu) = \left\{ \nu' \in \mathcal{F} : \sum_{|\mu|=\ell} |\nu_\mu - \nu'_\mu| = k_\ell, \quad \prod_{\mu: \nu_\mu - \nu'_\mu \neq 0} \theta_\mu \neq 0 \in L_\infty(D) \right\}.$$

Here, the empty product equals one, so that $\mathcal{S}_0(\nu) = \{\nu\}$.

Lemma 3.7. *Let Assumption 1 be satisfied, Q be from Lemma 3.4, and the diffusion coefficient given by (1.3). Then $[a]_{\nu\nu'} \neq 0$ implies $\nu' \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\nu)$ for some $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)$. Moreover, for any $\nu \in \mathcal{F}$, $0 < \alpha' < \alpha$ and $\rho > 1$, we get the estimate*

$$(3.4) \quad \sum_{\nu' \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\nu)} |[a]_{\nu\nu'}| \lesssim 4^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} \prod_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} (\rho 2^{\frac{\alpha'}{Q}\ell})^{-k_\ell}$$

in D with constants dependent on α', α, ρ , and Q , and

$$(3.5) \quad \#\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\nu) \lesssim 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} 2^{\frac{d}{Q} \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $|\cdot| = |\cdot|_Q$ from Lemma 3.4. Recall that the diffusion coefficient $[a]_{\nu\nu'}$ is given by

$$[a]_{\nu\nu'} = \prod_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} \int_{-1}^1 \exp(y_\mu \theta_\mu) L_{\nu_\mu}(y_\mu) L_{\nu'_\mu}(y_\mu) d\sigma_1(y_\mu).$$

Now let $\nu_\mu - \nu'_\mu \neq 0$ for some $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x \notin \text{supp } \theta_\mu$. By orthogonality of the Legendre polynomials it follows that $x \notin \text{supp } [a]_{\nu\nu'}$. As a first consequence, $[a]_{\nu\nu'} = 0$ if $\nu' \notin \bigcup_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)} \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\nu)$ by definition of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\nu)$. Furthermore, we note the following property of $\nu' \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\nu)$: let $L = \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}$ and let $\nu_\mu - \nu'_\mu \neq 0$ with $|\mu| = L$. Then the other entries of $\nu - \nu'$ are determined up to sign due to Lemma 3.4(ii). This directly gives (3.5) due to Lemma 3.4(iii). Also, different choices of μ with $|\mu| = L$ lead to disjoint supports due to Lemma 3.4(i).

It remains to provide the estimate (3.4). Let μ with $|\mu| = L$ and $\nu_\mu - \nu'_\mu \neq 0$. Then $[a]_{\nu\nu'} = 0$ on $D \setminus \text{supp } \theta_\mu$, and on $\text{supp } \theta_\mu$ we have the estimates

$$\left| \int_{-1}^1 \exp(y_{\mu'} \theta_{\mu'}) L_{\nu_{\mu'}}(y_{\mu'}) L_{\nu'_{\mu'}}(y_{\mu'}) d\sigma_1(y_{\mu'}) \right| \leq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \theta_{\mu'} \theta_\mu = 0 \text{ in } L_\infty(D), \\ \exp\left(\frac{\theta_{\mu'}}{2}(\rho_{\mu'} + \rho_{\mu'}^{-1})\right) \frac{\rho_{\mu'}^2}{\rho_{\mu'}^2 - 1} & \text{if } \nu_{\mu'} - \nu'_{\mu'} = 0, \\ 2 \exp\left(\frac{\theta_{\mu'}}{2}(\rho_{\mu'} + \rho_{\mu'}^{-1})\right) \frac{\rho_{\mu'}^2}{\rho_{\mu'}^2 - 1} \rho^{-|\nu_{\mu'} - \nu'_{\mu'}|} & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

due to Lemma 3.3. Setting $\rho_{\mu'} = \rho 2^{\alpha'|\mu'|}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |[a]_{\nu\nu'}| &\leq 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} \prod_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \exp(c\rho 2^{-(\alpha-\alpha')\ell}) \frac{\rho^2 2^{2\alpha'\ell}}{\rho^2 2^{2\alpha'\ell} - 1} (\rho 2^{\alpha'\ell})^{-k_\ell} \\ &= 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} \exp\left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (c\rho 2^{-(\alpha-\alpha')\ell} - \ln(1 - \rho^{-2} 2^{-2\alpha'\ell}))\right) \prod_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (\rho 2^{\alpha'\ell})^{-k_\ell}, \end{aligned}$$

where c is the hidden constant in Lemma 3.4(iv) and by Lipschitz continuity of the logarithm,

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (c\rho 2^{-(\alpha-\alpha')\ell} - \ln(1 - \rho^{-2} 2^{-2\alpha'\ell})) \leq c\rho \frac{1}{1 - 2^{-(\alpha-\alpha')}} + \frac{1}{(\rho^2 - 1)(1 - 2^{-2\alpha'})}.$$

The estimate (3.4) follows by summation and taking disjoint supports into account. \square

The combination of Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.7 suggest to approximate the operator B by

$$(3.6) \quad \langle B_{\mathcal{K}} v, w \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{\nu' \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\nu)} \int_D [a]_{\nu\nu'} \nabla v_{\nu'} \cdot \nabla w_\nu dx$$

with $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)$. An application of this operator to $L_\nu(y)v_\nu(x)$ results in a functional consisting of at most $\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}} \#\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\nu)$ summands of product Legendre polynomials with coefficients in V' . With Q from Lemma 3.4, we thus assign to each $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ the number

$$(3.7) \quad \text{cost}(\mathbf{k}) = \#\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\nu) \lesssim 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} 2^{\frac{d}{Q} \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}}.$$

The approximation error is controlled by Lemma 3.2 and (3.4). We are now interested in estimates of the decay

$$\min_{\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}} \text{cost}(\mathbf{k}) \leq N} \|B - B_{\mathcal{K}}\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'}$$

with respect to N . To this end, we use the following variant of Stechkin's Lemma. Its proof is given in Appendix A.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ be nonincreasing, and let $b_i > 0$. Then for $0 < p < 1$,*

$$\left(\sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} a_i b_i \right) \leq \left(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} a_i^p b_i \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k b_i \right)^{1 - \frac{1}{p}}.$$

We want to apply Lemma 3.8 to sequences indexed by $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ with certain decay conditions. As an upper bound we use the following lemma.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $0 < \alpha$, $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\rho > 1$. Furthermore, for $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ let*

$$a_{\mathbf{k}} = 2^{-d \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} \prod_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} (\rho 2^{\alpha\ell})^{-k_\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad b_{\mathbf{k}} = 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} 2^{d \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}}$$

Then for $p > 0$ satisfying $\frac{1}{p} - 1 < \frac{\alpha}{d}$, we have

$$(3.8) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)} a_{\mathbf{k}}^p b_{\mathbf{k}} \leq 1 + \rho^{-p} \exp\left(\frac{\rho^{-p}(2 - \rho^{-p})}{(1 - \rho^{-p})(1 - 2^{-\alpha p})}\right) \frac{1}{1 - 2^{(d(1-p) - \alpha p)}} < \infty.$$

Let \mathbf{k}_i be an ordering of $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ such that $a_{\mathbf{k}_i} \geq a_{\mathbf{k}_{i+1}}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then if $d > 0$

$$(3.9) \quad b_{\mathbf{k}_{i+1}} \leq 2^d \max_{j \leq i} b_{\mathbf{k}_{i+1}}.$$

Proof. We treat the factor $2^{d\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}}$ by introducing the sets

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0, L) = \{k \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0) : k_\ell = 0 \text{ for } \ell > L\}$$

and noting that

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0) = \bigcup_{L=0}^{\infty} \{\mathbf{k} + e_L : \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0, L)\}.$$

We also use the identity

$$\prod_{\ell=0}^L \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_{k,\ell} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{k,\ell} \right) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0, L)} 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} \prod_{\ell=0}^L a_{k_\ell, \ell}$$

for general products of sequences. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)} a_{\mathbf{k}}^p b_{\mathbf{k}} &= a_0^p b_0 + \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0, L)} a_{\mathbf{k}+e_L}^p b_{\mathbf{k}+e_L} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \rho^{-p} 2^{-\alpha L p} 2^{dL(1-p)} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0, L)} 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} \prod_{\ell=0}^L (\rho^p 2^{\alpha' \ell p})^{-k_\ell} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \rho^{-p} 2^{-\alpha L p} 2^{dL(1-p)} \prod_{\ell=0}^L \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\rho^p 2^{\alpha \ell p})^{-k} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\rho^p 2^{\alpha \ell p})^{-k} \right) \\ &= 1 + \rho^{-p} \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} 2^{-\alpha L p + dL(1-p)} \prod_{\ell=0}^L \frac{1 + \rho^{-p} 2^{-\alpha \ell p}}{1 - \rho^{-p} 2^{-\alpha \ell p}}, \end{aligned}$$

and the product in the last line is bounded

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\ell=0}^L \frac{1 + \rho^{-p} 2^{-\alpha \ell p}}{1 - \rho^{-p} 2^{-\alpha \ell p}} &\leq \exp \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^L (\ln(1 + \rho^{-p} 2^{-\alpha \ell p}) - \ln(1 - \rho^{-p} 2^{-\alpha \ell p})) \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \rho^{-p} \left(1 + \frac{1}{1 - \rho^{-p}} \right) 2^{-\alpha \ell p} \right) = \exp \left(\frac{\rho^{-p} (2 - \rho^{-p})}{(1 - \rho^{-p})(1 - 2^{-\alpha p})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

using Lipschitz continuity of the logarithm in the second inequality. We arrive at the result

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)} a_{\mathbf{k}}^p b_{\mathbf{k}} &\leq 1 + \rho^{-p} \exp \left(\frac{\rho^{-p} (2 - \rho^{-p})}{(1 - \rho^{-p})(1 - 2^{-\alpha p})} \right) \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} 2^{(d(1-p) - \alpha p)L} \\ &= 1 + \rho^{-p} \exp \left(\frac{\rho^{-p} (2 - \rho^{-p})}{(1 - \rho^{-p})(1 - 2^{-\alpha p})} \right) \frac{1}{1 - 2^{(d(1-p) - \alpha p)}} < \infty \end{aligned}$$

for $d(1-p) - \alpha p < 0$ which is (3.8).

We verify the result (3.9) by studying three different cases of sequences $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)$. Let $L = \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}$. If $k_L > 1$ then $a_{\mathbf{k}-e_L} < a_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $b_{\mathbf{k}-e_L} = b_{\mathbf{k}}$ which implies (3.9) for $\mathbf{k}_{i+1} = \mathbf{k}$. If $k_L = 1$ and $k_{L-1} = 0$, then $a_{\mathbf{k}-e_L+e_{L-1}} < a_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $2^d b_{\mathbf{k}-e_L+e_{L-1}} = b_{\mathbf{k}}$ again implying (3.9). The last case is $k_L = 1$ and $k_{L-1} > 0$. Then $a_{\mathbf{k}-e_{L-1}} < a_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $2b_{\mathbf{k}-e_{L-1}} \leq b_{\mathbf{k}}$ and the result follows. \square

We are now in the position to certify approximation rates based on $\text{cost}(B_{\mathcal{K}})$ for approximations of B .

Theorem 3.10. *Let Assumption 1 be satisfied, let Q be as in Lemma 3.4, and let the diffusion coefficient be given by (1.3). Then there is a sequence $(\mathbf{k}_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ such that*

the sets $\mathcal{K}_J = \{\mathbf{k}_j : j \leq J\}$ satisfy

$$\|B - B_{\mathcal{K}_J}\| \lesssim \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \text{cost}(\mathbf{k}_j) \right)^{-s}$$

for any $s < \frac{\alpha}{d}$, with constants depending on s, α, d , and Q . Moreover,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{J+1} \text{cost}(\mathbf{k}_j) \lesssim 2^{\frac{d}{Q}} \sum_{j=1}^J \text{cost}(\mathbf{k}_j).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume $|\cdot| = |\cdot|_Q$ from Lemma 3.4. We prove the rate by applying Lemma 3.8 to sequences of the form described in Lemma 3.9. Applying Lemma 3.7 with $\rho = 2\tilde{\rho} > 2$ and $\alpha' < \alpha$, for

$$a_{\mathbf{k}} = 2^{-d \max\{\ell : k_\ell > 0\}} \prod_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} (\tilde{\rho} 2^{\alpha' \ell})^{-k_\ell}, \quad b_{\mathbf{k}} = 2^{\#\{\ell : k_\ell > 0\}} 2^{d \max\{\ell : k_\ell > 0\}}$$

we have

$$\sum_{\nu' \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\nu)} |[a]_{\nu\nu'}| \lesssim a_{\mathbf{k}} b_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad \text{cost}(\mathbf{k}) \lesssim b_{\mathbf{k}}.$$

We apply Lemma 3.9 to get summability of the dominating sequence $a_{\mathbf{k}}$ and hence also get summability for $p > 0$ satisfying for $\frac{1}{p} - 1 < \frac{\alpha'}{d}$ and thus Lemma 3.8

It follows that the sum is finite for $\alpha' p > d(1-p)$, that is, if $\frac{1}{p} - 1 < \frac{\alpha'}{d}$. Since the choice of $0 < \alpha' < \alpha$ is arbitrary, the result follows with Lemma 3.8. \square

3.2. Approximation of diffusion coefficients by polynomials. Approximation by polynomials plays a central role in the proof of Lemma 3.3. Indeed, it is possible to get more general approximation results for the stochastic diffusion operators by directly approximating the diffusion coefficient a by polynomials in the stochastic variables. We first consider the stochastic storage costs of applying a diffusion operator that is polynomial in its stochastic variables.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $\tilde{a}(x, y)$ be of the form*

$$\tilde{a}(x, y) = \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{K}} a_\nu(x) y^\nu$$

where $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{F}$ with the property if $\nu \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\nu'_\mu \leq \nu_\mu$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$, then $\nu' \in \mathcal{K}$ as well. Then with $\tilde{B}: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$ given by

$$\langle \tilde{B}v, w \rangle = \int_D \int_Y \tilde{a}(x, y) \nabla_x v(x, y) \cdot \nabla_x w(x, y) d\sigma(y) dx,$$

for any $v \in V$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $\tilde{B}(v \otimes L_\nu) = \sum_{\nu' \in \mathcal{K}'} g_{\nu'} \otimes L_{\nu'}$ with certain $g_{\nu'} \in V'$, $\nu' \in \mathcal{K}'$, where

$$\#\mathcal{K}' \leq \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{K}} 2^{\#\{\mu : \nu_\mu > 0\}}.$$

Proof. First we note that

$$y^{\nu'} L_\nu(y) = \prod_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} y_\mu^{\nu'_\mu} L_{\nu_\mu}(y_\mu) = \prod_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\sum_{k_\mu = \nu_\mu - \nu'_\mu}^{\nu_\mu + \nu'_\mu} c_{k_\mu} L_{k_\mu}(y_\mu) \right) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_{\nu'}} \prod_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} c_{k_\mu} L_{k_\mu}(y_\mu)$$

with $\mathcal{K}_{\nu'} = \{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F} : \nu_\mu - \nu'_\mu \leq k_\mu \leq \nu_\mu + \nu'_\mu\}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{\nu'} \setminus \left(\bigcup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M} : \nu_\mu \geq 1} \mathcal{K}_{\nu' - e_\mu} \right) &= \{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F} : k_\mu = \nu_\mu - \nu'_\mu \text{ or } k_\mu = \nu_\mu + \nu'_\mu\}, \\ \#\{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F} : k_\mu = \nu_\mu - \nu'_\mu \text{ or } k_\mu = \nu_\mu + \nu'_\mu\} &\leq 2^{\#\{\mu : \nu'_\mu > 0\}}. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows by the downward closed property of \mathcal{K} . \square

The error analysis is simpler as in Lemma 3.2. Let $a(x, y)$ be the original diffusion coefficient and $\tilde{a}(x, y)$ be an approximation by polynomials in the stochastic variables. Let B and \tilde{B} be the corresponding operators. Then

$$\|B - \tilde{B}\|_{\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'} \leq \sup_{x \in D, y \in Y} |a(x, y) - \tilde{a}(x, y)|.$$

In the context of polynomials, we consider

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{0}) = \left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{F} : \sum_{|\mu|=\ell} \nu_\mu = k_\ell, \prod_{\mu: \nu_\mu \neq 0} \theta_\mu \neq 0 \in L_\infty(D) \right\},$$

see Definition 3.6.

Theorem 3.12. *Let Assumptions 1 and 3 hold and let Q be as in Lemma 3.4. Then there is a sequence $(\mathbf{k}_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ of multi-indices and a sequence of polynomials in the stochastic variables of the form*

$$a_{\mathcal{J}}(x, y) = \sum_{j=0}^{\mathcal{J}} \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}_j}(\mathbf{0})} a_\nu^{\mathcal{J}}(x) y^\nu$$

such that the sets $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{J}} = \{\mathbf{k}_j : j \leq \mathcal{J}\}$ satisfy

$$\sup_{x \in D, y \in Y} |a(x, y) - a_{\mathcal{J}}(x, y)| \lesssim \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} \text{cost}(\mathbf{k}_j) \right)^{-s}$$

for any $s < \frac{\alpha'}{d}$ with constants depending on s, α, α', d , and Q and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}+1} \text{cost}(\mathbf{k}_j) \lesssim 2^{\frac{d}{Q}} \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} \text{cost}(\mathbf{k}_j).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume $|\cdot| = |\cdot|_Q$ from Lemma 3.4. As a first step we analyse the expansion of

$$f\left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} z_\ell 2^{-\alpha\ell}\right) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_r} f_{\mathbf{k}} \prod_{\ell=0}^{\infty} T_{k_\ell}(z_\ell)$$

by product Chebyshev polynomials. Here T_n is the n -th Chebyshev polynomial of first kind. First, as $|T_n(z)| \leq 1$ for $z \in [-1, 1]$ we have the estimate

$$(3.11) \quad \left\| f\left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} z_\ell 2^{-\alpha\ell}\right) - \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}} f_{\mathbf{k}} \prod_{\ell=0}^{\infty} T_{k_\ell}(z_\ell) \right\|_{L_\infty([-1, 1]^{\mathbb{N}_0})} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0) \setminus \mathcal{K}} |f_{\mathbf{k}}|.$$

In order to define the coefficients $f_{\mathbf{k}}$ we require the correct measure. Let $d\lambda_1(z) = \frac{dz}{\pi\sqrt{1-z^2}}$ and λ the according product measure on $Z = [-1, 1]^{\mathbb{N}_0}$. Then

$$f_{\mathbf{k}} = 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} \int_Z \prod_{\ell=0}^{\infty} T_{k_\ell}(z_\ell) f\left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} z_\ell 2^{-\alpha\ell}\right) d\lambda(z)$$

We can estimate the coefficients recursively. To this end, we define the functions

$$f_{\mathbf{k}, L}(\tilde{z}) = 2^{\#\{\ell \leq L: k_\ell > 0\}} \int_{[-1, 1]^{L+1}} \prod_{\ell=0}^L T_{k_\ell}(z_\ell) f\left(\tilde{z} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} z_\ell 2^{-\alpha\ell}\right) d\lambda(z).$$

Note that for $k_L > 0$,

$$f_{\mathbf{k}, L+1}(\tilde{z}) = \int_{-1}^1 T_{k_L}(z) f_{\mathbf{k}, L}(\tilde{z} + 2^{-\alpha L} z) 2 d\lambda_1(z),$$

and for $k_L = 0$,

$$f_{\mathbf{k}, L+1}(\tilde{z}) = \int_{-1}^1 f_{\mathbf{k}, L}(\tilde{z} + 2^{-\alpha L} z) d\lambda_1(z).$$

We use the bounds of f in \mathcal{R}_0 to deduce bounds of the functions $f_{\mathbf{k},L}$. To this end, we define the rectangles

$$\mathcal{R}_\ell = \frac{1}{2} \left(-r_1^{(\ell)} - r_2^{(\ell)}, r_1^{(\ell)} + r_2^{(\ell)} \right) + \frac{i}{2} \left(-r_1^{(\ell)} + r_2^{(\ell)}, r_1^{(\ell)} - r_2^{(\ell)} \right)$$

with

$$r_1^{(\ell)} = 2^{-(\alpha-\alpha')\ell} r_1 = \rho \frac{2^{-(\alpha-\alpha')\ell}}{1 - 2^{-(\alpha-\alpha')\ell}} \quad \text{and} \quad r_2^{(\ell)} = 2^{-(\alpha+\alpha')\ell} r_2 = \rho^{-1} \frac{2^{-(\alpha'+\alpha)\ell}}{1 - 2^{-(\alpha+\alpha')\ell}}$$

and the ellipses

$$\mathcal{E}_\ell = \left\{ \frac{2^{-\alpha\ell}}{2} (z + z^{-1}) : 1 < |z| \leq \rho 2^{\alpha'\ell} \right\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{R}_{\ell+1} + \mathcal{E}_\ell \subset \mathcal{R}_\ell$. Hence, using approximation rates by polynomials for analytic functions, if $k_0 > 0$ we obtain

$$|f_{\mathbf{k},0}(z)| \leq 2M\rho^{-k_0} \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathcal{R}_1,$$

and if $k_0 = 0$,

$$|f_{\mathbf{k},0}(z)| \leq M \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathcal{R}_1;$$

see e.g., [24, Theorem 8.1]. Furthermore, the function $a_{\mathbf{k},0}$ is analytic in the interior of \mathcal{R}_1 . By induction, we get

$$|f_{\mathbf{k},L}(z)| \leq 2^{\#\{\ell \leq L: k_\ell > 0\}} M \prod_{\ell=0}^L 2^{-\alpha'\ell k_\ell} \rho^{-k_\ell}$$

for $z \in \mathcal{R}_{L+1}$, where $f_{\mathbf{k},L}$ is analytic. It follows that

$$(3.12) \quad |f_{\mathbf{k}}| \leq 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} M \prod_{\ell=0}^{\infty} 2^{-\alpha'\ell k_\ell} \rho^{-k_\ell}.$$

Since $2^{\alpha\ell} \sum_{|\mu|=\ell} |\theta_\mu(x)| \leq 1$ by Lemma 3.4(iv), we get

$$\left\| f \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} y_\mu \theta_\mu \right) - \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}} f_{\mathbf{k}} \prod_{\ell=0}^{\infty} T_{k_\ell} \left(2^{\alpha\ell} \sum_{|\mu|=\ell} y_\mu \theta_\mu \right) \right\|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0) \setminus \mathcal{K}} |f_{\mathbf{k}}|$$

for all $y \in Y$. By the disjoint support condition (i) we have

$$T_{k_\ell} \left(2^{\alpha\ell} \sum_{|\mu|=\ell} y_\mu \theta_\mu \right) = T_{k_\ell}(0) + \sum_{|\mu|=\ell} (T_{k_\ell}(2^{\alpha\ell} y_\mu \theta_\mu) - T_{k_\ell}(0)),$$

that is, the stochastic variables can be separated. Furthermore, $T_{k_\ell}(2^{\alpha\ell} y_\mu \theta_\mu) - T_{k_\ell}(0)$ is a polynomial of degree k_ℓ in y_μ with function-valued coefficients that have the same support as θ_μ . Thus, by condition (ii), the product can be written as

$$\prod_{\ell=0}^L T_{k_\ell} \left(2^{\alpha\ell} \sum_{|\mu|=\ell} y_\mu \theta_\mu \right) = \sum_{|\mu|=L} \prod_{\ell=0}^L T_{k_\ell} (2^{\alpha\ell} y_{A(\mu,\ell)} \theta_{A(\mu,\ell)}),$$

where $A(\mu, \ell)$ is the unique $\mu' \in \mathcal{M}$ with $|\mu'| = \ell$ such that $\theta_\mu \theta_{\mu'} \neq 0$ if it exists, and an arbitrarily chosen one with $|\mu'| = \ell$, otherwise. For each $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ there is $L \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $k_\ell = 0$ for all $\ell > L$. Thus, each \mathbf{k} contributes $\#\{\mu: |\mu| = L\} \lesssim 2^{dL}$ polynomials in the stochastic variables where $L = \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}$.

Observe that for $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}' \in \mathcal{N}$ with $k'_\ell \leq k_\ell$ for all ℓ we have that the estimate in (3.12) for $|f_{\mathbf{k}}|$ is smaller than the estimate for $|f_{\mathbf{k}'}|$. We may thus assume the set \mathcal{N} to have the property that if $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{N}$ then $\mathbf{k}' \in \mathcal{N}$ as well. Then the set $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ leads to a polynomial approximation of the form in Lemma 3.11 with

$$\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{N}} \left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{F} : \sum_{|\mu|=\ell} |\nu_\mu| = k_\ell, \exists x \in D \text{ s.t. } \prod_{\mu: \nu_\mu \neq 0} \theta_\mu(x) \neq 0 \right\}.$$

Each set in the union contains $\#\{\mu: |\mu| = L\} \lesssim 2^{dL}$ elements, where again $L = \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}$. In light of Lemma 3.11, we may thus associate to each $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ the costs

$$\text{cost}(\mathbf{k}) = 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} \#\{\mu: |\mu| = \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}\} \lesssim 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\} + d \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} = b_{\mathbf{k}}$$

and then apply Lemma 3.9 with $a_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{f_{\mathbf{k}}}{b_{\mathbf{k}}}$. The result follows. \square

Remark 3.13. The proof of Theorem 3.12 shows that the spatial coefficients of the approximation $a_{\mathcal{J}}(x, y)$ can be chosen as polynomials in the functions θ_{μ} . They satisfy

$$(3.13) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\mathcal{J}} \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}_j}(\mathbf{0})} a_{\nu}^{\mathcal{J}}(x) y^{\nu} = \sum_{j=0}^{\mathcal{J}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}_j}(\mathbf{0})} f_{\mathbf{k}} \prod_{\ell=0}^{\infty} T_{k_{\ell}} (2^{\alpha \ell} \sum_{|\mu|=\ell} y_{\mu} \theta_{\mu}).$$

4. COMPLEXITY ESTIMATES

In the case of the affine linear parametrization (1.2), we have analysed the computational complexity of the procedures that constitute the adaptive method in detail [5]. The main result is [5, Prop. 3.7] for evaluating residual estimators, which are subsequently used to refine the meshes. It states that the number of residual estimators and number of operations scale up to log factor linear in the current degrees of freedom, and in the required precision according to the approximation class of the current approximation of the solution.

In the case of the log-affine linear parametrization (1.3), we have a few additional difficulties. If we approximate the operator as in Theorem 3.10, we have the function valued coefficients

$$[a]_{\nu\nu'} = \int_Y \exp\left(\sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} y_{\mu} \theta_{\mu}\right) L_{\nu}(y) L_{\nu'}(y) d\sigma(y).$$

These can in principle be evaluated exactly, but may require $|\nu| + |\nu'|$ integrations by parts and is therefore expensive. Another theoretical problem is that one main building block for the residual estimation is [5, Lem. 2.2]. For convenience, we restate it here.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then there is $J_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ depending only on $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_0$ and $C(m_1, m_2)$ with additional polynomial dependence on m_1, m_2 such that for all $J \geq J_0$ the following holds: For any $\mathcal{T} \geq \hat{\mathcal{T}}_0$ with interior facets \mathcal{E} and any $\xi \in V'$ of the form*

$$(4.1) \quad \langle \xi, v \rangle = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} \int_K \xi_K v dx + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \int_E \xi_E v ds, \quad v \in V,$$

where $\xi_K \in \mathbb{P}_{m_1}(K)$, $K \in \mathcal{T}$, and $\xi_E \in \mathbb{P}_{m_2}(E)$, $E \in \mathcal{E}$, we have

$$\left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Theta_J(\mathcal{T})} |\langle \xi, \psi_{\lambda} \rangle_{V', V}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(m_1, m_2) 2^{-J} \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Theta} |\langle \xi, \psi_{\lambda} \rangle_{V', V}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

with

$$(4.2) \quad \Theta_J(\mathcal{T}) = \left\{ \lambda \in \Theta : (\forall K \in \mathcal{T} : \text{meas}_2(\text{supp } \psi_{\lambda} \cap K) > 0 \implies |\lambda| > \text{level}(K) + J) \right. \\ \left. \wedge (\forall E \in \mathcal{E} : \text{meas}_1(\text{supp } \psi_{\lambda} \cap E) > 0 \implies |\lambda| > \text{level}(E) + 2J) \right\}.$$

Proof. This lemma differs from the version [5, Lem. 2.2] in the dependence of the polynomial degrees m_1, m_2 ; the proof given there involves the estimates

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \Theta_J(\mathcal{T})} |\langle \xi, \psi_{\lambda} \rangle_{V', V}|^2 \lesssim 2^{-2J} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}} h_K^2 \|\xi_K\|_{L_2(K)}^2 + 2^{-2J} \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}} h_E \|\xi_E\|_{L_2(E)}^2 \lesssim 2^{-2J} \|\xi\|_{V'}^2$$

with the first hidden constant depends on $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_0$ and the second also depending on the polynomial degrees m_1, m_2 . Here, the dependence is indeed polynomial in m_1, m_2 , as can be seen by [27, Prop. 3.46] and the proof of [27, Thm. 3.59]. By (5.2), it follows that

$$\|\xi\|_{V'}^2 \lesssim \sum_{\lambda \in \Theta} |\langle \xi, \psi_{\lambda} \rangle_{V', V}|^2$$

with a further constant depending on $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_0$ concluding the proof. \square

Since the functions $[a]_{\nu\nu'}$ are not polynomials, Lemma 4.1 is not directly applicable. When we approximate in the spirit of Theorem 3.12, we have polynomial functions in θ_{ν} , which again are piecewise polynomials, and Lemma 4.1 can be applied. However, in contrast to the case of affine parametrizations, we do not have a uniform bound on the arising polynomial degrees. The following lemma describes the necessary size of the sets $\#(\Theta \setminus \Theta_J)$.

Lemma 4.2. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 4.1, for $q > 0$, let $J \geq J_0$ be the smallest integer such that $C(m_1, m_2)2^{-J} \leq q$. Then with $C(m_1, m_2)$ from Lemma 4.1 and an additional constant only depending on $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_0$,*

$$\#(\Theta \setminus \Theta_J) \lesssim C(m_1, m_2)^d \# \mathcal{T} \frac{1}{q^d}.$$

Proof. The result follows directly from $\#(\Theta \setminus \Theta_J) \lesssim 2^{dJ} \# \mathcal{T}$ with hidden constant only depending on $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_0$ and the fact that the smallest possible J satisfies $2^{J-1} \leq \frac{C(m_1, m_2)}{q}$. \square

The next hurdle is the efficient evaluation of the stochastic integrals. To this end, let $\mu(\ell, x)$ denote the unique index μ with $|\mu|_Q = \ell$ and $\theta_\mu(x) \neq 0$ if it exists, and an arbitrary index of level ℓ otherwise. Then

$$(4.3) \quad \int_Y \prod_{\ell=0}^{\infty} T_{k_\ell} (2^{\alpha\ell} \sum_{|\mu|=\ell} y_\mu \theta_\mu(x)) L_\nu(y) L_{\nu'}(y) d\sigma(y) \\ = \prod_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \int_{-1}^1 T_{k_\ell} (2^{\alpha\ell} y_\ell \theta_{\mu(\ell, x)}(x)) L_{\nu_{\mu(\ell, x)}}(y_\ell) L_{\nu'_{\mu(\ell, x)}}(y_\ell) d\sigma_1(y_\ell).$$

For small $\nu_{\mu(\ell, x)}, \nu'_{\mu(\ell, x)}$ and k_ℓ this can be computed cheaply by quadrature. It is however also possible to evaluate (4.3) with a complexity of $O(\sum_\ell k_\ell^3)$, independently of ν, ν' . To achieve this, for $y, z \in \mathbb{R}$ one can iterate the recursion formulas

$$T_{k+1}(z) = 2zT_k(z) - T_{k-1}(z), \\ \sqrt{\beta_{k+1}}L_{k+1}(y) = yL_k(y) - \sqrt{\beta_k}L_{k-1}(y)$$

for $k > 1$ and utilize orthonormality of the Legendre polynomials. This leads to the identity

$$(4.4) \quad \int_{-1}^1 T_k(yz) L_\ell(y) L_{\ell'}(y) d\sigma_1(y) = (T_k(Z))_{k+1, k+1+\ell'-\ell}$$

with

$$Z = z \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{\beta_{\ell-k}} & & & & \\ \sqrt{\beta_{\ell-k}} & 0 & & & & \\ & & \ddots & & & \\ & & & 0 & & \\ & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & & 0 & \sqrt{\beta_{\ell+k}} \\ & & & & \sqrt{\beta_{\ell+k}} & & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is thus possible to evaluate (4.3) pointwise with polynomial costs which in turn can be used to compute spatial integrals via quadrature. The arising polynomial degrees can again be bounded in terms of \mathbf{k} and the polynomial degree of the piecewise functions θ_μ . For further analysis of the computational complexity, we use the following adaptation of Lemma 3.9. Its proof mirrors the one of Lemma 3.9 and is given in Appendix A for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\alpha > 0$, $t, d_a, d_b \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and $\rho > 1$. Furthermore, for $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)$, let*

$$a_{\mathbf{k}} = 2^{-d_a \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} \prod_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} (\rho 2^{\alpha\ell})^{-k_\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad b_{\mathbf{k}} = 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\} d_b \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} \prod_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} \binom{k_\ell + t}{t}$$

Then for $p > 0$ such that $\frac{d_b}{p} - d_a < \alpha$, we have

$$(4.5) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)} a_{\mathbf{k}}^p b_{\mathbf{k}} \leq 1 + \rho^{-p} \exp\left(\frac{\rho^{-p}(t+1)(2-\rho^{-p})}{(1-\rho^{-p})(1-2^{-\alpha p})}\right) \frac{1}{1-2^{d_b-(\alpha+d_a)p}} < \infty.$$

Lemma 4.4. *Let Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 be satisfied and let Q be as in Lemma 3.4. For $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $\mathcal{K}_n \subset \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ be a finite downward-closed set. We define*

$$L_{\mathbf{k}} = \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}, \quad L = \max_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_n} L_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad M_{\mathbf{k}} = m \sum_{\ell=0}^L k_\ell, \quad M = \max_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_I} M_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad \hat{k}_\ell = \max_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_n} k_\ell.$$

Let $B_n: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$ be given by

$$\langle B_n v, w \rangle_{\mathcal{V}', \mathcal{V}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_n} f_{\mathbf{k}} \int_D \int_Y \prod_{\ell=0}^L T_{k_\ell} \left(2^{\frac{\alpha}{Q} \ell} \sum_{|\mu|_Q = \ell} y_\mu \theta_\mu \right) \nabla v \cdot \nabla w \, d\sigma(y) \, dx.$$

For $\nu \in \mathcal{F}$ and $[v]_\nu \in V(\mathcal{T}_\nu)$, let $g_\nu = B_n([v]_\nu \otimes L_\nu) \in \mathcal{V}'$. Then $\text{supp}([g_\nu]_{\nu'})_{\nu' \in \mathcal{F}} \subseteq \bigcup_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_n} \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\nu)$ and the functional $[g_\nu]_{\nu'}$ is uniquely determined by the piecewise polynomial flux term

$$(4.6) \quad \hat{g}_{\nu, \nu'}(x) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_n} f_{\mathbf{k}} \int_Y \prod_{\ell=0}^L T_{k_\ell} \left(2^{\frac{\alpha}{Q} \ell} \sum_{|\mu|_Q = \ell} y_\mu \theta_\mu(x) \right) L_\nu(y) L_{\nu'}(y) \, d\sigma(y) \nabla [v]_\nu(x)$$

in at most $\binom{d+M}{M} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_n} 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} (\#\mathcal{T}_\nu + 2^{\frac{d}{Q} L_{\mathbf{k}}})$ suitable interpolation points, and all $\hat{g}_{\nu, \nu'}$, $\nu \in \bigcup_{\mathbf{k}' \leq \mathbf{k}} \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}'}(\nu)$, can be evaluated at each point simultaneously using $O(L \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_n} 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} + \sum_{\ell=0}^L \hat{k}_\ell^3)$ arithmetic operations.

Moreover, let

$$a_{\mathbf{k}} = 2^{-\frac{d}{Q} \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} \prod_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} (\rho 2^{\frac{\alpha}{Q} \ell})^{-k_\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad b_{\mathbf{k}} = 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} 2^{\frac{d}{Q} \max\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}},$$

and let the set \mathcal{K}_I satisfy $a_{\mathbf{k}} \geq a_{\mathbf{k}'}$ for all $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_n, \mathbf{k}' \notin \mathcal{K}_n$, and $\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_n} b_{\mathbf{k}} \leq 2^{dn}$. Then

$$(4.7) \quad L \leq Qn - 1, \quad M \leq 1 + \frac{\alpha' + d}{\log_2 \rho} n$$

and for any $p > 0$,

$$(4.8) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_n} 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} \leq 2^{n(\alpha' + d)p} \rho^p \left(1 + \rho^{-p} \exp\left(\frac{\rho^{-p}(2 - \rho^{-p})}{(1 - \rho^{-p})(1 - 2^{-\alpha' Q^{-1} p})} \right) \frac{1}{1 - 2^{-\frac{\alpha' + d}{Q} p}} \right).$$

Proof. By Assumption 2 and Lemma 3.4, the function $\hat{g}_{\nu, \nu'}|_T$ is a polynomial of degree at most M on each element T in the smallest common refinement \mathcal{T} of $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{\lceil L/Q \rceil + \tau}$ and \mathcal{T}_ν . Thus, we need to collect at most $\binom{d+M}{M}$ interpolation points on each element to uniquely determine each $\hat{g}_{\nu, \nu'}$.

Now let $\mu(\ell, x)$ denote the unique index μ with $|\mu|_Q = \ell$ and $\theta_\mu(x) \neq 0$. Then for $k_\ell \leq \hat{k}_\ell$ and $\nu'_{\mu(\ell, x)} = \nu_{\mu(\ell, x)} \pm k_\ell$,

$$\hat{g}_{\nu, \nu'}(x) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_n} f_{\mathbf{k}} \prod_{\ell=0}^L \int_{-1}^1 T_{k_\ell} \left(2^{\frac{\alpha}{Q} \ell} y_\ell \theta_{\mu(\ell, x)}(x) \right) L_{\nu_{\mu(\ell, x)}}(y_\ell) L_{\nu'_{\mu(\ell, x)}}(y_\ell) \, d\sigma_1(y_\ell) \nabla [v]_\nu(x)$$

and $\hat{g}_{\nu, \nu'}(x) = 0$ for all other ν' . Therefore, for each element $T \in \mathcal{T}$ there are $2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}}$ indices $\nu \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\hat{g}_{\nu, \nu'}|_T \neq 0$. We therefore require at most $\binom{d+M}{M} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_n} 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} (\#\mathcal{T}_\nu + 2^{\frac{d}{Q} L_{\mathbf{k}}})$ interpolation points.

We can compute the integrals simultaneously via (4.4). This results in $O(\sum_{\ell=0}^L \hat{k}_\ell^3)$ basic arithmetic operations per interpolation point since each integral requires \hat{k}_ℓ matrix multiplications with a tridiagonal matrix of size $2\hat{k}_\ell + 1$ and $2\hat{k}_\ell$ summations of matrices for the recursion of the Chebyshev polynomials.

The estimate (4.7) for L follows directly from $\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_n} b_{\mathbf{k}} \leq 2^{dn}$. Furthermore, note that $M e_0 \in \mathcal{K}_n$ and $e_{Qn} \notin \mathcal{K}_n$ and thus

$$\rho^{-M} = a_{M e_0} \geq a_{e_{Qn}} = \rho^{-1} 2^{-(\alpha' + d)n},$$

which directly implies the bound on M . Finally, we apply Lemma 4.3 to get

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)} a_{\mathbf{k}}^p 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} \leq 1 + \rho^{-p} \exp\left(\frac{\rho^{-p}(2 - \rho^{-p})}{(1 - \rho^{-p})(1 - 2^{-\alpha' Q^{-1} p})} \right) \frac{1}{1 - 2^{-\frac{\alpha' + d}{Q} p}}.$$

Since $a_{\mathbf{k}} \geq \rho^{-1} 2^{-(\alpha' + d)n}$ for all $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_n$, the estimate (4.8) follows readily. \square

Algorithm 4.1 $((\Theta_\nu^+)_{\nu \in F^+}, (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\nu)_{\nu \in F^+}, ([r]_\nu)_{\nu \in F^+}, \eta, b) = \text{RESESTIMATE}(v; \zeta, \eta_0, \varepsilon)$, for $\#\text{supp}([v]_\nu)_\nu < \infty$, relative tolerance $\zeta > 0$, initial tolerance η_0 , target tolerance ε .

Set $\eta = \eta_0$; choose $q < \zeta$.

(i) Set $(F_i, n_i)_{i=0}^I = \text{APPLY}(v; \eta/C_\Psi)$ by Algorithm 2.1;

(ii) For each $i = 0, \dots, I$

(1) Set $F_i^+ = \bigcup_{\nu' \in F_i \setminus F_{i-1}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_{n_i}} \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\nu')$;

(2) For each $\nu' \in F_i \setminus F_{i-1}$ and each $\nu \in \text{supp}([B_{n_\nu}[v]_{\nu'} \otimes L_{\nu'}]_\nu)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}}$ compute

$$[g_i]_{\nu, \nu'} = [B_{n_\nu}[v]_{\nu'} \otimes L_{\nu'}]_\nu;$$

(3) For each $\nu \in F_i^+$ evaluate

$$[r_i]_\nu = - \sum_{\nu'} [g_i]_{\nu, \nu'} = \text{SUM}((-[g_i]_{\nu, \nu'})_{\nu'});$$

(iii) Set $F^+ = \bigcup_{i=0}^I F_i^+$;

(iv) For each $\nu \in F^+$ evaluate

$$[r]_\nu = \delta_{0, \nu} f - \sum_{i=0}^I [r_i]_\nu = \text{SUM}(\delta_{0, \nu} f, (-[g_i]_{\nu, \nu'})_{i=0}^I)$$

and set \hat{J}_ν so that $2^{-\hat{J}_\nu} C(M-1, M) \leq q$ with M the polynomial degree of $[r]_\nu$;

(v) For each $\nu \in F^+$ set $(\Theta_\nu^+, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_\nu) = \text{DUALNORMINDICATORS}([r]_\nu, \hat{J}_\nu)$;

(vi) Let $b = \eta + (1 + \frac{q}{\sqrt{1-q^2}}) \|(\|\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\nu\|_{\ell_2})_{\nu \in F^+}\|$. If $\eta \leq \frac{\zeta - q}{1 + \zeta} \|(\|\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\nu\|_{\ell_2})_{\nu \in F^+}\|$ or $b \leq \varepsilon$,

return $((\Theta_\nu^+)_{\nu \in F^+}, (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\nu)_{\nu \in F^+}, ([r]_\nu)_{\nu \in F^+}, \eta, b)$;

otherwise, set $\eta \leftarrow \eta/2$ and go to (i);

Remark 4.5. It can be advantageous to not store (4.6) directly. but to store the L factors independently to reuse them for several polynomials.

We are now in the position to characterize the complexity of Algorithm 4.1.

Proposition 4.6. Let $((\Theta_\nu^+)_{\nu \in F^+}, (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\nu)_{\nu \in F^+}, \eta, b)$ be the return values of Algorithm 4.1 and let

$$(4.9) \quad \Lambda^+ = \{(\nu, \lambda) \in \mathcal{F} \times \Theta : \nu \in F^+, \lambda \in \Theta_\nu^+\}.$$

Set $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_\nu = 0$ for $\nu \notin F^+$. Furthermore, let $\mathbf{z} = (\langle [f - Bv]_\nu, \psi_\lambda \rangle)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}, \lambda \in \Theta}$. Then $\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\ell_2} \leq b$ and either $b \leq \varepsilon$, or $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ satisfies

$$(4.10) \quad \|\hat{\mathbf{r}} - \mathbf{z}\|_{\ell_2} \leq \zeta \|\mathbf{z}\|_{\ell_2},$$

where we have $\#\text{supp } \hat{\mathbf{r}} \leq \#\Lambda^+ = \sum_{\nu \in F^+} \#\Theta_\nu^+$. Moreover, for any $p > 0$, there are polynomials p_1, p_2 with degrees only depending on the degrees of the polynomial constant in Lemma 4.2 and with coefficients depending on p , on the polynomial constant in Lemma 4.2 and on the parameters in Proposition 2.2, such that

$$(4.11) \quad \#\Lambda^+ \leq p_1(1 + |\log \eta| + \log \|(\|[v]_\nu\|_V)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}) \\ (\#\mathcal{T}(f) + \eta^{-p} \|(\|[v]_\nu\|_V)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^p N(\mathbb{T}) + \eta^{-\frac{1}{s}} \|(\|[v]_\nu\|_V)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{\frac{1}{s}}).$$

The number of operations in Algorithm 4.1 is bounded by

$$(4.12) \quad (1 + \log_2(\eta_0/\eta)) p_2(1 + |\log \eta| + \log \|(\|[v]_\nu\|_V)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}) \\ (\#F \log \#F + \#\mathcal{T}(f) + \eta^{-p} \|(\|[v]_\nu\|_V)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^p N(\mathbb{T}) + \eta^{-\frac{1}{s}} \|(\|[v]_\nu\|_V)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{\frac{1}{s}}).$$

Proof. The estimate (4.10) follows in complete analogy to the proof of [5, Prop. 3.7].

For the size of Λ^+ , we first analyse the family of triangulations $\mathbb{T}^+ = (\mathcal{T}_\nu^+)_{\nu \in F^+}$ so that $[r]_\nu$ has a piecewise polynomial representation on \mathcal{T}_ν^+ . Here \mathcal{T}_ν^+ does not need to be a complete

mesh for D . Its size can be estimated with Proposition 2.2 and Lemma 4.4 with any $p > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} N(\mathbb{T}^+) &\leq \mathcal{T}(f) + \sum_{i=0}^I \sum_{\nu \in F_i \setminus F_{i-1}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}_{n_i}} 2^{\#\{\ell: k_\ell > 0\}} (\#T_\nu + 2^{\frac{d}{Q}} L_{\mathbf{k}}) \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{T}(f) + 2^{\max_{i=0, \dots, I} n_i p} N(\mathbb{T}) + \sum_{i=0}^I 2^{dn_i} \#F_i \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{T}(f) + \eta^{-p} \|(\| [v]_\nu \|_V)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^p N(\mathbb{T}) + \eta^{-\frac{1}{s}} \|(\| [v]_\nu \|_V)_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{\frac{1}{s}} \end{aligned}$$

with constants having the same dependency as in Proposition 2.2 and additionally on p . Now we estimate the size of Λ^+ . First, we have to complete each \mathcal{T}_ν^+ to a mesh for D to apply DUALNORMINDICATORS in step (v). This leads to another factor L as in (4.7). Using Lemma 4.2, we get with M as in (4.7)

$$\#\Lambda^+ \lesssim LC(M-1, M)^d N(\mathbb{T}^+).$$

With (2.13), (4.7), and the previous estimate, we get (4.11).

The proof for (4.12) is again in complete analogy to the proof of [5, Prop. 3.7] with additional polynomial factors in L, M to account for varying polynomial degrees in DUALNORMINDICATORS and SUM and to compute the required interpolation points as in Lemma 4.4. \square

Remark 4.7. In the affine case (1.2) it is possible to choose $p = 0$ and the polynomial degree of p_1 and p_2 can be bounded by two. This is given in equations (3.11) and (3.12) in [5].

Finally we want to note that the coefficients of the product Chebyshev polynomials are readily available by

$$\exp\left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} 2^{-\alpha\ell} z_\ell\right) = \prod_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \exp(2^{-\alpha\ell} z_\ell) = \prod_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \left(I_0(2^{-\alpha\ell}) T_0(z_\ell) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_k(2^{-\alpha\ell}) T_k(z_\ell) \right)$$

where I_k is the k -th modified Bessel function of first kind.

5. OPTIMALITY OF THE SOLVER

This section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 2.4. The key ingredients for the proof are the ellipticity of the selfadjoint operator $B: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$

$$(5.1) \quad c_B \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 \leq \langle Bv, v \rangle = \|v\|_B^2 \leq C_B \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{V},$$

a frame $\Psi = \{\psi_\lambda \in \mathcal{V}: \lambda \in \Theta\}$ with

$$(5.2) \quad c_\Psi^2 \|f\|_{\mathcal{V}'}^2 \leq \|\Psi f\|_{\ell_2}^2 = \sum_{\lambda \in \Theta} |\langle f, \psi_\lambda \rangle|^2 \leq C_\Psi^2 \|f\|_{\mathcal{V}'}^2 \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{V}',$$

and a class of stable admissible subsets $\mathfrak{S} \subset 2^\Theta$ that have the following property.

Definition 5.1. A class of subsets $\mathfrak{S} \subset 2^\Theta$ is admissible if $S_1, S_2 \in \mathfrak{S}$ implies $S_1 \cup S_2 \in \mathfrak{S}$ and

$$\bigcup_{S \in \mathfrak{S}} S = \Theta.$$

It is stable with constant c_{stable} if for every $S \in \mathfrak{S}$ and $v \in V(S) = \text{span}\{\psi_\lambda: \lambda \in S\}$ there is a coefficient vector $\mathbf{z} \in \ell_2(S)$ with $\sum_{\lambda \in S} z_\lambda \psi_\lambda$ and

$$c_{\text{stable}} \|\mathbf{z}\|_{\ell_2} \leq \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}.$$

Section 5.1 is dedicated to show that a class connected to conforming triangulations is stable, and thus making the following more general results applicable to the setting of finite elements.

We can now state an abstract result on the optimality of approximation sets. A version of this with wavelets with tree structure is [6, Lem. 5.3] and similar result without additional structure is [17, Lem. 2.1].

Lemma 5.2. *Let \mathfrak{S} be an admissible and stable class of subsets with constant c_{stable} and $Bu = f$. Let $\sqrt{C_B}\beta < 1$, $\omega \leq \frac{c_{\text{stable}}\sqrt{C_B}}{C_\Psi\sqrt{C_B}}(1 - C_B\beta^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $w \in \mathcal{V}(\Lambda_0)$. Then the smallest set $\Lambda \in \mathfrak{S}$ with $\Lambda_0 \subset \Lambda$ such that*

$$\|\Psi(Bw - f)|_\Lambda\|_{\ell_2} \geq \omega \|\Psi(Bw - f)\|_{\ell_2}$$

satisfies

$$\#(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0) \leq \#(\hat{\Lambda} \setminus \Lambda_0)$$

for all $\hat{\Lambda} \in \mathfrak{S}$ with

$$(5.3) \quad \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\hat{\Lambda})} \|u - v\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \beta \|u - w\|_B.$$

Proof. Let $\hat{\Lambda} \in \mathfrak{S}$ with (5.3). Then the Galerkin solution \tilde{u} in $\mathcal{V}(\hat{\Lambda} \cup \Lambda_0)$ satisfies

$$\|u - \tilde{u}\|_B \leq \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\hat{\Lambda})} \|u - v\|_B \leq \sqrt{C_B} \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\hat{\Lambda})} \|u - v\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \sqrt{C_B}\beta \|u - w\|_B,$$

and thus by orthogonality

$$\|\tilde{u} - w\|_B^2 \geq (1 - C_B\beta^2) \|u - w\|_B^2.$$

We can now find stable coefficients $\mathbf{z} \in \ell_2(\hat{\Lambda} \cup \Lambda_0)$ of $\tilde{u} - w$, i.e., $c_{\text{stable}}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\ell_2} \leq \|\tilde{u} - w\|_{\mathcal{V}}$. Then

$$\|\Psi(Bw - f)|_{\hat{\Lambda}}\|_{\ell_2} = \|\Psi B(w - \tilde{u})|_{\hat{\Lambda}}\|_{\ell_2} \geq c_{\text{stable}} \|\Psi B(w - \tilde{u})|_{\hat{\Lambda}}\|_{\ell_2} \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\ell_2}}{\|\tilde{u} - w\|_{\mathcal{V}}}$$

and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the norm estimates (5.1) and (5.2)

$$\|\Psi B(w - \tilde{u})|_{\hat{\Lambda}}\|_{\ell_2} \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\ell_2}}{\|\tilde{u} - w\|_{\mathcal{V}}} \geq \frac{\|\tilde{u} - w\|_B^2}{\|\tilde{u} - w\|_{\mathcal{V}}} \geq \frac{\sqrt{C_B}}{C_\Psi\sqrt{C_B}} \|\Psi(Bw - f)\|_{\mathcal{V}}.$$

Together this results in

$$\|\Psi(Bw - f)|_{\hat{\Lambda}}\|_{\ell_2} \geq \omega \|\Psi(Bw - f)\|_{\mathcal{V}}$$

and thus by minimality of the size of Λ , the statement follows. \square

5.1. Stability of conforming subsets of finite element frames. The previous framework is applicable to finite elements.

Definition 5.3. A subset $S \subset \Theta$ is called conforming if there exists a conforming simplicial mesh \mathcal{T} generated by bisection such that

$$S = \{\lambda \in \Theta: \psi_\lambda \in V(\mathcal{T})\},$$

and we write $S = S(\mathcal{T})$ when S and \mathcal{T} satisfy this relation.

It is important to note that conforming subsets of Θ generate the same finite element space as the corresponding triangulation.

Lemma 5.4. *Let \mathcal{T} be a conforming simplicial mesh. Then $V(\mathcal{T}) = V(S(\mathcal{T}))$.*

Proof. We can form a sequence of conforming meshes $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_0 = \mathcal{T}_0 \leq \mathcal{T}_1 \leq \dots \leq \mathcal{T}_N = \mathcal{T}$ where \mathcal{T}_k is generated from \mathcal{T}_{k-1} by bisection of one edge. Thus, $V(\mathcal{T}_k) = V(\mathcal{T}_{k-1}) \oplus \text{span}\{\psi_{x_k}\}$ where ψ_{x_k} is the nodal basis function at the newly created vertex x_k . Notice that all supporting simplices of ψ_{x_k} were generated by the same number of bisections. Therefore, there is a uniform refinement of $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_0$ such that ψ_{x_k} is a nodal basis function of that mesh. Moreover, in the next $d - 1$ uniform refinement steps no edge containing x_k is bisected. Thus, there is j such that ψ_{x_k} is a nodal basis function of $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j$ as $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j$ is generated from $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{j-1}$ by d uniform refinements. We get $\text{span}\{\psi_{x_k}\} = \text{span}\{\psi_{j,k}\}$ and with this $V(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq V(S(\mathcal{T}))$. The other inclusion $V(\mathcal{T}) \supseteq V(S(\mathcal{T}))$ follows directly from the definition of $S(\mathcal{T})$. \square

This section is devoted to show that conforming simplicial meshes indeed give rise to stable subsets of finite element frames.

Theorem 5.5. *The conforming subsets $\{S(\mathcal{T}): \mathcal{T} \text{ is conforming}\}$ form an admissible stable class of subsets with constant c_{stable} dependent on uniform shape regularity.*

For the proof of this result, a few properties of uniform refinements are crucial. Let Q_j be the L_2 -orthogonal projection onto $V(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j)$. Then

$$(5.4) \quad \|v\|_{H_0^1(D)}^2 \approx \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{2j} \|Q_j v - Q_{j-1} v\|_{L_2(D)}^2 \approx \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{2j} \|Q_j v - v\|_{L_2(D)}^2;$$

see e.g. [9] for $d = 2$ or [13, Thm. 3.2].

Another consequence of uniform refinements is the Riesz-property

$$(5.5) \quad \|u_j\|_{L_2(D)} \approx 2^{-j} \|\mathbf{z}\|_{\ell_2}$$

where $u_j = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} z_k \psi_{j,k} \in V(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j)$.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a linear function and $T \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a d dimensional simplex. Let $v \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be the values of f on the vertices of T . Then there are constants c_d and C_d independent on the choice of T such that*

$$c_d \text{vol}(T) \|v\|_2^2 \leq \|f\|_{L_2(T)}^2 \leq C_d \text{vol}(T) \|v\|_2^2.$$

Furthermore, let f_0 a linear function where some values on the vertices have been replaced by 0. Then

$$\|f\|_{L_2(T)}^2 \geq \frac{c_d}{C_d} \|f_0\|_{L_2(T)}^2.$$

Proof. First, let $\lambda_T(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be the barycentric coordinates of x with respect to the vertices of T . Then

$$f(x) = \lambda_T(x)^\top v$$

and thus

$$\|f\|_{L_2(T)}^2 = v^\top \left(\int_T \lambda_T(x) \lambda_T(x)^\top dx \right) v.$$

Now let \hat{T} be a reference simplex and $L\hat{T} + n = T$ an affine linear transformation. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L_2(T)}^2 &= v^\top \left(\int_T \lambda_T(x) \lambda_T(x)^\top dx \right) v \\ &= |\det L| v^\top \left(\int_{\hat{T}} \lambda_T(Ly + n) \lambda_T(Ly + n)^\top dy \right) v \\ &= \frac{\text{vol}(T)}{\text{vol}(\hat{T})} v^\top \left(\int_{\hat{T}} \lambda_{\hat{T}}(y) \lambda_{\hat{T}}(y)^\top dy \right) v. \end{aligned}$$

Now the matrix $M = \int_{\hat{T}} \lambda_{\hat{T}}(y) \lambda_{\hat{T}}(y)^\top dy$ is independent of T and positive definite. The first part of the result follows with $c_d = \|M^{-1}\|_2 / \text{vol}(\hat{T})$ and $C_d = \|M\|_2 / \text{vol}(\hat{T})$. The second part follows by

$$\|f\|_{L_2(T)}^2 \geq c_d \text{vol}(T) \|v\|_2^2 \geq c_d \text{vol}(T) \|v_0\|_2^2 \geq \frac{c_d}{C_d} \|f_0\|_{L_2(T)}^2$$

where v_0 are the values of f_0 on the vertices. \square

The following construction of interpolation operators is crucial for the proof of Theorem 5.5.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\mathcal{T} \geq \hat{\mathcal{T}}_0$ be a conforming triangulation, $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and $v \in V(\mathcal{T})$. Then there is a projection $I_j: V(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow V(\mathcal{T}) \cap V(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j)$ such that*

$$(5.6) \quad (I_j v - v)|_T = 0 \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T} \text{ with } \text{level}(T) \leq j - \ell$$

and

$$(5.7) \quad \|I_j v - v\|_{L_2(D)}^2 \leq c_\ell \|Q_j v - v\|_{L_2(D)}^2,$$

where ℓ and c_ℓ only depend on the shape regularity and are independent of j .

Proof. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ be the finest mesh such that $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} \leq \mathcal{T}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} \leq \hat{\mathcal{T}}_j$. Then $V(\mathcal{T}) \cap V(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j) = V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}})$. Let x_k be the vertices of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$. We then define the projection $I_j v \in V(\tilde{\mathcal{T}})$ uniquely by its values on each of these vertices

$$(I_j v)(x_k) = \begin{cases} (Q_j v)(x_k) & \text{if } x_k \text{ is a vertex of a simplex } T \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_j \cap \tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \\ v(x_k) & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

We now aim to find ℓ to verify (5.6). For this, note that shape regularity bounds the number of simplices sharing a common vertex. By construction, $(I_j v - v)|_{\tilde{T}} = 0$ for all $\tilde{T} \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ that do not share a vertex with any $T \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_j \cap \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$. Conversely, consider a $\tilde{T} \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ that does share a vertex with some $T \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_j \cap \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$. Let $T = T_1, \dots, T_{\tilde{\ell}} = \tilde{T}$ be a sequence of simplices sharing the common vertex, and the consecutive elements T_j, T_{j+1} share a $d-1$ dimensional face. Then $|\text{level}(T_j) - \text{level}(T_{j+1})| \leq 1$ and thus $|\text{level}(T) - \text{level}(\tilde{T})| \leq \tilde{\ell} - 1$. Note that $\tilde{\ell}$ is bounded by the maximum number of simplices sharing a vertex. This only depends on shape regularity and is thus uniformly bounded by some ℓ . The property (5.6) follows.

To establish (5.7), we split $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ into the three disjoint subsets

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_j = \tilde{\mathcal{T}} \cap \hat{\mathcal{T}}_j, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{(0)} = \{T \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_j : (I_j v - v)|_T = 0\}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^* = \tilde{\mathcal{T}} \setminus (\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_j \cup \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{(0)}).$$

Let $\tilde{T} \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^*$. Then there is $T \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_j$ with $T \subset \tilde{T}$ and that shares the vertices of \tilde{T} on which $I_j v - v$ does not vanish. Let $\Psi: \tilde{T} \rightarrow T$ be an affine linear transformation. Then using Lemma 5.6 we get

$$\|Q_j v - v\|_{L_2(T)}^2 = \frac{\text{vol}(T)}{\text{vol}(\tilde{T})} \|(Q_j v - v) \circ \Psi\|_{L_2(\tilde{T})}^2 \geq \frac{c_d \text{vol}(T)}{C_d \text{vol}(\tilde{T})} \|I_j v - v\|_{L_2(\tilde{T})}^2$$

since the values $I_j v - v$ on the vertices either agree with those of $(Q_j v - v) \circ \Psi$ or are zero. Finally, for any $v \in V(\mathcal{T})$ we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_j v - v\|_{L_2(D)}^2 &= \sum_{\tilde{T} \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^*} \|I_j v - v\|_{L_2(\tilde{T})}^2 + \sum_{\tilde{T} \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_j} \|Q_j v - v\|_{L_2(T)}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{C_d \text{vol}(\tilde{T})}{c_d \text{vol}(T)} \sum_{T \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_j \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_j} \|Q_j v - v\|_{L_2(T)}^2 + \sum_{T \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_j} \|Q_j v - v\|_{L_2(T)}^2 \\ &\leq c_\ell \|Q_j v - v\|_{L_2(D)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_\ell = \frac{C_d \text{vol}(\tilde{T})}{c_d \text{vol}(T)}$ depends only on ℓ and shape regularity. \square

We also require that the change from basis of uniform basis functions to hierarchical basis functions behaves well. For this, recall that the nodes in $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j$ are enumerated by $\mathcal{N}_j \supset \mathcal{N}_{j-1}$.

Lemma 5.8. *Let $u_j = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} z_k \psi_{j,k} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_{j-1}} t_k \psi_{j-1,k} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j \setminus \mathcal{N}_{j-1}} t_k \psi_{j,k} \in V(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j)$. Then there are constants $c, C > 0$ independent of j and u_j such that*

$$c \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} |z_k|^2 \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} |t_k|^2 \leq C \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} |z_k|^2.$$

Proof. For $k \in \mathcal{N}_{j-1}$ we denote by $k_{(1)}, \dots, k_{(n_k)} \in \mathcal{N}_j \setminus \mathcal{N}_{j-1}$ the indices of nodes such that $(x_k, x_{k_{(i)}})$ are edges in $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j$ for $i = 1, \dots, n_k$. On the other hand, for $k \in \mathcal{N}_j \setminus \mathcal{N}_{j-1}$ we denote by $k^{(1)}, k^{(2)} \in \mathcal{N}_{j-1}$ the indices of nodes in $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{j-1}$ such that $x_k = \frac{1}{2}(x_{k^{(1)}} + x_{k^{(2)}})$.

As a direct consequence of the triangulations being generated by bisection, we get the refinement relation

$$\psi_{j-1,k} = r_{j,k,k} \psi_{j,k} + r_{j,k,k_{(1)}} \psi_{j,k_{(1)}} + \dots + r_{j,k,k_{(n_k)}} \psi_{j,k_{(n_k)}}$$

with

$$r_{j,k,k} = \frac{\psi_{j-1,k}(x_k)}{\psi_{j,k}(x_k)} \quad \text{and} \quad r_{j,k,k_{(i)}} = \frac{\psi_{j-1,k}(x_{k_{(i)}})}{\psi_{j,k_{(i)}}(x_{k_{(i)}})}.$$

Note that there is a uniform bound $n \geq n_k$ for all k by uniform shape regularity, and that the ratios satisfy

$$0 < \tilde{c} \leq r_{j,k,k_{(i)}} \leq \tilde{C}$$

with uniform constants c, C due to the triangulation $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j$ being uniform. On the other hand, for each index $k \in \{N_{j-1} + 1, \dots, N_j\}$ in at most two such refinement relations, namely for $k^{(1)}, k^{(2)} \in \{1, \dots, N_{j-1}\}$. We thus get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_{j-1}} t_k (r_{j,k,k} \psi_{j,k} + r_{j,k,k^{(1)}} \psi_{j,k^{(1)}} + \dots + r_{j,k,k^{(n_k)}} \psi_{j,k^{(n_k)}}) + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j \setminus \mathcal{N}_{j-1}} t_k \psi_{j,k} \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_{j-1}} b_k r_{j,k,k} \psi_{j,k} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j \setminus \mathcal{N}_{j-1}} (b_k + t_{k^{(1)}} r_{j,k^{(1)},k} + t_{k^{(2)}} r_{j,k^{(2)},k}) \psi_{j,k} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} z_k \psi_{j,k}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows by Schur's lemma, that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} |z_k|^2 \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} |t_k|^2 \max(n\tilde{C}, 1)(1 + 2\tilde{C})$$

and similarly, using

$$\psi_{j,k} = \frac{1}{r_{j,k,k}} \psi_{j-1,k} - \frac{r_{j,k,k^{(1)}}}{r_{j,k,k}} \psi_{j,k^{(1)}} - \dots - \frac{r_{j,k,k^{(n_k)}}}{r_{j,k,k}} \psi_{j,k^{(n_k)}}$$

we get

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} |t_k|^2 \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} |z_k|^2 \frac{1}{\tilde{c}^2} \max(n\tilde{C}, 1)(1 + 2\tilde{C}). \quad \square$$

Now we have the necessary tools to prove Theorem 5.5.

Proof of Theorem 5.5. Let S be conforming with corresponding conforming simplicial mesh \mathcal{T} . As a consequence of (5.4) and (5.7), for any $v \in V(S)$,

$$(5.8) \quad \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{2j} \|(I_j - I_{j-1})v\|_{L_2(D)}^2 \lesssim \|v\|_{H_0^1(D)}^2,$$

where $I_{-1}v = 0$. We construct the coefficients z_λ of a stable representation

$$(5.9) \quad v = \sum_{\lambda \in S} z_\lambda \psi_\lambda \in V(S)$$

in multiple steps. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $(\hat{z}_{j,k})_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j}$ be such that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} \hat{z}_{j,k} \psi_{j,k} = (I_j - I_{j-1})v \in V(S) \cap V(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j).$$

By (5.5), we have $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} |\hat{z}_{j,k}|^2 \leq 2^{2j} \|(I_j - I_{j-1})v\|_{L_2(D)}^2$. However, this does not yet yield (5.9), since not all nonzero coefficients $\hat{z}_{j,k}$ satisfy $(j, k) \in S$. Apply ℓ changes of basis of the form of Lemma 5.8 yields the coefficients

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_{j-\ell}} \tilde{z}_{j,j-\ell,k} \psi_{j-\ell,k} + \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_{j-i} \setminus \mathcal{N}_{j-i-1}} \tilde{z}_{j,j-i,k} \psi_{j-i,k} = (I_j - I_{j-1})v \in V(S) \cap V(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_j).$$

We utilize the condition (5.6) to deduce

$$(I_j - I_{j-1})v = 0 \quad \text{on } T \in \mathcal{T} \text{ with level } T \leq j - 1 - \ell.$$

Thus, the coarser basis functions $\psi_{i,k}$ with $i \leq j - 1 - \ell$ do not enter into the expansion of $(I_j - I_{j-1})v$. This in turn implies $\tilde{z}_{j,j-i,k} = 0$ for all $(j - i, k) \notin S$. Finally, we obtain the sought coefficients in (5.9) by setting

$$z_{j,k} = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} \tilde{z}_{j+i,j,k}, \quad \text{so that} \quad \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} z_\lambda \psi_\lambda = \sum_j (I_j - I_{j-1})v = v.$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma 5.8, we have the estimate

$$\sum_{\lambda \in S} |z_\lambda|^2 \leq (\ell + 1) \sum_{(j,k \in S)} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} |\tilde{z}_{j+i,j,k}|^2 \leq (\ell + 1) C^\ell \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_j} |\hat{z}_{j,k}|^2$$

which together with (5.8) implies the desired stability. \square

5.2. Proof of optimality theorem. In the refinement process described in [5, Sec. 3.2] we utilized a tree structure on the index set. It is now possible to introduce a tree structure on Θ such that any conforming set Θ satisfies the tree structure, that is $\lambda \in \Lambda$ implies that all ancestors λ' of λ are in Λ as well. We choose the ancestor relation defined as follows: $\lambda' = (j-1, k)$ is the parent of λ if either $\lambda = (j, k)$ or $\lambda = (j, k')$ where $x_{k'}$ is the midpoint of an edge with endpoint x_k . This implies the conditions stated in [5, Sec. 3.2].

To provide estimates of the number of refinements, we also require $\omega_0 < \omega_1$ and

$$\omega_1(1 - \zeta) + \zeta < (1 - 2\zeta) \frac{c_{\text{stable}} \sqrt{C_B}}{C_\Psi \sqrt{C_B}}$$

previously stated as (2.21). The following lemma is in virtue similar to [6, Lem. 5.3] with the additional difficulty that we have to combine conforming sets and sets with tree structure.

Lemma 5.9. *Let Λ^{k+1} be obtained by Algorithm 2.2. In addition to (2.16), (2.17), (2.18), let ω_1 satisfy (2.21). Then*

$$\#(\Lambda^{k+1} \setminus \Lambda(\mathbb{T}^k)) \lesssim \min \left\{ \#\bar{\Lambda}: \bar{\Lambda} \text{ is conforming and } \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\bar{\Lambda})} \|u - v\|_V \leq \beta \|u - u^k\|_B \right\}$$

where the hidden constant only depends on ω_0 and ω_1 and with $\beta > 0$ such that

$$(1 - C_B \beta^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left(\frac{\omega_1(1 - \zeta) + \zeta}{1 - 2\zeta} \right) \frac{C_\Psi \sqrt{C_B}}{c_{\text{stable}} \sqrt{C_B}}.$$

Proof. We set $\hat{\omega} = \frac{\omega_1(1-\zeta)+\zeta}{1-2\zeta}$. Then (2.21) ensures the relation between $\hat{\omega}$ and β required in Lemma 5.2 and $\omega_1 = (\hat{\omega} - \frac{(1+\hat{\omega})\zeta}{1-\zeta})$. Let $\hat{\Lambda} \supset \Lambda(\mathbb{T}^k)$ be the smallest conforming set satisfying

$$\|\Psi(Bu - f)|_{\hat{\Lambda}}\|_{\ell_2} \geq \hat{\omega} \|\Psi(Bu - f)\|_{\ell_2}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k|_{\hat{\Lambda}}\|_{\ell_2} &\geq \|\Psi(Bu - f)|_{\hat{\Lambda}}\|_{\ell_2} - \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k - \Psi(Bu - f)\|_{\ell_2} \\ &\geq \hat{\omega} \|\Psi(Bu - f)\|_{\ell_2} - \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k - \Psi(Bu - f)\|_{\ell_2} \\ &\geq \hat{\omega} \|\mathbf{r}^k\|_{\ell_2} - (1 + \hat{\omega}) \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k - \Psi(Bu - f)\|_{\ell_2} \\ &\geq (\hat{\omega} - \frac{(1 + \hat{\omega})\zeta}{1 - \zeta}) \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k\|_{\ell_2} \\ &= \omega_1 \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k\|_{\ell_2} \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\#(\hat{\Lambda} \setminus \Lambda(\mathbb{T}^k)) \leq \min \left\{ \#\bar{\Lambda}: \bar{\Lambda} \text{ is conforming and } \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\bar{\Lambda})} \|u - v\|_V \leq \beta \|u - u^k\|_B \right\}$$

by Lemma 5.2. Now tree estimation (cf. [6, Cor. 4.20]) ensures

$$(5.10) \quad \#(\Lambda^{k+1} \setminus \Lambda(\mathbb{T}^k)) \lesssim \#(\Lambda_T \setminus \Lambda(\mathbb{T}^k))$$

for all $\Lambda_T \supset \Lambda(\mathbb{T}^k)$ with tree structure satisfying

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k|_{\Lambda_T}\|_{\ell_2} \geq \omega_1 \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}^k\|_{\ell_2}.$$

Here, the hidden constant in (5.10) only depends on ω_0 and ω_1 . Since the smallest Λ_T is smaller than $\hat{\Lambda}$, we get

$$\#(\Lambda^{k+1} \setminus \Lambda(\mathbb{T}^k)) \lesssim \min \left\{ \#\bar{\Lambda}: \bar{\Lambda} \text{ is conforming and } \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\bar{\Lambda})} \|u - v\|_V \leq \beta \|u - u^k\|_B \right\}$$

as asserted. \square

The last necessary ingredient is the relation of the sizes of the sets Λ^k and the size of the meshes \mathbb{T}^k .

Lemma 5.10. *Let $\mathbb{T}^k = \text{MESH}(\Lambda^k)$ and Λ^k be generated by Algorithm 2.2. Then*

$$N(\mathbb{T}^k) - N(\mathbb{T}^0) \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^k \#(\Lambda^j \setminus \Lambda(\mathbb{T}^{j-1})).$$

Proof. By the tree structure of Λ^j , each element of $\Lambda^j \setminus \Lambda(\mathbb{T}^{j-1})$ corresponds to applying to a certain mesh element at most d successive bisections with conforming closures of the respective meshes. Following similar lines as in [5, Prop. 3.10], the result thus follows with the amortized complexity bound for bisection given in [23, Thm. 6.1]. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.4. By Lemma 5.10 and Lemma 5.9, we get

$$\begin{aligned} N(\mathbb{T}^k) - N(\mathbb{T}^0) &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^k \#(\Lambda^j \setminus \Lambda(\mathbb{T}^{j-1})) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^k \min \left\{ \#\bar{\Lambda} : \bar{\Lambda} \text{ is conforming and } \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\bar{\Lambda})} \|u - v\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \beta \|u - u^{j-1}\|_B \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We next note that for any conforming simplicial mesh,

$$\#\Lambda(\mathcal{T}) + 1 \approx \dim V(\mathcal{T}) + 1 \approx \#\mathcal{T}$$

with constants depending on shape regularity. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\min \left\{ \#\bar{\Lambda} : \bar{\Lambda} \text{ is conforming and } \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\bar{\Lambda})} \|u - v\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \beta \|u - u^{j-1}\|_B \right\} \\ &\approx \min \left\{ \#N(\mathbb{T}) : \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{T})} \|u - v\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \beta \|u - u^{j-1}\|_B \right\} \\ &\leq \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{\frac{1}{s}} (\beta \|u - u^{j-1}\|_B)^{-\frac{1}{s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using the error reduction (2.19) of Theorem 2.3 together with previous estimates, we get

$$N(\mathbb{T}^k) - N(\mathbb{T}^0) \lesssim \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{\frac{1}{s}} \|u - u^k\|_B^{-\frac{1}{s}} \beta^{-\frac{1}{s}} \sum_{j=1}^k (\delta^{\frac{1}{s}})^{1+k-j} \leq \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{\frac{1}{s}} \|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}}^{-\frac{1}{s}} \beta^{-\frac{1}{s}} c_B^{-\frac{1}{2s}} \frac{1}{1 - \delta^{\frac{1}{s}}},$$

which is (i) since $0 < c_B \beta^2 \leq \frac{c_B}{C_B} \leq 1$. This concludes the proof of (i).

The method TREEAPPROX scales linear in the size of Λ^k , and the methods MESH and GALERKINSOLVE scale linear in the size $N(\mathbb{T}^k)$. They are thus dominated by the costs of RESESTIMATE.

The costs of RESESTIMATE are estimated in Proposition 4.6. By invoking the first part of the theorem, we can estimate the approximation norm $\|u^k\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}$ in terms of $\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}$ via

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^k\|_{\mathcal{A}^s} &= \max_{N < N(\mathbb{T}^k)} N^s \min_{N(\mathbb{T}) \leq N} \min_{u_N \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{T})} \|u^k - u_N\|_{\mathcal{V}} \\ &\leq \max_{N < N(\mathbb{T}^k)} N^s \min_{N(\mathbb{T}) \leq N} \min_{u_N \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{T})} (\|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}} + \|u - u_N\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \\ &\leq N(\mathbb{T}^k)^s \|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}} + \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}. \end{aligned}$$

We also get

$$\|(\| [u^k]_{\nu} \|_{\mathcal{V}})_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{A}^s} \lesssim \|u^k\|_{\mathcal{A}^s} \leq \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s} + N(\mathbb{T}^k)^s \|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}} \lesssim \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}.$$

By (4.12), the number of operations is thus bounded by a fixed multiple of

$$\sum_{j=1}^k q(1 + |\log \eta_j| + \log \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}) (\#F^j \log \#F^j + \#\mathcal{T}(f) + \eta_j^{-p} \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^p N(\mathbb{T}^j) + \eta_j^{-\frac{1}{s}} \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{\frac{1}{s}})$$

for some polynomial q . Again, by the first part of the theorem, we can estimate $N(\mathbb{T}^k) \lesssim \|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}}^{-\frac{1}{s}} \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{\frac{1}{s}}$ and by error reduction $\delta^{k-j} \|u - u^j\|_{\mathcal{V}} \lesssim \|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}}$. Also, by construction $\eta_k \approx \|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $N(\mathbb{T}^0) \lesssim 1$ and $\#\mathcal{T}(f) \lesssim 1$. The term $\#F^j \log \#F^j$ is dominated by $N(\mathbb{T}^j) \log N(\mathbb{T}^j) \lesssim \|u - u^j\|_{\mathcal{V}}^{-p-\frac{1}{s}} \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{p+\frac{1}{s}}$. Thus, the number of operations is bounded by a

fixed multiple of

$$\begin{aligned} & q(1 + |\log\|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}}| + \log\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}) \sum_{j=1}^k (1 + \delta^{(p+\frac{1}{s})(j-k)}) \|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}}^{-p-\frac{1}{s}} \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{p+\frac{1}{s}} \\ & \leq q(1 + |\log\|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}}| + \log\|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}) \left(k + (1 - \delta^{p+\frac{1}{s}})^{-1} \|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}}^{-p-\frac{1}{s}} \|u\|_{\mathcal{A}^s}^{p+\frac{1}{s}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by error reduction $k \lesssim \frac{1}{\log\delta} (\log\|u - u^k\|_{\mathcal{V}} - \log\|u\|_{\mathcal{V}})$. This concludes the proof of (iii). For (ii) we use the same technique but the computational complexity of the method REESTIMATE in the affine case stated in [5, Prop. 3.7]. \square

6. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

We have extended the adaptive stochastic Galerkin finite element method developed in [5] to handle nonlinear parametrizations of coefficients, more specifically, allowing for series expansions composed with a general class of smooth nonlinearities. In particular, this applies to the exponential function, covering log-affine parametrizations. This treatment of nonlinear parametrizations can be accommodated within the basic structure of the method from [5], which is based on a combination of adaptive operator compression in the stochastic variables with spatial error estimation using finite element frames. The modification for nonlinear coefficient parametrizations requires modified compression strategies, such that the results on uniform error reduction by each iteration of the adaptive method shown in [5] remain valid.

Both for affine and for nonlinear parametrizations, we have shown that the adaptive scheme generates quasi-optimal approximations at near-optimal computational costs. To achieve optimal computational costs, as in [5, 6] we crucially rely on coefficient parametrizations with multilevel structure, which leads to suitable approximate sparsity of solutions and operators.

There are several natural directions for further work. First, the nonlinear coefficient parametrizations are a natural fit for applications to random domain problems with transformation to a reference domain as, e.g., in [20, 26]. Second, the generalization of the adaptive scheme to vector valued elliptic problems and to parabolic problems will be of interest. Finally, we also plan to investigate adaptive methods based on similar concepts for goal-oriented discretization refinement.

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF AUXILIARY LEMMAS

Proof of Lemma 3.2. The result follows from the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|Bv\|_{\mathcal{V}} & \leq \left(\sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \sum_{\nu' \in \mathcal{F}} [a]_{\nu\nu'} \nabla[v]_{\nu'} \right\|_{L_2(D)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \left(\sum_{\nu' \in \mathcal{F}} |[a]_{\nu\nu'}| |\nabla[v]_{\nu'}|^2 \right) \left(\sum_{\nu'} |[a]_{\nu\nu'}| \right) \right\|_{L_1(D)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \left\| \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\sum_{\nu' \in \mathcal{F}} |[a]_{\nu\nu'}| |\nabla[v]_{\nu'}|^2 \right) \right\|_{L_1(D)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \sum_{\nu' \in \mathcal{F}} |[a]_{\nu\nu'}| \right\|_{L_\infty(D)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \max_{\nu' \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} |[a]_{\nu\nu'}| \right\|_{L_\infty(D)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} |\nabla[v]_{\nu}|^2 \right\|_{L_1(D)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \sum_{\nu' \in \mathcal{F}} |[a]_{\nu\nu'}| \right\|_{L_\infty(D)}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

since by symmetry $[a]_{\nu\nu'} = [a]_{\nu'\nu}$, we arrive at

$$\|Bv\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}} \left\| \sum_{\nu' \in \mathcal{F}} |[a]_{\nu\nu'}| \right\|_{L_\infty(D)} \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}}. \quad \square$$

Proof of Lemma 3.8. First, we introduce the functions

$$a(x) = a_i \quad \text{if } x \in (i-1, i], \quad b(x) = b_i \quad \text{if } x \in (i-1, i], \quad \text{and} \quad B(x) = \int_0^x b(y) dy.$$

Note that $a(x)$ is monotonically decreasing and $B(x)$ is strictly monotonically increasing. Thus $B: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is bijective. Then

$$\left(\sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} a_i b_i \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^k b_i \right)^{-1} = \int_k^{\infty} a(x) b(x) \frac{1}{B(k)} dx = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{nB(k)}^{(n+1)B(k)} \frac{a(B^{-1}(y))}{B(k)} dy.$$

Using $0 < p < 1$ and monotonicity of a , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} a_i b_i \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^k b_i \right)^{-1} &\leq \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\int_{nB(k)}^{(n+1)B(k)} \frac{a(B^{-1}(y))}{B(k)} dy \right)^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a(B^{-1}(nB(k)))^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \left(\int_0^{\infty} \frac{a(B^{-1}(y))^p}{B(k)} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \left(\int_0^{\infty} \frac{a(x)^p b(x)}{B(k)} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i^p b_i \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k b_i \right)^{-\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Similarly to the proof of Lemma 3.9, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)} a_{\mathbf{k}}^p b_{\mathbf{k}} &= a_{\mathbf{0}}^p b_{\mathbf{0}} + \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0, L)} a_{\mathbf{k}+e_L}^p b_{\mathbf{k}+e_L} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \rho^{-p} 2^{(d_b - (\alpha + d_a)p)L} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0, L)} 2^{\#\{\ell: k_{\ell} > 0\}} \prod_{\ell=0}^L (\rho^p 2^{\alpha \ell p})^{-k_{\ell}} \binom{k_{\ell} + t}{t} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \rho^{-p} 2^{(d_b - (\alpha + d_a)p)L} \left(2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\rho^p 2^{\alpha \ell p})^{-k} \binom{k+t}{t} - 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \binom{k+t}{t} x^k = \frac{1}{(1-x)^{t+1}}$ for $|x| < 1$, we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{N}_0)} a_{\mathbf{k}}^p b_{\mathbf{k}} = 1 + \rho^{-p} \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} 2^{(d_b - (\alpha + d_a)p)L} \prod_{\ell=0}^L \frac{2 - (1 - \rho^{-p} 2^{-\alpha \ell p})^{t+1}}{(1 - \rho^{-p} 2^{-\alpha \ell p})^{t+1}},$$

and the product is bounded

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\ell=0}^L \frac{2 - (1 - \rho^{-p} 2^{-\alpha \ell p})^{t+1}}{(1 - \rho^{-p} 2^{-\alpha \ell p})^{t+1}} &\leq \exp \sum_{\ell=0}^L (\ln(2 - (1 - \rho^{-p} 2^{-\alpha \ell p})^{t+1}) - (t+1) \ln(1 - \rho^{-p} 2^{-\alpha \ell p})) \\ &\leq \exp \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^L \rho^{-p} (t+1) \left(1 + \frac{1}{1 - \rho^{-p}} \right) 2^{-\alpha \ell p} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\frac{\rho^{-p} (t+1) (2 - \rho^{-p})}{(1 - \rho^{-p})(1 - 2^{-\alpha p})} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\ln(2 - (1-x)^{t+1}) \leq (t+1)x$ and $\ln(1 - \rho^{-p}x) \leq \frac{x}{1 - \rho^{-p}}$ for $x \in (0, 1)$. The result follows. \square

REFERENCES

1. M. Bachmayr and A. Cohen, *Multilevel representations of random fields and sparse approximations of solutions to random PDEs*, Multiscale, Nonlinear and Adaptive Approximation II, Springer, 2024, pp. 25–54.
2. M. Bachmayr, A. Cohen, and W. Dahmen, *Parametric PDEs: Sparse or low-rank approximations?*, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis **38** (2018), no. 4, 1661–1708.
3. M. Bachmayr, A. Cohen, D. Dũng, and Ch. Schwab, *Fully discrete approximation of parametric and stochastic elliptic PDEs*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis **55** (2017), 2151–2186.
4. M. Bachmayr, A. Cohen, and G. Migliorati, *Sparse polynomial approximation of parametric elliptic PDEs. Part I: affine coefficients*, ESAIM. Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis **51** (2017), no. 1, 321–339.
5. M. Bachmayr, M. Eigel, H. Eisenmann, and I. Voulis, *A convergent adaptive finite element stochastic Galerkin method based on multilevel expansions of random fields*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.13770, 2024, accepted for publication in SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis.

6. M. Bachmayr and I. Voulis, *An adaptive stochastic Galerkin method based on multilevel expansions of random fields: convergence and optimality*, ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal. **56** (2022), no. 6, 1955–1992.
7. A. Bespalov, D. Praetorius, and M. Ruggeri, *Convergence and rate optimality of adaptive multilevel stochastic Galerkin FEM*, IMA J. Numer. Anal. **42** (2022), no. 3, 2190–2213. MR 4454920
8. P. Binev, *Tree approximation for hp-adaptivity*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis **56** (2018), no. 6, 3346–3357.
9. F. Bornemann and H. Yserentant, *A basic norm equivalence for the theory of multilevel methods*, Numerische Mathematik **64** (1993), no. 1, 455–476.
10. A. Cohen, R. DeVore, and R. H. Nochetto, *Convergence rates of AFEM with H^{-1} data*, Found. Comput. Math. **12** (2012), no. 5, 671–718.
11. A. Cohen, R. DeVore, and Ch. Schwab, *Analytic regularity and polynomial approximation of parametric and stochastic elliptic PDE's*, Analysis and Applications **9** (2011), no. 1, 11–47.
12. A. J. Crowder, C. E. Powell, and A. Bespalov, *Efficient adaptive multilevel stochastic Galerkin approximation using implicit a posteriori error estimation*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing **41** (2019), no. 3, A1681–A1705.
13. W. Dahmen and A. Kunoth, *Multilevel preconditioning*, Numerische Mathematik **63** (1992), no. 1, 315–344.
14. M. Eigel, C. J. Gittelsohn, Ch. Schwab, and E. Zander, *Adaptive stochastic Galerkin FEM*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering **270** (2014), 247–269.
15. ———, *A convergent adaptive stochastic Galerkin finite element method with quasi-optimal spatial meshes*, ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis **49** (2015), no. 5, 1367–1398.
16. M. Eigel and N. Hegemann, *On the convergence of adaptive Galerkin FEM for parametric PDEs with lognormal coefficients*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02839, 2024.
17. T. Gantumur, H. Harbrecht, and R. Stevenson, *An optimal adaptive wavelet method without coarsening of the iterands*, Math. Comp. **76** (2007), no. 258, 615–629.
18. C. J. Gittelsohn, *Adaptive wavelet methods for elliptic partial differential equations with random operators*, Numerische Mathematik **126** (2014), 471–513.
19. C.J. Gittelsohn, *An adaptive stochastic Galerkin method for random elliptic operators*, Mathematics of Computation **82** (2013), 1515–1541.
20. H. Harbrecht, M. Peters, and M. Siebenmorgen, *Analysis of the domain mapping method for elliptic diffusion problems on random domains*, Numer. Math. **134** (2016), no. 4, 823–856.
21. H. Harbrecht and R. Schneider, *A note on multilevel based error estimation*, Computational Methods in Applied Mathematics **16** (2016), no. 3, 447–458.
22. H. Harbrecht, R. Schneider, and Ch. Schwab, *Multilevel frames for sparse tensor product spaces*, Numerische Mathematik **110** (2008), no. 2, 199–220.
23. R. Stevenson, *The completion of locally refined simplicial partitions created by bisection*, Math. Comp. **77** (2008), no. 261, 227–241.
24. L. N. Trefethen, *Approximation theory and approximation practice*, extended ed., Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2020.
25. E. Ullmann, H. C. Elman, and O. G. Ernst, *Efficient iterative solvers for stochastic Galerkin discretizations of log-transformed random diffusion problems*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing **34** (2012), no. 2, A659–A682.
26. W. G. van Harten and L. Scarabosio, *Exploiting locality in sparse polynomial approximation of parametric elliptic PDEs and application to parameterized domains*, ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal. **58** (2024), no. 5, 1581–1613.
27. R. Verfürth, *A posteriori error estimation techniques for finite element methods*, Oxford University Press, 2013.