Augmented Subspace Scheme for Eigenvalue Problem by Weak Galerkin Finite Element Method

Yue Feng,* Zhijin Guan,† Hehu Xie‡ and Chenguang Zhou§

Abstract

This study proposes a class of augmented subspace schemes for the weak Galerkin (WG) finite element method used to solve eigenvalue problems. The augmented subspace is built with the conforming linear finite element space defined on the coarse mesh and the eigenfunction approximations in the WG finite element space defined on the fine mesh. Based on this augmented subspace, solving the eigenvalue problem in the fine WG finite element space can be reduced to the solution of the linear boundary value problem in the same WG finite element space and a low dimensional eigenvalue problem in the augmented subspace. The proposed augmented subspace techniques have the second order convergence rate with respect to the coarse mesh size, as demonstrated by the accompanying error estimates. Finally, a few numerical examples are provided to validate the proposed numerical techniques.

Keywords. Eigenvalue problem, augmented subspace scheme, weak Galerkin finite element method, second order convergence rate.

AMS subject classifications. 65N30, 65N25, 65L15, 65B99.

1 Introduction

One of the most important tasks in contemporary scientific and engineering society is solving eigenvalue problems. The difficulty of solving eigenvalue problems is invariably higher than that of solving similar linear boundary value problems due to the increased computing and memory requirements. Large-scale eigenvalue problem solving in particular will provide formidable obstacles to scientific computing. Numerous eigensolvers have been developed so far, including the Jacobi-Davidson type technique [4], the Preconditioned INVerse ITeration (PINVIT) method [5, 9, 12], the Krylov subspace type method (Implicitly Restarted Lanczos/Arnoldi Method (IRLM/IRAM) [25]), and the Generalized Conjugate Gradient Eigensolver (GCGE) [16, 17, 37]. The orthogonalization processes involved in solving Rayleigh-Ritz problems are a common bottleneck in the design of effective parallel techniques for identifying a large number of eigenpairs, and they are included in all of these widely used approaches.

---

*LSEC, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No.55, Zhongguancun Donglu, Beijing 100190, China, and School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China (`fengyue@amss.ac.cn`)

†LSEC, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No.55, Zhongguancun Donglu, Beijing 100190, China, and School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China (`guanzhijin@lsec.cc.ac.cn`)

‡LSEC, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No.55, Zhongguancun Donglu, Beijing 100190, China, and School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China (`hhxie@lsec.cc.ac.cn`)

§Faculty of Science, Beijing University of Technology, Beijing 100124, China (Corresponding author: `zhoucg@bjut.edu.cn`)

A class of augmented subspace methods and their multilevel correction methods has been proposed recently in [7, 11, 18, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32] for the solution of eigenvalue problems. This kind of technique creates an augmented subspace using the low dimensional finite element space generated on the coarse grid, which is employed in each correction step. The notion of an augmented subspace gives rise to a class of augmented subspace techniques that need just the final finite element space on the finest mesh and the low dimension finite element space on the coarse mesh. Using the augmented subspace methods, the solution of the eigenvalue problem on the final level of mesh can be transformed to the solution of linear boundary value problems on the final level of mesh and the solution of the eigenvalue problem on the low dimensional augmented subspace. Even the coarse and finest meshes lack nested properties, these kinds of algorithms can still work [8]. The multilevel correction methods, which are based on the augmented subspace methods, provide ways to construct multigrid methods for eigenvalue problems [7, 11, 28, 29, 31]. In addition, the authors design an eigenpair-wise parallel eigensolver for the eigenvalue problems in [32]. A significant amount of the wall time in the parallel computation is saved by using this kind of parallel approach, which avoids performing orthogonalization and inner-products in the high dimensional space. However, the aforementioned references are mostly investigated using conforming finite element methods. There are few results on the augmented subspace approaches based on nonstandard finite element methods for solving eigenvalue problems.

The WG method, which was initially introduced and explored in [27], concerns the finite element methods utilized to solve partial differential equations in which the differential operators, such as gradient operator, divergence operator, curl operator, and so on, are approximated as distributions by weak forms. The WG approach employs generalized discrete weak derivatives and parameter-free stabilizers to weakly enforce continuity in the approximation space, in contrast to the standard finite element technique. Consequently, it ought to be more convenient to create high order precision discretization than the conforming finite element approach. Additionally, the WG approach can be easily implemented on polygonal meshes thanks to the relaxation of the continuity constraint, which also gives additional freedom for h- and p-adaptation. So far, the WG method has been applied to various partial differential equations, such as the parabolic equation [15, 39], the biharmonic equation [21, 26, 38], the Brinkman equation [20, 36], the Helmholtz equation [22, 24] and the Maxwell equation [23]. The convergence analysis and several lower bound findings are produced in [34], where the WG approximation to the eigenvalue problems is firstly studied. Then, using the WG approach, the authors create a kind of two-grid or two-level schemes [35], and in [33], the shifted-inverse power technique is taken into consideration under the two-grid schemes. Based on the theoretical analysis presented in [35], it can be inferred that there is no independent relationship between the coarse and fine mesh sizes. As a result, the approaches cannot be used to develop an eigensolver for algebraic eigenvalue problems resulting from differential operator eigenvalue problems discretized by WG.

This paper's contribution is the augmented subspace methods for eigenvalue problem that are based on the WG approximation. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work aimed at the numerical analysis of the WG finite element discretization-based augmented subspace approaches for eigenvalue problems. In contrast to the findings in [35], our approaches' selections for the coarse and fine mesh sizes are independent of one another. The algebraic eigenvalue problems that result from the WG approximation to the differential eigenvalue problems can then be solved by designing an eigensolver using the proposed techniques. Furthermore, we demonstrate the algebraic error estimate for the WG augmented subspace approaches that follows

$$\left\| \bar{u}_h - u_h^{(\ell+1)} \right\|_{a,h} \leq CH^2 \left\| \bar{u}_h - u_h^{(\ell)} \right\|_{a,h},$$

when the computing domain is convex.

This paper is organized as follows. We provide the WG approaches for the eigenvalue problems and deduce the associated error estimates in Section 2. These results give explicit dependence of the error estimates on the eigenvalue distribution which is another contribution of this paper.

2

The majority of this work, Section 3, contains the augmented subspace techniques and the associated error estimates. A few numerical examples are given in Section 4 to validate the suggested augmented subspace algorithms' convergence rates. Lastly, the final section has a few closing thoughts.

2 Discretization by WG finite element method

The WG finite element approach for the second order elliptic eigenvalue problem is presented in this section. Additionally, the associated error estimates are offered. The letter C, with or without subscripts, symbolizes a generic positive constant for this purpose that may vary at various places in this work.

Here, we consider the numerical method to solve the following second order elliptic eigenvalue problem: Find $(\lambda, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot (A\nabla u) &=& \lambda u, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &=& 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ (A\nabla u, \nabla u) &=& 1, \end{cases} \qquad (2.1)$$

where Ω denotes a convex bounded polygonal or polyhedral domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 2, 3$, and $A \in [L^\infty(\Omega)]^{d \times d}$ is a symmetric matrix-valued function on Ω with suitable regularity. Assume that there exist positive constants c and C such that the matrix A satisfies the following property

$$c\xi^T\xi \le \xi^T A(x)\xi \le C\xi^T\xi \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } x \in \Omega. \qquad (2.2)$$

In order to define the WG finite element method for the eigenvalue problem, (2.1) should be written as the following variational form: Find $(\lambda, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times V$ such that $a(u, u) = 1$ and

$$a(u, v) = \lambda b(u, v), \quad \forall v \in V, \qquad (2.3)$$

where $V := H_0^1(\Omega)$ [1] and

$$a(u, v) = (A\nabla u, \nabla v), \quad b(u, v) = (u, v). \qquad (2.4)$$

Furthermore, based on the bilinear forms $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $b(\cdot, \cdot)$, we can define the norms on the space V as follows

$$\|v\|_a = \sqrt{a(v, v)}, \quad \forall v \in V, \quad \|w\|_b = \sqrt{b(w, w)}, \quad \forall w \in L^2(\Omega). \qquad (2.5)$$

It is well known that the eigenvalue problem (2.3) has an eigenvalue sequence $\{\lambda_j\}$ (cf. [2, 6]),

$$0 < \lambda_1 \le \lambda_2 \le \cdots \le \lambda_k \le \cdots, \quad \lim_{k \to \infty} \lambda_k = \infty.$$

And the associated eigenfunctions are provided as

$$u_1, u_2, \cdots, u_k, \cdots.$$

Here $a(u_i, u_j) = \delta_{ij}$ (δ_{ij} denotes the Kronecker function).

Now, let us define the WG finite element space for the eigenvalue problem (2.3). First we generate a shape-regular, quasi-uniform mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ of the computing domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d = 2, 3$). Denote by $\mathcal{E}_h$ the set of all edges or faces of the mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$. For simplicity, in this paper, we only consider the triangle or tetrahedral mesh. The diameter of a cell $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ is denoted by h_K and the mesh size h describes the maximal diameter of all cells $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. For each cell $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we use K_0 and ∂K to denote the interior and the boundary of K. In the sense of geometry, K_0 is identical

to K. Then we identify them if no ambiguity. Based on the mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$, we can construct the WG finite element space denoted by V_h as follows

$$V_h = \left\{ v : v|_{K_0} \in \mathcal{P}_r(K_0) \text{ for } K \in \mathcal{T}_h; v|_e \in \mathcal{P}_s(e) \text{ for } e \in \mathcal{E}_h, \text{ and } v|_e = 0 \text{ for } e \in \mathcal{E}_h \cap \partial\Omega \right\}, \quad (2.6)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_r(K_0)$ denotes the set of polynomials of degree no more than the integer $r \geq 0$, $\mathcal{P}_s(e)$ is the set of polynomials of degree no more than the integer $s \geq 0$. In this paper, we are concerned with the cases of $s = r$ or $r + 1$. From the definition of V_h, it is easy to know that the function in V_h does not require any continuity across interior edges/faces. Actually, the function in V_h can be characterized by its value on the interior of each element and its value on edges/faces. Therefore, the functions in V_h can be represented with two components, $v = \{v_0, v_b\}$, where v_0 denotes the value of v on all K_0 and v_b denotes the value of v on $\mathcal{E}_h$. The polynomial space $\mathcal{P}_s(e)$ consists of two choices: $s = r$ or $r + 1$ and the corresponding weak function space will sometimes be abbreviated as $V_{r,r}$ or $V_{r,r+1}$, respectively.

In order to define the WG method for the eigenvalue problem (2.3), we introduce the discrete weak gradient operator, which is defined on each element $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$. For the choices of V_h given above, i.e., using $V_{r,r}$ or $V_{r,r+1}$, suitable definitions of the weak gradient involve the Raviart-Thomas (RT) element or the Brezzi-Douglas-Marini (BDM) element [10], respectively. Let K be either a triangle or a tetrahedron and denote by $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_t(K)$ the set of homogeneous polynomials of order t in the variable $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_d)^T$. Define the BDM element by $G_r(K) = [\mathcal{P}_{r+1}(K)]^d$ and the RT element by $G_r(K) = [\mathcal{P}_r(K)]^d + \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_r(K)\mathbf{x}$ for $r \geq 0$. Then, we can define a discrete space

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h = \left\{ \mathbf{q} \in \left(L^2(\Omega) \right)^d : \mathbf{q}|_K \in G_r(K) \text{ for } K \in \mathcal{T}_h \right\}.$$

In the definitions of V_h and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h$, the RT element is coupled with $V_{r,r}$ while the BDM element is coupled with $V_{r,r+1}$. We should point out that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h$ is not necessarily a subspace of $H(\text{div}, \Omega)$, since it does not require any continuity in the normal direction across edges/faces.

The discrete weak gradient of $v_h \in V_h$ denoted by $\nabla_w v_h$ is defined as the unique polynomial $(\nabla_w v_h)|_K \in G_r(K)$ satisfying the following equation

$$(\nabla_w v_h, \mathbf{q})_K = -(v_0, \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q})_K + \langle v_b, \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} \rangle_{\partial K} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{q} \in G_r(K), \quad (2.7)$$

where $\mathbf{n}$ is the unit outward normal vector on ∂K. Clearly, such a discrete weak gradient is always well-defined. Furthermore, if $v \in H^1(K)$, i.e., $v_b = v_0|_{\partial K}$, and $\nabla v \in G_r(K)$. Then we have $\nabla_w v = \nabla v$. Here we only consider the $V_{r,r}$-RT and $V_{r,r+1}$-BDM pairs on simplicial elements. Of course, there are many other different choices of discrete spaces in the WG method, defined on either simplicial meshes or general polytopal meshes [21, 26].

In order to define an interpolation operator for the WG finite element space, we define an L^2 projection from V onto V_h by setting $Q_h v \equiv \{Q_0 v, Q_b v\}$, where $Q_0 v|_{K_0}$ is the local L^2 projection of v to $\mathcal{P}_r(K_0)$, for $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, and $Q_b v|_e$ is the local L^2 projection to $\mathcal{P}_s(e)$, for $e \in \mathcal{E}_h$. We also introduce $\mathbb{Q}_h$ the L^2 projection onto $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h$. It is well known that the following operator identity holds [27]:

$$\mathbb{Q}_h \nabla v = \nabla_w Q_h v, \quad \text{for all } v \in V. \quad (2.8)$$

For the $V_{r,r}$-RT and $V_{r,r+1}$-BDM pairs, the identity (2.8) shows that the discrete weak gradient is a good approximation to the classical gradient [27].

Then, the WG finite element method for the eigenvalue problem (2.3) can be defined as follows: Find $(\bar{\lambda}_h, \bar{u}_h) \in \mathbb{R} \times V_h$ such that $a_h(\bar{u}_h, \bar{u}_h) = 1$ and

$$a_h(\bar{u}_h, v_h) = \bar{\lambda}_h b_h(\bar{u}_h, v_h), \quad \forall v_h \in V_h, \quad (2.9)$$

where

$$a_h(u_h, v_h) = (A\nabla_w u_h, \nabla_w v_h)_{\mathcal{T}_h} = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (A\nabla_w u_h, \nabla_w v_h)_K, \qquad (2.10)$$

$$b_h(u_h, v_h) = (u_0, v_0)_{\mathcal{T}_h} = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (u_0, v_0)_K. \qquad (2.11)$$

Based on the bilinear form $a_h(\cdot, \cdot)$, we can define the following discrete norm on the space V_h as follows

$$\|v\|_{a,h} = \sqrt{a_h(v, v)}, \quad \forall v \in V_h. \qquad (2.12)$$

We can also define the semi-norm $\|\cdot\|_{b,h}$ by the bilinear form $b_h(\cdot, \cdot)$ on the space V_h

$$\|w\|_{b,h} = \sqrt{b_h(w, w)}, \quad \forall w \in V_h. \qquad (2.13)$$

From [2, 3], we obtain

$$0 < \bar{\lambda}_{1,h} \le \bar{\lambda}_{2,h} \le \cdots \le \bar{\lambda}_{k,h} \le \cdots \le \bar{\lambda}_{N_h,h},$$

and corresponding eigenfunctions

$$\bar{u}_{1,h}, \bar{u}_{2,h}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{k,h}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{N_h,h}, \qquad (2.14)$$

where $a_h(\bar{u}_{i,h}, \bar{u}_{j,h}) = \delta_{ij}$, $1 \le i, j \le N_h$ (N_h is the dimension of the finite element space V_h).

For the following analysis in this paper, we define $\mu_i = 1/\lambda_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots$, and $\bar{\mu}_{i,h} = 1/\bar{\lambda}_{i,h}$ for $i = 1, \cdots, N_h$.

In order to state the error estimates for the eigenpair approximation by the WG finite element method, we define the WG finite element projection $\mathcal{P}_h : V \mapsto V_h$ as follows

$$a_h(\mathcal{P}_h u, v_h) = \lambda b_h(u, v_h), \quad \forall v_h \in V_h. \qquad (2.15)$$

It is obvious that the finite element projection operator $\mathcal{P}_h$ has following error estimates.

Lemma 2.1. ([27]) *Assume the source equation corresponding to the eigenvalue problem has $H^{1+s}(\Omega)$ regularity and the eigenfunction u of (2.1) belongs to $H^{m+1}(\Omega)$ and $0 \le m \le r+1$. Then the following error estimates hold*

$$\|Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u\|_{a,h} \le C_1 h^m \|u\|_{m+1}, \qquad (2.16)$$

$$\|Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u\|_{b,h} \le C_2 h^{m+s} \|u\|_{m+1}. \qquad (2.17)$$

Before stating error estimates of the WG finite element method for the eigenvalue problem, we introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *For any eigenpair (λ, u) of (2.3), the following equality holds*

$$(\bar{\lambda}_{j,h} - \lambda)b_h(\mathcal{P}_h u, \bar{u}_{j,h}) = \lambda b_h(u - \mathcal{P}_h u, \bar{u}_{j,h}), \quad j = 1, \cdots, N_h.$$

Proof. Since $-\lambda b_h(\mathcal{P}_h u, \bar{u}_{j,h})$ appears on both sides, we only need to prove that

$$\bar{\lambda}_{j,h} b_h(\mathcal{P}_h u, \bar{u}_{j,h}) = \lambda b_h(u, \bar{u}_{j,h}).$$

From (2.3), (2.9) and (2.15), the following equalities hold

$$\bar{\lambda}_{j,h} b_h(\mathcal{P}_h u, \bar{u}_{j,h}) = a_h(\mathcal{P}_h u, \bar{u}_{j,h}) = \lambda b(u, \bar{u}_{j,h}).$$

Then the proof is completed. $\qquad \square$

Now, let us consider the error estimates for the first k eigenpair approximations associated with $\bar{\lambda}_{1,h} \leq \cdots \leq \bar{\lambda}_{k,h}$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let us define the spectral projection* $\bar{F}_{k,h} : V_h \mapsto \text{span}\{\bar{u}_{1,h}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{k,h}\}$ *as follows*

$$a_h(\bar{F}_{k,h}w_h, \bar{u}_{i,h}) = a_h(w_h, \bar{u}_{i,h}), \quad i = 1, \cdots, k \quad \text{for } w \in V_h. \tag{2.18}$$

Then the associated exact eigenfunctions $u_1, \cdots, u_k$ *of eigenvalue problem (2.3) have the following error estimates*

$$\left\| Q_h u_i - \bar{F}_{k,h} Q_h u_i \right\|_{a,h} \leq 2 \| Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i \|_{a,h} + \frac{\sqrt{\mu_{k+1,h}}}{\delta_{k,i,h}} \| Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i \|_{b,h}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k, \tag{2.19}$$

where $\delta_{k,i,h}$ *is defined as follows*

$$\delta_{k,i,h} = \min_{k < j \leq N_h} \left| \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}_{j,h}} - \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \right|. \tag{2.20}$$

Furthermore, these k *exact eigenfunctions have the following error estimate in* $\|\cdot\|_{b,h}$*-norm*

$$\left\| Q_h u_i - \bar{F}_{k,h} Q_h u_i \right\|_{b,h} \leq \left(2 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{\delta_{k,i,h}} \right) \| Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i \|_{b,h}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k. \tag{2.21}$$

Proof. Since $(I - \bar{F}_{k,h})\mathcal{P}_h u_i \in V_h$ and $(I - \bar{F}_{k,h})\mathcal{P}_h u_i \in \text{span}\{\bar{u}_{k+1,h}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{N_h,h}\}$, the following orthogonal expansion holds

$$(I - \bar{F}_{k,h})\mathcal{P}_h u_i = \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_h} \alpha_j \bar{u}_{j,h}, \tag{2.22}$$

where $\alpha_j = a_h(\mathcal{P}_h u_i, \bar{u}_{j,h})$. From Lemma 2.2, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha_j &= a_h(\mathcal{P}_h u_i, \bar{u}_{j,h}) = \bar{\lambda}_{j,h} b_h(\mathcal{P}_h u_i, \bar{u}_{j,h}) = \frac{\bar{\lambda}_{j,h} \lambda_i}{\bar{\lambda}_{j,h} - \lambda_i} b_h(u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i, \bar{u}_{j,h}) \\
&= \frac{1}{\mu_i - \bar{\mu}_{j,h}} b_h(u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i, \bar{u}_{j,h}).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.23}
$$

From the orthogonal property of eigenfunctions $\bar{u}_{1,h}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{N_h,h}$, we acquire

$$1 = a_h(\bar{u}_{j,h}, \bar{u}_{j,h}) = \bar{\lambda}_{j,h} b_h(\bar{u}_{j,h}, \bar{u}_{j,h}) = \bar{\lambda}_{j,h} \| \bar{u}_{j,h} \|_{b,h}^2,$$

which leads to the following property

$$\| \bar{u}_{j,h} \|_{b,h}^2 = \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}_{j,h}} = \bar{\mu}_{j,h}. \tag{2.24}$$

Because of (2.9) and the definitions of eigenfunctions $\bar{u}_{1,h}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{N_h,h}$, we obtain the following equalities

$$a_h(\bar{u}_{j,h}, \bar{u}_{k,h}) = \delta_{jk}, \qquad b_h\left(\frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}}, \frac{\bar{u}_{k,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{k,h}\|_{b,h}} \right) = \delta_{jk}, \quad 1 \leq j, k \leq N_h. \tag{2.25}$$

Then due to (2.22), (2.23), (2.24) and (2.25), we have the following estimates

$$\left\| (I - \bar{F}_{k,h})\mathcal{P}_h u_i \right\|_{a,h}^2 = \left\| \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_h} \alpha_j \bar{u}_{j,h} \right\|_{a,h}^2 = \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_h} \alpha_j^2$$

6

$$= \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_h} \left(\frac{1}{\mu_i - \bar{\mu}_{j,h}}\right)^2 b_h\big(u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i, \bar{u}_{j,h}\big)^2$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\delta_{k,i,h}^2} \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_h} \|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}^2\, b_h\left(u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i, \frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}}\right)^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{\delta_{k,i,h}^2} \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_h} \bar{\mu}_{j,h} b_h\left(u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i, \frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}}\right)^2$$

$$\leq \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{\delta_{k,i,h}^2} \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_h} b_h\left(u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i, \frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}}\right)^2$$

$$= \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{\delta_{k,i,h}^2} \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_h} b_h\left(Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i, \frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}}\right)^2 \leq \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{\delta_{k,i,h}^2}\, \|Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i\|_{b,h}^2, \qquad (2.26)$$

where the last inequality holds since $\frac{\bar{u}_{1,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{1,h}\|_{b,h}}, \cdots, \frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}}$ constitute an orthonormal basis for the space V_h in the sense of the inner product $b_h(\cdot,\cdot)$.

From (2.26), the following inequality holds

$$\big\|(I - \bar{F}_{k,h})\mathcal{P}_h u_i\big\|_{a,h} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}}{\delta_{k,i,h}}\, \|Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i\|_{b,h}. \qquad (2.27)$$

From (2.27), $\|\bar{F}_{k,h}\|_{a,h} \leq 1$ and the triangle inequality, it follows that

$$\big\|Q_h u_i - \bar{F}_{k,h} Q_h u_i\big\|_{a,h} = \|Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i\|_{a,h} + \big\|(I - \bar{F}_{k,h})\mathcal{P}_h u_i\big\|_{a,h} + \big\|\bar{F}_{k,h}(\mathcal{P}_h - Q_h)u_i\big\|_{a,h}$$

$$\leq \|Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i\|_{a,h} + \big\|(I - \bar{F}_{k,h})\mathcal{P}_h u_i\big\|_{a,h} + \big\|\bar{F}_{k,h}\big\|_{a,h}\, \|(\mathcal{P}_h - Q_h)u_i\|_{a,h}$$

$$\leq 2\|Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i\|_{a,h} + \frac{\sqrt{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}}{\delta_{k,i,h}}\, \|Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i\|_{b,h}.$$

This is the desired result (2.19).

Similarly, with the help of (2.22), (2.23), (2.24) and (2.25), we have following estimates

$$\big\|(I - \bar{F}_{k,h})\mathcal{P}_h u_i\big\|_{b,h}^2 = \left\|\sum_{j=k+1}^{N_h} \alpha_j \bar{u}_{j,h}\right\|_{b,h}^2 = \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_h} \alpha_j^2\, \|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}^2$$

$$= \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_h} \left(\frac{1}{\mu_i - \bar{\mu}_{j,h}}\right)^2 b_h\big(u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i, \bar{u}_{j,h}\big)^2 \|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}^2$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\delta_{k,i,h}^2} \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_h} \|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}^4\, b_h\left(u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i, \frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}}\right)^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{\delta_{k,i,h}^2} \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_h} \bar{\mu}_{j,h}^2 b_h\left(Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i, \frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}}\right)^2 \leq \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}^2}{\delta_{k,i,h}^2}\, \|Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i\|_{b,h}^2,$$

which leads to the inequality

$$\big\|(I - \bar{F}_{k,h})\mathcal{P}_h u_i\big\|_{b,h} \leq \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{\delta_{k,i,h}}\, \|Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i\|_{b,h}. \qquad (2.28)$$

From the definition of spectral projection (2.18), for any $w \in V_h$, we have

$$\bar{\lambda}_{i,h} b_h(\bar{F}_{k,h} w, \bar{u}_{i,h}) = a_h(\bar{F}_{k,h} w, \bar{u}_{i,h}) = a_h(w, \bar{u}_{i,h}) = \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} b_h(w, \bar{u}_{i,h}), \quad i = 1, \cdots, k.$$

This means the following equation holds

$$b_h(\bar{F}_{k,h}w, \bar{u}_{i,h}) = b_h(w, \bar{u}_{i,h}), \quad i = 1, \cdots, k, \quad \forall w \in V_h,$$

which leads to $\|\bar{F}_{k,h}\|_{b,h} \leq 1$.

From (2.28), $\|\bar{F}_{k,h}\|_{b,h} \leq 1$ and the triangle inequality, we find the following error estimates for the eigenfunction approximations in the $\|\cdot\|_{b,h}$-norm

$$\left\|Q_h u_i - \bar{F}_{k,h} Q_h u_i\right\|_{b,h} \leq \left\|Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i\right\|_{b,h} + \left\|(I - \bar{F}_{k,h})\mathcal{P}_h u_i\right\|_{b,h} + \left\|\bar{F}_{k,h}(\mathcal{P}_h u_i - Q_h u_i)\right\|_{b,h}$$

$$\leq \left(1 + \|\bar{F}_{k,h}\|_{b,h}\right) \|\mathcal{P}_h u_i - Q_h u_i\|_{b,h} + \left\|(I - \bar{F}_{k,h})\mathcal{P}_h u_i\right\|_{b,h}$$

$$\leq \left(2 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{\delta_{k,i,h}}\right) \|Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i\|_{b,h}.$$

This is the second desired result (2.21) and the proof is completed. $\qquad\square$

For the sake of simplicity in notation and to make sense of the estimates (2.19) and (2.21), we assume that the eigenvalue gap $\delta_{k,i,h}$ has a uniform lower bound, which is represented by $\delta_{k,i}$ (which can be understood as the "true" separation of the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_k$ from the unwanted eigenvalues) in the following sections of this paper. When the mesh size is sufficiently small, this assumption makes sense. Based on Theorem 2.1 and the convergence consequences of the WG finite element method for boundary value problems, we then acquire the following convergence order.

Corollary 2.1. *Under the conditions of Lemma 2.1, Theorem 2.1 and $\delta_{k,i,h}$ having a uniform lower bound $\delta_{k,i}$, the following error estimates hold*

$$\left\|Q_h u_i - \bar{F}_{k,h} Q_h u_i\right\|_{a,h} \leq C_3 h^m \|u\|_{m+1}, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq k, \tag{2.29}$$

$$\left\|Q_h u_i - \bar{F}_{k,h} Q_h u_i\right\|_{b,h} \leq C_4 h^{m+s} \|u\|_{m+1}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k. \tag{2.30}$$

The following theorem gives the error estimates for the one eigenpair approximation and the proof is similar to that of Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 2.2. *Let (λ, u) denote an exact eigenpair of the eigenvalue problem (2.3). Assume the eigenpair approximation $(\bar{\lambda}_{i,h}, \bar{u}_{i,h})$ has the property that $\bar{\mu}_{i,h} = 1/\bar{\lambda}_{i,h}$ is the closest to $\mu = 1/\lambda$. The corresponding spectral projector $E_{i,h} : V_h \mapsto \mathrm{span}\{\bar{u}_{i,h}\}$ is defined as follows*

$$a_h(E_{i,h}w, \bar{u}_{i,h}) = a_h(w, \bar{u}_{i,h}), \quad \text{for } w \in V_h.$$

Then the following error estimate holds

$$\|Q_h u - E_{i,h} Q_h u\|_{a,h} \quad \leq \quad 2\|Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u\|_{a,h} + \frac{\sqrt{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}}{\delta_{\lambda,h}} \|Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u\|_{b,h}, \tag{2.31}$$

where $\delta_{\lambda,h}$ is defined as follows

$$\delta_{\lambda,h} \quad := \quad \min_{j \neq i} |\bar{\mu}_{j,h} - \mu| = \min_{j \neq i} \left| \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}_{j,h}} - \frac{1}{\lambda} \right|. \tag{2.32}$$

Furthermore, the eigenfunction approximation $\bar{u}_{i,h}$ has the following error estimate in $\|\cdot\|_{b,h}$-norm

$$\|Q_h u - E_{i,h} Q_h u\|_{b,h} \quad \leq \quad \left(2 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}{\delta_{\lambda,h}}\right) \|Q_h u_i - \mathcal{P}_h u_i\|_{b,h}. \tag{2.33}$$

8

Proof. Since $(I - E_{i,h})\mathcal{P}_h u \in V_h$ and $(I - E_{i,h})\mathcal{P}_h u \in \text{span}\{\bar{u}_{1,h}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{i-1,h}, \bar{u}_{i+1,h}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{N_h,h}\}$, the following orthogonal expansion holds

$$(I - E_{i,h})\mathcal{P}_h u = \sum_{j \neq i} \alpha_j \bar{u}_{j,h}, \tag{2.34}$$

where $\alpha_j = a_h(\mathcal{P}_h u, \bar{u}_{j,h})$ has the same equality (2.23).

Then due to (2.23), (2.24), (2.25) and (2.34), we have following estimates

$$\|(I - E_{i,h})\mathcal{P}_h u\|_{a,h}^2 = \left\|\sum_{j \neq i} \alpha_j \bar{u}_{j,h}\right\|_{a,h}^2 = \sum_{j \neq i} \alpha_j^2$$

$$= \sum_{j \neq i} \left(\frac{1}{\mu - \bar{\mu}_{j,h}}\right)^2 b_h\big(u - \mathcal{P}_h u, \bar{u}_{j,h}\big)^2 \leq \frac{1}{\delta_{\lambda,h}^2} \sum_{j \neq i} \|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}^2 \, b_h\left(u - \mathcal{P}_h u, \frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}}\right)^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{\delta_{\lambda,h}^2} \sum_{j \neq i} \bar{\mu}_{j,h} b_h\left(u - \mathcal{P}_h u, \frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}}\right)^2$$

$$\leq \frac{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}{\delta_{\lambda,h}^2} \sum_{j \neq i} b_h\left(u - \mathcal{P}_h u, \frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}}\right)^2 = \frac{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}{\delta_{\lambda,h}^2} \sum_{j \neq i} b_h\left(Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u, \frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}}\right)^2$$

$$\leq \frac{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}{\delta_{\lambda,h}^2} \|Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u\|_{b,h}^2, \tag{2.35}$$

where the last inequality holds since $\frac{\bar{u}_{1,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{1,h}\|_{b,h}}, \cdots, \frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}}$ constitute an orthonormal basis for the space V_h in the sense of the inner product $b_h(\cdot, \cdot)$.

From (2.35), the following inequality holds

$$\|(I - E_{i,h})\mathcal{P}_h u\|_{a,h} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}}{\delta_{\lambda,h}} \|Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u\|_{b,h}. \tag{2.36}$$

From (2.36), $\|E_{i,h}\|_{a,h} \leq 1$ and the triangle inequality, it follows that

$$\|Q_h u - E_{i,h} Q_h u\|_{a,h} = \|Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u\|_{a,h} + \|(I - E_{i,h})\mathcal{P}_h u\|_{a,h} + \|E_{i,h}(\mathcal{P}_h - Q_h)u\|_{a,h}$$

$$\leq \|Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u\|_{a,h} + \|(I - E_{i,h})\mathcal{P}_h u\|_{a,h} + \|E_{i,h}\|_{a,h} \|(\mathcal{P}_h - Q_h)u\|_{a,h}$$

$$\leq 2\|Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u\|_{a,h} + \frac{\sqrt{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}}{\delta_{\lambda,h}} \|Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u\|_{b,h}.$$

This is the desired result (2.31).

Similarly, with the help of (2.23), (2.24), (2.25) and (2.34), we have the following estimates

$$\|(I - E_{i,h})\mathcal{P}_h u\|_{b,h}^2 = \left\|\sum_{j \neq i} \alpha_j \bar{u}_{j,h}\right\|_{b,h}^2 = \sum_{j \neq i} \alpha_j^2 \|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}^2$$

$$= \sum_{j \neq i} \left(\frac{1}{\mu - \bar{\mu}_{j,h}}\right)^2 b_h\big(u - \mathcal{P}_h u, \bar{u}_{j,h}\big)^2 \|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}^2$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\delta_{\lambda,h}^2} \sum_{j \neq i} \|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}^4 \, b_h\left(u - \mathcal{P}_h u, \frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}}\right)^2$$

9

$$= \frac{1}{\delta_{\lambda,h}^2} \sum_{j \neq i} \bar{\mu}_{j,h}^2 b_h \left(Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u, \frac{\bar{u}_{j,h}}{\|\bar{u}_{j,h}\|_{b,h}} \right)^2 \leq \frac{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}^2}{\delta_{\lambda,h}^2} \|Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u\|_{b,h}^2,$$

which leads to the inequality

$$\|(I - E_{i,h})\mathcal{P}_h u\|_{b,h} \leq \frac{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}{\delta_{\lambda,h}} \|Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u\|_{b,h}. \tag{2.37}$$

Similarly to the proof of Theorem 2.1, we also have $\|E_{i,h}\|_{b,h} \leq 1$. Then from (2.37) and the triangle inequality, we find the following error estimates for the eigenfunction approximations in the $\|\cdot\|_{b,h}$-norm

$$\|Q_h u - E_{i,h} Q_h u\|_{b,h} \leq \|Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u\|_{b,h} + \|(I - E_{i,h})\mathcal{P}_h u\|_{b,h} + \|E_{i,h}(\mathcal{P}_h u - Q_h u)\|_{b,h}$$

$$\leq (1 + \|E_{i,h}\|_{b,h}) \|\mathcal{P}_h u - Q_h u\|_{b,h} + \|(I - E_{i,h})\mathcal{P}_h u\|_{b,h} \leq \left(2 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}{\delta_{\lambda,h}} \right) \|Q_h u - \mathcal{P}_h u\|_{b,h}.$$

This is the second desired result (2.33) and the proof is completed. $\qquad\square$

Likewise, for the sake of simplicity in notation and to make sense of the estimates (2.31) and (2.33), we assume that the eigenvalue gap $\delta_{\lambda,h}$ defined by (2.32) equally has a uniform lower bound, indicated by δ_λ, which can be understood as the "true" separation of the eigenvalue λ from others in the following sections of this paper. When the mesh size is small enough, this assumption is also reasonable. Next, we have the following convergence result for the eigenvalue problems using the WG finite element method, which is based on Theorem 2.2.

Corollary 2.2. *Under the conditions of Lemma 2.1, Theorem 2.2 and $\delta_{\lambda,h}$ having a uniform lower bound δ_λ, the following error estimates hold*

$$\|Q_h u - E_{i,h} Q_h u\|_{a,h} \quad \leq \quad C_5 h^m \|u\|_{m+1}, \tag{2.38}$$

$$\|Q_h u - E_{i,h} Q_h u\|_{b,h} \quad \leq \quad C_6 h^{m+s} \|u\|_{m+1}. \tag{2.39}$$

Remark 2.1. *The convergence analysis of the WG finite element method for eigenvalue problems has been provided in [34]. Compared with the results there, the convergence results in Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 are sharper and gives the explicit dependence of the included constants on the eigenvalue distributions.*

3 Augmented subspace method and its error estimates

The augmented subspace techniques for the WG eigenvalue problem (2.9) are first laid out in this section. These schemes involve solving the eigenvalue problem on the augmented subspace $V_{H,h}$, which is generated by the coarse conforming linear finite element space W_H, and a WG finite element function in the fine finite element space V_h. They also involve solving the auxiliary linear boundary value problem in the fine finite element space V_h. Next, the related analysis of convergence for these augmented subspace schemes is addressed.

As in [30], we first create a coarse mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$ with the mesh size H, and the corresponding conforming linear finite element space W_H is defined on the mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$. This allows us to design the augmented subspace technique. The coarse conforming linear finite element space W_H is a subspace of the fine WG finite element space V_h, which is defined on the fine mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$. This is because, for the sake of simplicity, we assume in this paper that the coarse mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$ and the fine mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ have nested properties.

For the positive integer ℓ and given eigenfunction approximations $u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{k,h}^{(\ell)}$ which are the approximations for the first k eigenfunctions $\bar{u}_{1,h}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{k,h}$ of (2.9), we can do the augmented

---

Algorithm 1: Augmented subspace method for the first k eigenpairs

---

1. For $\ell = 1$, we define $\widehat{u}_{i,h}^{(\ell)} = u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}$, $i = 1, \cdots, k$, and the augmented subspace $V_{H,h}^{(\ell)} = W_H + \text{span}\{\widehat{u}_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, \widehat{u}_{k,h}^{(\ell)}\}$. Then solve the following eigenvalue problem: Find $(\lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{R} \times V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}$ such that $a_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}) = 1$ and

$$a_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, v_{H,h}) = \lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell)} b_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, v_{H,h}), \qquad \forall v_{H,h} \in V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}, \quad i = 1, \cdots, k. \tag{3.1}$$

2. Solve the following linear boundary value problems: Find $\widehat{u}_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)} \in V_h$ such that

$$a_h(\widehat{u}_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}, v_h) = \lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell)} b_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, v_h), \quad \forall v_h \in V_h, \quad i = 1, \cdots, k. \tag{3.2}$$

3. Define the augmented subspace $V_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} = W_H + \text{span}\{\widehat{u}_{1,h}^{(\ell+1)}, \cdots, \widehat{u}_{k,h}^{(\ell+1)}\}$ and solve the following eigenvalue problem: Find $(\lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}, u_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}) \in \mathbb{R} \times V_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)}$ such that $a_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}, u_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}) = 1$ and

$$a_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}, v_{H,h}) = \lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)} b_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}, v_{H,h}), \qquad \forall v_{H,h} \in V_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)}, \quad i = 1, \cdots, k. \tag{3.3}$$

   Solve (3.3) to obtain $(\lambda_{1,h}^{(\ell+1)}, u_{1,h}^{(\ell+1)}), \cdots, (\lambda_{k,h}^{(\ell+1)}, u_{k,h}^{(\ell+1)})$.

4. Set $\ell = \ell + 1$ and go to Step 2 for the next iteration until convergence.

---

subspace iteration step which is defined by Algorithm 1 to improve the accuracy of $u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{k,h}^{(\ell)}$.

For each ℓ, it is easy to know, the eigenvalue problems (3.1) and (3.3) has the following eigenvalues [2, 3],

$$0 < \lambda_{1,h}^{(\ell)} \leq \lambda_{2,h}^{(\ell)} \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{k,h}^{(\ell)} \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)},$$

and corresponding eigenfunctions

$$u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{2,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{k,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)}, \tag{3.4}$$

where $N_{H,h} = \dim V_{H,h}^{(\ell)} = N_H + k$ and $a_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}) = \delta_{ij}$, $1 \leq i, j \leq N_{H,h}$.

From the min-max principle [2, 3] and $V_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \subset V_h$, the eigenvalues $\lambda_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, \lambda_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)}$ provide upper bounds for the first $N_{H,h}$ eigenvalues of (2.9)

$$\bar{\lambda}_{i,h} \leq \lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, \quad \bar{\mu}_{i,h} \geq \mu_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N_{H,h}. \tag{3.5}$$

Since the low dimensional augmented subspace $V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}$ is a subspace of the WG finite element space V_h, the error estimates of eigenfunction approximations $u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{k,h}^{(\ell)}$ to the exact eigenfunctions $\bar{u}_{1,h}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{k,h}$ can be deduced from the similar way of the conforming finite element method for the eigenvalue problem.

In order to give the error estimates for the augmented subspace method defined by Algorithm 1, we define the subspace projection $\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} : V_h \mapsto V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}$ as follows

$$a_h\left(\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} w_h, v_{H,h}\right) = a_h\left(w_h, v_{H,h}\right), \quad \forall v_{H,h} \in V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}, \text{ for } w_h \in V_h. \tag{3.6}$$

In order to give the error estimate of $\|w_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} w_h\|_{b,h}$, we define the following quantity for error analysis:

$$
\eta_a(W_H) \;=\; \sup_{\substack{f \in L^2(\Omega) \\ \|f\|_{b,h}=1}} \; \inf_{w_H \in W_H} \|T_h f - w_H\|_{a,h}, \tag{3.7}
$$

where $T_h : L^2(\Omega) \mapsto V_h$ is defined as

$$
a_h(T_h f, v) = b_h(f, v), \qquad \forall v \in V_h \;\; \text{for } f \in L^2(\Omega). \tag{3.8}
$$

Then the projection operator $\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}$ has following error estimates

$$
\|w_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} w_h\|_{a,h} \;=\; \inf_{v_{H,h} \in V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}} \|w_h - v_{H,h}\|_{a,h}, \quad \text{for } w_h \in V_h, \tag{3.9}
$$

$$
\|w_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} w_h\|_{b,h} \;\le\; \eta_a(W_H)\|w_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} w_h\|_{a,h}, \quad \text{for } w_h \in V_h. \tag{3.10}
$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let us define the spectral projection* $F_{k,h}^{(m)} : V_h \mapsto \operatorname{span}\{u_{1,h}^{(m)}, \cdots, u_{k,h}^{(m)}\}$ *for any integer* $m \ge 1$ *as follows*

$$
a_h(F_{k,h}^{(m)} w, u_{i,h}^{(m)}) = a_h(w, u_{i,h}^{(m)}), \quad i = 1, \cdots, k \;\; \text{for } w \in V_h. \tag{3.11}
$$

Then the exact eigenfunctions $\bar{u}_{1,h}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{k,h}$ *of (2.9) and the eigenfunction approximations* $u_{1,h}^{(\ell+1)}$, $\cdots, u_{k,h}^{(\ell+1)}$ *from Algorithm 1 with the integer* $\ell \ge 1$ *have the following error estimate*

$$
\left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h} \le \sqrt{1 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{(\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)})^2} \eta_a^2(W_H)} \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}) \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}, \tag{3.12}
$$

where $\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)}$ *is defined as follows*

$$
\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)} = \min_{k < j \le N_h} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,h}^{(\ell)}} - \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}_{i,h}} \right|. \tag{3.13}
$$

Furthermore, the following $\|\cdot\|_{b,h}$*-norm error estimate holds*

$$
\left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h} \le \bar{\eta}_a(W_H) \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}. \tag{3.14}
$$

where

$$
\bar{\eta}_a(W_H) = \left(1 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)}} \right) \eta_a(W_H). \tag{3.15}
$$

Proof. Since $(I - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)})\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \in V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}$ and $(I - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)})\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \in \operatorname{span}\{u_{k+1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)}\}$, the following orthogonal expansion holds

$$
(I - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)})\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} = \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_{H,h}} \alpha_j u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}, \tag{3.16}
$$

where $\alpha_j = a_h(\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h}, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)})$. From Lemma 2.2, we have

$$
\alpha_j \;=\; a_h(\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h}, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}) = \lambda_{j,h}^{(\ell)} b_h\big(\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h}, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\big) = \frac{\lambda_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{\lambda}_{i,h}}{\lambda_{j,h}^{(\ell)} - \bar{\lambda}_{i,h}} b_h\big(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h}, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\big)
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_{i,h} - \mu_{j,h}^{(\ell)}} b_h \big(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h}, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \big). \tag{3.17}
$$

From the orthogonal property of eigenfunctions $u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)}$, we have

$$
1 = a_h(u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}) = \lambda_{j,h}^{(\ell)} b_h(u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}) = \lambda_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{b,h}^2,
$$

which leads to the following property

$$
\left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{b,h}^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,h}^{(\ell)}} = \mu_{j,h}^{(\ell)}. \tag{3.18}
$$

Because of (3.1), (3.3) and the definitions of eigenfunctions $u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)}$, we obtain the following equalities

$$
a_h(u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{k,h}^{(\ell)}) = \delta_{jk}, \qquad b_h \left(\frac{u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{b,h}}, \frac{u_{k,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\| u_{k,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{b,h}} \right) = \delta_{jk}, \quad 1 \le j,k \le N_{H,h}. \tag{3.19}
$$

Then due to (3.5), (3.16), (3.17), (3.18) and (3.19), we have following estimates

$$
\left\| (I - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)}) \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}^2 = \left\| \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_{H,h}} \alpha_j u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{a,h}^2 = \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_{H,h}} \alpha_j^2
$$

$$
= \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_{H,h}} \left(\frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_{i,h} - \mu_{j,h}^{(\ell)}} \right)^2 b_h \big(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h}, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \big)^2
$$

$$
\le \frac{1}{(\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)})^2} \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_{H,h}} \left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{b,h}^2 b_h \left(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h}, \frac{u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{b,h}} \right)^2
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{(\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)})^2} \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_{H,h}} \mu_{j,h}^{(\ell)} b_h \left(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h}, \frac{u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_b} \right)^2
$$

$$
\le \frac{\mu_{k+1,h}^{(\ell)}}{(\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)})^2} \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_{H,h}} b_h \left(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h}, \frac{u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{b,h}} \right)^2
$$

$$
\le \frac{\mu_{k+1,h}^{(\ell)}}{(\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)})^2} \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h}^2, \tag{3.20}
$$

where the last inequality holds since $\frac{u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\| u_{1,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_b}, \cdots, \frac{u_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\| u_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_b}$ constitute an orthonormal basis for the space $V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}$ in the sense of the inner product $b_h(\cdot, \cdot)$.

Combining (3.5) and (3.20) leads to the following inequality

$$
\left\| (I - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)}) \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}^2 \le \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{(\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)})^2} \eta_a^2(W_H) \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}) \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}^2. \tag{3.21}
$$

13

From (3.21) and the orthogonal property $a_h((I - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)})\bar{u}_{i,h}, (I - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)})\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h}) = 0$, it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}^2 &= \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}^2 + \left\| (I - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)})\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}^2 \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{(\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)})^2} \eta_a^2(W_H) \right) \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)})\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}^2 .
\end{aligned}
$$

This is the desired result (3.12).

Similarly, with the help of (3.5), (3.16), (3.17), (3.18) and (3.19), we have the following estimates

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\| (I - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)})\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_b^2 &= \left\| \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_{H,h}} \alpha_j u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_b^2 = \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_{H,h}} \alpha_j^2 \left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_b^2 \\
&= \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_{H,h}} \left(\frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_{i,h} - \mu_{j,h}^{(\ell)}} \right)^2 b_h\left(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h}, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right)^2 \left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{b,h}^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)})^2} \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_{H,h}} \left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{b,h}^4 \; b_h\left(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h}, \frac{u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{b,h}} \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{(\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)})^2} \sum_{j=k+1}^{N_{H,h}} (\mu_{j,h}^{(\ell)})^2 b_h\left(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h}, \frac{u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{b,h}} \right)^2 \leq \frac{(\mu_{k+1,h}^{(\ell)})^2}{(\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)})^2} \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h}^2 \\
&\leq \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}^2}{(\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)})^2} \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h}^2 ,
\end{aligned}
$$

which leads to the inequality

$$
\left\| (I - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)})\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h} \leq \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)}} \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h} . \tag{3.22}
$$

From (3.10), (3.22) and the triangle inequality, we have the following error estimates for the eigenvector approximations in the $\|\cdot\|_{b,h}$-norm

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h} &\leq \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h} + \left\| (I - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)})\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h} \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)}} \right) \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)})\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h} \leq \left(1 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)}} \right) \eta_a(W_H) \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)})\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h} \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)}} \right) \eta_a(W_H) \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h} .
\end{aligned}
$$

This is the second desired result (3.14) and the proof is completed. $\qquad\square$

Theorem 3.1. *Under the conditions of Lemma 3.1, Algorithm 1 has the following error estimate for $\ell \geq 1$*

$$
\left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell+1)}\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h} \leq \gamma \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h} , \tag{3.23}
$$

where

$$
\gamma = \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} \sqrt{1 + \frac{\eta_a^2(W_H)}{\bar{\lambda}_{k+1,h}(\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell+1)})^2}} \left(1 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{k+1,h}}{\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell)}} \right) \eta_a^2(W_H) . \tag{3.24}
$$

14

Proof. From Algorithm 1, it is easy to know that $u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{k,h}^{(\ell)}$ is the orthogonal basis for the space span$\{u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{k,h}^{(\ell)}\}$. We define the $b_h(\cdot, \cdot)$-orthogonal projection operator $\pi_{k,h}^{(\ell)}$ to the space span$\{u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{k,h}^{(\ell)}\}$. Then there exist k real numbers $q_1, \cdots, q_k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\pi_{k,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h}$ has the following expansion

$$\pi_{k,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} q_j u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}. \tag{3.25}$$

From (3.6) and the definition of $V_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)}$ in Step 3 of Algorithm 1, we obtain the orthogonal property of the projection operator $\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)}$, together with (3.2), (3.10), (3.14) and (3.25), the following inequalities hold

$$\left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}^2 = a_h \left(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h}, \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right)$$

$$= a_h \left(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \sum_{j=1}^{k} \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} \frac{q_j}{\lambda_{j,h}^{(\ell)}} \hat{u}_{j,h}^{(\ell+1)}, \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right)$$

$$= \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} b_h \left(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{q_j}{\lambda_{j,h}^{(\ell)}} \lambda_{j,h}^{(\ell)} u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}, \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right)$$

$$= \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} b_h \left(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \sum_{j=1}^{k} q_j u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}, \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right) = \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} b_h \left(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \pi_{k,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h}, \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right)$$

$$\leq \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - \pi_{k,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h} \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h}$$

$$\leq \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h} \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h}$$

$$\leq \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} \bar{\eta}_a(W_H) \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h} \eta_a(W_H) \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}, \tag{3.26}$$

where $\bar{\eta}_a(W_H)$ is defined in Lemma 3.1. Then from (3.26), it follows that

$$\left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h} \leq \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} \bar{\eta}_a(W_H) \eta_a(W_H) \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}. \tag{3.27}$$

Since $u_{1,h}^{(\ell+1)}, \cdots, u_{k,h}^{(\ell+1)}$ only come from (3.3), and Lemma 3.1, we have for $i = 1, \cdots, k$

$$\left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h} \leq \sqrt{1 + \frac{\eta_a^2(W_H)}{\bar{\lambda}_{k+1,h} (\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell+1)})^2}} \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)}) \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}.$$

Together with (3.27), we arrive at

$$\left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h} \leq \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} \sqrt{1 + \frac{\eta_a^2(W_H)}{\bar{\lambda}_{k+1,h} (\delta_{k,i,h}^{(\ell+1)})^2}} \bar{\eta}_a(W_H) \eta_a(W_H) \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h},$$

which is the desired result (3.23) and the proof is completed. $\qquad \square$

Remark 3.1. *According to Theorem 3.1, the augmented subspace techniques have a second order convergence rate, as indicated by the convergence result (3.23). Furthermore, we ought to lower the term $\eta_a(W_H)$, which is dependent on the coarse conforming linear finite element space W_H, in order to speed up the convergence rate. In other words, the convergence can be accelerated by expanding the subspace W_H.*

Remark 3.2. *Since the error estimates for the eigenvalue approximation can be simply inferred from the following error expansion, we are only concerned with the error estimates for the eigenvector approximation in this paper*

$$0 \leq \widehat{\lambda}_i - \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} = \frac{a_h(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \psi, \bar{u}_{i,h} - \psi)}{b(\psi, \psi)} - \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} \frac{b(\bar{u}_{i,h} - \psi, \bar{u}_{i,h} - \psi)}{b(\psi, \psi)} + 2 \frac{a_h(\bar{u}_{i,h}, \psi) - b(\bar{\lambda}_{i,h} \bar{u}_{i,h}, \psi)}{b(\psi, \psi)},$$

where ψ is the eigenfunction approximation for the exact eigenfunction $\bar{u}_{i,h}$ and

$$\widehat{\lambda}_i = \frac{a_h(\psi, \psi)}{b(\psi, \psi)}.$$

Since each linear equation can be solved separately, it follows that Step 2 of Algorithm 1 can be performed using the parallel computing approach. Nevertheless, a kind of parallel methods for eigenvalue problems can be designed using the augmented subspace approach. The eigenvalue problem (3.3) is solved in Step 3 of Algorithm 1. However, we must perform the inner products of the k vectors in the high dimensional space V_h in order to generate the matrices for (3.3). This is a very low scalable procedure for the parallel computing [17, 32, 37]. That is to say, a bottleneck for parallel computing does exist in the inner product calculation for many high dimensional vectors. We provide an additional version of the augmented subspace technique for a single (possibly non-smallest) eigenpair, which represents the single process version of this kind of parallel schemes, to get around this crucial bottleneck. Algorithm 2 defines the relevant numerical approach. This idea in relation to the conforming finite element technique has already been put out and examined in [32].

In Algorithm 2, we assume that the given eigenpair approximation $(\lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{R} \times V_h$ with different superscripts is the closest to an exact eigenpair $(\bar{\lambda}_{i,h}, \bar{u}_{i,h})$ of (2.9). Based on this setting, we can give the following convergence result for the augmented subspace method defined by Algorithm 2.

For each ℓ, it is easy to know, the eigenvalue problem (3.28) and (3.30) also have the following eigenvalues [2, 3],

$$0 < \lambda_{1,h}^{(\ell)} \leq \lambda_{2,h}^{(\ell)} \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{k,h}^{(\ell)} \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)},$$

and corresponding eigenfunctions

$$u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{2,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{k,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)}, \tag{3.31}$$

where $N_{H,h} = \dim V_{H,h}^{(\ell)} = N_H + 1$ and $a_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}) = \delta_{ij}, 1 \leq i, j \leq N_{H,h}$.

It is simple to understand that the WG finite element space V_h is a subspace of the low dimensional augmented subspace $V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}$ in Algorithm 2. Then, Algorithm 2's error estimates are comparable to those of Algorithm 1. We also utilize the definitions (3.6) and (3.7) for the sake of simplicity in notation. Next, we apply the property (3.5) and error estimates (3.9), and finally, we employ (3.10) for the eigenvalue problems (3.28) and (3.30).

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(\bar{\lambda}_h, \bar{u}_h)$ denote an exact eigenpair of the eigenvalue problem (2.9). Assume the eigenpair approximation $(\lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{i,h}^{(\ell)})$ has the property that $\mu_{i,h}^{(\ell)} = 1/\lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell)}$ is closest to $\bar{\mu}_h = 1/\bar{\lambda}_h$. The spectral projector $E_{i,h}^{(\ell)} : V_h \mapsto \mathrm{span}\{u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}\}$ according to the eigenpair approximation $(\lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{R} \times V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}$ is defined as follows*

$$a_h(E_{i,h}^{(\ell)} w, u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}) = a_h(w, u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}), \quad \text{for } w \in V_h.$$

Then the eigenpair approximation $(\lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{R} \times V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}$ produced by Algorithm 2 satisfies the following error estimates

$$\left\| \bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{a,h} \leq \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} \sqrt{1 + \frac{\eta_a^2(W_H)}{\bar{\lambda}_{1,h} (\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)})^2}} \left\| \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{a,h}, \tag{3.32}$$

16

Algorithm 2: Augmented subspace method for one eigenpair

---

1. For $\ell = 1$, we define $\widehat{u}_{i,h}^{(\ell)} = u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}$, and the augmented subspace $V_{H,h}^{(\ell)} = W_H + \text{span}\{\widehat{u}_{i,h}^{(\ell)}\}$. Then solve the following eigenvalue problem: Find $(\lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{R} \times V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}$ such that $a_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}) = 1$ and

$$a_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, v_{H,h}) = \lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell)} b_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, v_{H,h}), \qquad \forall v_{H,h} \in V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}. \tag{3.28}$$

2. Solve the following linear boundary value problem: Find $\widehat{u}_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)} \in V_h$ such that

$$a_h(\widehat{u}_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}, v_h) = \lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell)} b_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, v_h), \quad \forall v_h \in V_h. \tag{3.29}$$

3. Define the augmented subspace $V_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} = W_H + \text{span}\{\widehat{u}_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}\}$ and solve the following eigenvalue problem: Find $(\lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}, u_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}) \in \mathbb{R} \times V_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)}$ such that $a_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}, u_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}) = 1$ and

$$a_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}, v_{H,h}) = \lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)} b_h(u_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}, v_{H,h}), \qquad \forall v_{H,h} \in V_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)}. \tag{3.30}$$

Solve (3.30) and the output $(\lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}, u_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)})$ is chosen such that $u_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}$ has the largest component in $\text{span}\{\widehat{u}_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}\}$ among all eigenfunctions of (3.30).

4. Set $\ell = \ell + 1$ and go to Step 2 for the next iteration until convergence.

$$\left\| \bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{b,h} \leq \bar{\eta}_a(W_H) \left\| \bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{a,h}, \tag{3.33}$$

where $\delta_{\lambda,h}$ and $\bar{\eta}_a(W_H)$ are defined as follows

$$\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)} = \min_{j \neq i} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,h}^{(\ell)}} - \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}_h} \right|, \quad \bar{\eta}_a(W_H) = \left(1 + \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}_{1,h} \delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)}} \right) \eta_a(W_H). \tag{3.34}$$

Proof. Since $(I - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)}) \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \in V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}$ and $(I - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)}) \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \in \text{span}\{u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{i-1,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{i+1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)}\}$, the following orthogonal expansion holds

$$(I - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)}) \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h = \sum_{j \neq i} \alpha_j u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}, \tag{3.35}$$

where $\alpha_j = a_h(\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)})$. From Lemma 2.2, we have the same equality (3.17).

From the orthogonal property of eigenfunctions $u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)}$, we acquire

$$1 = a_h(u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}) = \lambda_{j,h}^{(\ell)} b_h(u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}) = \lambda_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{b,h}^2,$$

which leads to the following property

$$\left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{b,h}^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,h}^{(\ell)}} = \mu_{j,h}^{(\ell)}. \tag{3.36}$$

Because of (3.28), (3.30) and the definition of eigenfunctions $u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}, \cdots, u_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)}$, we obtain the following equalities

$$a_h(u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}, u_{k,h}^{(\ell)}) = \delta_{jk}, \qquad b_h\left(\frac{u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\|u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\right\|_{b,h}}, \frac{u_{k,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\|u_{k,h}^{(\ell)}\right\|_{b,h}}\right) = \delta_{jk}, \quad 1 \le j, k \le N_{H,h}. \qquad (3.37)$$

Then due to (3.5), (3.17), (3.19), (3.35) and (3.36), we have following estimates

$$\left\|(I - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)})\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h}^2 = \left\|\sum_{j\neq i}\alpha_j u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\right\|_{a,h}^2 = \sum_{j\neq i}\alpha_j^2 = \sum_{j\neq i}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_h - \mu_{j,h}^{(\ell)}}\right)^2 b_h\big(\bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\big)^2$$

$$\le \frac{1}{(\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)})^2}\sum_{j\neq i}\left\|u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\right\|_{b,h}^2 b_h\left(\bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h, \frac{u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\|u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\right\|_{b,h}}\right)^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{(\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)})^2}\sum_{j\neq i}\mu_{j,h}^{(\ell)}b_h\left(\bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h, \frac{u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\|u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\right\|_{b}}\right)^2$$

$$\le \frac{\mu_{1,h}^{(\ell)}}{(\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)})^2}\sum_{j\neq i}b_h\left(\bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h, \frac{u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\|u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\right\|_{b,h}}\right)^2 \le \frac{\mu_{1,h}^{(\ell)}}{(\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)})^2}\left\|\bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h\right\|_{b,h}^2, \qquad (3.38)$$

where the last inequality holds since $\dfrac{u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\|u_{1,h}^{(\ell)}\right\|_{b}}, \cdots, \dfrac{u_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\|u_{N_{H,h},h}^{(\ell)}\right\|_{b}}$ constitute an orthonormal basis for the space $V_{H,h}^{(\ell)}$ in the sense of the inner product $b_h(\cdot, \cdot)$.

Combining (3.5) and (3.38) leads to the following inequality

$$\left\|(I - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)})\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h}^2 \quad \le \quad \frac{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}{(\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)})^2}\eta_a^2(W_H)\left\|(I - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)})\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h}^2. \qquad (3.39)$$

From (3.39) and the orthogonal property $a_h((I - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)})\bar{u}_h, (I - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)})\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h) = 0$, it follows that

$$\left\|\bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h}^2 \quad = \quad \left\|\bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h}^2 + \left\|(I - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)})\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h}^2$$

$$\le \quad \left(1 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}{(\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)})^2}\eta_a^2(W_H)\right)\left\|(I - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)})\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h}^2.$$

This is the desired result (3.32).

Similarly, with the help of (3.5), (3.17), (3.35), (3.36) and (3.37), we have following estimates

$$\left\|(I - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)})\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h\right\|_{b,h}^2 = \left\|\sum_{j\neq i}\alpha_j u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\right\|_{b,h}^2 = \sum_{j\neq i}\alpha_j^2\left\|u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\right\|_{b,h}^2$$

$$= \sum_{j\neq i}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_h - \mu_{j,h}^{(\ell)}}\right)^2 b_h\big(\bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h, u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\big)^2\left\|u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\right\|_{b,h}^2$$

$$\le \frac{1}{(\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)})^2}\sum_{j\neq i}\left\|u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\right\|_{b,h}^4 b_h\left(\bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h, \frac{u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\|u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}\right\|_{b,h}}\right)^2$$

$$
= \frac{1}{(\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)})^2} \sum_{j \neq i} (\mu_{j,h}^{(\ell)})^2 b_h \left(\bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h, \frac{u_{j,h}^{(\ell)}}{\left\| u_{j,h}^{(\ell)} \right\|_{b,h}} \right)^2 \leq \frac{(\mu_{1,h}^{(\ell)})^2}{(\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)})^2} \left\| \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{b,h}^2
$$

$$
\leq \frac{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}^2}{(\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)})^2} \left\| \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{b,h}^2,
$$

which leads to the inequality

$$
\left\| (I - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)}) \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{b,h} \leq \frac{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}{\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)}} \left\| \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{b,h}. \tag{3.40}
$$

From (3.10), (3.40) and the triangle inequality, we have the following error estimates for the eigenvector approximations in the $\|\cdot\|_{b,h}$-norm

$$
\left\| \bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{b,h} \leq \left\| \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{b,h} + \left\| (I - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)}) \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{b,h}
$$

$$
\leq \left(1 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}{\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)}} \right) \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}) \bar{u}_h \right\|_{b,h} \leq \left(1 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}{\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)}} \right) \eta_a(W_H) \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell)}) \bar{u}_h \right\|_{a,h}
$$

$$
\leq \left(1 + \frac{\bar{\mu}_{1,h}}{\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)}} \right) \eta_a(W_H) \left\| \bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{a,h}.
$$

This is the second desired result (3.33) and the proof is completed. $\qquad \square$

Theorem 3.2. *Under the conditions of Lemma 3.2, Algorithm 2 has the following error estimate for $\ell \geq 1$*

$$
\left\| \bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{a,h} \leq \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} \sqrt{1 + \frac{\eta_a^2(W_H)}{\bar{\lambda}_{1,h} (\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell+1)})^2}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}_{1,h} \delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)}} \right) \eta_a^2(W_H) \left\| \bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{a,h}. \tag{3.41}
$$

Proof. We define the $b(\cdot, \cdot)$-orthogonal projection operator $\pi_h^{(\ell)}$ to the space $\text{span}\{u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}\}$. Then there exists a real number $q \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\pi_h^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h = q u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}$. Then from the orthogonal property of the projection operator $\mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)}$, (3.10), (3.29) and (3.33), we obtain

$$
\left\| \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{a,h}^2 = a_h \left(\bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_h, \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_h \right)
$$

$$
= a_h \left(\bar{u}_h - \frac{\bar{\lambda}_{i,h}}{\lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell)}} q \widehat{u}_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}, \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_h \right)
$$

$$
= a_h \left(\bar{u}_h, \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_h \right) - \frac{\bar{\lambda}_{i,h}}{\lambda_{i,h}^{(\ell)}} q a_h \left(\widehat{u}_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}, \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_h \right)
$$

$$
= \bar{\lambda}_h b_h \left(\bar{u}_h, \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_h \right) - \bar{\lambda}_{i,h} b_h \left(q u_{i,h}^{(\ell)}, \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_h \right)
$$

$$
= \bar{\lambda}_h b_h \left(\bar{u}_h - \pi_h^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h, \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_h \right) \leq \bar{\lambda}_h \left\| \bar{u}_h - \pi_h^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{b,h} \left\| \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{b,h}
$$

$$
\leq \bar{\lambda}_h \left\| \bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{b,h} \left\| \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{b,h}
$$

$$
\leq \bar{\lambda}_h \left(1 + \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}_{1,h} \delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)}} \right) \eta_a(W_H) \left\| \bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{a,h} \eta_a(W_H) \left\| \bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{a,h}
$$

$$\leq \bar{\lambda}_h \left(1 + \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}_{1,h}\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)}}\right) \eta_a^2(W_H) \left\|\bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h} \left\|\bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)}\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h}. \tag{3.42}$$

Since the approximation $u_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}$ only comes from (3.28) or (3.30), together with Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\left\|\bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h} \leq \sqrt{1 + \frac{\eta_a^2(W_H)}{\bar{\lambda}_{1,h}\big(\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell+1)}\big)^2}} \left\|(I - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)})\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h}. \tag{3.43}$$

From (3.42), there holds

$$\left\|\bar{u}_h - \mathcal{P}_{H,h}^{(\ell+1)}\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h} \leq \bar{\lambda}_h \left(1 + \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}_{1,h}\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)}}\right) \eta_a^2(W_H) \left\|\bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h}. \tag{3.44}$$

Combining (3.43) with (3.44), we have the following estimate

$$\left\|\bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)}\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h} \leq \bar{\lambda}_h \sqrt{1 + \frac{\eta_a^2(W_H)}{\bar{\lambda}_{1,h}\big(\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell+1)}\big)^2}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}_{1,h}\delta_{\lambda,h}^{(\ell)}}\right) \eta_a^2(W_H) \left\|\bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell)}\bar{u}_h\right\|_{a,h}.$$

This is the desired result (3.41) and the proof is complete. $\qquad\square$

4 Applications to Laplace eigenvalue problem

This section will demonstrate the applications of the augmented subspace techniques introduced in Section 3 to the Laplace eigenvalue problem and provide the associated convergence rates. It is noteworthy that the finest WG finite element space has little bearing on the coarse mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$ mesh size selection in augmented subspace techniques. Compared to the two-grid WG finite element technique [33, 35], wherein the choices of coarse and fine meshes are not free each other, this represents a significant distinction.

Here, we are concerned with the following standard Laplace eigenvalue problem: Find $(\lambda, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u &= \lambda u, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0, \quad\;\, \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ |u|_1^2 &= 1, \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

where $|\cdot|_1$ represents H^1-type semi-norm and the computing domain is set to be the unit square $\Omega = (0,1) \times (0,1)$. Then, in (2.3), the bilinear forms $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $b(\cdot, \cdot)$ are defined as follows

$$a(u,v) = \int_\Omega \nabla u \cdot \nabla v d\Omega, \qquad b(u,v) = \int_\Omega uv d\Omega.$$

Additionally, the norms $\|\cdot\|_{a,h}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{b,h}$ defined in (2.12) and (2.13) are equivalent to the H^1-type semi-norm $|\cdot|_1$ and L^2 norm $\|\cdot\|_0$, respectively. In order to use the WG finite element discretization method, we employ the meshes defined in Section 2.

Here, the problem (4.1) is treated using the augmented subspace techniques specified by Algorithms 1 and 2. In this section, the regular refinement is used to create the fine mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ from the coarse mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$. The WG finite element space on the fine mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ is set to V_h, and the coarse conforming linear finite element space on the coarse mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$ is set to W_H. We consider the computational domain Ω to be convex for the sake of simplicity.

In order to give the explicit convergence rate of the augmented subspace methods defined by Algorithms 1 and 2, we need to estimate the quantity $\eta_a(W_H)$ in (3.7). For this aim, we define the conforming linear finite element projection $\mathcal{P}_H : H_0^1(\Omega) \mapsto W_H$ as follows

$$a(\mathcal{P}_H w, v_H) = a(w, v_H), \quad \forall v_H \in W_H, \text{ for } w \in H_0^1(\Omega). \tag{4.2}$$

It is well known that the following error estimate holds

$$\|Tf - \mathcal{P}_H Tf\|_1 \leq CH\|Tf\|_2 \leq CH\|f\|_{b,h}, \tag{4.3}$$

where $T : L^2(\Omega) \mapsto H_0^1(\Omega)$ is defined as follows

$$a(Tf, v) = b(f, v), \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega). \tag{4.4}$$

In order to deduce the estimate for the term $\eta_a(W_H)$, we define the norm $\|\cdot\|_{1,h}$ as follows

$$\|v\|_{1,h}^2 = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left(\|\nabla v_0\|_{0,K}^2 + h_K^{-1}\|v_0 - v_b\|_{\partial K}^2 \right).$$

Obviously, the norm $\|\cdot\|_{1,h}$ coincides with $\|\cdot\|_1$ on the Sobolev space $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Furthermore, there is the following equivalence between $\|\cdot\|_{1,h}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{a,h}$ on the WG finite element space V_h.

Lemma 4.1. *([19]) For any $v_h \in V_h$, the following inequalities hold*

$$C_7\|v_h\|_{1,h} \leq \|v_h\|_{a,h} \leq C_8\|v_h\|_{1,h}, \tag{4.5}$$

where C_7 and C_8 are two constants independent of the mesh size h.

Then $\|T_h f - \mathcal{P}_H Tf\|_{a,h}$ has following inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T_h f - \mathcal{P}_H Tf\|_{a,h} &\leq \|T_h f - Q_h Tf\|_{a,h} + \|Q_h Tf - \mathcal{P}_H Tf\|_{a,h} \\
&\leq \|T_h f - Q_h Tf\|_{a,h} + C\|Q_h Tf - \mathcal{P}_H Tf\|_{1,h} \\
&\leq \|T_h f - Q_h Tf\|_{a,h} + C\|Q_h Tf - Tf\|_{1,h} + C\|Tf - \mathcal{P}_H Tf\|_{1,h} \\
&\leq \|T_h f - Q_h Tf\|_{a,h} + C\|Q_h Tf - Tf\|_{1,h} + C\|Tf - \mathcal{P}_H Tf\|_1 \\
&\leq C(h + h + H)\|Tf\|_2 \leq CH\|f\|_{b,h},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where the constant depends on the shape of the mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$.

From the definition of $\eta_a(W_H)$ in (3.7), and (4.6), we can obtain the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_a(W_H) &\leq \sup_{\substack{f \in L^2(\Omega) \\ \|f\|_{b,h}=1}} \inf_{w_H \in W_H} \|T_h f - w_H\|_{a,h} \leq \sup_{\substack{f \in L^2(\Omega) \\ \|f\|_{b,h}=1}} \|T_h f - \mathcal{P}_H Tf\|_{a,h} \\
&\leq \sup_{\substack{f \in L^2(\Omega) \\ \|f\|_{b,h}=1}} CH\|f\|_{b,h} = CH.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Based on Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, the convergence results for the augmented subspace method can be concluded with the following inequalities

$$\left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h} \leq C\left(CH\right)^{2\ell} \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}, \quad i = 1, \cdots, k, \tag{4.8}$$

$$\left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{b,h} \leq CH \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - F_{k,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}, \quad i = 1, \cdots, k, \tag{4.9}$$

and

$$\left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - E_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h} \leq C\left(CH\right)^{2\ell} \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - E_{i,h}^{(1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}, \tag{4.10}$$

$$\left\| \bar{u}_h - E_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_h \right\|_{b,h} \quad \leq \quad CH \left\| \bar{u}_{i,h} - E_{i,h}^{(\ell+1)} \bar{u}_{i,h} \right\|_{a,h}. \tag{4.11}$$

The goal of this section is to validate these convergence findings using a few numerical examples. The exact WG finite element eigenfunction can be found by directly solving the eigenvalue problem on the fine WG finite element space V_h. Let this be noted. To aid with comprehension, the nomenclature in all of the following figures denotes the exact WG finite element eigenfunctions and the augmented subspace approximations, respectively, with and without the "`dir`" superscript.

4.1 Augmented subspace method for P_0/P_0 WG finite element space

For the WG finite element space P_0/P_0, we examine the performance of the augmented subspace approach described by Algorithms 1 and 2 in the first subsection. Here, W_H is defined as the conforming linear finite element space on the coarse mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$ in all numerical cases. The P_0/P_0 WG finite element space V_h defined on the finer mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ can be written as follows

$$V_h = \left\{ v : v|_{K_0} \in \mathcal{P}_0(K_0) \text{ for } K \in \mathcal{T}_h; v|_e \in \mathcal{P}_0(e) \text{ for } e \in \mathcal{E}_h, \text{ and } v|_e = 0 \text{ for } e \in \mathcal{E}_h \cap \partial\Omega \right\}.$$

The fine mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ is obtained from the coarse mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$ by the regular refinement. Here, we set the size $h = \sqrt{2}/256$ for the fine mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$.

We also verify the convergence results for the conforming linear finite element space W_H with various sizes H by examining the numerical errors corresponding to the results in (4.8)-(4.11). The goal is to determine how the mesh size H affects the convergence rate. In this case, the regular type of quasiuniform mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$ is also specified as the coarse mesh.

Under the boundary condition restriction, the initial eigenfunction approximation is specified to be rand vectors in this case. Next, we employ the augmented subspace approach, as specified by Algorithms 1 and 2, to carry out the iteration steps. The convergence behaviors for the first eigenfunction using the augmented subspace techniques are displayed in Figure 1, and they correspond to the coarse mesh sizes $H = \sqrt{2}/8$, $\sqrt{2}/16$, $\sqrt{2}/32$, and $\sqrt{2}/64$, respectively. The rates of convergence associated with $\| \cdot \|_{a,h}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{b,h}$ are, respectively, 0.048945, 0.012834, 0.00279122, 0.00058513 and 0.052177, 0.01405, 0.0032556, 0.00076374. As a consequence, the results (4.8)-(4.11) hold and validate the second order convergence speed of the augmented subspace technique described by Algorithms 1 and 2.

Next, we evaluate Algorithm 1 in terms of its ability to compute the first 4 eigenpairs. The corresponding convergence behaviors for the smallest 4 eigenfunctions by Algorithm 1 are displayed in Figure 2. The conforming linear finite element space on the mesh with sizes $H = \sqrt{2}/8$, $\sqrt{2}/16$, $\sqrt{2}/32$, and $\sqrt{2}/64$, respectively, forms the coarse space W_H. Employing the 4-th eigenfunction as an example, we can determine the related convergence rates, which indicate the second convergence order of the algorithm given by Algorithm 1, to be 0.3353, 0.11061, 0.029854, and 0.0054112. Furthermore, we are able to observe from Figure 2 that the 4-th eigenfunction's convergence rate is slower than the 1-st eigenfunction's, which is in accordance with Theorem 3.1.

Assessing Algorithm 2's performance in determining the single 4-th eigenpair is the next objective. Since smallest eigenpairs is not the goal, the eigenvalue problem (2.3) is solved on the coarse WG finite element space V_H to provide the initial eigenfunction approximation. The augmented subspace approach, which is specified by Algorithm 2, is then used to carry out the iteration phases. The coarse space was the linear finite element space on the mesh with sizes $H = \sqrt{2}/8$, $\sqrt{2}/16$, $\sqrt{2}/32$, and $\sqrt{2}/64$, respectively. The corresponding convergence behaviors for the only 4-th eigenfunction by Algorithm 2 are depicted in Figure 3. The norms $\| \cdot \|_{a,h}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{b,h}$ in Figure 3 correspond to the convergence rates, which are 0.35325, 0.12501, 0.034437 and 0.0083731, and 0.35058, 0.12584, 0.035226 and 0.0090371, respectively. According to these findings, the augmented subspace approach described by Algorithm 2 has a second order speed of convergence, validating the findings of (4.10)-(4.11).

22

Figure 1: The convergence behaviors for the first eigenfunction by Algorithm 1 corresponding to the P_0/P_0 WG finite element method and the coarse mesh size $H = \sqrt{2}/8$, $\sqrt{2}/16$, $\sqrt{2}/32$ and $\sqrt{2}/64$, respectively.

Figure 2: The convergence behaviors for the smallest 4 eigenfunctions by Algorithm 1 with the P_0/P_0 WG finite element method and the coarse space being the linear finite element space on the mesh with size $H = \sqrt{2}/8$, $\sqrt{2}/16$, $\sqrt{2}/32$ and $\sqrt{2}/64$, respectively.

Figure 3: The convergence behaviors for the only 4-th eigenfunction by Algorithm 2 with the P_0/P_0 WG finite element method and the coarse space being the linear finite element space on the mesh with size $H = \sqrt{2}/8$, $\sqrt{2}/16$, $\sqrt{2}/32$ and $\sqrt{2}/64$, respectively.

4.2 Augmented subspace method for P_1/P_1 WG finite element space

We examine the augmented subspace method's performance for the WG finite element space P_1/P_1, as described by Algorithms 1 and 2, in the second subsection. Also, W_H is designated as the conforming linear finite element space on the coarse mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$ in these numerical tests. Here, V_h is the P_1/P_1 WG finite element space defined on the fine mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$, which is generated by the regular refinement from the coarse mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$.

Here, we set the size $h = \sqrt{2}/256$ for the fine mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ and the WG finite element space V_h is defined as follows

$$V_h = \left\{ v : v|_{K_0} \in \mathcal{P}_1(K_0) \text{ for } K \in \mathcal{T}_h; v|_e \in \mathcal{P}_1(e) \text{ for } e \in \mathcal{E}_h, \text{ and } v|_e = 0 \text{ for } e \in \mathcal{E}_h \cap \partial\Omega \right\}.$$

We also check the numerical errors corresponding to the conforming linear finite element space W_H with different sizes H. This helps to confirm the convergence results for the P_1/P_1 WG finite element technique described in (4.8)-(4.11). Here, also determining how the convergence rate varies with mesh size H is a goal. In this case, the regular type of quasiuniform mesh $\mathcal{T}_H$ is also specified as the coarse mesh.

In a similar vein, under the boundary condition restriction, the initial eigenfunction approximation is also made to be rand vectors. The convergence characteristics for the first eigenfunction using the augmented subspace techniques are displayed in Figure 4, which corresponds to the coarse mesh sizes $H = \sqrt{2}/8$, $\sqrt{2}/16$, $\sqrt{2}/32$, and $\sqrt{2}/64$, respectively. $\| \cdot \|_{a,h}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{b,h}$ have respective convergence rates of 0.053287, 0.013798, 0.0036045, 0.00075399 and 0.05535, 0.014936, 0.0038268, 0.00090686. The findings support the results (4.8)-(4.11) by demonstrating the second order convergence speed of the augmented subspace technique specified in Algorithms 1 and 2.

Next, we additionally examine Algorithm 1's performance in terms of computing the first 4

Figure 4: The convergence behaviors for the first eigenfunction by Algorithm 1 corresponding to the P_1/P_1 WG finite element method and the coarse mesh size $H = \sqrt{2}/8$, $\sqrt{2}/16$, $\sqrt{2}/32$ and $\sqrt{2}/64$, respectively.

eigenpairs. The corresponding convergence behaviors for the smallest 4 eigenfunctions by Algorithm 1 are presented in Figure 5. The conforming linear finite element space on the mesh with sizes $H = \sqrt{2}/8$, $\sqrt{2}/16$, $\sqrt{2}/32$, and $\sqrt{2}/64$, respectively, constitutes the coarse space. By employing the 4-th eigenfunction as an example, we can also get the related convergence rates 0.29933, 0.10565, 0.029315, and 0.0065776, which reflect second convergence order of Algorithm 1.

The final objective is evaluating the efficiency of Algorithm 2 in determining the only 4-th eigenpair. Similarly, the coarse WG finite element space V_H is used to solve the eigenvalue problem (2.3) to get the initial eigenfunction approximation. The corresponding convergence behaviors for the only 4-th eigenfunction by Algorithm 2 are displayed in Figure 6. The conforming linear finite element space on the mesh with sizes $H = \sqrt{2}/8$, $\sqrt{2}/16$, $\sqrt{2}/32$, and $\sqrt{2}/64$, respectively, is the coarse space. The convergence rates associated with $\|\cdot\|_{a,h}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{b,h}$ are 0.33464, 0.1179, 0.027908, 0.0030174 and 0.35213, 0.12511, 0.034041, 0.0084659, respectively, as depicted in Figure 6. The results (4.10)-(4.11) are likewise validated by these findings.

5   Concluding remarks

In this study, two augmented subspace strategies for addressing the eigenvalue problems using the WG finite element method are proposed, with the assistance of conforming linear finite element space on the coarse mesh. We construct the associated error estimates, which demonstrate that the WG method's augmented subspace scheme has a second convergence order in relation to the coarse mesh size.

We can develop a sort of eigensolver for algebraic eigenvalue problems, which originate from the discretization of the differential eigenvalue problem using the WG finite element technique, based

Figure 5: The convergence behaviors for the smallest 4 eigenfunctions by Algorithm 1 with the P_1/P_1 WG finite element method and the coarse space being the linear finite element space on the mesh with size $H = \sqrt{2}/8$, $\sqrt{2}/16$, $\sqrt{2}/32$ and $\sqrt{2}/64$, respectively.

Figure 6: The convergence behaviors for the only 4-th eigenfunction by Algorithm 2 with the P_1/P_1 WG finite element method and the coarse space being the linear finite element space on the mesh with size $H = \sqrt{2}/8$, $\sqrt{2}/16$, $\sqrt{2}/32$ and $\sqrt{2}/64$, respectively.

on these provided augmented subspace approaches. Moreover, the methods presented here provide a means of designing the parallel eigensolver for the WG finite element discretization technique, which will be the subject of our next research project.

Acknowledgements

References

[1] R. A. Adams, *Sobolev Spaces*, Academic Press, New York, 1975.

[2] I. Babuška and J. Osborn, *Finite element-Galerkin approximation of the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of selfadjoint problems*, Math. Comp., 52 (1989), 275–297.

[3] I. Babuška and J. Osborn, *Eigenvalue Problems*, In Handbook of Numerical Analysis, Vol. II, (Eds. P. G. Lions and Ciarlet P.G.), Finite Element Methods (Part 1), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 641–787, 1991.

[4] Z. Bai, J. Demmel, J. Dongarra, A. Ruhe, and H. van der Vorst, editors. *Templates for the Solution of Agebraic Eigenvalue Problems: A Practical Guide*, Society for Industrial and Applied Math., Philadelphia, 2000.

[5] J. H. Bramble, J. Pasciak, and A. Knyazev, *A subspace preconditioning algorithm for eigenvector/eigenvalue computation*, Adv. Comput. Math., 6(1) (1996), 159–189.

[6] F. Chatelin, *Spectral Approximation of Linear Operators*, Academic Press Inc, New York, 1983.

[7] H. Chen, H. Xie and F. Xu, *A full multigrid method for eigenvalue problems*, J. Comput. Phys., 322 (2016), 747–759.

[8] H. Dang, H. Xie, G. Zhao and C. Zhou, *A nonnested augmented subspace method for elliptic eigenvalue problems with curved interfaces*, J. Sci. Comput., 94(2) (2023), Paper No. 34.

[9] E. G. D'yakonov and M. Yu. Orekhov, *Minimization of the computational labor in determining the first eigenvalues of differential operators*, Math. Notes, 27 (1980), 382–391.

[10] M. Fortin and F. Brezzi, Mixed and Hybrid Finite Element Methods, New York, Springer-Verlag, 1991.

[11] Q. Hong, H. Xie and F. Xu, *A multilevel correction type of adaptive finite element method for eigenvalue problems*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 40(6) (2018), A4208–A4235.

[12] A. Knyazev, *Preconditioned eigensolvers-an oxymoron?* Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal., 7 (1998), 104–123.

[13] A. Knyazev, *Toward the optimal preconditioned eigensolver: Locally optimal block preconditioned conjugate gradient method*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 23(2) (2001), 517–541.

[14] A. Knyazev and K. Neymeyr, *Efficient solution of symmetric eigenvalue problems using multi-grid preconditioners in the locally optimal block conjugate gradient method*, Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal., 15 (2003), 38–55.

[15] Q. Li and J. Wang, *Weak Galerkin finite element methods for parabolic equations*, Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations, 29(6) (2013), 2004–2024.

[16] Y. Li, Z. Wang and H. Xie, *GCGE: a package for solving large scale eigenvalue problems by parallel block damping inverse power method*, CCF Transactions on High Performance Computing, 5 (2023), 171–190.

[17] Y. Li, H. Xie, R. Xu, C. You and N. Zhang, *A parallel generalized conjugate gradient method for large scale eigenvalue problems*, CCF Transactions on High Performance Computing, 2 (2020), 111–122.

[18] Q. Lin and H. Xie, *A multi-level correction scheme for eigenvalue problems*, Math. Comp., 84 (2015), 71–88.

[19] L. Mu, J. Wang, Y. Wang and X. Ye, A weak Galerkin mixed finite element method for biharmonic equations, in: Conference Proceeding for Numerical Solutions of Partial Differential Equations: Theory, Algorithms and their Applications, Vol. 45, 2013, 247–277.

[20] L. Mu, J. Wang and X. Ye, *A stable numerical algorithm for the Brinkman equations by weak Galerkin finite element methods*, J. Comput. Phys., 273 (2014), 327–342.

[21] L. Mu, J. Wang and X. Ye, *Weak Galerkin finite element methods for the biharmonic equation on polytopal meshes*, Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations, 30(3) (2014), 1003–1029.

[22] L. Mu, J. Wang and X. Ye, *A new weak Galerkin finite element method for the Helmholtz equation*, IMA J. Numer. Anal., 35(3) (2015), 1228–1255.

[23] L. Mu, J. Wang, X. Ye, and S. Zhang, *A weak Galerkin finite element method for the Maxwell equations*, J. Sci. Comput., 65(1) (2015), 363–386.

[24] L. Mu, J. Wang, X. Ye and S. Zhao, *A numerical study on the weak Galerkin method for the Helmholtz equation*, Commun. Comput. Phys., 15(5) (2014), 1461–1479.

[25] D. Sorensen, *Implicitly Restarted Arnoldi/Lanczos Methods for Large Scale Eigenvalue Calculations*, Springer Netherlands, 1997.

[26] C. Wang and J. Wang, *An efficient numerical scheme for the biharmonic equation by weak Galerkin finite element methods on polygonal or polyhedral meshes*, Comput. Math. Appl., 68(12) (2014), 2314–2330.

[27] J. Wang and X. Ye, *A weak Galerkin finite element method for second-order elliptic problems*, J. Comput. Appl. Math., 241 (2013), 103–115.

[28] H. Xie, *A type of multilevel method for the Steklov eigenvalue problem*, IMA J. Numer. Anal., 34 (2014), 592–608.

[29] H. Xie, *A multigrid method for eigenvalue problem*, J. Comput. Phys., 274 (2014), 550–561.

[30] H. Xie, *A type of multi-level correction scheme for eigenvalue problems by nonconforming finite element methods*, BIT Numerical Mathematics, 55(4) (2015), 1243–1266.

[31] H. Xie, L. Zhang and H. Owhadi, *Fast eigenvalue computation with operator adapted wavelets and hierarchical subspace correction*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 57(6) (2019), 2519–2550.

[32] F. Xu, H. Xie and N. Zhang, *A parallel augmented subspace method for eigenvalue problems*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 42(5) (2020), A2655–A2677.

[33] Q. Zhai, X. Hu and R. Zhang, *The shifted-inverse power weak Galerkin method for eigenvalue problems*, J. Comput. Math., 38(4) (2020), 606–623.

[34] Q. Zhai, H. Xie, R. Zhang and Z. Zhang, *The weak Galerkin method for elliptic eigenvalue problems*, Commun. Comput. Phys., 26(1) (2019), 160–191.

[35] Q. Zhai, H. Xie, R. Zhang and Z. Zhang, *Acceleration of weak Galerkin methods for the Laplacian eigenvalue problem*, J. Sci. Comput., 79 (2019), 914–934.

[36] Q. Zhai, R. Zhang and L. Mu, *A new weak Galerkin finite element scheme for the Brinkman model*, Commun. Comput. Phys., 19(5) (2016), 1409–1434.

[37] N. Zhang, Y. Li, H. Xie, R. Xu and C. You, *A generalized conjugate gradient method for eigenvalue problems* (in Chinese), Scientia Sinica Mathematica, 51 (2021), 1297–1320.

[38] R. Zhang and Q. Zhai, *A weak Galerkin finite element scheme for the biharmonic equations by using polynomials of reduced order*, J. Sci. Comput., 64(2) (2015), 559–585.

[39] S. Zhou, F. Gao, B. Li and Z. Sun, *Weak Galerkin finite element method with second-order accuracy in time for parabolic problems*, Appl. Math. Lett., 90 (2019), 118–123.