



HAL
open science

Sharp stability analysis for high-order finite element discretizations of general wave propagation problems

Théophile Chaumont-Frelet, Serge Nicaise

► To cite this version:

Théophile Chaumont-Frelet, Serge Nicaise. Sharp stability analysis for high-order finite element discretizations of general wave propagation problems. ICIAM 2019 - International Congress on Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Jul 2019, Valencia, Spain. hal-02321133

HAL Id: hal-02321133

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-02321133>

Submitted on 21 Oct 2019

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.

Sharp stability analysis for high-order finite element discretizations of general wave propagation problems


T. Chaumont-Frelet (Inria project-team Nachos, CNRS, UCA LJAD)
S. Nicaise (Univ. Valenciennes, LAMAV)

ICIAM - July 17, 2019

Recent advances on computational wave propagation

Given f , we seek u such that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\frac{\omega^2}{\kappa} u - \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u \right) = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\ \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n} - \frac{i\omega}{\sqrt{\kappa\rho}} u = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_A, \end{array} \right.$$



where:

Ω is a (sufficiently) smooth domain, $\partial\Omega = \overline{\Gamma_D} \cup \overline{\Gamma_A}$,

κ and ρ are (sufficiently) smooth strictly positive functions,

$\omega \geq 0$ is the angular frequency.

Classically, assuming $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, we recast the original problem into:

Variational formulation

Find $u \in H_{\Gamma_D}^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$b(u, v) = (f, v),$$

where

$$b(u, v) = -\omega^2 \left(\frac{1}{\kappa} u, v \right) - i\omega \left\langle \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa\rho}} u, v \right\rangle_{\Gamma_A} + \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u, \nabla v \right).$$

We equip the space $H_{\Gamma_D}^1(\Omega)$ with the following “energy” norm

$$\|v\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}^2 = \omega^2 \|v\|_{0,\Omega}^2 + |v|_{1,\Omega}^2,$$

that is motivated by the coefficients in $b(\cdot, \cdot)$.

We introduce a conforming finite element subspace

$$V_h = \left\{ v_h \in H_{\Gamma_D}^1(\Omega) \mid v_h|_K \in \mathcal{P}_p(K) \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h \right\} \subset H_{\Gamma_D}^1(\Omega).$$

that is build on polynomials of degree p .

Discrete solution

Find $u_h \in V_h$ such that

$$b(u_h, v_h) = (f, v_h) \quad \forall v_h \in V_h.$$

We are interested in stability properties of FEM in the high-frequency regime.

Under which condition is the finite element method stable?

What is the influence of the polynomial degree p ?

These questions are linked to the “approximation factor”

For $\phi \in L^2(\Omega)$, define u_ϕ^* as the unique element of $H_{\Gamma_D}^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$b(w, u_\phi^*) = (w, \phi) \quad \forall w \in H_{\Gamma_D}^1(\Omega).$$

Approximation factor

$$\eta = \sup_{\phi \in L^2(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|u_\phi^* - \mathcal{I}_h u_\phi^*\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}}{\|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}}$$

It is the best constant such that

$$\|u_\phi^* - \mathcal{I}_h u_\phi^*\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \leq \eta \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega} \quad \forall \phi \in L^2(\Omega).$$

η illustrate how well V_h can represent continuous solutions.
Most of this talk is devoted to a careful analysis of this quantity.

- 1 Relationship between approximation factor and stability of FEM
 - Warm up exercise: the zero frequency case
 - The high-frequency case
- 2 Upper bounds for the approximation factor and stability conditions
 - Settings
 - A naive approach
 - A regularity splitting for general media
- 3 Numerical experiments and sharpness of the main results
 - A methodology to illustrate the main results
 - Numerical experiments

- 1 Relationship between approximation factor and stability of FEM
 - Warm up exercise: the zero frequency case
 - The high-frequency case
- 2 Upper bounds for the approximation factor and stability conditions
 - Settings
 - A naive approach
 - A regularity splitting for general media
- 3 Numerical experiments and sharpness of the main results
 - A methodology to illustrate the main results
 - Numerical experiments

- 1 Relationship between approximation factor and stability of FEM
 - Warm up exercise: the zero frequency case
 - The high-frequency case
- 2 Upper bounds for the approximation factor and stability conditions
 - Settings
 - A naive approach
 - A regularity splitting for general media
- 3 Numerical experiments and sharpness of the main results
 - A methodology to illustrate the main results
 - Numerical experiments

We set $\omega = 0$. Our problem becomes:

Variational formulation

Find $u \in H_{\Gamma_D}^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$b(u, v) = (f, v) \quad \forall v \in H_{\Gamma_D}^1(\Omega),$$

with

$$b(u, v) = \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u, \nabla v \right).$$

This is a text-book problem, often called the Poisson problem.

The sesquilinear form is continuous and coercive

$$|b(u, v)| \lesssim \|u\|_{1, \omega, \Omega} \|v\|_{1, \omega, \Omega} \quad \operatorname{Re} b(v, v) \gtrsim \|v\|_{1, \omega, \Omega}^2.$$

We immediatly obtain quasi-optimality (Céa's lemma):

$$\begin{aligned}\|u - u_h\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}^2 &\lesssim b(u - u_h, u - u_h) && \text{(Coercivity)} \\ &= b(u - u_h, u - \mathcal{I}_h u) && \text{(Galerkin's orthogonality)} \\ &\lesssim \|u - u_h\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \|u - \mathcal{I}_h u\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}. && \text{(Continuity)}\end{aligned}$$

Quasi-optimality

$$\|u - u_h\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \lesssim \|u - \mathcal{I}_h u\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}.$$


We consider the following 1D toy problem

$$\begin{cases} -u''(x) &= (\pi/2)^2 \sin(\pi x/2) \\ u(0) &= 0, \\ u'(1) &= 0, \end{cases}$$


whose solution is given by

$$u(x) = \sin\left(\frac{\pi x}{2}\right).$$

Convergence of the \mathcal{P}_1 FEM



Convergence of the \mathcal{P}_2 FEM



The discrete solution is quasi-optimal for arbitrary meshes.

The FEM is stable on arbitrary meshes:
up to constant, we get the best possible discrete representation.

- 1 Relationship between approximation factor and stability of FEM
 - Warm up exercise: the zero frequency case
 - The high-frequency case
- 2 Upper bounds for the approximation factor and stability conditions
 - Settings
 - A naive approach
 - A regularity splitting for general media
- 3 Numerical experiments and sharpness of the main results
 - A methodology to illustrate the main results
 - Numerical experiments


To do so, let us consider the following 1D toy problem

$$\begin{cases} -\omega^2 u(x) - u''(x) & = 1, & x \in (0, 1), \\ u(0) & = 0, \\ u'(1) - iku(1) & = 0, \end{cases}$$

whose solution is given by


$$u(x) = \frac{1}{\omega^2} (1 - \cos(\omega x)).$$

A low frequency case with \mathcal{P}_1 elements: $\omega = 4\pi$




The behaviour is comparable to the coercive case.

A high frequency case with \mathcal{P}_1 elements: $\omega = 64\pi$




We observe a “gap” between the FEM and the interpolation error.

A high frequency case with \mathcal{P}_1 elements: $\omega = 256\pi$




The “gap” is more important for this higher frequency.

A high frequency case with \mathcal{P}_1 elements: $\omega = 2048\pi$




It looks like the FEM is not even converging!

A low frequency case with \mathcal{P}_3 elements: $\omega = 4\pi$




The behaviour is comparable to the coercive case.

A high frequency case with \mathcal{P}_3 elements: $\omega = 64\pi$




The FEM look stable.

A high frequency case with \mathcal{P}_3 elements: $\omega = 256\pi$



The FEM still look stable.

A high frequency case with \mathcal{P}_3 elements: $\omega = 2048\pi$



We finally see the gap.

The FEM is not stable for all meshes:
there is a “gap” between the interpolation and finite element errors.

This gap increases with the frequency,
but seems less important for $p = 3$ than $p = 1$.

It is often called “pollution effect” in the literature.
The remaining of this talk is devoted to a precise analysis of this phenomenon.

The sesquilinear form reads

$$b(u, v) = -\omega^2 \left(\frac{1}{\kappa} u, v \right) - i\omega \left\langle \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa\rho}} u, v \right\rangle_{\Gamma_A} + \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u, \nabla v \right),$$

where ω is large.

Hence, it is continuous

$$|b(u, v)| \lesssim \|u\|_{1, \omega, \Omega} \|v\|_{1, \omega, \Omega},$$

but not coercive

$$\operatorname{Re} b(v, v) \gtrsim \|v\|_{1, \omega, \Omega}^2 - \omega^2 \|v\|_{0, \Omega}^2.$$

We would like to employ Céa's Lemma, but we only have a Gårdling inequality:

$$|b(u - u_h, u - u_h)| \gtrsim \|u - u_h\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}^2 - \omega^2 \|u - u_h\|_{0,\Omega}^2.$$

We cannot employ Céa's Lemma directly, as we are missing coercivity.

We can tackle this problem using the "Schatz argument".

A.H. Schatz, 1974

An observation concerning Ritz-Galerkin methods with indefinite bilinear forms.

J. Douglas, J.E. Santos, D. Sheen, L.S. Bennethum, 1993,

Frequency domain treatment of one-dimensional scalar waves.

F. Ihlenburg, I. Babuška, 1995,

Finite element solution of the Helmholtz equation with high wave number. Part I: The h-version of the FEM.

Set $\phi = u - u_h \in L^2(\Omega)$, and define $u_\phi^* \in H_{\Gamma_D}^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$b(w, u_\phi^*) = (w, \phi) = (w, u - u_h) \quad \forall w \in H_{\Gamma_D}^1(\Omega),$$

Then, picking the test function $w = u - u_h$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - u_h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 &= b(u - u_h, u_\phi^*) = b(u - u_h, u_\phi^* - \mathcal{I}_h u_\phi^*) \\ &\lesssim \|u - u_h\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \|u_\phi^* - \mathcal{I}_h u_\phi^*\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand by definition of η :

$$\|u_\phi^* - \mathcal{I}_h u_\phi^*\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \leq \eta \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega} = \eta \|u - u_h\|_{0,\Omega}.$$

Aubin-Nitsche trick

$$\|u - u_h\|_{0,\Omega} \lesssim \eta \|u - u_h\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}.$$

We have established that $\|u - u_h\|_{0,\Omega} \leq C\eta\|u - u_h\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} b(u - u_h, u - u_h) &\gtrsim \|u - u_h\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}^2 - \omega^2 \|u - u_h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 \\ &\gtrsim \left(1 - C\omega^2\eta^2\right) \|u - u_h\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming that $\omega\eta$ is “sufficiently small”, we have

$$b(u - u_h, u - u_h) \gtrsim \|u - u_h\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}^2,$$

and we can employ Céa's Lemma as before!

Asymptotic quasi-optimality

Under the assumption that $\omega\eta$ is sufficiently small, we have

$$\|u - u_h\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \lesssim \|u - \mathcal{I}_h u\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}.$$

This result is not really satisfactory, as we don't know what " $\omega\eta$ is sufficiently small" means!

It motivates careful analysis to develop sharp upper bounds on η . Specifically, explicit estimates in terms of ω , h and p are required.

- 1 Relationship between approximation factor and stability of FEM
 - Warm up exercise: the zero frequency case
 - The high-frequency case
- 2 Upper bounds for the approximation factor and stability conditions
 - Settings
 - A naive approach
 - A regularity splitting for general media
- 3 Numerical experiments and sharpness of the main results
 - A methodology to illustrate the main results
 - Numerical experiments

- 1 Relationship between approximation factor and stability of FEM
 - Warm up exercise: the zero frequency case
 - The high-frequency case
- 2 Upper bounds for the approximation factor and stability conditions
 - **Settings**
 - A naive approach
 - A regularity splitting for general media
- 3 Numerical experiments and sharpness of the main results
 - A methodology to illustrate the main results
 - Numerical experiments

For the sake of simplicity, we consider a non-trapping problem.

Non-trapping problem

For all $\phi \in L^2(\Omega)$, for all $\omega \geq 0$ there exists a unique $u_\phi^* \in H_{\Gamma_D}^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$b(w, u_\phi^*) = (w, \phi) \quad \forall w \in H_{\Gamma_D}^1(\Omega).$$


In addition, it holds that

$$\|u_\phi^*\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega},$$

uniformly in ω .

Some vocabulary: the number of dofs per wavelength

$N_\lambda = \lambda/h \simeq (\omega h)^{-1}$ is a measure of the number of dofs per wavelength.



In the above picture, $\lambda = 2h$: there are two dofs per wavelength.

In the following, we assume that $\omega \gtrsim 1$ and $N_\lambda \gtrsim 1$ for the sake of simplicity.

- 1 Relationship between approximation factor and stability of FEM
 - Warm up exercise: the zero frequency case
 - The high-frequency case
- 2 Upper bounds for the approximation factor and stability conditions
 - Settings
 - **A naive approach**
 - A regularity splitting for general media
- 3 Numerical experiments and sharpness of the main results
 - A methodology to illustrate the main results
 - Numerical experiments

Recall that

$$\eta = \sup_{\phi \in L^2(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|u_\phi^* - \mathcal{I}_h u_\phi^*\|_{1, \omega, \Omega}}{\|\phi\|_{0, \Omega}}.$$

Consider an arbitrary $\phi \in L^2(\Omega)$. There exists a unique $u_\phi^* \in H_{\Gamma_D}^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$b(w, u_\phi^*) = (w, \phi) \quad \forall w \in H_{\Gamma_D}^1(\Omega).$$

We want to estimate the interpolation error $u_\phi^* - \mathcal{I}_h u_\phi^*$.

To do so, we are going to show that $u_\phi^* \in H^2(\Omega)$.

In strong form, we have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\frac{\omega^2}{\kappa} u_\phi^* - \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_\phi^* \right) = \phi \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_\phi^* = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\ \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_\phi^* \cdot \mathbf{n} + \frac{i\omega}{\sqrt{\kappa\rho}} u_\phi^* = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_A, \end{array} \right.$$

and we can write

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_\phi^* \right) := F = \phi + \frac{\omega^2}{\kappa} u_\phi^* \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_\phi^* = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\ \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_\phi^* \cdot \mathbf{n} := G = -\frac{i\omega}{\sqrt{\kappa\rho}} u_\phi^* \quad \text{on } \Gamma_A. \end{array} \right.$$

Then, standard elliptic regularity results show that

$$\|u_\phi^*\|_{2,\Omega} \lesssim \|F\|_{0,\Omega} + \|G\|_{1/2,\Gamma_A}.$$

A naïve approach: $H^2(\Omega)$ -norm estimate

Since the problem is non-trapping $\|u_\phi\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}$, and we have

$$\|F\|_{0,\Omega} = \left\| \phi + \frac{\omega^2}{\kappa} u_\phi^* \right\|_{0,\Omega} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega} + \omega \|u_\phi\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \lesssim \omega \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega},$$

and

$$\|G\|_{0,\Omega} = \left\| \frac{-i\omega}{\sqrt{\kappa\rho}} u_\phi^* \right\|_{1/2,\Gamma_A} \lesssim \omega \|u_\phi^*\|_{1/2,\Gamma_A} \lesssim \omega \|u_\phi^*\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \lesssim \omega \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}.$$

$H^2(\Omega)$ -norm estimate

$$\|u_\phi^*\|_{2,\Omega} \lesssim \omega \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}.$$

At that point, standard interpolation theory shows that

$$\|u_\phi^* - \mathcal{I}_h u_\phi^*\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \lesssim h |u_\phi^*|_{2,\Omega} \lesssim \omega h \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}$$

Recalling that

$$\eta = \sup_{\phi \in L^2(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|u_\phi^* - \mathcal{I}_h u_\phi^*\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}}{\|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}},$$

we obtain:

Upper bound for the approximation factor

$$\eta \lesssim \omega h.$$

We have $\eta \lesssim \omega h$. Then, the condition “ $\omega \eta$ small”, means $\omega^2 h \lesssim 1$.

As $\omega^2 h = (N_\lambda)^{-1} \omega$, the condition

A stability condition

$$N_\lambda \gtrsim \omega$$

guaranties stability of the FEM for all frequencies.

We derived a stability condition of the form $N_\lambda \gtrsim \omega$.

This stability condition is valid for any polynomial degree p . However, we do not see improvements when p increases, which is not in agreement with numerical experiments.

Actually, this stability condition is optimal if $p = 1$, but not when $p > 1$.

It seems difficult to obtain an improvement with p , since we only have $u_\phi^* \in H^2(\Omega)$ as $\phi \in L^2(\Omega)$ only.

We cannot simply assume more regularity on ϕ , since we are employing a duality argument.

- 1 Relationship between approximation factor and stability of FEM
 - Warm up exercise: the zero frequency case
 - The high-frequency case
- 2 Upper bounds for the approximation factor and stability conditions
 - Settings
 - A naive approach
 - A regularity splitting for general media
- 3 Numerical experiments and sharpness of the main results
 - A methodology to illustrate the main results
 - Numerical experiments

We cannot expect more than

$$\eta \simeq \mathcal{O}(h),$$

asymptotically, as the right-hand sides are in $L^2(\Omega)$.

The breakthrough idea is to introduce a clever splitting of the solution as

$$u_\phi^* = u_0 + \tilde{u},$$

where $u_0 \in H^2(\Omega)$ “behaves well” at high-frequency and \tilde{u} is more regular.

So far, such splitting have only been obtained in homogeneous media.

J.M. Melenk and S.A. Sauter, 2010

Convergence analysis for finite element discretizations of the Helmholtz equation with Dirichlet-to-Neumann boundary conditions.

J.M. Melenk and S.A. Sauter, 2011

Wavenumber explicit convergence analysis for Galerkin discretizations of the Helmholtz equation.

The key idea (with a lot of hand-waving!) is the formal expansion

$$u_\phi^\star = \sum_{j \geq 0} \omega^j u_j,$$

where we hope that the iterates are independent of ω with increasing regularity.

This expansion is purely formal.

However, plugging it in the PDE problem solved by u_ϕ^\star , we obtain an actual definition for the u_j .

T. Chaumont-Frelet, S. Nicaise, 2019

Wavenumber explicit convergence analysis for finite element discretizations of general wave propagation problems.

The key idea (with a lot of **hand-waving!**) is the **formal expansion**

$$u_\phi^\star = \sum_{j \geq 0} \omega^j u_j,$$

where we **hope** that the iterates are independent of ω with increasing regularity.

This expansion is purely formal.

However, plugging it in the PDE problem solved by u_ϕ^\star , we obtain an actual definition for the u_j .

T. Chaumont-Frelet, S. Nicaise, 2019

Wavenumber explicit convergence analysis for finite element discretizations of general wave propagation problems.

Identifying powers of ω , we introduce the following definition

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_0 \right) = \phi & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_0 = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\ \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_A, \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_1 \right) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_1 = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\ \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_1 \cdot \mathbf{n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa\rho}} u_0 & \text{on } \Gamma_A, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_j \right) = \frac{1}{\kappa} u_{j-2} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_j = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\ \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_j \cdot \mathbf{n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa\rho}} u_{j-1} & \text{on } \Gamma_A. \end{cases}$$

We have

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_0 \right) = \phi & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_0 = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\ \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_0 \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_A, \end{cases}$$

so that $u_0 \in H^2(\Omega)$ with

$$\|u_0\|_{2,\Omega} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}.$$

Similarly, since

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_1 \right) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_1 = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\ \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_1 \cdot \mathbf{n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa\rho}} u_0 & \text{on } \Gamma_A. \end{cases}$$

we have

$$\|u_1\|_{3,\Omega} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{3/2,\Gamma_A} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{2,\Omega} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}.$$

Finally, by induction, we have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_j \right) = \frac{1}{\kappa} u_{j-2} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_j = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\ \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla u_j \cdot \mathbf{n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa \rho}} u_{j-1} & \text{on } \Gamma_A, \end{array} \right.$$

so that $u_j \in H^{j+2}(\Omega)$ with

$$\|u_j\|_{j+2,\Omega} \lesssim \|u_j\|_{j-2,\Omega} + \|u_{j-1}\|_{j-1,\Omega} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}.$$

We have introduced a sequence u_j so that $u_j \in H^{j+2}(\Omega)$ and

$$\|u_j\|_{j+2,\Omega} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}.$$

The definition of the sequence was motivated by the formal expansion

$$u_\phi^\star = \sum_{j \geq 0} \omega^j u_j.$$

This expansion is purely formal, and actually does not converge.
We need to thoroughly examine the residuals.

We thus introduce, for $p \geq 1$ the residuals

$$r_p = u_\phi^\star - \sum_{j=0}^{p-2} \omega^j u_j,$$

so that

$$u_\phi^\star = \left(\sum_{j=0}^{p-2} \omega^j u_j \right) + r_p.$$

We need to study the regularity and frequency behaviour of r_p .

We have $r_1 = u_\phi^*$. Thus, $r_1 \in H^2(\Omega)$ with

$$|r_1|_{2,\Omega} \lesssim |u_\phi^*|_{2,\Omega} \lesssim \omega \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}.$$

Then, we see that r_2 satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla r_2 \right) &= \frac{\omega^2}{\kappa} u_\phi^* & \text{in } \Omega, \\ r_2 &= 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_D, \\ \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla r_2 \cdot \mathbf{n} &= -\frac{i\omega}{\sqrt{\kappa\rho}} r_1. \end{cases}$$

Hence, $r_2 \in H^3(\Omega)$ with

$$|r_2|_{3,\Omega} \lesssim \omega^2 \|u_\phi^*\|_{1,\Omega} + \omega \|r_1\|_{2,\Omega} \lesssim \omega^2 \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}.$$

More generally, we have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla r_p \right) = \frac{\omega^2}{\kappa} r_{p-2} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ r_p = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_A, \\ \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla r_p = -\frac{i\omega}{\sqrt{\kappa\rho}} r_{p-1} & \text{on } \Gamma_D. \end{array} \right.$$

By induction, we show that $r_p \in H^{p+1}(\Omega)$ with

$$\|r_p\|_{p+1,\Omega} \lesssim \omega^2 \|r_{p-2}\|_{p-1,\Omega} + \omega \|r_{p-1}\|_{p,\Omega} \lesssim \omega^p \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}.$$

We have shown that for all $p \geq 1$, we have

$$u_\phi^\star = \left(\sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \omega^j u_j \right) + r_p,$$

with $u_j \in H^{j+2}(\Omega)$, $r_p \in H^{p+1}(\Omega)$

$$\|u_j\|_{j+2,\Omega} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega} \quad \|r_p\|_{p+1,\Omega} \lesssim \omega^p \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}.$$

The residual r_p behaves as a solution with smooth right-hand side. It is similar to the “regular part” of the Melnik-Sauter splitting.

The u_j have increasing regularity, and behave “nicely” at high frequencies.

Upper bound for the approximation factor

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_\phi^* - \mathcal{I}_h u_\phi^*\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} &\lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \omega^j \|u_j - \mathcal{I}_h u_j\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} + \|r_p - \mathcal{I}_h r_p\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \omega^j h^{j+1} |u_j|_{j+2,\omega,\Omega} + h^p |r_p|_{p+1,\omega,\Omega} \\ &\lesssim h \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} (\omega h)^j \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega} + \omega^p h^p \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega} \\ &\lesssim (h + \omega^p h^p) \|\phi\|_{0,\Omega}. \quad ((\omega h)^j = N_\lambda^{-j} \lesssim 1)\end{aligned}$$

Upper bound for the approximation factor

$$\eta \lesssim h + \omega^p h^p.$$

We have shown that $\omega\eta \lesssim \omega h + \omega^{p+1}h^p \simeq (N_\lambda)^{-1} + \omega(N_\lambda)^{-1/p}$.

It follows that for any fixed p , the FEM is stable if

Stability condition

$$N_\lambda \gtrsim \omega^{1/p}$$

For any fixed p , N_λ must be increased to preserve stability, but the increase rate is lower for larger p .

High order methods require less dofs per wavelength to achieve stability.

- 1 Relationship between approximation factor and stability of FEM
 - Warm up exercise: the zero frequency case
 - The high-frequency case
- 2 Upper bounds for the approximation factor and stability conditions
 - Settings
 - A naive approach
 - A regularity splitting for general media
- 3 Numerical experiments and sharpness of the main results
 - A methodology to illustrate the main results
 - Numerical experiments

- 1 Relationship between approximation factor and stability of FEM
 - Warm up exercise: the zero frequency case
 - The high-frequency case
- 2 Upper bounds for the approximation factor and stability conditions
 - Settings
 - A naive approach
 - A regularity splitting for general media
- 3 Numerical experiments and sharpness of the main results
 - A methodology to illustrate the main results
 - Numerical experiments

Our key results state that if $N_\lambda \gtrsim \omega^{1/p}$, then

$$\|u - u_h\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \lesssim \|u - \mathcal{I}_h u\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}.$$

To illustrate this, we would like to compute, for a fixed p , what is the minimal value $N_\lambda^*(\omega)$ such that the FEM is stable when $N_\lambda \geq N_\lambda^*(\omega)$.

We consider a fixed domain and a fixed right-hand side, and solve the Helmholtz problem for several frequencies ω .

For each frequency, we approximate the problem for different mesh sizes h , and record the convergence history of

$$\|u - u_h\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u - \mathcal{I}_h u\|_{1,\omega,\Omega}.$$

For each frequency, we denote by $N_\lambda^*(\omega)$ the smallest value such that

$$\|u - u_h\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \leq 2\|u - \mathcal{I}_h u\|_{1,\omega,\Omega} \quad \forall N_\lambda \geq N_\lambda^*(\omega),$$


where the constant 2 is chosen arbitrarily.

This $N_\lambda^*(\omega)$ then defines a sufficient number of dofs per wavelength to ensure stability.


According to our main result, we shall observe that

$$N_\lambda^*(\omega) \lesssim \omega^{1/p}.$$

- 1 Relationship between approximation factor and stability of FEM
 - Warm up exercise: the zero frequency case
 - The high-frequency case
- 2 Upper bounds for the approximation factor and stability conditions
 - Settings
 - A naive approach
 - A regularity splitting for general media
- 3 Numerical experiments and sharpness of the main results
 - A methodology to illustrate the main results
 - Numerical experiments



Heterogeneous domain




Locally refined mesh

Piecewise constant coefficients


$$\begin{array}{lll} \kappa_1 = 1, & \kappa_2 = 10, & \kappa_3 = 1000, \\ \rho_1 = 1, & \rho_2 = 0.5, & \rho_3 = 0.1. \end{array}$$

The right-hand side is Gaussian load term centered at the origin.

Zero-levelset curves of the real parts of solutions




$$\omega = 10\pi$$



$$\omega = 20\pi$$

Required dofs per wavelength $N_\lambda^*(\omega)$



We have $N_\lambda^*(\omega) \simeq \omega^{1/p}$, which indicates that our stability condition is sharp.

We derived a novel frequency-explicit stability condition for heterogeneous domains with smooth coefficients.

With slight modifications, we can actually take into account piecewise smooth coefficients, so that our analysis applies to a wide range of problems.

The derived stability condition is valid for any fixed polynomial degree p , and numerical experiments indicate that it is sharp.

For non-trapping domains, this stability condition is: $N_\lambda \gtrsim \omega^{1/p}$.

This analysis strongly encourages the use of high order FEM, as they exhibit an improved stability.