



HAL
open science

On the approximation of electromagnetic fields by edge finite elements. Part 3: sensitivity to coefficients

Patrick Ciarlet

► **To cite this version:**

Patrick Ciarlet. On the approximation of electromagnetic fields by edge finite elements. Part 3: sensitivity to coefficients. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 2020, 10.1137/19M1275383 . hal-02276430v3

HAL Id: hal-02276430

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-02276430v3>

Submitted on 17 Jun 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **ON THE APPROXIMATION OF ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS BY**
2 **EDGE FINITE ELEMENTS. PART 3: SENSITIVITY TO**
3 **COEFFICIENTS**

4 PATRICK CIARLET, JR.*

5 **Abstract.** In bounded domains, the regularity of the solutions to boundary value problems
6 depends on the geometry, and on the coefficients that enter into the definition of the model. This is in
7 particular the case for the time-harmonic Maxwell equations, whose solutions are the electromagnetic
8 fields. In this paper, emphasis is put on the electric field. We study the regularity in terms of the
9 fractional order Sobolev spaces H^s , $s \in [0, 1]$. Precisely, our first goal is to determine the regularity
10 of the electric field and of its curl, that is to find some regularity exponent $\tau \in (0, 1)$, such that they
11 both belong to H^s , for all $s \in [0, \tau)$. After that, one can derive error estimates. Here, the error is
12 defined as the difference between the exact field and its approximation, where the latter is built with
13 Nédélec's first family of finite elements. In addition to the regularity exponent, one needs to derive
14 a stability constant that relates the norm of the error to the norm of the data: this is our second
15 goal. We provide explicit expressions for both the regularity exponent and the stability constant
16 with respect to the coefficients. We also discuss the accuracy of these expressions, and we provide
17 some numerical illustrations.

18 **Key words.** Maxwell's equations, interface problem, edge elements, sensitivity to coefficients,
19 error estimates

20 **AMS subject classifications.** 78A48, 35B65, 65N30

21 **1. Introduction.** We study the numerical approximation of electromagnetic
22 fields governed by Maxwell's equations. More precisely, our goal is to characterize
23 the dependence of the error between the exact and computed fields, with respect to
24 the coefficients that define the model (PDEs, supplemented with boundary condi-
25 tions). This paper is the third part of the series entitled "On the Approximation of
26 Electromagnetic Fields by Edge Finite Elements" [12, 13].

27 For Maxwell's equations, the coefficients are the electric permittivity, the magnetic
28 permeability and the conductivity. Classically, the model is recast as an equivalent
29 variational formulation. The first goal is to determine the value of the constants that
30 appear in the analysis of the variational formulation, which are the continuity mod-
31 ulus of the forms, and the coercivity or inf-sup constants. Then, one performs the
32 numerical analysis of the model. In addition to the above-mentioned constants, one
33 has to estimate the order of convergence, which depends on the (extra-)regularity of
34 the fields ; this (extra-)regularity depends itself on the behavior of the coefficients,
35 and on the geometry of the model. In particular, it is crucial to use ad hoc norms
36 to measure the fields and the data, and particular care is devoted to the definition
37 of those norms. We observe that if the coefficients belong to a set not reduced to a
38 singleton (eg. random coefficients), then the (extra-)regularity may vanish in some
39 limit cases.

40
41 The outline of the paper is as follows.
42 In the next section, we introduce the model problem (see eg. [2]), set in a bounded
43 region of \mathbb{R}^3 , with volume sources. We prescribe some a priori conditions on the co-
44 efficients, and on the source terms ; the coefficients are only supposed to be piecewise
45 smooth, hence they may be discontinuous. The variational formulation is introduced.

*POEMS, ENSTA Paris, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, 828 Bd des Maréchaux, 91762 Palaiseau
Cedex, France (patrick.ciarlet@ensta-paris.fr).

46 Then, in section 3, we recall the main results regarding the discretisation of elec-
 47 tromagnetic fields by Nédélec’s finite elements [30, 29, 12, 20]. We also define the
 48 function spaces that will allow us to perform the analysis of the model. Particular
 49 attention is paid to the fractional order Sobolev spaces, which play a crucial role in
 50 the analysis. These are defined using either the real interpolation method [28, 33, 9],
 51 or with the help of the Sobolev-Slobodeckij norms [24, 25, 11]: this yields two ways to
 52 measure their elements. In section 4, we provide the (well-known) estimates for the
 53 continuity modulus and the coercivity constant related to the variational formulation,
 54 with respect to the coefficients of the model.

55 There remains to estimate the so-called regularity exponent and the stability constant,
 56 which relate the norm of the electromagnetic fields in *ad hoc* fractional order Sobolev
 57 spaces norms to the norm of the source terms. Estimating these last two quantities
 58 with respect to the coefficients of the model is less classical. Hence, most novelties in
 59 the paper are contained in the approach developed in sections 5 and 6. In section 5, we
 60 recall how one can split the electromagnetic fields into a regular part and a gradient
 61 part [4], so the (lack of) regularity of the fields rests on the regularity of the gradients.
 62 This is the subject of section 6. We use a perturbation argument *à la* Jochmann [27]
 63 or Bonito *et al* [6] to estimate this regularity with respect to the coefficients of the
 64 model. We call it the *global approach*. When the coefficient are piecewise constant,
 65 one may also use the *local approach*, see Appendix B. The main novelties are threefold:
 66 the extension of existing results to problems with complex-valued coefficients, set in
 67 a non-topologically trivial domain; the use of the two measures for elements of the
 68 Sobolev spaces, and their interplay; the design of estimates for the numerical error
 69 that depend only on the coefficients of the model (see Theorem 6.15). To conclude,
 70 we illustrate our results by two examples in section 7.

71
 72 We denote constant fields by the symbol *cst*. Vector-valued (respectively tensor-
 73 valued) function spaces are written in boldface character (resp. blackboard bold
 74 characters). Given a non-empty open set \mathcal{O} of \mathbb{R}^3 , we use the notation $(\cdot|\cdot)_{0,\mathcal{O}}$ (re-
 75 spectively $\|\cdot\|_{0,\mathcal{O}}$) for the $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ and the $\mathbf{L}^2(\mathcal{O}) := (L^2(\mathcal{O}))^3$ hermitian scalar prod-
 76 ucts (resp. norms). More generally, $(\cdot|\cdot)_{s,\mathcal{O}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{s,\mathcal{O}}$ (respectively $|\cdot|_{s,\mathcal{O}}$) denote
 77 the hermitian scalar product and the norm (resp. semi-norm) of the Sobolev spaces
 78 $H^s(\mathcal{O})$ and $\mathbf{H}^s(\mathcal{O}) := (H^s(\mathcal{O}))^3$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ (resp. for $s > 0$). *The index zmv indi-*
 79 *cates zero-mean-value fields.* If moreover the boundary $\partial\mathcal{O}$ is Lipschitz, \mathbf{n} denotes
 80 the unit outward normal vector field to $\partial\mathcal{O}$. Finally, it is assumed that the reader
 81 is familiar with function spaces related to Maxwell’s equations, such as $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}; \mathcal{O})$,
 82 $\mathbf{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; \mathcal{O})$, $\mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \mathcal{O})$, $\mathbf{H}_0(\text{div}; \mathcal{O})$ etc. A priori, $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}; \mathcal{O})$ is endowed with the
 83 norm $\mathbf{v} \mapsto (\|\mathbf{v}\|_{0,\mathcal{O}}^2 + \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{v}\|_{0,\mathcal{O}}^2)^{1/2}$, etc. We refer to the monographs of Monk [29]
 84 and Assous *et al* [4] for details. We will define more specialized function spaces later
 85 on.

86 **2. The model problem.** Let Ω be a *domain* in \mathbb{R}^3 , that is an open, connected
 87 and bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^3 with a Lipschitz-continuous boundary $\partial\Omega$. We are interested
 88 in solving the time-harmonic Maxwell’s equations (with time-dependence $\exp(-i\omega t)$,
 89 for a given pulsation $\omega > 0$),

90 (2.1)
$$i\omega \mathbf{d} + \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{j} \text{ in } \Omega,$$

91 (2.2)
$$-i\omega \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e} = 0 \text{ in } \Omega,$$

92 (2.3)
$$\text{div} \mathbf{d} = \varrho \text{ in } \Omega,$$

93 (2.4)
$$\text{div} \mathbf{b} = 0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

94 Above, $(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{b})$ are the electromagnetic fields. We suppose that \mathbf{d} and \mathbf{b} are related
 95 to \mathbf{e} and \mathbf{h} by the constitutive relations

$$96 \quad (2.5) \quad \mathbf{d} = \varepsilon \mathbf{e}, \quad \mathbf{b} = \mu \mathbf{h} \text{ in } \Omega,$$

97 where the real-valued coefficient ε is the electric permittivity and the real-valued
 98 coefficient μ is the magnetic permeability.

99 The source terms \mathbf{j} and ϱ are respectively the current density and the charge density,
 100 and they are related by the charge conservation equation

$$101 \quad (2.6) \quad -\omega \varrho + \operatorname{div} \mathbf{j} = 0.$$

102 We suppose that the current density may be written as

$$103 \quad (2.7) \quad \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{j}_{ext} + \sigma \mathbf{e} \text{ in } \Omega,$$

104 where \mathbf{j}_{ext} is an externally imposed current, and the real-valued coefficient σ is the
 105 conductivity.

106 **2.1. A priori assumptions.** Classically, the electromagnetic fields all belong
 107 to $\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)$ and the coefficients ε , μ and σ have a fixed-sign (positive): we make these
 108 assumptions from now on. We also assume throughout this work that these coefficients
 109 together with their inverses belong to $L^\infty(\Omega)$, and we use the notations $\varepsilon_{max} =$
 110 $\|\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$, $\varepsilon_{min} = (\|\varepsilon^{-1}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})^{-1}$, etc.

111 We choose the data $(\mathbf{j}_{ext}, \varrho)$ in $\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{div}; \Omega) \times H^{-1}(\Omega)$. It is also possible to choose
 112 $\mathbf{j}_{ext} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)$ with $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{j}_{ext} \in H^{-t}(\Omega)$ for some $t \in (0, 1)$, but we assume for simplicity
 113 that $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{j}_{ext} \in L^2(\Omega)$. We refer to §6.5 for the study of the more general case.

114 Finally, we assume that the medium Ω is surrounded by a perfect conductor, so that
 115 the boundary condition below holds:

$$116 \quad (2.8) \quad \mathbf{e} \times \mathbf{n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

117 Eqs. (2.1)-(2.8) together with the assumptions on the coefficients and on the source
 118 terms define our *model problem*. When we focus on the discretization, see §3.3 and
 119 afterwards, we assume that Ω is a *Lipschitz polyhedron*, that ε, σ are *piecewise smooth*
 120 *on* Ω , and that μ is *constant on* Ω . We call this setting the *polyhedral model problem*.
 121 Let us mention that once the field \mathbf{e} is known, then all other electromagnetic fields \mathbf{d} ,
 122 \mathbf{b} and \mathbf{h} are known too. As a consequence, we focus on the study of the field \mathbf{e} . In
 123 particular, we note that \mathbf{e} belongs to the function space $\mathbf{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)$.

124 **2.2. Variational formulation.** In the spirit of the charge conservation equation
 125 tion, let us introduce $\varrho_{ext} = -i/\omega \operatorname{div} \mathbf{j}_{ext} \in L^2(\Omega)$. Our model problem can be
 126 formulated in the electric field \mathbf{e} only, namely

$$127 \quad (2.9) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } \mathbf{e} \in \mathbf{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega) \text{ such that} \\ -\omega^2 \varepsilon_\sigma \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{curl}(\mu^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}) = \omega \mathbf{j}_{ext} \text{ in } \Omega \\ \operatorname{div} \varepsilon_\sigma \mathbf{e} = \varrho_{ext} \text{ in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

128 Above, the complex-valued coefficient ε_σ is defined by $\varepsilon_\sigma = \varepsilon + i\sigma/\omega$. Note that in
 129 (2.9), the equation $\operatorname{div} \varepsilon_\sigma \mathbf{e} = \varrho_{ext}$ is implied by the second-order equation $-\omega^2 \varepsilon_\sigma \mathbf{e} +$
 130 $\mathbf{curl}(\mu^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}) = \omega \mathbf{j}_{ext}$, together with the charge conservation equation (2.6) and
 131 the splitting of the current (2.7), so it can be omitted. Moreover, one can check that
 132 the equivalent variational formulation in $\mathbf{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)$ writes

$$133 \quad (2.10) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } \mathbf{e} \in \mathbf{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega) \text{ such that} \\ (\mu^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e} | \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{v})_{0,\Omega} - \omega^2 (\varepsilon_\sigma \mathbf{e} | \mathbf{v})_{0,\Omega} = \omega (\mathbf{j}_{ext} | \mathbf{v})_{0,\Omega}, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega). \end{cases}$$

134 Under the assumptions on the coefficients, this variational formulation is well-posed
 135 (see for instance [4, §8.3.2]). In other words,

$$136 \quad (2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & \exists C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)} > 0, \text{ such that } \forall \mathbf{j}_{ext} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega), \exists! \mathbf{e} \text{ solution to (2.10), and} \\ & \|\mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)} \leq C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)} \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0, \Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

137 **3. Discretisation of electromagnetic fields.** Here, we define finite element
 138 approximations of the electric field \mathbf{e} . We also recall how one can build an a pri-
 139 ori error estimate between \mathbf{e} and its approximation. When we study the numerical
 140 approximations and for the ease of exposition, we assume that Ω is a Lipschitz poly-
 141 hedron (polyhedral model problem). To define finite dimensional subspaces $(\mathbf{V}_h)_h$
 142 of $\mathbf{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)$, we choose the so-called Nédélec's first family of edge finite elements,
 143 defined on simplicial meshes of Ω . We follow here [12, §2.4]. It is sufficient to use
 144 first-order finite elements because we focus on electromagnetic fields with low regular-
 145 ity. $\bar{\Omega}$ is triangulated by a shape regular family of meshes $(\mathcal{T}_h)_h$, made up of (closed)
 146 simplices, generically denoted by K . A mesh is indexed by $h := \max_K h_K$ (the mesh-
 147 size), where h_K is the diameter of K . Denoting by ρ_K the diameter of the largest ball
 148 inscribed in K , we assume that there exists a shape regularity parameter $\varsigma > 0$ such
 149 that for all h , for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, it holds $h_K \leq \varsigma \rho_K$. Nédélec's $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)$ -conforming
 150 (first family, first-order) finite element spaces are defined as

$$151 \quad \mathbf{V}_h := \{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega) : \mathbf{v}_h|_K \in \mathcal{R}_1(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\},$$

152 where $\mathcal{R}_1(K)$ is the six-dimensional vector space of polynomials on K

$$153 \quad \mathcal{R}_1(K) := \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{P}_1(K) : \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3\}.$$

154 According to [30, Theorem 1], any element \mathbf{v} in $\mathcal{R}_1(K)$ is uniquely determined by the
 155 degrees of freedom in the moment set $M_E(\mathbf{v})$:

$$156 \quad M_E(\mathbf{v}) := \left(\int_e \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{t} \, dl \right)_{e \in A_K}.$$

157 Above, A_K is the set of edges of K , and \mathbf{t} is a unit vector along the edge e . The global
 158 set of moments on \mathbf{V}_h is then obtained by taking one degree of freedom as above per
 159 interior edge of \mathcal{T}_h . We recall that the basic approximability property writes (cf. [29,
 160 Lemma 7.10])

$$161 \quad (3.1) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left(\inf_{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h} \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_h\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)} \right) = 0, \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega).$$

162 Assuming for simplicity that the integrals are computed exactly, the discrete electric
 163 problem writes

$$164 \quad (3.2) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } \mathbf{e}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h \text{ such that} \\ (\mu^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}_h | \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{v}_h)_{0, \Omega} - \omega^2 (\varepsilon_\sigma \mathbf{e}_h | \mathbf{v}_h)_{0, \Omega} = i\omega (\mathbf{j}_{ext} | \mathbf{v}_h)_{0, \Omega}, \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h. \end{cases}$$

165 Because the exact problem is well-posed, cf. (2.11), one may apply Céa's lemma to
 166 find

$$167 \quad (3.3) \quad \exists C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^\sharp > 0, \forall h, \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{e}_h\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)} \leq C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^\sharp \inf_{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h} \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{v}_h\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)}.$$

168 Classically, the constant $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^\sharp$ depends on the coercivity constant and on the norm
 169 of the sesquilinear form in the left-hand side of (2.10) and (3.2). This constant is
 170 investigated in detail in section 4. It follows from (3.1) that

$$171 \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|e - e_h\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)} = 0.$$

172 In order to obtain a result which is more accurate, typically a convergence rate in the
 173 order of h^s for some $s > 0$, one has to use information on the (extra-)regularity of the
 174 electric field. Let us recall how this can be achieved.

175 **3.1. A few reminders about Sobolev spaces.** Let $\mathcal{O} \subset \Omega$ be a non-empty
 176 connected open subset of \mathbb{R}^3 with Lipschitz boundary. To give a precise meaning to
 177 the regularity of a scalar or vector field on \mathcal{O} , we use the well-known Sobolev scale
 178 $(H^s(\mathcal{O}))_s$.

179 (0) For $s \in \mathbb{N}$, one uses the standard definition:

$$180 \quad H^s(\mathcal{O}) := \{v \in L^2(\mathcal{O}) \text{ s.t. } \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^3, |\alpha| \leq s, \partial_\alpha v \in L^2(\mathcal{O})\},$$

181 equipped with the norm $\|v\|_{s, \mathcal{O}} := (\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^3, |\alpha| \leq s} \|\partial_\alpha v\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O})}^2)^{1/2}$. Obviously, $H^0(\mathcal{O}) =$
 182 $L^2(\mathcal{O})$.

183 (1) To define those spaces for $s > 0$, $s \notin \mathbb{N}$, several possibilities exist. Let us begin
 184 with the real interpolation method [28] (see also Appendix A), which allows us to
 185 define those Hilbert spaces for non-integer indices $s = m + \sigma$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, as

$$186 \quad H^s(\mathcal{O}) := (H^m(\mathcal{O}), H^{m+1}(\mathcal{O}))_{\sigma, 2}.$$

187 The corresponding norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{s, \mathcal{O}}$. In particular, for all $0 \leq s \leq t$, it
 188 holds that $H^t(\mathcal{O}) \subset H^s(\mathcal{O})$ with continuous embedding [9, §14]:

$$189 \quad \exists C_{(s,t)} > 0, \forall v \in H^t(\mathcal{O}), \quad \|v\|_{s, \mathcal{O}} \leq C_{(s,t)} \|v\|_{t, \mathcal{O}}.$$

190 Given $0 < s_0 \leq s_1 < t < 1$, $s \mapsto C_{(s,t)}$ is continuous on $[s_0, s_1]$.

191 A well-known alternative is to define, for $\sigma \in (0, 1)$:

$$192 \quad \underline{H}^\sigma(\mathcal{O}) := \{v \in L^2(\mathcal{O}) \text{ s.t. } |v|_{\underline{H}^\sigma(\mathcal{O})} < \infty\},$$

193 where

$$194 \quad |v|_{\underline{H}^\sigma(\mathcal{O})} := \left(\int_{\mathcal{O}} \int_{\mathcal{O}} \frac{|v(\mathbf{x}) - v(\mathbf{y})|^2}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^{3+2\sigma}} d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} \right)^{1/2} \text{ is the Sobolev-Slobodeckij semi-norm,}$$

195 and $\underline{H}^\sigma(\mathcal{O})$ is endowed with the Sobolev-Slobodeckij norm

$$196 \quad \|v\|_{\underline{H}^\sigma(\mathcal{O})} := \left(\|v\|_{0, \mathcal{O}}^2 + |v|_{\underline{H}^\sigma(\mathcal{O})}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

197 And then, for $s = m + \sigma$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma \in (0, 1)$:

$$198 \quad \underline{H}^s(\mathcal{O}) := \{v \in H^m(\mathcal{O}) \text{ s.t. } \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^3 \text{ with } |\alpha| = m, \partial_\alpha v \in \underline{H}^\sigma(\mathcal{O})\},$$

199 endowed with the Sobolev-Slobodeckij norm

$$200 \quad \|v\|_{\underline{H}^s(\mathcal{O})} := \left(\|v\|_{m, \mathcal{O}}^2 + \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^3, |\alpha|=m} |\partial_\alpha v|_{\underline{H}^\sigma(\mathcal{O})}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

201 The Sobolev-Slobodeckij semi-norm is

$$202 \quad |v|_{\underline{H}^s(\mathcal{O})} := \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^3, |\alpha|=m} |\partial_\alpha v|_{\underline{H}^\sigma(\mathcal{O})}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

203 For all $s \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \mathbb{N}$, it holds that $H^s(\mathcal{O}) = \underline{H}^s(\mathcal{O})$ algebraically and topologically:

$$204 \quad \exists m_{(s)}, M_{(s)} > 0, \forall v \in H^s(\mathcal{O}), \quad m_{(s)} \|v\|_{\underline{H}^s(\mathcal{O})} \leq \|v\|_{s,\mathcal{O}} \leq M_{(s)} \|v\|_{\underline{H}^s(\mathcal{O})}.$$

205 However, in a bounded set \mathcal{O} , there are no results on the uniform equivalence of
 206 Sobolev-Slobodeckij norms and real interpolation norms when s spans $(0, 1)$, ie. on
 207 bounding one norm with the other times a constant that is independent of $s \in (0, 1)$.
 208 We refer to [25, 11] for illuminating discussions on this topic. On the other hand (see
 209 [24] or [9, §14]), if s spans $[s_0, s_1]$ with $0 < s_0 \leq s_1 < 1$, there is a uniform equivalence
 210 of norms: in other words, m, m^{-1}, M, M^{-1} are continuous on $[s_0, s_1]$.

211 (2) For $s \geq 0$, $H_0^s(\mathcal{O})$ is the closure of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{O})$ in $H^s(\mathcal{O})$. For $s \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, it holds that
 212 $H_0^s(\mathcal{O}) = H^s(\mathcal{O})$ algebraically and topologically, see for instance [21, Theorem 1.4.2.4]
 213 ; while for $s > \frac{1}{2}$, it holds that $H_0^s(\mathcal{O}) \subsetneq H^s(\mathcal{O})$.

214 (3) For $s < 0$, $\tilde{H}^s(\mathcal{O})$ is the topological dual of $H_0^{-s}(\mathcal{O})$.

215 (4) For $s \geq 0$, $\tilde{H}^s(\mathcal{O})$ (also denoted in the literature by $H_{00}^s(\mathcal{O})$) is composed of ele-
 216 ments of $H^s(\mathcal{O})$ such that the continuation by zero outside \mathcal{O} belongs to $H^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$;
 217 for $s \notin \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{N}$, it holds that $\tilde{H}^s(\mathcal{O}) = H_0^s(\mathcal{O})$, while for $s \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{N}$, it holds that
 218 $\tilde{H}^s(\mathcal{O}) \subsetneq H_0^s(\mathcal{O})$. Going back to the real interpolation method, for non-integer in-
 219 dices $s = m + \sigma$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, one has $\tilde{H}^s(\mathcal{O}) = (H_0^m(\mathcal{O}), H_0^{m+1}(\mathcal{O}))_{\sigma, 2}$.

220

221 For the *regularity studies*, we choose the real interpolation method, while we
 222 use the double-integral Sobolev-Slobodeckij norms and semi-norms to perform the
 223 *numerical analysis*, and derive convergence rates.

224 **3.2. Piecewise smooth fields.** The set $\mathcal{P} := \{\Omega_j\}_{j=1, \dots, J}$ is called a *parti-*
 225 *tion* of Ω if $(\Omega_j)_{j=1, \dots, J}$ are disjoint domains, and it holds $\Omega = \cup_{j=1}^J \overline{\Omega_j}$. When the
 226 $(\Omega_j)_{j=1, \dots, J}$ are Lipschitz polyhedra, we use the term *polyhedral partition*. Given a
 227 partition, we introduce the corresponding *interface* $\Sigma := \cup_{1 \leq j \neq j' \leq J} (\partial\Omega_j \cap \partial\Omega_{j'})$. For
 228 a field v defined on Ω , we denote by v_j its restriction to Ω_j , for all j . In relation to
 229 the partition \mathcal{P} and for $s \geq 0$, we define

$$230 \quad PH^s(\Omega) := \{v \in L^2(\Omega) : v_j \in H^s(\Omega_j), 1 \leq j \leq J\}, \text{ endowed with}$$

$$231 \quad \|v\|_{PH^s(\Omega)} := \left(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq J} \|v_j\|_{s, \Omega_j}^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{or} \quad \|v\|_{\underline{PH}^s(\Omega)} := \left(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq J} \|v_j\|_{\underline{H}^s(\Omega_j)}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

232 To simplify the notations, the reference to \mathcal{P} is usually omitted. Let us recall the
 233 technical result (Theorem 4.1 of [1], or Lemma 2.1 of [6]).

234 **PROPOSITION 3.1.** *For all $s \in [0, 1]$, it holds that*

$$235 \quad \|v\|_{PH^s(\Omega)} \leq \|v\|_{s, \Omega}, \quad \forall v \in H^s(\Omega).$$

236 Note that one has $PH^s(\Omega) = H^s(\Omega)$ algebraically and topologically for all partitions
 237 and for all $s \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$.

238 Finally, we introduce

$$239 \quad \mathbf{PH}^s(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega) := \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{PH}^s(\Omega) : \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{PH}^s(\Omega)\} \text{ for } s > 0;$$

$$240 \quad PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega) := \{\zeta \in L^\infty(\Omega) : \zeta_j \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega_j), 1 \leq j \leq J\}.$$

241 $\mathbf{PH}^s(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)$ is endowed with the graph norm. We observe that one has the embed-
 242 ding $\mathbf{PH}^s(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega) \subset \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)$, according to the definition of $\mathbf{PH}^s(\Omega)$.

243 And we endow $PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ with the norm $\|\zeta\|_{PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} := \|\zeta\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + |\zeta|_{PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}$,
 244 and the semi-norm $|\zeta|_{PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} := \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \|\nabla \zeta_j\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_j)}$. For a piecewise constant
 245 coefficient ζ , it holds that $\|\zeta\|_{PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} = \|\zeta\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} |\zeta_j|$.

246 When the partition is trivial, that is $\mathcal{P} = \{\Omega\}$, we omit the P or \mathbf{P} in the name of
 247 the function space.

248 We note that, for the polyhedral model, the assumption on the coefficients writes
 249 $\varepsilon, \sigma \in PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, and the interface Σ can be viewed as the locus of the discontinu-
 250 ities of at least one the two coefficients. More generally, if $\varepsilon, \sigma, \mu \in PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, Σ is
 251 the locus of the discontinuities of at least one the three coefficients.

252 **3.3. Finite element interpolation or quasi-interpolation operators.** In a
 253 Lipschitz polyhedron Ω , one can build finite element interpolation, or quasi-interpola-
 254 tion, operators that act on piecewise smooth fields, with range in \mathbf{V}_h . For a polyhedral
 255 partition $\mathcal{P} := \{\Omega_j\}_{j=1,\dots,J}$, the family of meshes $(\mathcal{T}_h)_h$ is said to be conforming if, for
 256 all h , for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, there exists j_0 such that $K \subset \Omega_{j_0}$. Let us recall briefly the theory
 257 of finite element interpolation. Classically, those results are obtained by studying the
 258 properties of the mappings to the reference element, using Sobolev-Slobodeckij semi-
 259 norms. It holds, for conforming meshes,

$$260 \quad (3.4) \quad \forall s \in (0, 1], \exists \underline{C}_{(\varsigma, s)}^{interp} > 0, \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{PH}^s(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega), \forall h,$$

$$\|\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h^{interp} \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)} \leq \underline{C}_{(\varsigma, s)}^{interp} h^s \{\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\underline{\mathbf{PH}}^s(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{v}\|_{\underline{\mathbf{PH}}^s(\Omega)}\}.$$

261 In (3.4), the interpolation operator Π_h^{interp} is defined in [29, §5.5] for $s > \frac{1}{2}$, respec-
 262 tively is the so-called combined interpolation operator of [12, §4.2] for $s \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Regard-
 263 ing the theory of finite element quasi-interpolation, a similar result can be derived.
 264 Namely, that (3.4) holds, where Π_h^{interp} now stands for the quasi-interpolation opera-
 265 tor defined in [20, §3.5]. The two finite element interpolation and quasi-interpolation
 266 bounds are identical, bearing in mind that Π_h^{interp} is either the interpolation, or the
 267 quasi-interpolation, operator. In addition, we note that $\underline{C}_{(\varsigma, s)}^{interp}$ is not proven to be
 268 independent of s in the above mentioned papers. On the other hand, one can check
 269 that $\underline{C}_{(\varsigma, s)}^{interp}$ depends continuously on s in $(0, 1)$ with the help of the tools proposed
 270 in those papers. For the derivation of those continuous dependence results, we refer
 271 precisely to: the proof of Theorem 3.3 in [20] using abstract estimates from [19, §5]
 272 for the quasi-interpolation; resp. [12, §4.2] using estimates for the Scott-Zhang inter-
 273 polation, for the combined interpolation. Both proofs rely on [9, §14.3].

274 With the help of the results on the equivalence of norms of §3.1(1), we conclude that
 275 one can write (3.4) with the real interpolation norms

$$276 \quad (3.5) \quad \forall s \in (0, 1], \exists C_{(\varsigma, s)}^{interp} > 0, \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{PH}^s(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega), \forall h,$$

$$\|\mathbf{v} - \Pi_h^{interp} \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)} \leq C_{(\varsigma, s)}^{interp} h^s \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{PH}^s(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)}.$$

277 Furthermore, one can choose $s \mapsto C_{(\varsigma, s)}^{interp}$ that is continuous on $[s_0, s_1]$, for all $0 <$
 278 $s_0 \leq s_1 < 1$.

279 **3.4. Extra-regularity of the electric field and convergence rate.** Since
 280 $\mathbf{j}_{ext} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega)$, one may prove that the electric field that solves (2.9)-(2.10) enjoys
 281 extra smoothness. More precisely, the aim is to prove that

$$282 \quad (3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \exists \tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)} > 0, \quad \forall t \in (0, \tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}), \quad \exists C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma, t)}^*, \quad \forall \mathbf{j}_{ext} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega), \\ & \mathbf{e} \in \mathbf{PH}^t(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega) \text{ and } \|\mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{PH}^t(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)} \leq C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma, t)}^* \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

283 Above, $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}$ plays the role of a *regularity exponent*, while $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma, s)}^*$ can be seen as
 284 a *stability constant*.

285 Let Θ be a set of coefficients $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$ whose elements are all piecewise smooth on
 286 the same partition, and assume that $\underline{\tau} = \inf_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma) \in \Theta} \tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)} > 0$, where $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}$ is
 287 defined in (3.6), and let \mathbf{j}_{ext} , the data, be given. Regrouping all the previous re-
 288 sults, one concludes first that for all $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma) \in \Theta$, the solution \mathbf{e} to (2.9)-(2.10) is in
 289 $\bigcap_{s \in [0, \underline{\tau})} \mathbf{PH}^s(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)$; and second that one has the error estimates

$$290 \quad (3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \forall s \in (0, \underline{\tau}), \\ & \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{e}_h\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)} \leq C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^\sharp C_{(s, s)}^{interp} C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma, s)}^* h^s \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

291 In the error estimates (3.7), only $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^\sharp$ and $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma, s)}^*$ depend on the coefficients
 292 $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$. Also, for a given $\varepsilon \in (0, \underline{\tau})$, since $s \mapsto C_{(s, s)}^{interp}$ is continuous for $s > 0$, one
 293 may replace $C_{(s, s)}^{interp}$ by the s -independent $\max_{s \in [\varepsilon, \underline{\tau})} C_{(s, s)}^{interp}$, for all $s \in [\varepsilon, \underline{\tau})$.

294
 295 Our purpose is now to estimate more precisely the constants that appear in (3.3),
 296 (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7). The dependency of $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^\sharp$ on $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$ is addressed in sec-
 297 tion 4. For $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}$ and $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma, s)}^*$, this dependency can be studied via the *global*
 298 *approach*, which relies on a decomposition of the electric field, and of its curl, into
 299 a regular part, and a gradient part. To obtain this splitting, we adapt [4, Chapter
 300 6] to the case of complex-valued coefficients, and in the process we generalize the
 301 results of [15] to the case of a non-topologically trivial domain: this is the subject
 302 of section 5. In section 6, one studies the regularity of the gradient part, where the
 303 scalar potential is governed by a second order elliptic PDEs complemented either with
 304 Dirichlet boundary conditions (for the electric field) or with Neumann boundary con-
 305 ditions (for its curl). The global approach, in the spirit of [27, 6], uses a perturbation
 306 argument, where the regularity of the gradient part, ie. of its scalar potential, is
 307 derived in comparison to the regularity of the solution to the Laplace equation with
 308 the same boundary condition. Indeed, in a domain Ω and for $L^2(\Omega)$ volume data, it
 309 is known from [26] that the gradient of the solution to the Laplace equation belongs
 310 to $\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega)$. Using interpolation theory, one can find a regularity exponent $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}$ in
 311 (3.6) for our problem. Up to our knowledge, this analysis has only been carried out
 312 for PDEs with real-valued coefficients. Here, we check in particular that the analysis
 313 proposed in [6] can be extended to the case of complex-valued coefficients. The main
 314 results are: the derivation of a regularity exponent $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}$ that depends polynomially
 315 on the coefficients, and the computation of an upper bound for the stability constant
 316 $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma, s)}^*$ when s spans $(0, \tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)})$. Finally, in section 7 we illustrate the theory on
 317 two examples for which the singular behavior can be determined explicitly.

318 *Remark 3.2.* For piecewise constant coefficients, there exists an alternative, which
 319 focuses on the singular behavior of the gradient part of the solution by finding directly
 320 the “best” regularity exponent $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{opt}$ attached to this part of the solution. We call
 321 it the *local approach*, see Appendix B. On the other hand, providing an upper bound
 322 with the local approach for $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma, s)}^*$ when s spans $(0, \tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{opt})$, is an open question.

323 **4. Estimating the constant** $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^\sharp$. Let $\mathbf{V} := \mathbf{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)$ be endowed with
 324 $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{V}} := (\|\mathbf{v}\|_{0, \Omega}^2 + \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{v}\|_{0, \Omega}^2)^{1/2}$, and $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ be the sesquilinear form on \mathbf{V} defined
 325 by:

$$326 \quad (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \mapsto (\mu^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{v} | \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{w})_{0, \Omega} - \omega^2 (\varepsilon_\sigma \mathbf{v} | \mathbf{w})_{0, \Omega}.$$

327 Then, let $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{cont}$ be the best continuity constant, or continuity modulus, of $a(\cdot, \cdot)$:

$$328 \quad C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{cont} = \sup_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{V} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|a(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})|}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{V}} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbf{V}}},$$

329 resp. $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{coer}$ be the best coercivity constant of $a(\cdot, \cdot)$:

$$330 \quad C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{coer} = \inf_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|a(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v})|}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{V}}^2}.$$

331

332 **PROPOSITION 4.1.** *Let the coefficients ε , μ and σ be as in section 2.1. Then the*
 333 *sesquilinear form $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ is continuous, with $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{cont} \leq \max(\omega(\omega^2 \varepsilon_{max}^2 + \sigma_{max}^2)^{1/2}, \mu^{-1})$,*
 334 *and it is coercive with $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{coer} \geq \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{min} \min(\omega \varepsilon_{min} \varepsilon_{max}^{-1}, \mu^{-1}(\omega^2 \varepsilon_{max}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{min}^2)^{-1/2})$.*

335 *Proof.* (We omit the subscript $0, \Omega$ for the $L^2(\Omega)$ -scalar product and norm). Re-
 336 garding continuity, given $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{V}$, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} 337 \quad |a(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})| &\leq \omega^2 \|\varepsilon_\sigma\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{v}\| \|\mathbf{w}\| + \mu^{-1} \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{v}\| \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{w}\| \\ 338 \quad &\leq \max(\omega^2 \|\varepsilon_\sigma\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \mu^{-1}) (\|\mathbf{v}\| \|\mathbf{w}\| + \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{v}\| \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{w}\|) \\ 339 \quad &\leq \max(\omega^2 \|\varepsilon_\sigma\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \mu^{-1}) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{V}} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbf{V}} \\ 340 \quad &\leq \max(\omega(\omega^2 \varepsilon_{max}^2 + \sigma_{max}^2)^{1/2}, \mu^{-1}) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{V}} \|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathbf{V}} \end{aligned}$$

341 because $\|\varepsilon_\sigma\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq (\varepsilon_{max}^2 + \omega^{-2} \sigma_{max}^2)^{1/2}$.

342 Regarding coercivity, given $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}$, if we let $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{v}$, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} 343 \quad |a(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v})|^2 &= (-\omega^2 (\varepsilon \mathbf{v} | \mathbf{v}) + \mu^{-1} \|\mathbf{c}\|^2)^2 + \omega^2 (\sigma \mathbf{v} | \mathbf{v})^2 \\ 344 \quad &= \omega^4 (\varepsilon \mathbf{v} | \mathbf{v})^2 + \mu^{-2} \|\mathbf{c}\|^4 - 2\omega^2 \mu^{-1} (\varepsilon \mathbf{v} | \mathbf{v}) \|\mathbf{c}\|^2 + \omega^2 (\sigma \mathbf{v} | \mathbf{v})^2 \\ 345 \quad &\geq (\omega^4 - \omega^2 \eta) (\varepsilon \mathbf{v} | \mathbf{v})^2 + \mu^{-2} (1 - \omega^2 \eta^{-1}) \|\mathbf{c}\|^4 + \omega^2 (\sigma \mathbf{v} | \mathbf{v})^2, \end{aligned}$$

346 for all $\eta > 0$ (Young's inequality). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} 347 \quad |a(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v})|^2 &\geq (\omega^4 - \omega^2 \eta) (\varepsilon \mathbf{v} | \mathbf{v})^2 + \mu^{-2} (1 - \omega^2 \eta^{-1}) \|\mathbf{c}\|^4 + \omega^2 \sigma_{min}^2 \|\mathbf{v}\|^4 \\ 348 \quad &\geq \omega^2 \varepsilon_{min}^2 (\omega^2 + \sigma_{min}^2 \varepsilon_{max}^{-2} - \eta) \|\mathbf{v}\|^4 + \mu^{-2} (1 - \omega^2 \eta^{-1}) \|\mathbf{c}\|^4. \end{aligned}$$

349 As a consequence, choosing $\eta \in (\omega^2, \omega^2 + \sigma_{min}^2 \varepsilon_{max}^{-2})$, one derives coercivity. For
 350 instance, let $\eta = \omega^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{min}^2 \varepsilon_{max}^{-2}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 351 \quad |a(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v})|^2 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \omega^2 \sigma_{min}^2 \frac{\varepsilon_{min}^2}{\varepsilon_{max}^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|^4 + \frac{\sigma_{min}^2}{2\mu^2 (\omega^2 \varepsilon_{max}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{min}^2)} \|\mathbf{c}\|^4 \\ 352 \quad &\geq \frac{\sigma_{min}^2}{2} \min \left(\omega^2 \frac{\varepsilon_{min}^2}{\varepsilon_{max}^2}, \frac{1}{\mu^2 (\omega^2 \varepsilon_{max}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{min}^2)} \right) (\|\mathbf{v}\|^4 + \|\mathbf{c}\|^4) \\ 353 \quad &\geq \frac{\sigma_{min}^2}{4} \min \left(\omega^2 \frac{\varepsilon_{min}^2}{\varepsilon_{max}^2}, \frac{1}{\mu^2 (\omega^2 \varepsilon_{max}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{min}^2)} \right) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{V}}^4. \end{aligned}$$

354 Hence, $|a(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v})| \geq \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{min} \min(\omega \varepsilon_{min} \varepsilon_{max}^{-1}, \mu^{-1} (\omega^2 \varepsilon_{max}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{min}^2)^{-1/2}) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{V}}^2$. \square

355 COROLLARY 4.2. *Let the coefficients ε , μ and σ be as in section 2.1. Then the*
 356 *error estimate (3.3) holds with*

$$357 \quad C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^\sharp \leq \frac{2 \max(\omega(\omega^2 \varepsilon_{max}^2 + \sigma_{max}^2)^{1/2}, \mu^{-1})}{\sigma_{min} \min(\omega \varepsilon_{min} \varepsilon_{max}^{-1}, \mu^{-1}(\omega^2 \varepsilon_{max}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{min}^2)^{-1/2})}.$$

358 *Proof.* This is an obvious consequence of the fact that one can choose

$$359 \quad C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^\sharp = \frac{C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{cont}}{C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{coer}}$$

360 in the error estimate (3.3). □

361 **5. Splitting into a regular part and a gradient part.** Below, we recall
 362 some results of [4], and we adapt them to the case of complex-valued coefficients if
 363 necessary. Let ξ be a coefficient defined on Ω , we assume in the current section that
 364 ξ fulfills:

$$365 \quad (5.1) \quad \begin{cases} \xi \text{ is a complex-valued measurable scalar field on } \Omega, \xi, \xi^{-1} \in L^\infty(\Omega), \\ \exists \xi_- > 0, \theta^* \in [0, 2\pi), \Re(\exp(-i\theta^*)\xi) \geq \xi_- \text{ a.e. in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

366

367 LEMMA 5.1. *Let the coefficients ε and σ be as in section 2.1. Then $\xi = \varepsilon_\sigma$ fulfills*
 368 *(5.1), where θ^* can be any element of $[0, \pi/2]$.*

369 *Remark 5.2.* In other words, $\xi = \varepsilon_\sigma$ belongs to a subclass of those coefficients that
 370 are defined by (5.1). In the case where $\sigma \geq 0$ (in particular, in the non-conducting
 371 case, that is when it holds that $\sigma = 0$ on some region of Ω), the above result still holds
 372 for all $\theta^* \in [0, \pi/2)$. On the other hand, a real-valued, sign-changing coefficient ξ *does*
 373 *not fulfill* (5.1). We refer to [8, 7, 18, 10] for those more “exotic” configurations of
 374 Maxwell’s equations, in which ε and/or μ are real-valued and exhibit a sign-change.

375 *Proof.* One has $\varepsilon_\sigma, \varepsilon_\sigma^{-1} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. The result follows from $\Re(\exp(-i\theta^*)\varepsilon_\sigma) \geq$
 376 $\cos \theta^* \varepsilon_{min} + \sin \theta^* \sigma_{min}/\omega > 0$ a.e. in Ω . □

377 Define

$$378 \quad \mathbf{X}_{Dir}(\Omega, \xi) := \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega) : \xi \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega)\},$$

$$379 \quad \mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega, \xi) := \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega) : \xi \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_0(\text{div}; \Omega)\}.$$

380 The function spaces $\mathbf{X}_{Dir}(\Omega, \xi)$ and $\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega, \xi)$ are endowed with the graph norm
 381 $\mathbf{v} \mapsto (\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega)}^2 + \|\xi \mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega)}^2)^{1/2}$. In the particular case where ξ is equal to 1, one
 382 writes $\mathbf{X}_B(\Omega)$ instead of $\mathbf{X}_B(\Omega, 1)$, for $B \in \{Dir, Neu\}$. We also define the subspaces
 383 of *regular* fields, resp. the *null* subspaces:

$$384 \quad \mathbf{H}_B(\Omega) := \mathbf{X}_B(\Omega) \cap \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega), \quad B \in \{Dir, Neu\},$$

$$385 \quad \mathbf{Z}_B(\Omega) := \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{X}_B(\Omega) : \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{v} = 0, \text{div} \mathbf{v} = 0 \text{ in } \Omega\}, \quad B \in \{Dir, Neu\}.$$

386 In our case, both ε_σ and μ fulfill (5.1) and moreover, since $\mathbf{j}_{ext} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega)$, we
 387 note that the solution \mathbf{e} to (2.9) is such that $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbf{X}_{Dir}(\Omega, \varepsilon_\sigma)$, and $\mu^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e} \in$
 388 $\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega, \mu)$.

389 **5.1. Geometric framework.** The domain Ω can be topologically non-trivial,
390 or with a non-connected boundary. Regarding the first item, we assume that:
391 either **(Top)** $_{I=0}$ 'given any curl-free vector field $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{C}^1(\Omega)$, there exists $p \in C^0(\Omega)$
392 such that $\mathbf{v} = \nabla p$ in Ω ';
393 or **(Top)** $_{I>0}$ 'there exist I non-intersecting manifolds, $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_I$, with bound-
394 aries $\partial\Sigma_i \subset \partial\Omega$, such that, if we let $\dot{\Omega} = \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^I \Sigma_i$, given any curl-free vector field
395 \mathbf{v} , there exists $\dot{p} \in C^0(\dot{\Omega})$ such that $\mathbf{v} = \nabla \dot{p}$ in $\dot{\Omega}$ '.
396 When $I = 0$, $\dot{\Omega} = \Omega$. For short, we write **(Top)** $_I$ to cover both instances. One can
397 build cuts that are piecewise plane, see [23, Chapter 6]. Finally, we assume that $\dot{\Omega}$ is a
398 connected set. For the polyhedral model problem, we assume that **(Top)** $_I$ is fulfilled.
399 The domain Ω is said to be topologically trivial when $I = 0$. When $I > 0$, the set $\dot{\Omega}$
400 has pseudo-Lipschitz boundary in the sense of [3].

401
402 The a priori regularity of elements of $\mathbf{X}_{Dir}(\Omega)$ and $\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega)$ is described in [3,
403 Remark 2.16 and Proposition 3.7]. Below, \subset refers to an algebraical and topological
404 embedding.

405 **PROPOSITION 5.3.** *Let Ω be a Lipschitz polyhedron: there exists $\sigma_{Dir} \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ such*
406 *that it holds that $\mathbf{X}_{Dir}(\Omega) \subset \mathbf{H}^{\sigma_{Dir}}(\Omega)$. Assume in addition that **(Top)** $_I$ is fulfilled:*
407 *there exists $\sigma_{Neu} \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ such that it holds that $\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega) \subset \mathbf{H}^{\sigma_{Neu}}(\Omega)$.*
408 *Let Ω be a domain: the embeddings hold with $\sigma_{Dir} = \sigma_{Neu} = \frac{1}{2}$.*

409 **COROLLARY 5.4.** *With the same assumptions as in Proposition 5.3, it holds that*
410 *$\mathbf{Z}_{Dir}(\Omega) \subset \mathbf{H}^{\sigma_{Dir}}(\Omega)$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{Neu}(\Omega) \subset \mathbf{H}^{\sigma_{Neu}}(\Omega)$.*

411 Finally, one can prove that the null spaces $\mathbf{Z}_{Dir}(\Omega)$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{Neu}(\Omega)$ are finite dimen-
412 sional vector spaces.

413 **5.2. Splittings of fields.** We provide now splittings into a regular part, and
414 a gradient part, of elements of $\mathbf{X}_{Dir}(\Omega, \xi)$ ("electric case"), resp. of elements of
415 $\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega, \xi)$ ("magnetic case"), called *regular/gradient splittings*. The proofs can be
416 found in §6.1.6 and §6.2.6 of [4]. We provide some comments on these splittings below.

417 **THEOREM 5.5.** *Let Ω be a domain such that **(Top)** $_I$ is fulfilled, and assume that ξ*
418 *fulfills (5.1). Then, there exists a continuous splitting operator acting from $\mathbf{X}_{Dir}(\Omega, \xi)$*
419 *to $\mathbf{H}_{Dir}(\Omega) \times \mathbf{Z}_{Dir}(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega)$.*
420 *More precisely, given $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{X}_{Dir}(\Omega, \xi)$,*

$$421 \quad (5.2) \quad \exists(\mathbf{v}_{reg}, \mathbf{z}, p_0) \in \mathbf{H}_{Dir}(\Omega) \times \mathbf{Z}_{Dir}(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega), \quad \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_{reg} + \mathbf{z} + \nabla p_0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

422 *One has*

$$423 \quad (5.3) \quad \|\mathbf{v}_{reg}\|_{1,\Omega} + \|\mathbf{v}_{reg}\|_{\mathbf{X}_{Dir}(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{z}\|_{\sigma_{Dir},\Omega} + \|\mathbf{v}_{reg} + \mathbf{z}\|_{1/2,\Omega} \leq C_{\mathbf{X}}^{Dir} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl};\Omega)}.$$

424 *The scalar field p_0 is governed by the variational formulation:*

$$425 \quad (5.4) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } p_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega) \text{ such that} \\ (\xi \nabla p_0 | \nabla \psi)_{0,\Omega} = -(\xi \mathbf{z} | \nabla \psi)_{0,\Omega} - (\xi \mathbf{v}_{reg} | \nabla \psi)_{0,\Omega} \\ \quad - (\text{div } \xi \mathbf{v} | \psi)_{0,\Omega}, \quad \forall \psi \in H_0^1(\Omega). \end{cases}$$

426 **THEOREM 5.6.** *Let Ω be a domain such that **(Top)** $_I$ is fulfilled, and assume*
427 *that ξ fulfills (5.1). Then, there exists a continuous splitting operator acting from*
428 *$\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega, \xi)$ to $\mathbf{H}_{zmv}^1(\Omega) \times \mathbf{Z}_{Neu}(\Omega) \times H_{zmv}^1(\Omega)$.*
429 *More precisely, given $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega, \xi)$,*

$$430 \quad (5.5) \quad \exists(\mathbf{w}_{reg}, \mathbf{z}, q_0) \in \mathbf{H}_{zmv}^1(\Omega) \times \mathbf{Z}_{Neu}(\Omega) \times H_{zmv}^1(\Omega), \quad \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{w}_{reg} + \mathbf{z} + \nabla q_0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

431 *One has*

$$432 \quad (5.6) \quad \|\mathbf{w}_{reg}\|_{1,\Omega} + \|\mathbf{w}_{reg}\|_{\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{z}\|_{\sigma_{Neu},\Omega} + \|\mathbf{w}_{reg} + \mathbf{z}\|_{1/2,\Omega} \leq C_{\mathbf{X}}^{Neu} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl};\Omega)}.$$

433 *The scalar field q_0 is governed by the variational formulation:*

$$434 \quad (5.7) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } q_0 \in H_{zmv}^1(\Omega) \text{ such that} \\ (\xi \nabla q_0 | \nabla \psi)_{0,\Omega} = -(\xi \mathbf{z} | \nabla \psi)_{0,\Omega} - (\xi \mathbf{w}_{reg} | \nabla \psi)_{0,\Omega} \\ -(\operatorname{div} \xi \mathbf{v} | \psi)_{0,\Omega}, \quad \forall \psi \in H_{zmv}^1(\Omega). \end{cases}$$

435 In the splitting (5.2) of $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{X}_{Dir}(\Omega, \xi)$, all three terms $\mathbf{v}_{reg}, \mathbf{z}, \nabla p_0$ have vanishing
436 tangential components on the boundary $\partial\Omega$, whereas in the splitting (5.5) of $\mathbf{v} \in$
437 $\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega, \xi)$, \mathbf{w}_{reg} does not verify a homogeneous boundary condition in general. Since
438 ξ fulfills (5.1), both variational formulations (5.4) and (5.7) are well-posed. Finally,
439 we note that regarding the a priori regularity in (5.2), one has $\mathbf{v}_{reg} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)$ and $\mathbf{z} \in$
440 $\mathbf{H}^{\sigma_{Dir}}(\Omega)$. Likewise, regarding the a priori regularity in (5.5), one has $\mathbf{w}_{reg} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega)$
441 and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{H}^{\sigma_{Neu}}(\Omega)$.

442 **5.3. Comments.** One may easily generalize the splitting theory to the case
443 where ξ is a complex-valued, measurable, *tensor* field. As a matter of fact, it is
444 straightforward to check that if ξ fulfills:

$$445 \quad \begin{cases} \xi \text{ is a complex-valued measurable tensor field on } \Omega, \quad \xi, \xi^{-1} \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\Omega), \\ \exists \xi_- > 0, \theta^* \in [0, 2\pi), \quad \forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^3, \quad \Re(\exp(-i\theta^*) \xi \mathbf{z} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{z}}) \geq \xi_- |\mathbf{z}|^2 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

446 then the conclusions of Theorems 5.5 and 5.6 still apply. Obviously, (5.4) and (5.7)
447 are well-posed.

448 In the special case where ξ is a *normal tensor* field ($\xi^* \xi = \xi \xi^*$ a.e. in Ω), or equiv-
449 alently there exists a unitary tensor field \mathbb{U} and a diagonal tensor field \mathbb{D} such that
450 $\xi = \mathbb{U}^{-1} \mathbb{D} \mathbb{U}$ a.e. in Ω , one can reformulate the second line of the above condition as

$$451 \quad (5.8) \quad \exists \xi_- > 0, \theta^* \in [0, 2\pi), \quad \min_{k=1,2,3} \Re(\exp(-i\theta^*) \mathbb{D}_{kk}) \geq \xi_- \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

452 **6. The global approach for finding a regularity exponent $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}$ and a**
453 **stability constant $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma, s)}^*$.** To estimate the regularity exponent, we adapt some
454 results of [6] to the case of complex-valued coefficients. Let ξ be a coefficient defined
455 on Ω , we assume in the current section that ξ fulfills (5.1). This assumption prescribes
456 that

$$457 \quad (6.1) \quad \begin{aligned} &\xi \in \{z = \rho \exp(i\theta), \rho \in [\xi_-, \xi_{max}], \theta \in [\theta_{min}, \theta_{max}]\} \text{ a.e. in } \Omega, \text{ where} \\ &\xi_{max} := \|\xi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \text{ and } 0 \leq \theta_{max} - \theta_{min} \leq 2 \arccos\left(\frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

458 In other words, since $\arccos(\xi_-/\xi_{max}) < \pi/2$ the coefficient ξ takes its values in some
459 open, *half plane* in \mathbb{C} . If the coefficients ε and σ are as in section 2.1, then $\xi = \varepsilon_\sigma$
460 takes its values in some open, *quarter plane* in \mathbb{C} .

461

462 We recall that $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbf{X}_{Dir}(\Omega, \varepsilon_\sigma)$ and $\mu^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e} \in \mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega, \mu)$. Hence, according
463 to Theorems 5.5 and 5.6, we may write:

$$464 \quad (6.2) \quad \mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_{reg} + \mathbf{z}_e + \nabla p_0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \mathbf{e}_{reg} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega), \quad \mathbf{z}_e \in \mathbf{H}^{\sigma_{Dir}}(\Omega);$$

$$465 \quad (6.3) \quad \mu^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e} = \mathbf{c}_{reg} + \mathbf{z}_c + \nabla q_0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \mathbf{c}_{reg} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega), \quad \mathbf{z}_c \in \mathbf{H}^{\sigma_{Neu}}(\Omega).$$

466 In addition, it holds that

$$467 \quad \|\mathbf{e}_{reg}\|_{1,\Omega} + \|\mathbf{e}_{reg}\|_{\mathbf{X}_{Dir}(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{z}_e\|_{\sigma_{Dir},\Omega} + \|\mathbf{e}_{reg} + \mathbf{z}_e\|_{1/2,\Omega} \leq C_{\mathbf{X}}^{Dir} \|\mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl};\Omega)},$$

$$468 \quad \|\mathbf{c}_{reg}\|_{1,\Omega} + \|\mathbf{c}_{reg}\|_{\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{z}_c\|_{\sigma_{Neu},\Omega} + \|\mathbf{c}_{reg} + \mathbf{z}_c\|_{1/2,\Omega} \leq C_{\mathbf{X}}^{Neu} \|\mu^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl};\Omega)}.$$

469 It now remains to evaluate the regularity and norm of the gradient parts ∇p_0 and
 470 ∇q_0 . Note that p_0 is governed by the second-order scalar PDE (5.4) with *Dirichlet*
 471 *boundary condition*, while q_0 is governed by the second-order scalar PDE (5.7) with
 472 *Neumann boundary condition*. We will use this vocabulary in the following to address
 473 both cases.

474 **6.1. Preliminary results.** To start with, given $\mathcal{O} \subset \Omega$ a non-empty connected
 475 open subset of \mathbb{R}^3 with Lipschitz boundary, let $\mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{O})$ be equal to $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ in the
 476 Dirichlet case, resp. $L^2_{zmv}(\mathcal{O})$ in the Neumann case, and $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{O})$ be equal to $H^1_0(\mathcal{O})$
 477 in the Dirichlet case, resp. $H^1_{zmv}(\mathcal{O})$ in the Neumann case. We equip $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{O})$ with the
 478 norm $\|v\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{O})} := \|\nabla v\|_{0,\mathcal{O}}$.

479 Then, for $s \in (0, 1)$, we introduce $\mathcal{H}^s(\mathcal{O})$, the Sobolev space obtained by the real
 480 interpolation method between $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{O})$ and $\mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{O})$: if needed, we distinguish the two
 481 cases by writing $\mathcal{H}^s_{Dir}(\mathcal{O})$, resp. $\mathcal{H}^s_{Neu}(\mathcal{O})$. In particular, by definition (cf. §3.1), it
 482 holds that $\mathcal{H}^s_{Dir}(\mathcal{O}) = \tilde{H}^s(\mathcal{O})$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$, and we recall that $H^s(\mathcal{O}) = \tilde{H}^s(\mathcal{O})$
 483 for all $s \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

484 We denote by $\mathcal{H}^{-s}(\mathcal{O})$ the dual space of $\mathcal{H}^s(\mathcal{O})$, for $s \in [0, 1]$. Finally, for $s \in [0, 1]$,
 485 we define $\mathcal{H}^{1+s}(\mathcal{O}) := \{v \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{O}) \text{ s.t. } \nabla v \in \mathbf{H}^s(\mathcal{O})\}$, equipped with the norm
 486 $\|v\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1+s}(\mathcal{O})} := \|\nabla v\|_{s,\mathcal{O}}$.

487 **LEMMA 6.1.** *Given $s \in [0, 1]$, there exists $C_{(s)}^P > 0$ such that*

$$488 \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{H}^{1+s}(\mathcal{O}), \quad \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1+s}(\mathcal{O})} \leq \|v\|_{1+s,\mathcal{O}} \leq C_{(s)}^P \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1+s}(\mathcal{O})}.$$

489 *Proof.* The result is obvious for $s \in \{0, 1\}$, according to the Poincaré inequality.
 490 We let now $s \in (0, 1)$.

491 For the left inequality, notice that

$$492 \quad \forall v \in H^1(\mathcal{O}), \quad \|\nabla v\|_{0,\Omega} \leq \|v\|_{1,\Omega}; \quad \forall v \in H^2(\mathcal{O}), \quad \|\nabla v\|_{1,\Omega} \leq \|v\|_{2,\Omega}.$$

493 As a consequence, the left inequality follows. This is the so-called *exact sequence*
 494 *property*. Following Appendix A, if we let $v \in \mathcal{H}^{1+s}(\mathcal{O})$:

$$495 \quad \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1+s}(\mathcal{O})} := \|\nabla v\|_{s,\mathcal{O}}$$

$$496 \quad = \|t^{-s} \inf_{\substack{\nabla v = \mathbf{v}_0 + \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_0 \in \mathbf{L}^2(\mathcal{O}), \mathbf{v}_1 \in \mathbf{H}^1(\mathcal{O})}} (\|\mathbf{v}_0\|_{0,\mathcal{O}}^2 + t^2 \|\mathbf{v}_1\|_{1,\mathcal{O}}^2)^{1/2} \|_{L^2(0,\infty; \frac{dt}{t})}$$

$$497 \quad \leq \|t^{-s} \inf_{\substack{v = v_0 + v_1 \\ v_0 \in H^1(\mathcal{O}), v_1 \in H^2(\mathcal{O})}} (\|\nabla v_0\|_{0,\mathcal{O}}^2 + t^2 \|\nabla v_1\|_{1,\mathcal{O}}^2)^{1/2} \|_{L^2(0,\infty; \frac{dt}{t})}$$

$$498 \quad (\text{cf. above}) \leq \|t^{-s} \inf_{\substack{v = v_0 + v_1 \\ v_0 \in H^1(\mathcal{O}), v_1 \in H^2(\mathcal{O})}} (\|v_0\|_{1,\mathcal{O}}^2 + t^2 \|v_1\|_{2,\mathcal{O}}^2)^{1/2} \|_{L^2(0,\infty; \frac{dt}{t})}$$

$$499 \quad =: \|v\|_{1+s,\mathcal{O}}.$$

500 For the right inequality, let us introduce the Poincaré constant:

$$501 \quad \mathcal{C} := \sup_{v \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{O}) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|v\|_{0,\mathcal{O}}}{\|\nabla v\|_{0,\mathcal{O}}}.$$

502 Using the equivalence of norms, the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{\underline{H}^{1+s}(\mathcal{O})}$, the Poincaré inequality,
 503 and finally the equivalence of norms again, we find:

$$\begin{aligned}
 504 \quad \|v\|_{1+s,\mathcal{O}} &\leq M_{(1+s)} \|v\|_{\underline{H}^{1+s}(\mathcal{O})} := M_{(1+s)} \left(\|v\|_{1,\mathcal{O}}^2 + |\nabla v|_{\underline{H}^s(\mathcal{O})}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
 505 &\leq M_{(1+s)} \left((1 + \mathcal{C}^2) \|\nabla v\|_{0,\mathcal{O}}^2 + |\nabla v|_{\underline{H}^s(\mathcal{O})}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
 506 &\leq M_{(1+s)} (1 + \mathcal{C}^2)^{1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{\underline{H}^s(\mathcal{O})} \\
 507 &\leq M_{(1+s)} (1 + \mathcal{C}^2)^{1/2} m_{(s)}^{-1} \|\nabla v\|_{s,\mathcal{O}} =: M_{(1+s)} (1 + \mathcal{C}^2)^{1/2} m_{(s)}^{-1} \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1+s}(\mathcal{O})}.
 \end{aligned}$$

508 Hence, one may choose $C_{(s)}^P = M_{(1+s)} (1 + \mathcal{C}^2)^{1/2} m_{(s)}^{-1}$. □

509 If we let $\underline{s} \in [0, 1]$, we want to find the a priori regularity of the solution to

$$510 \quad (6.4) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } u \in \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega) \text{ such that} \\ (\xi \nabla u | \nabla v)_{0,\Omega} = \langle f, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)}, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega), \end{cases}$$

511 and f is some data in $\mathcal{H}^{-\underline{s}}(\Omega)$.

512 If ξ is constant on Ω , that is if one considers the Laplace operator with Dirichlet
 513 boundary condition, or with Neumann boundary condition, then one may apply the
 514 classical results of [26] or [32] (see [6, p. 504]). See also Proposition 6.7 below. In the
 515 statement of the next Theorem, the constant $c^{Lap}(s)$ depends on Ω . For the sake of
 516 conciseness, we omit this dependence.

517 **THEOREM 6.2.** *Let $\xi \neq 0$ be constant on Ω . Then, for all $s \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, there exists*
 518 *$c(s) := c^{Lap}(s) > 0$ such that for all $f \in \mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)$, the solution $u \in \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)$ to (6.4)*
 519 *belongs to $\mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega)$, and*

$$520 \quad \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{c(s)}{\xi_{max}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)}.$$

521 **DEFINITION 6.3.** *Let the coefficient ξ fulfill (5.1). We say that ξ fulfills the coef-*
 522 *efficient assumption if there exists a partition \mathcal{P} of Ω such that $\xi \in PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$.*

523 If ξ fulfills the coefficient assumption on a partition, then ξ^{-1} fulfills the coefficient
 524 assumption on the same partition.

525

526 From now on in the current section, we consider the case where $\xi \neq 0$ is a scalar,
 527 non-constant, *complex-valued* coefficient that fulfills the coefficient assumption on a
 528 partition $\mathcal{P} := \{\Omega_j\}_{j=1,\dots,J}$. In [6], the authors study the case of a symmetric-tensor,
 529 real-valued coefficient ξ . There are similarities between the two cases, and also some
 530 differences, that are highlighted below. We refer to §6.5 for a generalization to the
 531 case of a normal-tensor, complex-valued coefficient ξ . Let

$$532 \quad \Lambda_\xi := \frac{|\xi|_{PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}}{\xi_{max}}.$$

533 By definition, it holds that $\|\xi\|_{PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} = \xi_{max}(1 + \Lambda_\xi)$. For a piecewise constant
 534 coefficient ξ , one has $\Lambda_\xi = 0$. Otherwise, $\Lambda_\xi > 0$.

535

536 For $s \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, choosing $\mathcal{O} \in \{\Omega_j, 1 \leq j \leq J\}$, we denote by D_j^s the norm of the

537 natural embedding of $\mathbf{H}^s(\Omega_j)$ into $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}^s(\Omega_j)$:

$$538 \quad (6.5) \quad D_j^s := \sup_{\mathbf{v}_j \in \mathbf{H}^s(\Omega_j) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_j\|_{\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}^s(\Omega_j)}}{\|\mathbf{v}_j\|_{s, \Omega_j}}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq J;$$

$$D_s := \max(1, \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} D_j^s) \geq 1.$$

539

540 *Remark 6.4.* It holds that $\lim_{s \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}} D_j^s = +\infty$, because constant, non-vanishing
541 fields defined on Ω_j belong to $\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_j)$, but not to $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_j)$.

542 Also, we denote the Poincaré constants by:

$$543 \quad (6.6) \quad C_j := \sup_{\mathbf{v}_j \in \mathbf{H}_0^1(\Omega_j) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_j\|_{0, \Omega_j}}{\|\nabla \mathbf{v}_j\|_{0, \Omega_j}}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq J; \quad C := \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} C_j > 0.$$

544 We note that, obviously, the constants Λ_ξ , $(D_j^s)_j$, D_s , $(C_j)_j$ and C all depend on Ω ,
545 and on the partition \mathcal{P} . These dependences are omitted.

546 Then, we define the multiplicative operator $m_\xi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega), \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega))$ by: $m_\xi \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) =$
547 $\xi(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})$, for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)$, a.e. $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$. One may now adapt the proof of Proposition
548 2.1 of [6] to the complex-valued case, to find...

549 **PROPOSITION 6.5.** *Let ξ fulfill the coefficient assumption. Then, for all $s \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$,*
550 *it holds that $m_\xi \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H}^s(\Omega), \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}^s(\Omega))$ and in addition,*

$$551 \quad (6.7) \quad \|m_\xi\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H}^s(\Omega), \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}^s(\Omega))} \leq \xi_{\max} N_\xi^s, \quad \text{where } N_\xi^s := D_s(2(1 + C^2 \Lambda_\xi^2))^{s/2}.$$

552 *Furthermore, for all $r \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, it holds that*

$$553 \quad (6.8) \quad \|m_\xi\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H}^s(\Omega), \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}^s(\Omega))} \leq \xi_{\max} (N_\xi^r)^{s/r}, \quad \forall s \in [0, r].$$

554 We then recall the technical Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 of [6], which are independent of the
555 coefficient ξ . Introduce the operator $D \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega), \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Omega))$ defined by

$$556 \quad \langle D\mathbf{v}, q \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)} = (\mathbf{v} | \nabla q)_{0, \Omega}, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega), \quad \forall q \in \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega).$$

557

558 **PROPOSITION 6.6.** *For all $s \in [0, 1]$, one has*

$$559 \quad (6.9) \quad D \in \mathcal{L}(\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}^s(\Omega), \mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)) \quad \text{and} \quad \|D\|_{\mathcal{L}(\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}^s(\Omega), \mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega))} \leq 1.$$

560 Introduce the operator $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Omega), \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega))$ defined by

$$561 \quad (\nabla(Lv) | \nabla q)_{0, \Omega} = \langle v, q \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)}, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Omega), \quad \forall q \in \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega).$$

562 One may rephrase Theorem 6.2 (with $\xi = 1$) as follows.

563 **PROPOSITION 6.7.** *For all $r \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, one has $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{r-1}(\Omega), \mathcal{H}^{r+1}(\Omega))$ and*
564 *there exists $K_r \geq 1$ such that it holds that:*

$$565 \quad (6.10) \quad \|L\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{r-1}(\Omega), \mathcal{H}^{r+1}(\Omega))} \leq K_r;$$

$$566 \quad (6.11) \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, r], \quad \|L\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega), \mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega))} \leq (K_r)^{s/r}.$$

567 Obviously, K_r depends on Ω . This dependence is omitted.

568 **6.2. Regularity of scalar fields.** We transpose Theorem 3.1 of [6] to the
569 complex-valued case. Since the second half of the proof (choice of the parameter
570 k , here complex-valued; explicit dependence of the regularity exponent τ and stabil-
571 ity constant c on \mathcal{P} , ξ ...) is quite different in this case, we provide it for the sake of
572 completeness.

573 **THEOREM 6.8.** *Let ξ be a scalar, non-constant, complex-valued coefficient that*
574 *fulfills the coefficient assumption. Then, there exists a regularity exponent $\tau_\xi :=$*
575 *$\tau(\mathcal{P}, \xi_-/\xi_{max}, \Lambda_\xi) \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that, for all $s \in [0, \tau_\xi)$, there exists a constant*
576 *$c(s, \xi) := c(\mathcal{P}, s, \xi_-/\xi_{max}, \Lambda_\xi)$ such that for all $f \in \mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)$, the solution $u \in \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)$*
577 *to (6.4) belongs to $\mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega)$, and*

$$578 \quad \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{c(s, \xi)}{\xi_{max}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)}.$$

579 *Remark 6.9.* By introducing the scaling factor $(\xi_{max})^{-1}$, one is able to refine the
580 dependence of the constant c on the coefficient, namely that c depends only on the
581 amplitude ξ_-/ξ_{max} and the local, scaled, variations Λ_ξ . And because the coefficient
582 ξ is non-constant, condition (5.1) yields $\xi_-/\xi_{max} \in (0, 1)$.

583 *Proof.* Let $k \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Using the operator D , we note that given $f^* \in \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Omega)$
584 and denoting by u^* the solution to (6.4) with data f^* , it holds that

$$585 \quad f^* = D(\xi \nabla u^*) = D(k \nabla u^*) - D((k - \xi) \nabla u^*) = D(\nabla(ku^*)) - D((1 - \frac{\xi}{k}) \nabla(ku^*)).$$

586 Introducing $\bar{\xi} = (1 - \xi/k) \in PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ and $v^* = ku^* \in \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)$, we get $f^* = D(\nabla v^*) -$
587 $D(\bar{\xi} \nabla v^*)$. Because $LD\nabla$ is equal to the identity operator in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega), \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega))$, it
588 follows that

$$589 \quad Lf^* = v^* - L(D(\bar{\xi} \nabla v^*)) = v^* - L(D(m_{\bar{\xi}}(\nabla v^*))).$$

590 Let us now denote $Q := LDm_{\bar{\xi}}\nabla \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega), \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega))$. If moreover Q belongs to
591 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega), \mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega))$ for some $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, then we derive from the above that if we
592 consider some data $f \in \mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)$ in (6.4), one has

$$593 \quad (6.12) \quad |k| \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\|L\|_{s-1, s+1}}{1 - \|Q\|_{s+1, s+1}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)},$$

594 *under the condition $\|Q\|_{s+1, s+1} < 1$, where $\|L\|_{s-1, s+1} := \|L\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega), \mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega))}$ and*
595 $\|Q\|_{s+1, s+1} := \|Q\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega), \mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega))}$.

596 Given $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, let $v \in \mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega)$. One checks successively that: $\nabla v \in \mathbf{H}^s(\Omega)$;
597 $m_{\bar{\xi}}(\nabla v) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}^s(\Omega)$ (cf. Proposition 6.5); $D(m_{\bar{\xi}}\nabla v) \in \mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)$ (cf. Proposition 6.6);
598 $L(Dm_{\bar{\xi}}\nabla v) \in \mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega)$ (cf. Proposition 6.7). In addition, all those results are
599 accompanied by a continuous dependence. Hence, one has $Q \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega), \mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega))$,
600 with

$$601 \quad (6.13) \quad \|Q\|_{s+1, s+1} \leq \|L\|_{s-1, s+1} \|D\|_{\mathcal{L}(\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}^s(\Omega), \mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega))} \|m_{\bar{\xi}}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H}^s(\Omega), \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}^s(\Omega))}.$$

602 So it remains to prove that there exists $\tau \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that, for all $s \in [0, \tau)$,
603 $\|Q\|_{s+1, s+1} < 1$, where the bound on the norm is derived by an appropriate choice of
604 $k \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.

605 To that aim, let $\tau_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ be given, and let $s \in [0, \tau_0)$. Using the bound (6.13), we
606 obtain first that

$$607 \quad (6.14) \quad \|Q\|_{s+1, s+1} \leq (K_{\tau_0})^{s/\tau_0} \bar{\xi}_{max} (N_{\bar{\xi}}^{\tau_0})^{s/\tau_0},$$

608 where $\bar{\xi}_{max} := \|\bar{\xi}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$, according to (6.8), (6.11) and Proposition 6.6. We know
 609 from Proposition 6.7 that $K_{\tau_0} \geq 1$, and that it is independent of k and ξ . Let us study
 610 now the behavior of $\bar{\xi}_{max}$ and $N_{\bar{\xi}}^{\tau_0}$ with respect to k and ξ , so that for an appropriate
 611 choice of k and of $\tau \in (0, \tau_0]$, one can guarantee that

$$612 \quad (6.15) \quad (K_{\tau_0})^{s/\tau_0} \bar{\xi}_{max} (N_{\bar{\xi}}^{\tau_0})^{s/\tau_0} < 1, \quad \forall s \in [0, \tau).$$

613 To achieve (6.15), one needs that $\bar{\xi}_{max} < 1$. Indeed, once k is given, it holds that
 614 $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} (K_{\tau_0})^{s/\tau_0} (N_{\bar{\xi}}^{\tau_0})^{s/\tau_0} = 1$.

615 Let $k = \bar{\rho} \exp(i\tilde{\theta})$, $\bar{\rho} > 0$, $\tilde{\theta} \in [0, 2\pi)$. Keeping the notations of (6.1), one has

$$616 \quad |\bar{\xi}(\mathbf{x})|^2 = |1 - \xi(\mathbf{x})/k|^2 = 1 + \frac{\rho(\mathbf{x})}{\bar{\rho}} \left(\frac{\rho(\mathbf{x})}{\bar{\rho}} - 2 \cos(\theta(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{\theta}) \right), \text{ a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega.$$

617 It follows that $|\bar{\xi}(\mathbf{x})| < 1$ a.e. $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ if, and only if,

$$618 \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{\rho(\mathbf{x})}{\bar{\rho}} < \cos(\theta(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{\theta}), \text{ a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega.$$

619 Choosing the angular part $\tilde{\theta} = \frac{1}{2}(\theta_{min} + \theta_{max})$ and recalling that $\xi_{max} = \|\rho\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$
 620 (cf. (6.1)), this condition is implied by

$$621 \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{\xi_{max}}{\bar{\rho}} < \cos\left(\frac{1}{2}(\theta_{max} - \theta_{min})\right).$$

622 Since one has $\theta_{max} - \theta_{min} \leq 2 \arccos(\xi_-/\xi_{max})$, a sufficient condition is

$$623 \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{\xi_{max}}{\bar{\rho}} < \frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}} \iff \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\xi_{max})^2}{\xi_-} < \bar{\rho}.$$

624 So, let us choose $k = \gamma (\xi_{max})^2 / \xi_- \exp(\frac{i}{2}(\theta_{min} + \theta_{max}))$ for some $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ to be
 625 determined. With this value of $k = k(\gamma)$, one can find an upper bound for $\bar{\xi}_{max}$:

$$626 \quad |\bar{\xi}(\mathbf{x})|^2 = 1 + \frac{\rho(\mathbf{x})(\xi_-)^2}{\gamma^2 (\xi_{max})^3} \left(\frac{\rho(\mathbf{x})}{\xi_{max}} - 2\gamma \frac{\xi_{max}}{\xi_-} \cos(\theta(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{\theta}) \right), \text{ a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega.$$

627 But $\rho(\mathbf{x}) \leq \xi_{max}$ and $\cos(\theta(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{\theta}) \geq \cos(\frac{1}{2}(\theta_{max} - \theta_{min}))$ a.e. $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, so

$$628 \quad \frac{\rho(\mathbf{x})}{\xi_{max}} - 2\gamma \frac{\xi_{max}}{\xi_-} \cos(\theta(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{\theta}) \leq 1 - 2\gamma \frac{\xi_{max}}{\xi_-} \cos\left(\frac{1}{2}(\theta_{max} - \theta_{min})\right)$$

$$629 \quad \leq 1 - 2\gamma, \text{ a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega.$$

630 Since $1 - 2\gamma < 0$, we now observe that $\rho(\mathbf{x}) \geq \xi_-$ a.e. $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ leads to

$$631 \quad |\bar{\xi}(\mathbf{x})|^2 \leq 1 + \frac{1 - 2\gamma}{\gamma^2} \left(\frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}} \right)^3, \text{ a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega.$$

632 The minimum of $\gamma \mapsto (1 - 2\gamma)/\gamma^2$ on $(\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ is obtained for $\gamma = 1$ and is equal to -1 .
 633 So we finally choose $k = k(1)$, i.e.

$$634 \quad (6.16) \quad k = \frac{(\xi_{max})^2}{\xi_-} \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}(\theta_{min} + \theta_{max})\right),$$

635 and conclude that, for this choice of k , it holds that

$$636 \quad (6.17) \quad \bar{\xi}_{max} \leq \left(1 - \left(\frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}}\right)^3\right)^{1/2}.$$

637 With this choice for k , one can also infer an upper bound for $N_{\bar{\xi}}^{\tau_0} = D_{\tau_0}(2(1 +$
638 $C^2\Lambda_{\bar{\xi}}^2))^{\tau_0/2}$, where $\Lambda_{\bar{\xi}} = |\bar{\xi}|_{PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}/\bar{\xi}_{max} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \|\nabla \bar{\xi}_j\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_j)}/\bar{\xi}_{max}$.

639 Let us bound $\bar{\xi}_{max}$ from below:

$$\begin{aligned} 640 \quad 0 < \left(1 - \frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}}\right)^2 &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\rho(\mathbf{x})\xi_-}{(\xi_{max})^2}\right)^2, \quad \text{a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \\ 641 \quad &= 1 + \frac{\rho(\mathbf{x})(\xi_-)^2}{(\xi_{max})^3} \left(\frac{\rho(\mathbf{x})}{\xi_{max}} - 2\frac{\xi_{max}}{\xi_-}\right), \quad \text{a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \\ 642 \quad &\leq 1 + \frac{\rho(\mathbf{x})(\xi_-)^2}{(\xi_{max})^3} \left(\frac{\rho(\mathbf{x})}{\xi_{max}} - 2\frac{\xi_{max}}{\xi_-} \cos(\theta(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{\theta})\right), \quad \text{a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \\ 643 \quad &= |\bar{\xi}(\mathbf{x})|^2, \quad \text{a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega \\ 644 \quad \text{so } |\bar{\xi}(\mathbf{x})| &\geq 1 - \frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}} > 0, \quad \text{a.e. } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

645 Hence, $\bar{\xi}_{max} \geq 1 - \xi_-/\xi_{max}$.

646 Next, for $1 \leq j \leq J$:

$$647 \quad \|\nabla \bar{\xi}_j\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_j)} = \frac{1}{|k|} \|\nabla \xi_j\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_j)} = \frac{\xi_-}{(\xi_{max})^2} \|\nabla \xi_j\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_j)}.$$

648 It follows that¹:

$$\begin{aligned} 649 \quad \Lambda_{\bar{\xi}} &\leq \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}}\right)} \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \|\nabla \bar{\xi}_j\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_j)}, \\ 650 \quad &= \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}}\right)} \frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}} \frac{\max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \|\nabla \xi_j\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_j)}}{\xi_{max}}, \\ 651 \quad \text{so } \Lambda_{\bar{\xi}} &\leq \frac{1}{\left(\frac{\xi_{max}}{\xi_-} - 1\right)} \Lambda_{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

652 We conclude that

$$653 \quad N_{\bar{\xi}}^{\tau_0} \leq D_{\tau_0} \left(2\left(1 + \frac{C^2}{\left(\frac{\xi_{max}}{\xi_-} - 1\right)^2} \Lambda_{\xi}^2\right)\right)^{\tau_0/2}.$$

654 From this point on, one can choose $\tau \leq \tau_0$ to ensure that (6.15), and so (6.14), hold.

655 Due to the upper bounds on $\bar{\xi}_{max}$ and $N_{\bar{\xi}}^{\tau_0}$, it is sufficient that

$$656 \quad \left(1 - \left(\frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}}\right)^3\right)^{1/2} \left(2(K_{\tau_0} D_{\tau_0})^{2/\tau_0} \left(1 + \frac{C^2}{\left(\frac{\xi_{max}}{\xi_-} - 1\right)^2} \Lambda_{\xi}^2\right)\right)^{s/2} < 1, \quad \forall s \in [0, \tau).$$

¹Notice that in the particular case where ξ is piecewise constant, we have that $\Lambda_{\bar{\xi}} = \Lambda_{\xi} = 0$.

657 Since $2(K_{\tau_0}D_{\tau_0})^{2/\tau_0} \geq 2$ (see Proposition 6.7 and (6.5)) and $(1 + C^2 \dots) \geq 1$, this
 658 last condition is equivalent to

$$659 \quad \left(1 - \left(\frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}}\right)^3\right) \left(2(K_{\tau_0}D_{\tau_0})^{2/\tau_0} \left(1 + \frac{C^2}{\left(\frac{\xi_{max}}{\xi_-} - 1\right)^2} \Lambda_\xi^2\right)\right)^\tau < 1.$$

660 This leads to choosing
 (6.18)

$$661 \quad \tau_\xi = \min \left(\tau_0, -\frac{\log \left(1 - \left(\frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}}\right)^3\right)}{\log 2 + \frac{2}{\tau_0} \log(K_{\tau_0}D_{\tau_0}) + \log \left(1 + \frac{C^2}{\left(\frac{\xi_{max}}{\xi_-} - 1\right)^2} \Lambda_\xi^2\right)} \right) \in (0, \tau_0].$$

662 Finally, we also conclude from (6.12), (6.14), (6.16) and the bounds above that, for all
 663 $s \in [0, \tau)$, for all $f \in \mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)$, the solution $u \in \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)$ to (6.4) belongs to $\mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega)$,
 664 and

$$665 \quad \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s+1}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\xi_-}{(\xi_{max})^2} \frac{(K_{\tau_0})^{s/\tau_0}}{1 - (K_{\tau_0})^{s/\tau_0} \bar{\xi}_{max} (N_{\bar{\xi}}^{\tau_0})^{s/\tau_0}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)}$$

$$666 \quad \leq \frac{c(s, \xi)}{\xi_{max}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)}, \text{ where}$$

$$667 \quad (6.19) \quad c(s, \xi) = \frac{\frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}} (K_{\tau_0})^{s/\tau_0}}{1 - \left(2(K_{\tau_0}D_{\tau_0})^{2/\tau_0} \left(1 + \frac{C^2}{\left(\frac{\xi_{max}}{\xi_-} - 1\right)^2} \Lambda_\xi^2\right)\right)^{s/2} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}}\right)^3\right)^{1/2}}.$$

668 This proves the claim. \square

669 According to (6.17), one finds that $\bar{\xi}_{max} = 0$ only in the particular case where $\xi_- =$
 670 ξ_{max} . As a matter of fact, in this case, we know from (5.1) that $\xi(\mathbf{x}) = \xi_- \exp(i\theta^*)$
 671 a.e. in Ω . Hence, the operator $D m_\xi \nabla$ is proportional to the Laplacian $D \nabla$ and
 672 the result is trivial: one can even pick any regularity exponent τ lower than $\frac{1}{2}$, cf.
 673 Theorem 6.2.

674 On the other hand, for a *piecewise constant* coefficient ξ , one has $\Lambda_\xi = 0$, so that once
 675 $\tau_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ is chosen, (6.18) and (6.19) respectively simplify to:

$$676 \quad (6.20) \quad \tau_\xi = \min \left(\tau_0, -\frac{\log \left(1 - \left(\frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}}\right)^3\right)}{\log 2 + \frac{2}{\tau_0} \log(K_{\tau_0}D_{\tau_0})} \right) \in (0, \tau_0];$$

$$677 \quad (6.21) \quad c(s, \xi) = \frac{\frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}} (K_{\tau_0})^{s/\tau_0}}{1 - (2(K_{\tau_0}D_{\tau_0})^{2/\tau_0})^{s/2} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}}\right)^3\right)^{1/2}}.$$

678 For our model problem, of special interest is the electric case, with the coefficient
 679 $\xi = \varepsilon_\sigma$: in this case, $(\varepsilon_\sigma)_-$ can be chosen among $(\cos \theta^* \varepsilon_{min} + \sin \theta^* \sigma_{min}/\omega)_{\theta^* \in [0, \pi/2]}$.
 680 In particular

$$681 \quad (\varepsilon_\sigma)_- \geq \max_{\theta^* \in [0, \pi/2]} (\cos \theta^* \varepsilon_{min} + \sin \theta^* \sigma_{min}/\omega) = ((\varepsilon_{min})^2 + (\sigma_{min}/\omega)^2)^{1/2}.$$

682 On the other hand,

$$683 \quad (\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max} \leq ((\varepsilon_{max})^2 + (\sigma_{max}/\omega)^2)^{1/2}.$$

684 When both ε and σ are constant on Ω , the operator $-\operatorname{div} \varepsilon_\sigma \nabla$ (with Dirichlet bound-
685 ary condition) is proportional to the Laplace operator (with Dirichlet boundary condi-
686 tion), and one has $(\varepsilon_{min})^2 + (\sigma_{min}/\omega)^2 = (\varepsilon_{max})^2 + (\sigma_{max}/\omega)^2$, so the bounds on
687 $(\varepsilon_\sigma)_-$ and $(\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max}$ are sharp. According again to Theorem 6.2, any $\tau_{\varepsilon_\sigma} < \frac{1}{2}$ with
688 $c_{\varepsilon_\sigma} = c^{Lap}(\tau_{\varepsilon_\sigma})$ is admissible in this case.

689 In the other configurations (non-constant ε_σ), let $\tau_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ be fixed, and introduce

$$690 \quad R_{\varepsilon_\sigma} := (\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max}/(\varepsilon_\sigma)_- > 1;$$

691 then the regularity exponent (6.18), respectively the stability constant (6.19) of The-
692 orem 6.8, are given by

$$693 \quad (6.22) \quad \tau_{\varepsilon_\sigma} = \min \left(\tau_0, -\frac{\log(1 - (R_{\varepsilon_\sigma})^{-3})}{\log 2 + \frac{2}{\tau_0} \log(K_{\tau_0} D_{\tau_0}) + \log \left(1 + \frac{C^2}{(R_{\varepsilon_\sigma} - 1)^2} \Lambda_{\varepsilon_\sigma}^2 \right)} \right) \in (0, \tau_0];$$

$$694 \quad (6.23) \quad c(s, \varepsilon_\sigma) = \frac{(R_{\varepsilon_\sigma})^{-1} (K_{\tau_0})^{s/\tau_0}}{1 - \left(2(K_{\tau_0} D_{\tau_0})^{2/\tau_0} \left(1 + \frac{C^2}{(R_{\varepsilon_\sigma} - 1)^2} \Lambda_{\varepsilon_\sigma}^2 \right) \right)^{s/2} (1 - (R_{\varepsilon_\sigma})^{-3})^{1/2}}.$$

695 **6.3. Bounding the norm of scalar fields.** We now bound the norm of the
696 right-hand sides of the variational formulations (5.4) and (5.7), governing resp. p_0
697 and q_0 .

698 **LEMMA 6.10.** *Let Ω be a domain such that $(\mathbf{Top})_I$ is fulfilled, and assume that*
699 *ξ fulfills the coefficient assumption. Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{X}_B(\Omega, \xi)$ be given, for $B \in \{Dir, Neu\}$.*
700 *Let $s \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$: if $B = Dir$, the right-hand sides f defined by (5.4) belong to $\mathcal{H}_{Dir}^{s-1}(\Omega)$;*
701 *resp. if $B = Neu$ the right-hand sides f defined by (5.7) belong to $\mathcal{H}_{Neu}^{s-1}(\Omega)$. In*
702 *addition, for all $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, it holds that*

$$703 \quad (6.24) \quad \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)} \leq c^B s^{1/2} \|\operatorname{div} \xi \mathbf{v}\|_{0,\Omega} + C_{(s, \frac{1}{2})} \xi_{max} N_\xi^s \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)}.$$

704 *Proof.* Let us focus on the case $B = Dir$ (proof is similar in the case $B = Neu$).
705 We use the same notations as in Theorem 5.5. Introduce $f \in \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Omega)$:

$$706 \quad f : \psi \mapsto (\xi(\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{v}_{reg})|\nabla \psi)_{0,\Omega} + (\operatorname{div} \xi \mathbf{v}|\psi)_{0,\Omega}, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{H}^1(\Omega).$$

707 Let $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ be given.

708 First, it is obvious that $f_0 : \psi \mapsto (\operatorname{div} \xi \mathbf{v}|\psi)_{0,\Omega}$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)$. Indeed, according
709 to Appendix A:

$$710 \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{H}^{1-s}(\Omega), |(\operatorname{div} \xi \mathbf{v}|\psi)_{0,\Omega}| \leq \|\operatorname{div} \xi \mathbf{v}\|_{0,\Omega} \|\psi\|_{0,\Omega} \leq c^{Dir} s^{1/2} \|\operatorname{div} \xi \mathbf{v}\|_{0,\Omega} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1-s}(\Omega)}. \blacksquare$$

711 Hence, $f_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)$ and $\|f_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)} \leq c^{Dir} s^{1/2} \|\operatorname{div} \xi \mathbf{v}\|_{0,\Omega}$.

712 Then we recall that $\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{v}_{reg}$ belongs to $\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega) \subset \mathbf{H}^s(\Omega)$, so that $m_\xi(\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{v}_{reg}) =$
713 $\xi(\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{v}_{reg}) \in \widehat{\mathbf{H}}^s(\Omega)$ according to Proposition 6.5. Then it follows from Proposition 6.6
714 that $D(m_\xi(\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{v}_{reg})) \in \mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)$. In other words, $\psi \mapsto (\xi(\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{v}_{reg})|\nabla \psi)_{0,\Omega}$ also
715 belongs to $\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)$.

716 Regarding the norm estimate (6.24), we simply use the bounds (6.7) and (6.9) together
717 with (5.3) to conclude the proof: the dependence in s (the constant $C_{(s, \frac{1}{2})}$) comes from

718 the continuous embedding $\mathbf{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega) \subset \mathbf{H}^s(\Omega)$. \square

719 Given $r \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, one may use (6.8) for $s \in (0, r]$, and thus replace (6.24) for all
 720 $s \in (0, r]$ by

$$721 \quad (6.25) \quad \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)} \leq c^B s^{1/2} \|\operatorname{div} \xi \mathbf{v}\|_{0,\Omega} + C_{(s, \frac{1}{2})} \xi_{max} (N_{\xi}^r)^{s/r} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)}.$$

722 **6.4. Application to the polyhedral model problem.** We recall that, un-
 723 der the assumptions defining the polyhedral model problem, the coefficients $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$
 724 are such that ε, σ fulfill the coefficient assumption, and μ is constant on Ω . Accord-
 725 ing to the definition of the model problem (2.9), it always hold that $\mu^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e} \in$
 726 $\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega, \mu)$. Here, because μ is a constant, $\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega, \mu) = \mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega)$. It follows that
 727 $\mu^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e} \in \mathbf{H}^{\sigma_{Neu}}(\Omega)$ with $\sigma_{Neu} > \frac{1}{2}$, cf. Proposition 5.3. Then, regarding the
 728 choice of a regularity exponent for the electric field \mathbf{e} itself, because $\varepsilon_{\sigma} \in PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$,
 729 we note that either any $\tau_{\varepsilon_{\sigma}} < \frac{1}{2}$ is admissible (constant ε_{σ}), or that it is given by
 730 (6.22) (non-constant ε_{σ}). Indeed, one has the regular/gradient splitting (6.2):

$$731 \quad \mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_{reg} + \mathbf{z}_e + \nabla p_0 \text{ in } \Omega, \text{ where } \mathbf{e}_{reg} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\Omega), \mathbf{z}_e \in \mathbf{H}^{\sigma_{Dir}}(\Omega).$$

732 The regularity of the gradient part, namely $\nabla p_0 \in \mathbf{H}^s(\Omega)$ is a straightforward con-
 733 sequence of Theorems 6.2 (constant ε_{σ}) and 6.8 (non-constant ε_{σ}), provided that the
 734 right-hand side f given there belongs to $\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)$, for all values $s \in [0, \tau_{\varepsilon_{\sigma}})$. But, since
 735 this regularity result on f was proven in Lemma 6.10, one has indeed $\nabla p_0 \in \mathbf{H}^s(\Omega)$,
 736 for all $s \in [0, \tau_{\varepsilon_{\sigma}})$.

737

738 It follows that we can provide values for $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}$ (regularity exponent), resp.
 739 $C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma, s)}^*$ (stability constant), in (3.6). Because the limiting value of a regularity
 740 exponent is constrained by $\tau_{\varepsilon_{\sigma}}$ ($\tau_{\varepsilon_{\sigma}} < \frac{1}{2} < \sigma_{Neu}$), we choose

$$741 \quad \tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)} := \tau_{\varepsilon_{\sigma}} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}).$$

742 From now on, we assume that we are given a set Θ of coefficients $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$, such
 743 that ε, σ fulfill the coefficient assumption, and μ is constant on Ω . Moreover, we
 744 consider the case where $\underline{\tau} := \inf_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma) \in \Theta} \tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)} > 0$. This covers in particular the
 745 case where Θ is a singleton $\{(\varepsilon^0, \mu^0, \sigma^0)\}$, and $\underline{\tau} = \tau_{(\varepsilon^0, \mu^0, \sigma^0)}$.

746 **LEMMA 6.11.** *Let p_0 be defined as in (5.4). For all $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma) \in \Theta$, for all $s \in (0, \underline{\tau})$,*
 747 *the norm in $\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)$ of the right-hand side f in (5.4) is bounded by*

$$748 \quad \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)} \leq c_0^0 \omega \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega} + c_{\operatorname{div}}^0 \omega^{-1} \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega}, \text{ where}$$

$$749 \quad c_0^0 := C_{(s, \frac{1}{2})} (\varepsilon_{\sigma})_{max} (N_{\varepsilon_{\sigma}}^{\underline{\tau}})^{s/\underline{\tau}} (C_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{coer})^{-1}, \text{ and } c_{\operatorname{div}}^0 := c^{Dir} s^{1/2}.$$

750 **Remark 6.12.** We recall that

$$751 \quad (N_{\varepsilon_{\sigma}}^{\underline{\tau}})^{s/\underline{\tau}} := (D_{\underline{\tau}})^{s/\underline{\tau}} (2(1 + C^2 \Lambda_{\varepsilon_{\sigma}}^2))^{s/2},$$

752 where $D_{\underline{\tau}}$ is defined at (6.5), resp. C is the Poincaré constant defined at (6.6), and
 753 $\Lambda_{\varepsilon_{\sigma}} := ((\varepsilon_{\sigma})_{max})^{-1} |\varepsilon_{\sigma}|_{PW^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}$. Note that only $D_{\underline{\tau}}$ and C , and hence $N_{\varepsilon_{\sigma}}^{\underline{\tau}}$, depend
 754 on the partition induced by $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$.

755 *Proof.* According to (6.25), we know that the right-hand side that defines ∇p_0 is
 756 bounded by

$$757 \quad \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)} \leq c^{Dir} s^{1/2} \|\operatorname{div} \varepsilon_{\sigma} \mathbf{e}\|_{0,\Omega} + C_{(s, \frac{1}{2})} (\varepsilon_{\sigma})_{max} (N_{\varepsilon_{\sigma}}^{\underline{\tau}})^{s/\underline{\tau}} \|\mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)}.$$

758 Going back to the model problem (2.9), the left part of the upper bound is readily
 759 replaced by $c^{Dir} s^{1/2} \omega^{-1} \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega}$. Then, using the coercivity bound of Propo-
 760 sition 4.1:

$$761 \quad C_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{coer} \|\mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl};\Omega)}^2 \leq \omega |(\mathbf{j}_{ext}|\mathbf{e})_{0,\Omega}| \leq \omega \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega} \|\mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl};\Omega)},$$

762 we find for the right part the bound

$$763 \quad C_{(s,\frac{1}{2})} (\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max} (N_{\varepsilon_\sigma}^\tau)^{s/\tau} (C_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{coer})^{-1} \omega \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega},$$

764 which proves the claim. \square

765 The bound on $\|\nabla p_0\|_{s,\Omega} = \|p_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1+s}(\Omega)}$ follows: for all $s \in (0, \underline{\tau})$,

$$766 \quad \|\nabla p_0\|_{s,\Omega} \leq \frac{c_{Dir}(s, \varepsilon_\sigma)}{(\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max}} (c_0^0 \omega \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega} + c_{div}^0 \omega^{-1} \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega}),$$

767 where $c_{Dir}(s, \varepsilon_\sigma)$ is given in Theorem 6.2 or Theorem 6.8; $c_{Dir}(s, \varepsilon_\sigma)$ depends on the
 768 partition induced by $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$.

769 We are now in a position to estimate the norm of \mathbf{e} in $\mathbf{PH}^s(\operatorname{curl};\Omega)$, for all values
 770 $s \in (0, \underline{\tau})$, which then leads to the desired convergence rate.

771 LEMMA 6.13. For all $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma) \in \Theta$, for all $s \in (0, \underline{\tau})$, one has the estimate

$$772 \quad \|\mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{PH}^s(\operatorname{curl};\Omega)} \leq C_{0(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma,s)}^* \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega} + C_{div(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma,s)}^* \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega}, \text{ where}$$

$$773 \quad C_{0(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma,s)}^* := \left(\frac{C_{(s,\frac{1}{2})}}{C_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{coer}} \left(c_{Dir}(s, \varepsilon_\sigma) (N_{\varepsilon_\sigma}^\tau)^{s/\tau} + C_{\mathbf{X}}^{Dir} \right) \right. \\ 774 \quad \left. + C_{(s,\sigma_{Neu})} I_{\mathbf{X}_{Neu}} \left(\frac{(1 + \mu \omega^2 (\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max})}{C_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{coer}} + \mu \right) \right) \omega,$$

$$775 \quad C_{div(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma,s)}^* := \frac{c_{Dir}(s, \varepsilon_\sigma) c^{Dir} s^{1/2}}{(\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max}} \omega^{-1},$$

776 and $I_{\mathbf{X}_{Neu}}$ denotes the norm of the embedding $\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega) \subset \mathbf{H}^{\sigma_{Neu}}(\Omega)$.

777 Remark 6.14. The above is slightly different from (3.6), where both contributions
 778 of the norm $\|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{div};\Omega)}$ are merged. Also, only $c_{Dir}(s, \varepsilon_\sigma)$ and $N_{\varepsilon_\sigma}^\tau$ depend on the
 779 partition induced by $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$.

780 Proof. One has $\|\mathbf{e}\|_{s,\Omega} \leq \|\mathbf{e}_{reg} + \mathbf{z}_e\|_{s,\Omega} + \|\nabla p_0\|_{s,\Omega}$, and the bound on $\|\nabla p_0\|_{s,\Omega}$
 781 is given right above. On the other hand,

$$782 \quad \|\mathbf{e}_{reg} + \mathbf{z}_e\|_{s,\Omega} \leq C_{(s,\frac{1}{2})} \|\mathbf{e}_{reg} + \mathbf{z}_e\|_{1/2,\Omega} \\ 783 \quad \leq C_{(s,\frac{1}{2})} C_{\mathbf{X}}^{Dir} \|\mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl};\Omega)} \leq \frac{C_{(s,\frac{1}{2})} C_{\mathbf{X}}^{Dir}}{C_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{coer}} \omega \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega}.$$

784 We conclude that: for all $s \in (0, \underline{\tau})$,

$$785 \quad \|\mathbf{e}\|_{s,\Omega} \leq \left(\frac{c_{Dir}(s, \varepsilon_\sigma) c_0^0}{(\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max}} + \frac{C_{(s,\frac{1}{2})} C_{\mathbf{X}}^{Dir}}{C_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{coer}} \right) \omega \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega} + \frac{c_{Dir}(s, \varepsilon_\sigma) c_{div}^0 \omega^{-1}}{(\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max}} \|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega},$$

786 where c_0^0 and c_{div}^0 are defined in Lemma 6.11.

787 Regarding the norm of $\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}$, we recall that $\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e} \in \mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega)$. But $\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega)$ is

788 continuously embedded in $\mathbf{H}^{\sigma_{Neu}}(\Omega)$ (Proposition 5.3) so we find that for all $s \in (0, \underline{\tau})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
789 \quad & \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{s,\Omega} \leq C_{(s,\sigma_{Neu})} \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{\sigma_{Neu},\Omega} \\
790 \quad & \leq C_{(s,\sigma_{Neu})} I_{\mathbf{X}_{Neu}} \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega)} \\
791 \quad & = C_{(s,\sigma_{Neu})} I_{\mathbf{X}_{Neu}} \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl};\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

792 Next, we have, using the model problem (2.9):

$$\begin{aligned}
793 \quad & \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl};\Omega)} \leq \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{0,\Omega} + \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{0,\Omega} \\
794 \quad & = \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{0,\Omega} + \mu \|\mathbf{curl} \mu^{-1} \mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{0,\Omega} \\
795 \quad & = \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{0,\Omega} + \mu \|\omega^2 \varepsilon_\sigma \mathbf{e} + \omega \mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega} \\
796 \quad & \leq (1 + \mu \omega^2 (\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max}) \|\mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl};\Omega)} + \mu \omega \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega} \\
797 \quad & \leq \left(\frac{(1 + \mu \omega^2 (\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max})}{C_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{coer}} + \mu \right) \omega \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega}.
\end{aligned}$$

798 Hence, for all $s \in (0, \underline{\tau})$,

$$799 \quad \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{s,\Omega} \leq C_{(s,\sigma_{Neu})} I_{\mathbf{X}_{Neu}} \left(\frac{(1 + \mu \omega^2 (\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max})}{C_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{coer}} + \mu \right) \omega \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega}.$$

800 Then, using Proposition 3.1, we find, for all $s \in (0, \underline{\tau})$:

$$801 \quad \|\mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{PH}^s(\mathbf{curl};\Omega)} \leq \|\mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{PH}^s(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{PH}^s(\Omega)} \leq \|\mathbf{e}\|_{s,\Omega} + \|\mathbf{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{s,\Omega},$$

802 and the conclusion follows. \square

803 We recall that $C_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^\sharp = C_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{cont} (C_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{coer})^{-1}$ is the constant appearing in C ea's lemma
804 (and bounded in §4) and that $\varsigma > 0$ is the shape regularity parameter of the family
805 of meshes. Then one has the following convergence rate for the polyhedral model
806 problem.

807 **THEOREM 6.15.** *Let $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$ be such that ε, σ fulfill the coefficient assumption,*
808 *and μ is constant on Ω . For all $s \in (0, \tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)})$, there exist constants $C_{(\varsigma,s)}^{interp}$,*
809 *$C_{0(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma,s)}^*$, and $C_{\text{div}(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma,s)}^*$ such that for all $\mathbf{j}_{ext} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div};\Omega)$ and all h , the error*
810 *estimate hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}
811 \quad & \|\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{e}_h\|_{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{curl};\Omega)} \leq C_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^\sharp C_{(\varsigma,s)}^{interp} h^s \left(C_{0(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma,s)}^* \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega} \right. \\
812 \quad (6.26) \quad & \left. + C_{\text{div}(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma,s)}^* \|\text{div} \mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

813 Let Θ be a set of coefficients $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$ whose elements are all piecewise smooth on the
814 same polyhedral partition, and assume that $\underline{\tau} := \inf_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma) \in \Theta} \tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)} > 0$. Then (6.26)
815 holds true for all $s \in (0, \underline{\tau})$.

816 **Remark 6.16.** The above is slightly different from (3.7), where both contributions
817 of the norm $\|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\text{div};\Omega)}$ are merged.

818 *Proof.* It is straightforward to derive the result (6.26) by using successively (3.3)
819 and (3.5), and finally the estimate of Lemma 6.13 for $\underline{\tau} = \tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}$. \square

820 **6.5. A few possible generalizations.** Let us mention two cases we have ex-
821 cluded so far: first when μ fulfills the coefficient assumption, but μ is not constant on
822 Ω ; second when $\mathbf{j}_{ext} \notin \mathbf{H}(\operatorname{div}; \Omega)$, but $\mathbf{j}_{ext} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)$ with $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{j}_{ext} \in H^{-t}(\Omega)$ for some
823 $t \in (0, 1)$.

824

825 In the first situation, all the previous analyses apply, except when one addresses
826 the regularity of $\mu^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}$ with respect to the scale $(\mathbf{H}^s(\Omega))_s$. Although it still
827 holds that $\mu^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e} \in \mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega, \mu)$, one has $\mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega, \mu) \neq \mathbf{X}_{Neu}(\Omega)$. To find a
828 regularity exponent, one uses now (6.3), where the regularity is determined by the
829 gradient part ∇q_0 : see Theorem 6.8 (Neumann case), which yields the value of the
830 regularity exponent τ_μ . One then chooses

$$831 \quad \tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)} := \min(\tau_{\varepsilon, \sigma}, \tau_\mu) \in (0, \frac{1}{2}).$$

832 Next, one derives an estimate on $\|\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{s, \Omega}$, for all $s \in (0, \tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)})$. Noting that the
833 multiplicative operator m_μ belongs to $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H}^s(\Omega), \mathbf{H}^s(\Omega))$, it follows that

$$834 \quad \|\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{s, \Omega} \leq \|m_\mu\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H}^s(\Omega), \mathbf{H}^s(\Omega))} \|\mu^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{s, \Omega}.$$

835 The first quantity, $\|m_\mu\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{H}^s(\Omega), \mathbf{H}^s(\Omega))}$, is easily bounded from above, thanks to
836 Proposition 6.5 and (6.5).

837 Then, using (6.3), one writes

$$838 \quad \|\mu^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{s, \Omega} \leq \|\mathbf{c}_{reg} + \mathbf{z}_c\|_{s, \Omega} + \|\nabla q_0\|_{s, \Omega}.$$

839 Thanks to (5.6), one has

$$840 \quad \|\mathbf{c}_{reg} + \mathbf{z}_c\|_{s, \Omega} \leq C_{(s, \frac{1}{2})} \|\mathbf{c}_{reg} + \mathbf{z}_c\|_{1/2, \Omega} \leq C_{(s, \frac{1}{2})} C_{\mathbf{X}}^{Neu} \|\mu^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)}.$$

841 On the other hand, according to Theorem 6.8 it holds that

$$842 \quad \|\nabla q_0\|_{s, \Omega} \leq \frac{c_{Neu}(s, \mu)}{\mu_{max}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^{s-1}(\Omega)},$$

843 where f is the right-hand side of (5.7). Using Lemma 6.10 yields

$$844 \quad \|\nabla q_0\|_{s, \Omega} \leq c_{Neu}(s, \mu) C_{(s, \frac{1}{2})} (N_\mu^\tau)^{s/\tau} \|\mu^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)}.$$

845 Aggregating the two estimates, one finds now

$$846 \quad \|\mu^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{s, \Omega} \leq C_{(s, \frac{1}{2})} \left(C_{\mathbf{X}}^{Neu} + c_{Neu}(s, \mu) (N_\mu^\tau)^{s/\tau} \right) \|\mu^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)}.$$

847 Writing finally

$$\begin{aligned} 848 \quad \|\mu^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)} &\leq \|\mu^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{0, \Omega} + \|\operatorname{curl} \mu^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{0, \Omega} \\ 849 &\leq \frac{1}{\mu_{min}} \|\operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{0, \Omega} + \|\operatorname{curl} \mu^{-1} \operatorname{curl} \mathbf{e}\|_{0, \Omega} \\ 850 \quad (\text{cf. (2.9)}) &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\mu_{min}} + \omega^2 (\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max} \right) \|\mathbf{e}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\operatorname{curl}; \Omega)} + \omega \|\mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0, \Omega} \end{aligned}$$

851 and using the coercivity, the rest of the estimates follow easily.

852

853 In the second situation, namely when $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{j}_{ext} \in H^{-t}(\Omega)$ for some $t \in (0, 1)$, one
 854 must use a generalized regular/gradient splitting. Precisely, one introduces (see [4,
 855 Theorem 6.1.15]):

$$856 \quad \mathbf{X}_{Dir}(\Omega, \xi, -t) := \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; \Omega) : \operatorname{div} \xi \mathbf{v} \in H^{-t}(\Omega)\}.$$

857 Then, one may generalize Theorem 5.5 to elements of $\mathbf{X}_{Dir}(\Omega, \xi, -t)$. the only dif-
 858 ference is that ∇p_0 is now governed by

$$859 \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } p_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega) \text{ such that} \\ (\xi \nabla p_0 | \nabla \psi)_{0,\Omega} = -(\xi \mathbf{z} | \nabla \psi)_{0,\Omega} - (\xi \mathbf{v}_{reg} | \nabla \psi)_{0,\Omega} - \langle \operatorname{div} \xi \mathbf{v}, \psi \rangle_{H_0^1(\Omega)}, \quad \forall \psi \in H_0^1(\Omega). \end{cases}$$

860 With this result at hand, one may proceed as before, replacing the occurrences of
 861 $\|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{0,\Omega}$ by $\|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{j}_{ext}\|_{-t,\Omega}$: one simply notices that when $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{j}_{ext} \in H^{-t}(\Omega)$, one
 862 may still apply Lemma 6.10, but only for all $s \in (0, \min(\frac{1}{2}, 1-t))$. Hence, one chooses

$$863 \quad \tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma,t)} := \min(\tau_{\varepsilon\sigma}, \tau_\mu, 1-t) \in (0, \frac{1}{2}).$$

864 Computations can then be carried out.

865 Then, what happens when Θ is not reduced to a singleton? For simplicity², let
 866 us consider that all its elements $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$ are such that ε, σ, μ are piecewise-constant
 867 on a *fixed partition* and that $\mathbf{j}_{ext} \in \mathbf{H}(\operatorname{div}; \Omega)$. Then the regularity exponent writes

$$869 \quad \underline{\tau} := \inf_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma) \in \Theta} \min(\tau_{\varepsilon\sigma}, \tau_\mu).$$

870 According to (6.20), we see that if condition

$$871 \quad (6.27) \quad \sup_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma) \in \Theta} \frac{(\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max}}{(\varepsilon_\sigma)_-} + \sup_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma) \in \Theta} \frac{\mu_{max}}{\mu_{min}} < \infty$$

872 holds, then $\underline{\tau} > 0$ and for any $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma) \in \Theta$ one may apply the previous results for
 873 all $s \in [0, \underline{\tau}]$. Note that this condition is comparable to the one found using the
 874 local approach, see (B.8), because one has $(\varepsilon_\sigma)_{max} \leq \omega^{-1}(\varepsilon_{max}^2 \omega^2 + \sigma_{max}^2)^{1/2}$, and
 875 $(\varepsilon_\sigma)_- \geq \omega^{-1}(\varepsilon_{min}^2 \omega^2 + \sigma_{min}^2)^{1/2}$. On the other hand, there exist configurations such
 876 that if, eg., $\sup_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma) \in \Theta} \mu_{max}/\mu_{min} = \infty$, it holds that $\inf_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma) \in \Theta} \tau_\mu = 0$. In other
 877 words, there is no (extra-)regularity in this limit case. We refer to §7.2 for an illus-
 878 tration.

879 Also, what can be said in the context of §5.3, that is when ξ is a complex-valued,
 880 measurable, *tensor* field that fulfills the coefficient assumption? It turns out that one
 881 may address the case of a *normal tensor* field, ie. $\xi = \mathbb{U}^{-1} \mathbb{D} \mathbb{U}$ a.e. in Ω , where \mathbb{U}
 882 is a unitary tensor field, resp. \mathbb{D} is a diagonal tensor field, defined in Ω . Let us briefly
 883 explain why.

884 First, Proposition 6.5 still applies. Then, (5.1) is now replaced by (5.8): but the latter
 885 can be seen as the equivalent of the former, imposed on $\mathbb{D}_{11}, \mathbb{D}_{22}$ and \mathbb{D}_{33} . Hence one
 886 may use the reformulated (6.1), namely

$$887 \quad \mathbb{D}_{kk} \in \{z = \rho \exp(i\theta), \rho \in [\xi_-, \xi_{max}], \theta \in [\theta_{min}, \theta_{max}]\} \text{ a.e. in } \Omega, \text{ for } k = 1, 2, 3,$$

$$888 \quad \text{where } \xi_{max} := \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}^3 \setminus \{0\}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\Omega} \frac{|\xi \mathbf{z}|}{|\mathbf{z}|}, \text{ and } 0 \leq \theta_{max} - \theta_{min} \leq 2 \arccos \left(\frac{\xi_-}{\xi_{max}} \right),$$

² If more generally the coefficients are piecewise smooth, or if the partition depends on the element $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$, the condition is more involved than (6.27) proposed below.

889 in the proof of Theorem 6.8.

890 The proof then proceeds as before, and one can conclude that Theorem 6.8 still holds.

891 The rest of the proofs are unchanged.

892

893 Finally, let us mention that the non-conductive case ($\sigma = 0$) can be handled
894 similarly, under the assumption that the model problem is well-posed (ie. ω^2 is not
895 an eigenvalue of the corresponding eigenproblem). In this case the coercivity constant
896 is *frequency dependent*, in the sense that it is inversely proportional to the distance of
897 ω^2 to the closest eigenvalue, see for instance [4, §8.3]. On the other hand, the estimates
898 on the regularity exponent and on the stability constant can still be recovered in this
899 context.

900 **7. Evaluating the regularity exponent.** Below, we evaluate the "sharpness"
901 of the bounds on $\tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}$ on two examples.

902 **7.1. The coplanar waveguide.** First, let us consider the coplanar waveguide
903 case, as provided by the MORwiki Community [34, 5]. Precisely, the geometry of
904 interest is a parallelepiped, see Figure 1. The upper part of the domain is made of
905 air, while the bottom part is made of a substrate (in yellow) in which three perfectly
906 conducting striplines (in blue) are embedded. The electric permittivity ε and the
907 conductivity σ are piecewise constant (with different values in the air and in the sub-
908 strate), while the magnetic permeability μ takes the same value in the air and in the
909 substrate.

910 The resulting Ω is thus equal to the parallelepiped minus the three striplines, and the
911 interface Σ separates the two materials (air, substrate): it is flat, see Figure 1. Im-
912 portantly, all angles, either at the boundary, or at the interface between the two
913 materials, are equal to multiples of $\pi/2$. One solves the model problem (2.9) in this
914 configuration for a given \mathbf{j}_{ext} .

915




FIG. 1. A coplanar waveguide [34].

916 Since the coefficients are piecewise constant, one may use the local approach (cf.
917 Appendix B). According to the framework developed there, one has to study the local
918 problems on interior domains (no intersection with $\partial\Omega$, cf. §B.1) resp. on bound-
919 ary domains (cf. §B.2), to determine the "best regularity" exponent $\tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{opt}$. In the

920 present case, studying local problems on interior domains, see (B.7), one finds that
 921 there is no constraint on $\tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{opt}$ because the interface is flat. On the other hand, the
 922 study of local problems on boundary domains is more involved a priori ; there are edge
 923 problems with interface (at the intersection $\partial\Omega \cap \Sigma$), edge problems without interface
 924 (on $\partial\Omega$), and finally corner problems without interface (on $\partial\Omega$).

925 Interestingly, for the edge problems with interface and because the diedric angles are
 926 equal to $\pi/2$ in both materials, one notices that, using a symmetry argument (odd
 927 reflection for the Dirichlet boundary condition, resp. even reflection for the Neumann
 928 boundary condition, see [22, p. 41]), one can recast the problem as an interior prob-
 929 lem, with a flat interface. Hence, $\tau_{\mathbf{e},\Sigma}(\xi) = 1$ for $\xi \in \{\mu, \varepsilon_\sigma\}$.

930 Also, making the same observation on the value of the angles, and using again a
 931 symmetry argument, one can recast the corner problem without interface as an edge
 932 problem without interface: it follows that $\tau_{\mathbf{c},\partial\Omega}(\xi) = \tau_{\mathbf{e},\partial\Omega}(\xi)$, where $\tau_{\mathbf{e},\partial\Omega}(\xi)$ is char-
 933 acterized next, for $\xi \in \{\mu, \varepsilon_\sigma\}$, and one has $\tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{opt} = \min(1, \tau_{\mathbf{e},\partial\Omega}(\mu), \tau_{\mathbf{e},\partial\Omega}(\varepsilon_\sigma))$.

934 So, in the end, there remains to study the edge problem without interface to determine
 935 the value of $\tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{opt}$. But this is a standard problem: one looks for the regularity ex-
 936 ponent in an L-shape (local) domain \mathcal{O} for the Laplace operator (there is no interface,
 937 hence no jump of the coefficient) with either homogeneous Dirichlet or, homogeneous
 938 Neumann, boundary condition: it is well-known that $\tau_{\mathbf{e},\partial\Omega}(\mu) = \tau_{\mathbf{e},\partial\Omega}(\varepsilon_\sigma) = 2/3$.

939 Aggregating all results, one concludes that $\tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{opt} = 2/3$ for the coplanar waveguide,
 940 *independently of the values of the coefficients* $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$. In other words the lower
 941 bounds provided by (6.27) and (B.8) are not “sharp”.

942 **7.2. The checkerboard.** We study now a simple example (cf. for instance
 943 Dauge’s benchmark [16]), to illustrate the fact that the conditions (6.27) and (B.8)
 944 can be “sharp”: let us consider the domain $\Omega := (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1) \times (0, 1)$, made of
 945 four cubes, stacked together:

$$946 \quad \begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &:= (-1, 0) \times (-1, 0) \times (0, 1), & \Omega_2 &:= (0, 1) \times (-1, 0) \times (0, 1), \\ \Omega_3 &:= (0, 1) \times (0, 1) \times (0, 1), & \Omega_4 &:= (-1, 0) \times (0, 1) \times (0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

947 We assume that ε and σ are constant, while μ is piecewise constant, and equal to 1
 948 in $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_3$, resp. to $\delta \in (0, 1)$ in $\Omega_2 \cup \Omega_4$.

949 Again, all angles are multiples of $\pi/2$. Proceeding as in §7.1, one observes first that
 950 $\tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{opt} = \min(1, \tau_{\mathbf{e},\Sigma}(\mu))$. Then, solving (B.7) and looking for the smallest non-zero
 951 eigenvalue ν_0 , one may check that it is governed by

$$952 \quad \cos\left(\sqrt{\nu_0} \frac{\pi}{2}\right) = \frac{1 - \delta}{1 + \delta}, \text{ or equivalently } \sqrt{\nu_0} = \frac{2}{\pi} \arccos\left(\frac{1 - \delta}{1 + \delta}\right).$$

953 Performing the expansion in the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$, one finds that $\sqrt{\nu_0} \sim \frac{4}{\pi}\sqrt{\delta}$. Since
 954 $\tau_{\mathbf{e},\Sigma(\mu)} = \sqrt{\nu_0}$, we find $\tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{opt} \sim \frac{4}{\pi}\sqrt{\delta}$, so there is no (extra-)regularity in the limit
 955 case: in this sense the conditions (6.27) and (B.8) are “sharp” for the checkerboard.
 956 To conclude, we provide some excerpts from Dauge’s benchmark [16], see Table 1.
 957 These numerical values corroborate the asymptotic formula when δ goes to 0.

958 **7.3. Comments.** When applicable, the local approach allows one to compute
 959 the “best” regularity exponent $\tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{opt}$, up to numerical precision. As a matter of fact,
 960 one has to solve numerically a series of eigenproblems, see §§B.1-B.2. Or, in more
 961 favorable cases (cf. §7.1), it is even known exactly. However, the theory we recalled in
 962 Appendix B is limited to the case of piecewise constant coefficients, on a polyhedral

δ	$\frac{4}{\pi}\sqrt{\delta}$	$(\sqrt{\nu_0})_{computed}$
10^{-1}	$4.0263 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$3.8996 \cdot 10^{-1}$
10^{-2}	$1.2732 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$1.2690 \cdot 10^{-1}$
10^{-8}	$1.2732 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.2732 \cdot 10^{-4}$

TABLE 1
Asymptotic and computed values of $\sqrt{\nu_0}$.

963 partition. Or, at least, to coefficients that are locally (piecewise) constant near the
964 interface and locally smooth near the boundary. And, near the boundary and for
965 smooth coefficients, one may use the so-called *frozen coefficients* technique, cf. [21,
966 §5.2] or [17, §5]. In principle, the value of $\tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{opt}$ can still be computed. But when
967 the coefficients are only piecewise smooth, the technique no longer applies.
968 Also, there is no obvious way to compute the constant $C_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma,t)}^*$ appearing in (3.6)
969 when t spans $(0, \tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{opt})$, or to provide bounds of such a constant with respect to the
970 coefficients, with the help of the local approach.
971 On the other hand, the global approach allows one to address all of the above, on a
972 partition made of (possibly) non-polyhedral domains. It is only when the discretiza-
973 tion is concerned that one assumes the partition to be made of polyhedra.

974 **8. Acknowledgements.** The author thanks Julia Charrier for many interest-
975 ing discussions and feedback, and Erell Jamelot and Serge Nicaise for providing some
976 useful insight regarding the local approach (Appendix B). The author also acknowl-
977 edges the contribution of Vasileios Vrettakos, who analyzed the coplanar waveguide
978 configuration during his Master’s internship [35] using different mathematical tools
979 and measures of electromagnetic fields than the ones presented here.

980

REFERENCES

- 981 [1] M. Ainsworth, W. McLean, and T. Tran. The conditioning of boundary element equations on
982 locally refined meshes and preconditioning by diagonal scaling. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*,
983 36:1901–1932, 1999.
- 984 [2] A. Alonso and A. Valli. An optimal domain decomposition preconditioner for low-frequency
985 time harmonic Maxwell equations. *Math. Comp.*, 68:607–631, 1999.
- 986 [3] C. Amrouche, C. Bernardi, M. Dauge, and V. Girault. Vector potentials in three-dimensional
987 non-smooth domains. *Math. Meth. Appl. Sci.*, 21:823–864, 1998.
- 988 [4] F. Assous, P. Ciarlet, Jr., and S. Labrunie. *Mathematical foundations of computational elec-*
989 *tromagnetism*, volume 198 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, 2018.
- 990 [5] P. Benner and J. Schneider. Uncertainty quantification for Maxwell’s equations using stochastic
991 collocation and model order reduction. *International Journal for Uncertainty Quantifica-*
992 *tion*, 5:195–208, 2015.
- 993 [6] A. Bonito, J.-L. Guermond, and F. Luddens. Regularity of the Maxwell equations in heteroge-
994 neous media and Lipschitz domains. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 408:498–512, 2013.
- 995 [7] A.-S. Bonnet-Ben Dhia, L. Chesnel, and P. Ciarlet, Jr. T-coercivity for the Maxwell problem
996 with sign-changing coefficients. *Communications in PDEs*, 39:1007–1031, 2014.
- 997 [8] A.-S. Bonnet-Ben Dhia, L. Chesnel, and P. Ciarlet, Jr. Two-dimensional Maxwell’s equations
998 with sign-changing coefficients. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 79:29–41, 2014.
- 999 [9] S. Brenner and L.R. Scott. *The mathematical theory of finite element methods, 3rd Edition*.
1000 Springer Verlag, 2008.
- 1001 [10] M. Campos Pinto and B. Després. Constructive formulations of resonant Maxwell’s equations.
1002 *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 49:3637–3670, 2017.
- 1003 [11] S.N. Chandler-Wilde, D.P. Hewett, and A. Muiola. Interpolation of Hilbert and Sobolev spaces:
1004 quantitative estimates and counterexamples. *Mathematika*, 61:414–443, 2015.
- 1005 [12] P. Ciarlet, Jr. On the approximation of electromagnetic fields by edge finite elements. Part 1:

- 1006 Sharp interpolation results for low-regularity fields. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 71:85–104, 2016.
- 1007 [13] P. Ciarlet, Jr., S. Fliss, and C. Stohrer. On the approximation of electromagnetic fields by
1008 edge finite elements. Part 2: A heterogeneous multiscale method for Maxwell’s equations.
1009 *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 73:1900–1919, 2017.
- 1010 [14] M. Costabel, M. Dauge, and S. Nicaise. Singularities of Maxwell interface problems. *Math.*
1011 *Mod. Num. Anal.*, 33:627–649, 1999.
- 1012 [15] M. Costabel, M. Dauge, and S. Nicaise. Singularities of eddy current problems. *Math. Mod.*
1013 *Num. Anal.*, 37:807–831, 2003.
- 1014 [16] M. Dauge. Benchmark computations for Maxwell equations. [https://perso.univ-rennes1.fr/
1015 monique.dauge/core/index.html](https://perso.univ-rennes1.fr/monique.dauge/core/index.html).
- 1016 [17] M. Dauge. Neumann and mixed problems on curvilinear polyhedra. *Integr. Equat. Oper. Th.*,
1017 15:227–261, 1992.
- 1018 [18] B. Després, L.-M. Imbert-Gérard, and R. Weder. Hybrid resonance of Maxwell’s equations in
1019 slab geometry. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 101:623–659, 2014.
- 1020 [19] A. Ern and J.-L. Guermond. Finite element quasi-interpolation and best approximation.
1021 *ESAIM: M2AN*, 51:1367–1385, 2017.
- 1022 [20] A. Ern and J.-L. Guermond. Analysis of the edge finite element approximation of the Maxwell
1023 equations with low regularity solutions. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 75:918–932, 2018.
- 1024 [21] P. Grisvard. *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*. Pitman, 1985.
- 1025 [22] P. Grisvard. *Singularities in boundary value problems*, volume 22 of *RMA*. Masson, 1992.
- 1026 [23] P.W. Gross and P.R. Kotiuga. *Electromagnetic theory and computation: a topological approach*.
1027 MSRI Publications Series, 48. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- 1028 [24] N. Heuer. Additive Schwarz method for the p-version of the boundary element method for the
1029 single layer potential operator on a plane screen. *Numer. Math.*, 88:485–511, 2001.
- 1030 [25] N. Heuer. On the equivalence of fractional-order Sobolev semi-norms. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*,
1031 417:505–518, 2014.
- 1032 [26] D. S. Jerison and C. E. Kenig. The inhomogeneous Dirichlet problem in Lipschitz domains. *J.*
1033 *Functional Analysis*, 130:161–219, 1995.
- 1034 [27] F. Jochmann. An H^s -regularity result for the gradient of solutions to elliptic equations with
1035 mixed boundary conditions. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 238:429–450, 1999.
- 1036 [28] J.-L. Lions and E. Magenes. *Problèmes aux limites non homogènes et applications*. Dunod,
1037 1968.
- 1038 [29] P. Monk. *Finite element methods for Maxwell’s equations*. Oxford University Press, 2003.
- 1039 [30] J.-C. Nédélec. Mixed finite elements in \mathbb{R}^3 . *Numer. Math.*, 35:315–341, 1980.
- 1040 [31] J.-C. Nédélec. *Acoustic and Electromagnetic Equations*. Springer, 2001.
- 1041 [32] G. Savaré. Regularity results for elliptic equations in Lipschitz domains. *J. Funct. Anal.*,
1042 152:176–201, 1998.
- 1043 [33] L. Tartar. *An introduction to Sobolev spaces and interpolation spaces*, volume 3 of *Lecture*
1044 *Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana*. Springer, 2007.
- 1045 [34] The MORwiki Community. Coplanar waveguide. MORwiki – Model Order Reduction Wiki,
1046 2018.
- 1047 [35] V. Vrettakos. Quantification de l’incertain en électromagnétisme : identification des
1048 dépendances par rapport aux paramètres. Master’s thesis, Paris-Saclay University,
1049 Palaiseau, France, 2016.

1050 **Appendix A. Real interpolation method.** We follow here [33, §§22-23]
1051 and [9, §14]. Let H_0, H_1 be two Hilbert spaces, continuously embedded into a third
1052 Hilbert space H :

- 1053 • $H_0 + H_1$ is equipped with the norm $\|v\|_{H_0 + H_1} = \inf_{v=v_0+v_1} (\|v_0\|_{H_0} + \|v_1\|_{H_1})$;
 - 1054 • resp., $H_0 \cap H_1$ is equipped with the norm $\|v\|_{H_0 \cap H_1} = \max(\|v\|_{H_0}, \|v\|_{H_1})$.
- 1055 One introduces, for $v \in H_0 + H_1$, $K(t; v) := \inf_{v=v_0+v_1} (\|v_0\|_{H_0}^2 + t^2\|v_1\|_{H_1}^2)^{1/2}$. For
1056 $s \in (0, 1)$, one defines the interpolated space

$$1057 \quad (H_0, H_1)_{s,2} := \left\{ v \in H_0 + H_1 \text{ s.t. } t^{-s}K(t; v) \in L^2(0, \infty; \frac{dt}{t}) \right\},$$

1058 equipped with the norm $\|v\|_{(H_0, H_1)_{s,2}} := \|t^{-s}K(t; v)\|_{L^2(0, \infty; \frac{dt}{t})}$.

1059
1060 In the case where $H_1 \subset H_0$, we use the notation $H_s = (H_0, H_1)_{s,2}$. In this case
1061 and after elementary computations, one finds that :

1062 • For all $s, s' \in (0, 1)$, $s \leq s'$:

1063
$$\exists C_{(s,s')}, \forall v \in H_{s'}, \quad \|v\|_{H_s} \leq C_{(s,s')} \|v\|_{H_{s'}}.$$

1064 • For all $s \in (0, 1)$, $H_s \subset H_0$:

1065
$$\exists c_0 > 0, \forall s \in (0, 1), \forall v \in H_s, \quad \|v\|_{H_0} \leq c_0 s^{1/2} (1-s)^{1/2} \|v\|_{H_s}.$$

1066 • For all $s \in (0, 1)$, $H_1 \subset H_s$:

1067
$$\exists c_1 > 0, \forall s \in (0, 1), \forall v \in H_1, \quad s^{1/2} (1-s)^{1/2} \|v\|_{H_s} \leq c_1 \|v\|_{H_1}.$$

1068 If $H_1 = H_0$, the above holds for $c_0 = 2$, resp. $c_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$.

1069 **Appendix B. The local approach for finding a regularity exponent**

1070 $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}$. We know that e and $\mu^{-1} \mathbf{curl} e$ may be split into regular and gradient
 1071 parts (6.2)-(6.3). The regularity of the regular parts is known to be independent of
 1072 the coefficients (see Proposition 5.3). On the other hand, the regularity of the gradient
 1073 parts, ∇p_0 governed by (5.4), resp. ∇q_0 governed by (5.7), depends a priori on the co-
 1074 efficients: it is now determined by the local approach. Based on the global approach,
 1075 we have obtained a regularity exponent $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}$ which is strictly lower than $\frac{1}{2}$. So it
 1076 may not be equal to the “best” regularity exponent $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{opt}$. Indeed, one knows that
 1077 the best regularity exponent is always lower than or equal to 1, and that there exist
 1078 configurations for which it is equal to 1, see eg. [3]. To summarize, $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{opt} \in (0, 1]$
 1079 and

- 1080 • either $p_0, q_0 \in PH^2(\Omega)$ always holds, in which case $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{opt} = 1$;
 1081 • or $p_0, q_0 \in \bigcap_{s \in [0, \tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{opt})} PH^{1+s}(\Omega)$, and possibly $p_0, q_0 \notin PH^{1+\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{opt}}(\Omega)$,
 1082 always holds, in which case $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{opt} \in (0, 1)$.

1083 Below, we recall how one can characterize the best regularity exponent $\tau_{(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)}^{opt}$ by the
 1084 local approach, in the case where the *coefficients* $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$ are as in section 2.1, and
 1085 moreover $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$ are *piecewise constant over a polyhedral partition*. Below, we focus
 1086 on the influence of the interface Σ , that is to say on the influence of the coefficients.
 1087 Obviously, the influence of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ must be taken into account. But unless
 1088 the interface intersects with it, the coefficients do not play a role in the regularity of
 1089 the solution there, only the geometry of the boundary does. Along the same lines, if
 1090 the coefficient is constant on Ω , the local approach allows one to determine the “best”
 1091 (largest) value of σ_{Dir} and σ_{Neu} . We follow here [14, 15] and Refs. therein: according
 1092 to Kondratiev’s theory, one studies the second order elliptic PDEs locally all over Ω ,
 1093 and in particular the (local) regularity of its solution [21, §8.2].

1094 **B.1. Interior domain.** Let \mathcal{O} be the domain on which a local problem is de-
 1095 fined. We consider here that \mathcal{O} is an *interior domain*, that is $\partial\mathcal{O} \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset$. The case
 1096 of a boundary domain ($\partial\mathcal{O} \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$) is sketched in §B.2.

1097 The first type of local problems occurs when $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ does not intersect with the interface,
 1098 and then the solution belongs to $H^2(\mathcal{O})$.

1099 There are three other types of local problems, namely:

- 1100 • problems where the interface is a smooth manifold, in this case the solution
 1101 is piecewise smooth, ie. it belongs to $PH^2(\mathcal{O})$;
 1102 • edge problems where the interface is a smooth manifold, *except for one edge* e ,
 1103 that allow to determine the so-called edge singularities: there exists $\tau_e \in (0, 1)$
 1104 such that the solution always belongs to $\bigcap_{s \in [0, \tau_e)} PH^{1+s}(\mathcal{O})$, but may not
 1105 belong to $PH^{1+\tau_e}(\mathcal{O})$;

1106 • corner problems, where the interface is smooth, *except for several edges that*
 1107 *intersect at a corner \mathbf{c}* , that allow to determine the so-called corner singu-
 1108 larities: there exists $\tau_{\mathbf{c}} \in (0, 1)$ such that the solution always belongs to
 1109 $\bigcap_{s \in [0, \tau_{\mathbf{c}})} PH^{1+s}(\mathcal{O})$, but may not belong to $PH^{1+\tau_{\mathbf{c}}}(\mathcal{O})$.

1110 We focus first on *corner problems*. The case of the edge problem is treated next.
 1111 For a corner \mathbf{c} , the singularities are obtained as non-zero quasi-homogeneous functions
 1112 which solve the same problem in Γ with zero right-hand side, where Γ is the *infinite*
 1113 *cone* that coincides with the domain \mathcal{O} at \mathbf{c} . Introducing \mathbb{S}^2 the unit sphere, resp.
 1114 $(\rho, \theta, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times [0, \pi) \times [0, 2\pi)$ the spherical coordinates, centered at \mathbf{c} , and defining
 1115 $G := \Gamma \cap \mathbb{S}^2$, one can choose a priori those functions in the sets

$$1116 \quad S_{\mathbf{c}}^{\lambda}(\Gamma) := \{ \Psi = \rho^{\lambda} \psi(\theta, \varphi) \text{ s.t. } \psi \in H^1(G) \}, \text{ where } \lambda \in \mathbb{C}.$$

1117 More precisely (see [15, p. 818]), one should look for quasi-homogeneous func-
 1118 tions of the type $\rho^{\lambda} \sum_{q=0, Q} (\log \rho)^q \psi_q(\theta, \varphi)$ with $Q \in \mathbb{N}$. However it is sufficient
 1119 for our purposes – determining the exponent – to focus on homogeneous functions.
 1120 In spherical coordinates, we recall that the volume element writes $\rho^2 d\rho d\zeta$, where
 1121 $d\zeta := \sin \theta d\theta d\varphi$, whereas the gradient writes $\nabla v = \partial_{\rho} v \mathbf{e}_{\rho} + \rho^{-1} \nabla_{\zeta} v$, with $\nabla_{\zeta} v :=$
 1122 $\partial_{\theta} v \mathbf{e}_{\theta} + (\sin \theta)^{-1} \partial_{\varphi} v \mathbf{e}_{\varphi}$.

1123 Because \mathcal{O} is an interior domain, observe that one has $G = \mathbb{S}^2$ and $\partial\Gamma = \emptyset$.

1124 For the local corner problem at hand, since one is looking for $\Psi_{\mathbf{c}} = \rho^{\lambda_{\mathbf{c}}} \psi(\theta, \varphi)$ in
 1125 $H_{loc}^1(\Gamma)$, one finds that a necessary and sufficient condition on the exponent $\lambda_{\mathbf{c}}$ is that
 1126 $\Re(\lambda_{\mathbf{c}}) > -\frac{1}{2}$; and moreover that

$$1127 \quad \tau_{\mathbf{c}}(\xi) := \min_{\lambda_{\mathbf{c}} \text{ st. } \Re(\lambda_{\mathbf{c}}) > -\frac{1}{2}} \left(\lambda_{\mathbf{c}} + \frac{1}{2} \right),$$

1128 where $\Psi_{\mathbf{c}} \neq 0$ is a (non-smooth) function governed by $\text{div}(\xi \nabla \Psi_{\mathbf{c}}) = 0$ in Γ . The
 1129 coefficient ξ being independent of ρ , one easily checks that it is equivalent to finding
 1130 solutions to the eigenproblem

$$1131 \quad (\text{B.1}) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } \psi \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^2) \setminus \{0\}, \nu \in \mathbb{C} \text{ such that} \\ \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi \nabla_{\zeta} \psi \cdot \nabla_{\zeta} \overline{\psi'} d\zeta = \nu \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi \psi \overline{\psi'} d\zeta, \forall \psi' \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^2), \end{cases}$$

1132 with the relation $\nu = \lambda_{\mathbf{c}}(\lambda_{\mathbf{c}} + 1)$. Note that $\psi = 1$ and $\nu = 0$ is an eigenpair of
 1133 (B.1), which yields the values $\lambda_{\mathbf{c}} = 0$ or $\lambda_{\mathbf{c}} = -1$. The latter is excluded, because one
 1134 has necessarily $\Re(\lambda_{\mathbf{c}}) > -\frac{1}{2}$. Whereas the former yields $\Psi_{\mathbf{c}} = 1$, which is a smooth
 1135 function, and thus one concludes that no singular behavior is associated with $\nu = 0$.
 1136 Then, choosing $\psi' = \psi$ in (B.1) one finds that

$$1137 \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi |\nabla_{\zeta} \psi|^2 d\zeta = \nu \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi |\psi|^2 d\zeta.$$

1138 Using the notation $\nu_R := \Re(\nu)$ and $\nu_I := \Im(\nu)$ for complex-valued fields, and taking
 1139 respectively the real and imaginary part of the previous equation, one derives the
 1140 relations

$$1141 \quad (\text{B.2}) \quad \nu_R := \frac{(\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi_R |\nabla_{\zeta} \psi|^2 d\zeta) (\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi_R |\psi|^2 d\zeta) + (\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi_I |\nabla_{\zeta} \psi|^2 d\zeta) (\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi_I |\psi|^2 d\zeta)}{(\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi_R |\psi|^2 d\zeta)^2 + (\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi_I |\psi|^2 d\zeta)^2},$$

$$1142 \quad (\text{B.3}) \quad \nu_I := \frac{(\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi_I |\nabla_{\zeta} \psi|^2 d\zeta) (\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi_R |\psi|^2 d\zeta) - (\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi_R |\nabla_{\zeta} \psi|^2 d\zeta) (\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi_I |\psi|^2 d\zeta)}{(\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi_R |\psi|^2 d\zeta)^2 + (\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \xi_I |\psi|^2 d\zeta)^2}.$$

1143 Considering both cases $\xi = \mu$ and $\xi = \varepsilon_\sigma$, one notices that, under the assumptions of
 1144 section 2.1, the spectral theorem can be applied to characterize the solutions to the
 1145 eigenproblem (B.1), see for instance [31, §2.1]. In particular, the eigenfunctions can be
 1146 chosen as the elements of a Hilbert basis of $L^2(\mathbb{S}^2)$. We already observed that $\psi = 1$
 1147 is an eigenfunction (with related eigenvalue $\nu = 0$). Hence, as a consequence of the
 1148 Poincaré inequality in $H_{zmv}^1(\mathbb{S}^2)$, there exists $c_P > 0$ such that, for all eigenfunctions
 1149 ψ related to a non-zero eigenvalue, it holds that

$$1150 \quad (B.4) \quad \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla_\varsigma \psi|^2 d\varsigma}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\psi|^2 d\varsigma} \geq c_P^2.$$

1151 For the two cases of interest:

1152 • If $\xi = \mu$ (real-valued coefficient case), one has according to (B.2)-(B.3) that

$$1153 \quad (B.5) \quad \nu = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \mu |\nabla_\varsigma \psi|^2 d\varsigma}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \mu |\psi|^2 d\varsigma} \geq \frac{\mu_{min}}{\mu_{max}} c_P^2 > 0.$$

1154 Recall that $\nu = \lambda_c(\lambda_c + 1)$, ie. $\lambda_c = -\frac{1}{2} \pm \sqrt{\nu + \frac{1}{4}}$. Due to the condition
 1155 $\Re(\lambda_c) > -\frac{1}{2}$ and because one has $\nu > 0$, the only admissible relation is
 1156 $\lambda_c = -\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\nu + \frac{1}{4}}$. Hence $\lambda_c > 0$ for all non-zero eigenvalues ν , which yields
 1157 $\tau_c(\mu) > 1/2$ *independently of the values of μ_{min} and μ_{max} .*

1158 • If $\xi = \varepsilon_\sigma$ (complex-valued coefficient case), one has according to (B.2) that

$$1159 \quad (B.6) \quad \nu_R \geq \frac{(\xi_R)_{min}^2 + (\xi_I)_{min}^2}{(\xi_R)_{max}^2 + (\xi_I)_{max}^2} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\nabla_\varsigma \psi|^2 d\varsigma}{\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} |\psi|^2 d\varsigma} \geq \frac{\varepsilon_{min}^2 \omega^2 + \sigma_{min}^2}{\varepsilon_{max}^2 \omega^2 + \sigma_{max}^2} c_P^2 > 0,$$

1160 while, according to (B.3), ν_I can take positive or negative values. Due to
 1161 the condition $\Re(\lambda_c) > -\frac{1}{2}$ and because one has now $\nu_R > 0$, see (B.6), the
 1162 only admissible relation is again $\lambda_c = -\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\nu + \frac{1}{4}}$. Let $\nu + \frac{1}{4} = \rho_\nu \exp(i\theta_\nu)$,
 1163 $\rho_\nu > 0$, $\theta_\nu \in [0, 2\pi)$. Then $\Re(\sqrt{\nu + \frac{1}{4}}) = (\rho_\nu)^{1/2} \cos(\theta_\nu/2)$, with $\rho_\nu \geq (\nu_R + \frac{1}{4})$
 1164 and $\cos^2(\theta_\nu/2) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos \theta_\nu) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + (\rho_\nu)^{-1}(\nu_R + \frac{1}{4}))$. Hence,

$$1165 \quad \Re(\sqrt{\nu + \frac{1}{4}}) = \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\rho_\nu + \nu_R + \frac{1}{4} \right) \right)^{1/2} \geq \left(\nu_R + \frac{1}{4} \right)^{1/2} > \frac{1}{2}.$$

1166 This yields $\tau_c(\varepsilon_\sigma) > 1/2$ *independently of the values of ε_{max} , ε_{min} , σ_{max} and*
 1167 σ_{min} .

1168 We focus now on *edge problems*. For an edge \mathbf{e} , the singularities are obtained as
 1169 non-zero quasi-homogeneous functions which solve the same problem in Γ with zero
 1170 right-hand side, where $\Gamma \times \mathbb{R}$ is the *infinite sector* that coincides with the domain \mathcal{O}
 1171 at \mathbf{e} . Introducing \mathbb{S}^1 the unit circle, resp. $(\rho, \theta, z) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times [0, 2\pi) \times \mathbb{R}$ the cylindrical
 1172 coordinates with $\mathbf{e} \subset \{z = 0\}$, and defining $G := \Gamma \cap \mathbb{S}^1$, one can choose a priori those
 1173 functions in the sets

$$1174 \quad S_\mathbf{e}^\lambda(\Gamma) := \{ \Psi = \rho^\lambda \psi(\theta) \text{ s.t. } \psi \in H^1(G) \}, \text{ where } \lambda \in \mathbb{C}.$$

1175 One should look for quasi-homogeneous functions, however restricting to homogeneous
1176 is again sufficient to determine the exponent. In the polar coordinates (ρ, θ) , we recall
1177 that the surface element writes $\rho d\rho d\theta$, whereas the gradient writes $\nabla v = \partial_\rho v \mathbf{e}_\rho +$
1178 $\rho^{-1} \partial_\theta v \mathbf{e}_\theta$. Because \mathcal{O} is an interior domain, observe that one has $G = \mathbb{S}^1$ and $\partial\Gamma = \emptyset$.
1179 For the local edge problem at hand, since one is looking for $\Psi_{\mathbf{e}} = \rho^{\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}} \psi(\theta)$ in $H_{loc}^1(\Gamma)$,
1180 one finds that a necessary and sufficient condition on the exponent $\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}$ is that $\Re(\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}) >$
1181 0 ; and moreover that

$$1182 \quad \tau_{\mathbf{e}}(\xi) := \min_{\lambda_{\mathbf{e}} \text{ st. } \Re(\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}) > 0} \lambda_{\mathbf{e}},$$

1183 where $\Psi_{\mathbf{e}} \neq 0$ is a (non-smooth) function governed by $\text{div}(\xi \nabla \Psi_{\mathbf{e}}) = 0$ in Γ . The
1184 coefficient ξ being independent of ρ , it is equivalent to finding solutions to the eigen-
1185 problem

$$1186 \quad (\text{B.7}) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } \psi \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^1) \setminus \{0\}, \nu \in \mathbb{C} \text{ such that} \\ \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \xi \partial_\theta \psi \partial_\theta \overline{\psi'} d\theta = \nu \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \xi \psi \overline{\psi'} d\theta, \forall \psi' \in H^1(\mathbb{S}^1), \end{cases}$$

1187 with the relation $\nu = \lambda_{\mathbf{e}}^2$. The spectral theorem can be applied under the assumptions
1188 of section 2.1 for $\xi = \mu$ and $\xi = \varepsilon_\sigma$. As previously, $\psi = 1$ and $\nu = 0$ is an eigenpair
1189 of (B.7), leading to $\Psi_{\mathbf{e}} = 1$, and one concludes again that no singular behavior is
1190 associated with $\nu = 0$. So, using the Poincaré inequality in $H_{zmv}^1(\mathbb{S}^1)$, there exists
1191 $c_P > 0$ such that, for all eigenfunctions ψ related to a non-zero eigenvalue, the bound
1192 (B.4) holds, and one also recovers (B.2)-(B.3), with ∇_ζ replaced by $\partial_\theta \psi$, resp. $d\zeta$ by
1193 $d\theta$. Then:

- 1194 • If $\xi = \mu$ (real-valued coefficient case), one derives again the lower bound
1195 (B.5) on ν . Due to the condition $\Re(\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}) > 0$, the only admissible relation is
1196 $\lambda_{\mathbf{e}} = \sqrt{\nu}$. Hence $\lambda_{\mathbf{e}} > 0$ for all non-zero eigenvalues ν , which yields $\tau_{\mathbf{e}}(\mu) > 0$.
1197 More precisely, one gets the lower bound

$$1198 \quad \tau_{\mathbf{e}}(\mu) \geq c_P \left(\frac{\mu_{min}}{\mu_{max}} \right)^{1/2}.$$

- 1199 • If $\xi = \varepsilon_\sigma$ (complex-valued coefficient case), one has the lower bound (B.6)
1200 for ν_R . And, according to (B.3), ν_I can take positive or negative values.
1201 Due to the condition $\Re(\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}) > 0$ and because $\nu_R > 0$, one has $\lambda_{\mathbf{e}} = \sqrt{\nu}$.
1202 Writing $\nu := \nu_R + i\nu_I = \rho_\nu \exp(i\theta_\nu)$, with $\rho_\nu > 0$ and $\theta_\nu \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$, one has
1203 $\lambda_{\mathbf{e}} = \rho_\nu^{1/2} \exp(i\theta_\nu/2)$, so that $\Re(\sqrt{\nu}) \geq 2^{-1/2} \rho_\nu^{1/2}$. One may check that

$$1204 \quad \Re(\sqrt{\nu}) \geq 2^{-1/2} \left(\frac{(\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \xi_R |\partial_\theta \psi|^2 d\theta)^2 + (\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \xi_I |\partial_\theta \psi|^2 d\theta)^2}{(\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \xi_R |\psi|^2 d\theta)^2 + (\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \xi_I |\psi|^2 d\theta)^2} \right)^{1/4}.$$

1205 Hence, one gets the lower bound

$$1206 \quad \tau_{\mathbf{e}}(\varepsilon_\sigma) \geq 2^{-1/2} c_P \left(\frac{\varepsilon_{min}^2 \omega^2 + \sigma_{min}^2}{\varepsilon_{max}^2 \omega^2 + \sigma_{max}^2} \right)^{1/4}.$$

1207 **B.2. Boundary domain.** We consider now that the domain \mathcal{O} on which a local
1208 problem is defined is a *boundary domain*, for which $\partial\mathcal{O} \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$. The main difference
1209 with the interior domain case is that the local problems now come with a (homo-
1210 geneous) boundary condition: Dirichlet boundary condition for p_0 , resp. Neumann

1211 boundary condition for q_0 . On the other hand, the theory is quite similar to the one
 1212 of §B.1. As in the interior domain case, one must consider edge problems, and corner
 1213 problems. Below, we suppose explicitly that $\mathcal{O} \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset$.

1214 For the *corner problem*, one looks for homogeneous solutions that belong to $S_c^\lambda(\Gamma)$,
 1215 but now $\partial\Gamma \neq \emptyset$, and $G = \Gamma \cap \mathbb{S}^2$ is a strict subset of \mathbb{S}^2 . Then, one solves an
 1216 eigenproblem like (B.1), with the relation $\nu = \lambda_c(\lambda_c + 1)$, now set in the function
 1217 space $H_0^1(G)$ (Dirichlet boundary condition), resp. in $H_{zmv}^1(G)$ (Neumann boundary
 1218 condition). The main observation for the corner problem set in a boundary domain
 1219 is that, since there holds a Poincaré inequality in both function spaces, one may still
 1220 apply the previous analysis (interior domain), to draw the conclusions. Namely, one
 1221 finds that

$$1222 \quad \tau_c(\mu) > 1/2, \quad \tau_c(\varepsilon_\sigma) > 1/2,$$

1223 *independently of the values of the coefficients.*

1224 For the *edge problem*, one looks for homogeneous solutions that belong to $S_e^\lambda(\Gamma)$, where
 1225 $\partial\Gamma \neq \emptyset$, and G is a strict subset of \mathbb{S}^1 . One solves an eigenproblem like (B.7), with the
 1226 relation $\nu = \lambda_e^2$, set in the function space $H_0^1(G)$ (Dirichlet boundary condition), resp.
 1227 in $H_{zmv}^1(G)$ (Neumann boundary condition). Since there holds a Poincaré inequality
 1228 in both function spaces, one may again apply the previous analysis (interior domain),
 1229 to draw the conclusions. One finds the lower bounds:

$$1230 \quad \tau_e(\mu) \geq c_{P,Neu} \left(\frac{\mu_{min}}{\mu_{max}} \right)^{1/2}, \quad \tau_e(\varepsilon_\sigma) \geq 2^{-1/2} c_{P,Dir} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_{min}^2 \omega^2 + \sigma_{min}^2}{\varepsilon_{max}^2 \omega^2 + \sigma_{max}^2} \right)^{1/4}.$$

1231 Finally, if there is no interface in \mathcal{O} , ie. $\mathcal{O} \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$, one simply considers that the
 1232 coefficient ξ is constant on \mathcal{O} . In this case the value of $\tau_c, \tau_e \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ is determined by
 1233 the geometry of the boundary. Precisely, if \mathcal{O} is defined as the intersection of Ω with
 1234 a ball, one finds that $\tau_c < 1$ or $\tau_e < 1$ if, and only if, \mathcal{O} is not convex.

1235 **B.3. Behavior of the best exponent.** From the previous studies, we conclude
 1236 that one derives the actual value of the best regularity exponent by taking $\tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{opt} :=$
 1237 $\min(1, \min_e \tau_e, \min_c \tau_c)$. In particular, one may compute numerically the value of
 1238 $\tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{opt}$.

1239 As for the global approach (see §6.5), let us study what happens when Θ is not reduced
 1240 to a singleton. Again, let us consider that all its elements $(\varepsilon, \mu, \sigma)$ are such that ε, σ, μ
 1241 are piecewise-constant on a *fixed partition*. We see that if condition

$$1242 \quad (B.8) \quad \sup_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma) \in \Theta} \frac{\mu_{max}}{\mu_{min}} + \sup_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma) \in \Theta} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_{max}^2 \omega^2 + \sigma_{max}^2}{\varepsilon_{min}^2 \omega^2 + \sigma_{min}^2} \right)^{1/2} < \infty$$

1243 holds, then $\inf_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma) \in \Theta} \tau_{(\varepsilon,\mu,\sigma)}^{opt} > 0$.