

Uniform asymptotics for a family of degenerating variational problems and multiscale approximations with error estimates

Shane Cooper¹, Ilia V. Kamotski¹, and Valery P. Smyshlyaev^{1,2}

¹Department of Mathematics, University College London, Gordon Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK.

²Corresponding author. Email: v.smyshlyaev@ucl.ac.uk

October 3, 2023

Abstract

We study an abstract family of asymptotically degenerating variational problems. Those are natural generalisations of families of problems emerging upon application of a rescaled Floquet-Bloch-Gelfand transform to resolvent problems for high-contrast elliptic PDEs with highly oscillatory periodic coefficients. An asymptotic analysis of these models leads us to a hierarchy of approximation results with uniform operator-type error estimates under various assumptions, satisfied by specific examples. We provide approximations for the resolvents in terms of a certain ‘bivariate’ operator which appears an abstract generalisation of the two-scale limit operators for highly oscillatory high-contrast PDEs. The resulting approximating self-adjoint operator, providing tight operator error estimates, is the bivariate operator sandwiched by a connecting operator which for a broad class of periodic problems specialises to a new two-scale version of the classical Whittaker-Shannon interpolation. An explicit description of the limit spectrum in the abstract setting is provided, and new tight error estimates on the distance between the original and limit spectra are established. Our generic approach allows us to readily consider a wide class of asymptotically degenerating problems including but also going beyond high-contrast highly oscillatory PDEs. The obtained results are illustrated by various examples.

1 Introduction

One of the main motivations for the present study comes from the desire for construction of accurate approximations of two-scale type, with controllably small errors, for mathematical models with strong interaction between micro and macro-scales. An interest in such models comes from the fact that they are often capable of displaying certain non-standard and unusual physical effects in an asymptotically explicit way, which often clarifies the nature and the microscopic mechanism of the observable macroscopic effects. One class of such models includes two-scale Partial Differential Equations (PDEs) with high-contrast coefficients, or in other words asymptotically degenerating PDEs. Consider for example a simple scalar model of time-harmonic wave propagation in an ε -periodic medium described by

$$(1.1) \quad \operatorname{div}(a_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x)\nabla u_\varepsilon) + \rho\omega^2 u_\varepsilon = 0, \quad x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Here $\omega > 0$ is angular frequency, ρ is (for simplicity) a positive constant, and $a_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x) = a_\delta(x/\varepsilon)$ where $a_\delta(y) = 1 - \chi(y) + \delta\chi(y)$ and χ is the characteristic function of a set of isolated “soft” inclusions 1-periodic with respect to each variable x_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, surrounded by a “stiff” connected matrix.

When both ε and δ are small, a critical scaling is $\delta \sim \varepsilon^2$, which in the context of the wave propagation model (1.1) is known to be a “micro-resonant” scaling: frequencies producing order-one wavelengths in the matrix material would produce order- ε wavelengths in the inclusion material i.e. those comparable with the inclusions’ size, or in other words such frequencies are comparable to the resonant frequencies of the inclusions. This is reflected in the two-scale asymptotics of certain Bloch wave solutions to (1.1): $u_\varepsilon(x) \sim u_0(x, x/\varepsilon)$, where $u_0(x, y)$ is a function of only macroscopic variable x in the matrix but is also a function of the microscopic variable y in the resonating inclusions. This leads to a limit two-scale system for u_0 which displays such effects as band-gap opening near the resonances, as was probably first formally observed in a similar context in [3] and then made rigorous in [31] and [52, 53]. The $\delta \sim \varepsilon^2$ scaling plays a similarly key role in the so-called double porosity type diffusion models, for related earlier studies see e.g. [27, 1, 42, 2, 49]. The continued intensive interest in studying such degenerate models is largely due to the fact that the related two-scale approximations indeed possess a wealth of interesting and unusual properties. For an incomplete list of related other works we mention

[4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 24, 35, 37, 36, 44, 46, 50]. Somewhat similar effects are observed in thin periodic structures, see e.g. recent publications [19, 20] and further references therein.

Problem (1.1) is mathematically a spectral problem for unbounded self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{A}u = -\operatorname{div}A_\varepsilon\nabla u_\varepsilon$ in Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with spectral parameter $\lambda = \rho\omega^2$. (Here we regard $A_\varepsilon(x) := a_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon^2}(x)$ i.e. we set for simplicity $\delta = \varepsilon^2$.) A key for the analysis of (1.1), including of its asymptotic properties as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, lies in analysing the related resolvent problem

$$(1.2) \quad -\operatorname{div}A_\varepsilon\nabla u_\varepsilon + u_\varepsilon = F, \quad F \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Indeed, as we will see in this work too, asymptotic behaviour of a wide class of resolvent problems like (1.2) plays crucial role for the properties of the related spectral problems as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, they often also hold keys for analysing related evolution problems, both parabolic and hyperbolic, cf. e.g. [59, 43, 37].

This all motivates efforts on constructing tractable but accurate approximations first to the solutions of (1.2). In other words, this leads to a natural and until recently largely open question: can one establish tractable leading-order approximations for the asymptotically degenerating equations like (1.2), with small error estimates for the solutions for small ε uniformly with respect to F (in various norms)?

In the context of non-degenerate PDEs or classical homogenisation (e.g. for problem (1.2) which corresponds to a fixed $\delta > 0$ in (1.1)), error estimates for the approximation given by the related homogenised equations are by now well-known, and various approaches exist to establish them. We shall not even attempt here to provide a review of all these different methods except to mention one approach of particular relevance to this work: the so-called *spectral method*, see for example [54, 22, 8, 55], and also [26] and further references therein for most recent developments of the spectral approach for long-time homogenisation problems in both periodic and random settings. Our approach here is conceptually somewhat similar to [8] but we believe bears at the same time fundamental novelties allowing to obtain new results for much wider classes of examples, both non-degenerate and degenerate, see Section 7. Namely, our method does not employ analytic perturbation theory or alike but (as clarified below) performs instead a robust generic asymptotic analysis of variational problems and related operators near certain degeneracy points. This is what ultimately allows us to successfully analyse the more general degenerate problems with relative ease.

As far as degenerate problems are concerned, there has been some progress recently in obtaining approximations with error estimates specifically for the high-contrast problem like the ‘‘double-porosity’’ one above with $\delta = \varepsilon^2$ in (1.2). A leading-order approximation with L^2 error estimates was established in [15], for multiple spatial dimensions, using the spectral method as a basis; however the techniques employed therein appear problem specific and not readily generalisable. In one-spatial dimension double porosity models, leading-order approximations with error estimates were obtained in [14] and [16] by different approaches.

We emphasise here that upon applying our general method to the above key example of multi-dimensional double porosity model, see Section 7.2, we provide new operator estimates between the initial problem and a novel approximation via the two-scale limit operator. A crucial role is played here, see Theorem 7.9, by a new two-scale interpolation operator $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square)$, where \square is the y -periodicity cell. \mathcal{I}_ε is an L^2 -isometry and a key tool for recasting, for any final $\varepsilon > 0$, an input function $F(x)$ of (1.2) as a two-scale function $f_0(x, y)$. This in turn serves as an input for the two-scale limit problem, which ultimately ensures the desired operator error estimate, see (7.64), with further implications e.g. for error estimates on Floquet-Bloch spectrum and eigenfunctions (Bloch waves), Theorem 7.13 and Remark 7.14. Operator \mathcal{I}_ε is a specialisation of a naturally constructed abstract connecting operator A_ε (Theorem 6.10), and appears to be a novel two-scale analogue of classical Whittaker-Shannon interpolation formula, see Remark 7.10. It plays a role somewhat similar to the periodic unfolding operator see e.g. [21], which has proven capable of establishing operator-type estimates for certain classical (moderate contrast at low frequencies) homogenisation problems, e.g. [30]. We argue however (see Remark 7.11) that the new two-scale interpolation operator \mathcal{I}_ε is the most natural one for a wide class of models, including the high-contrast problems at micro-resonant frequencies.

That all being said, one of the main aims of this article is to demonstrate that a large class of the above mentioned problems (as well as many others) are all examples of one particular generic abstract family of asymptotically degenerating variational problems. As such, their leading-order asymptotics has a common structure reflecting the fact that these are all particular instances of an asymptotic approximation for that general variational problem. In this article we derive the leading-order asymptotics for

this abstract problem with error estimates. We then specify the underlying abstract objects to provide asymptotics (with operator-type error estimates) for various specific problems of interest.

As a way to motivate the general problem we recall that the starting point in the spectral method, used in the above-mentioned ε -periodic PDE setting (1.2) where $A_\varepsilon(x) = a_\delta(x/\varepsilon)$, is following. Apply the rescaling $x \mapsto \varepsilon y$ and then the Floquet-Bloch-Gelfand transform (see Section 7.1) to arrive at the family of problems on Sobolev space $H_{per}^1(\square)$ of \square -periodic functions, parametrised by quasi-periodicity variable (“quasimomentum”) θ :

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} \text{For each } \theta \in [-\pi, \pi]^n, \text{ find } u_{\varepsilon, \theta} \in H_{per}^1(\square) \text{ such that} \\ -\varepsilon^{-2}(\nabla + i\theta) \cdot a_\delta(y)(\nabla + i\theta)u_{\varepsilon, \theta} + u_{\varepsilon, \theta} = f, \end{cases}$$

where f is the transform of (rescaled) F .

Next, we observe that the weak formulation of problem (1.3) is of the following more abstract type:

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{cases} \text{For each } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ and } \theta \in \Theta, \text{ find } u_{\varepsilon, \theta} \in H \text{ such that} \\ \varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta(u_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \tilde{u}) + b_\theta(u_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \tilde{u}) = \langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle, \quad \forall \tilde{u} \in H, \end{cases}$$

where $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is compact, H a complex Hilbert space, f a bounded linear functional on H , a_θ and b_θ are non-negative bounded sesquilinear forms such that $a_\theta + b_\theta$ is a family of uniformly equivalent inner products on H , and a_θ is Lipschitz-continuous in θ (see Section 2 for the precise details). Notice that in many of our motivating examples the ‘singular’ forms a_θ have non-trivial degeneracy subspaces $V_\theta = \{u \in H \mid a_\theta(u, u) = 0\}$, that is why we refer to such variational problems as (asymptotically) *degenerate*.

The formulation (1.4) does not just cover the above classical or double-porosity type settings (1.3) (for $\delta > 0$ fixed and $\delta = \varepsilon^2$ respectively, with corresponding a_θ and b_θ), but also a much wider class of interesting problems. For example it includes among others, as illustrated by examples in Section 7, models as diverse as:

- ‘Inverted’ high-contrast model (Section 7.3), with resulting approximation (accompanied by operator error bounds) by an infinite contrast ‘stiff inclusions problem’ rather than any two-scale one;
- Problems with concentrated perturbations (Section 7.4) where θ can be not (only) the quasi-periodicity parameter;
- Problems with ‘weakly bonded’ imperfect interfaces (Section 7.5);
- Elasticity with ‘partially degenerating’ inclusions (Section 7.6);
- Schrödinger equations with a strong periodic magnetic field (Section 7.7);
- Differential-difference equations (Section 7.8);
- Difference equations (Section 7.9).

Further examples which are not covered in the present work but also fall into the abstract framework of (1.4) include: a wide class of partially degenerating high-contrast PDE systems (cf. [37] for some related background details); homogenisation problems on periodic quantum graphs and their generalisations, cf. e.g. [36]; problems in thin domains; problems on discrete periodic lattices; some higher-order differential and pseudo-differential operators. We emphasise here that we do not generally require the forms a_θ and b_θ to be generated by differential operators, nor do we require θ to necessarily be the Floquet-Bloch parameter or even for H to be a function space. This suggests possible far-reaching consequences of the present approach that can go even further beyond the scope of the examples outlined above.

The article is organised as follows. In Section 2 we formulate the abstract problem and introduce our main assumption (H1) that can be regarded as a version of a *spectral gap* condition. Namely, for every $\theta \in \Theta$ the form a_θ is coercive (generally non-uniformly in θ) on the orthogonal complement W_θ of its null-space V_θ . This condition is a far-reaching generalisation of a ‘key assumption’ introduced in [37] found to be important in establishing the two-scale convergence to homogenisation limits for a general class of partially degenerating elliptic PDE systems of type (1.2) in general domains.

In Section 3, we show that if the null-space V_θ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to θ then a_θ is uniformly coercive in θ on W_θ , and as a result the leading-order approximation simply comes from ‘projecting’ problem (1.4) onto V_θ , see Theorem 3.1. This simple result not only forms the basis for further investigation, it appears applicable to certain physically relevant models, for example, the *inverted* double porosity model (Example 7.3) and in the study of certain polarisations of electromagnetic waves in photonic crystal fibres, cf. [23, 25].

In Section 4 we study the case of discontinuous V_θ . This situation is typical in motivating examples such as the above classical and high-contrast problems (1.2), and corresponds to loss of the θ -uniformity of the spectral gap which requires a much more subtle asymptotic analysis of the solutions near related singular points. In particular, in Theorem 4.8 we construct a leading-order approximation to problems (1.4) when the null-space V_θ possesses an isolated singularity (say at the origin $\theta = 0$) that is removable

in the following sense: there exists a subspace V_\star such that $V_\theta^\star = \begin{cases} V_\theta, & \theta \neq 0, \\ V_\star, & \theta = 0 \end{cases}$ is Lipschitz continuous,

see (H2). The resulting approximate problem (4.23) is on a ‘‘sum’’ of V_θ^\star and the ‘defect subspace’ Z (describing the discontinuity gap between V_\star and V_0), with $\mathcal{M}_\theta z = z + \mathcal{N}_\theta z$ where $\mathcal{N}_\theta z$ is an abstract version of the classical corrector, see (4.4). The results of Section 4 are found useful for certain applications, see e.g. the example with concentrated perturbations in Section 7.4.

Problem (4.23) is simpler than (1.4), but still depends on ε and θ . In Section 5, we provide an approximation with even simpler self-similar ε and θ dependencies via their ratio $\theta/\varepsilon =: \xi$. This is done by approximating the forms a_θ and b_θ for small θ , which can be performed under additional θ -quadratic degeneracy condition for the spectral gap (H3) and mild regularity assumptions (H4) and (H5) on a_θ and b_θ , that are readily observed in many (even if not all, cf the example in Section 7.4 mentioned above) practical examples.

This leads us to one of the main results, Theorem 5.9, that provides a uniform approximation to the two-parameter solution $u_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ of (1.4) in terms of a solutions to a one-parameter family of variational problems (5.26) on the smaller space V_0 with sesquilinear forms $a_\xi^h + b_0$, $\xi = \theta/\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Here the non-negative form $a_\xi^h(z, \tilde{z})$ acts on the even smaller defect subspace Z , and is quadratic in ξ . Form a_ξ^h appears to generalise the homogenised matrix in classical homogenisation problems, and Z is found to be finite-dimensional under a stronger version (H1’) of the spectral gap condition which typically holds in many practical examples, see Section 5.4. (Notice however a simple example of a difference equation in Section 7.9, where (H1’) does not hold. Nevertheless our general scheme is still applicable and yields, despite infinite-dimensional Z , explicit approximations with error estimates in terms of a two-scale limit operator sandwiches by the two-scale interpolation operator, see Theorem 7.27.)

The significance of the dependence of the approximating problem (5.26) only on single parameter $\xi = \theta/\varepsilon$ manifests itself in Section 6 were ε -independent approximations in terms of an abstract version of a ‘two-scale’ limit operator, with principal symbol a_ξ^h , are constructed. Namely, Section 6 focuses on the associated abstract spectral problem in an ambient Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \supset H$:

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{cases} \text{For each } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ and } \theta \in \Theta, \text{ find } \lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta} \in [0, \infty), u_{\varepsilon,\theta} \in H \setminus \{0\} \text{ such that} \\ \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta(u_{\varepsilon,\theta}, \tilde{u}) + b_\theta(u_{\varepsilon,\theta}, \tilde{u}) = \lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta} d_\theta(u_{\varepsilon,\theta}, \tilde{u}) \quad \forall \tilde{u} \in H, \end{cases}$$

where d_θ is an inner product in \mathcal{H} and a positive compact sesquilinear form on H , satisfying some isometry conditions (H6) that are trivially observed in examples. Using the results of the previous sections we establish that the union of the spectra $\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ converges in appropriate sense, with rate ε . Moreover, in Theorem 6.10 we approximate the resolvent problem in terms of certain self-adjoint ‘bivariate’ operator \mathcal{L} , which is an abstract version of two-scale limit operator and is related to the ‘homogenised’ form $a_\xi^h + b_0$ via (inverse) Fourier transform (i.e. $\xi \mapsto -i\nabla$). An important role is played here by the already mentioned abstract L^2 -isometric connecting operator A_ε . We then show (Theorem 6.11) that the limit spectrum converges to the spectrum of \mathcal{L} , with a rate ε . The bivariate operator \mathcal{L} , specified by form (6.43), can be viewed as a second-order constant-coefficient differential operator acting in the Bochner space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \overline{V_0})$, where $\overline{V_0}$ is the closure of V_0 in \mathcal{H} . It can be seen to generalise the two-scale limit operators found for some high-contrast models via two-scale convergence. Amongst other things, the spectrum of the bivariate operator is characterised in terms of certain operator-valued function (generalising in some way the Zhikov’s β -function introduced in [52, 53]). This in turn provides an asymptotic characterisation, with error estimates, for gaps in $\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ which in particular leads to new estimates for the gaps in the Floquet-Bloch spectrum in specific examples.

Extensive Section 7 aims at demonstrating the power and versatility of our abstract results by applying them to a diverse set of physically motivated examples. We thereby not only re-establish, in the new light, some previously known results but obtain a number of new results for various high-contrast and some other asymptotically degenerating problems. Each of the problems is picked not only for their wider relevance, but also to demonstrate a particular feature and breadth of the article’s main assumptions

and results. While in some examples we go into fine details for demonstrating the full power of the developed general methods, in others we do not pursue a maximal generality but do quite the opposite: try to present a simpler example displaying a particular feature.

For all the above reasons, we expect the proposed approach to have a significant potential for further developments and applications, possibly going far beyond those discussed in the present work. In particular, the generality of the abstract scheme and versatile features of the emerging accompanying tools like the two-scale interpolation operator and its more abstract version, are expected to allow treating various non-periodic and time-dependent problems.

2 Abstract problem formulation

An abstract setup for the general class of problems under consideration in this article is as follows. Let H be a separable complex Hilbert space with a family of inner products $(\cdot, \cdot)_\theta$ parametrised by θ varying in a compact subset Θ of \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 1$. We assume throughout that the norms $\|\cdot\|_\theta := (\cdot, \cdot)_\theta^{1/2}$ are uniformly equivalent in θ , i.e.

$$(2.1) \quad \exists K > 0 \text{ such that } \|u\|_{\theta_1} \leq K \|u\|_{\theta_2}, \quad \forall u \in H, \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta.$$

We also suppose throughout that the inner products have the following structure

$$(2.2) \quad (u, \tilde{u})_\theta = a_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) + b_\theta(u, \tilde{u}), \quad u, \tilde{u} \in H,$$

where a_θ and b_θ are non-negative sesquilinear forms¹ on H . Furthermore, we assume that a_θ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to θ in the following sense: there exists $L_a > 0$ such that

$$(2.3) \quad |a_{\theta_1}(u, \tilde{u}) - a_{\theta_2}(u, \tilde{u})| \leq L_a |\theta_1 - \theta_2| \|u\|_{\theta_1} \|\tilde{u}\|_{\theta_1}, \quad \forall u, \tilde{u} \in H, \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta.$$

We consider a general class of problems reducible to the following common abstract variational form. For any given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, $\theta \in \Theta$, and $f \in H^*$,

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{cases} \text{find } u_{\varepsilon, \theta} \in H \text{ such that} \\ \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta(u_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \tilde{u}) + b_\theta(u_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \tilde{u}) = \langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle, \quad \forall \tilde{u} \in H. \end{cases}$$

Here H^* is the dual space of H and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the duality pairing. Clearly, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$(2.5) \quad A_{\varepsilon, \theta}(\cdot, \cdot) := \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta(\cdot, \cdot) + b_\theta(\cdot, \cdot)$$

is an equivalent inner product for H , and therefore problem (2.4) is well-posed by the Riesz theorem.

Our main aim is to establish asymptotic approximations of the solution $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ with respect to small ε that are uniform in an appropriate sense in both θ and f .

For each θ , we introduce the set of “degeneracy” or the kernel of a_θ

$$(2.6) \quad V_\theta := \{v \in H \mid a_\theta[v] = 0\},$$

where henceforth $\mathfrak{b}[v] := \mathfrak{b}(v, v)$ for a sesquilinear form \mathfrak{b} . Notice that, as a_θ is non-negative, it immediately follows from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality that

$$(2.7) \quad a_\theta(v, u) = a_\theta(u, v) = 0, \quad \forall v \in V_\theta, \forall u \in H.$$

Further, since the sesquilinear form a_θ is bounded with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_\theta$, (2.7) implies that V_θ is a closed linear subspace of H . Let W_θ , another closed linear subspace of H , be the orthogonal complement of V_θ in H with respect to the inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_\theta$:

$$(2.8) \quad W_\theta := \{w \in H \mid (w, v)_\theta = 0, \forall v \in V_\theta\}.$$

The main assumption of the article is the following pointwise in θ (spectral) **gap condition**:

$$(H1) \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta, \exists \nu_\theta > 0 \text{ such that } \forall w \in W_\theta \text{ the inequality } a_\theta[w] \geq \nu_\theta \|w\|_\theta^2 \text{ holds.}$$

¹In a complex Hilbert space H , for a non-negative sesquilinear form $\mathfrak{b} : H \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $\mathfrak{b}[u] := \mathfrak{b}(u, u)$ is non-negative real $\forall u \in H$. It is then straightforward to see that \mathfrak{b} is complex-Hermitian or symmetric, with Cauchy-Schwarz and triangle inequalities held, i.e. $\mathfrak{b}(u, \tilde{u}) = \overline{\mathfrak{b}(\tilde{u}, u)}$, $|\mathfrak{b}(u, \tilde{u})| \leq \mathfrak{b}^{1/2}[u] \mathfrak{b}^{1/2}[\tilde{u}]$, $\mathfrak{b}^{1/2}[u + \tilde{u}] \leq \mathfrak{b}^{1/2}[u] + \mathfrak{b}^{1/2}[\tilde{u}]$, $\forall u, \tilde{u} \in H$. (Here $\mathfrak{b}^{1/2}[u] := (\mathfrak{b}[u])^{1/2}$.) We shall also be using throughout the following simple implications, “squared” triangle inequalities: $\mathfrak{b}[u_1 + u_2] \leq 2 \mathfrak{b}[u_1] + 2 \mathfrak{b}[u_2]$, $\mathfrak{b}[u_1 + u_2 + u_3] \leq 3 \mathfrak{b}[u_1] + 3 \mathfrak{b}[u_2] + 3 \mathfrak{b}[u_3]$, $\forall u_1, u_2, u_3 \in H$.

Remark 2.1. To clarify why (H1) can be called a spectral gap condition, notice that for every $\theta \in \Theta$ the form a_θ defines a non-negative bounded self-adjoint operator in H . Condition (H1) implies together with (2.2) that the spectrum of this operator is contained in $\{0\} \cup [\nu_\theta, 1]$, in particular if both V_θ and W_θ are nontrivial $(0, \nu_\theta)$ is in the gap of the spectrum. In Section 6 and in some examples of Section 7, a_θ will specify possibly unbounded self-adjoint operator in a bigger Hilbert space \mathcal{H} into which H is densely (compactly) embedded, for which (H1) will still be implying presence of a spectral gap.

Remark 2.2. In a wide class of examples (see Section 7) one can readily verify that the following further strengthening (see Proposition 5.10) of condition (H1) holds. There exists $C > 0$ and a non-negative sesquilinear form c , $\|\cdot\|_\theta$ -compact (see Section 5.4 for the precise definition) for all $\theta \in \Theta$, such that

$$(H1') \quad \|w\|_\theta^2 \leq C a_\theta[w] + c[w], \quad \forall w \in W_\theta, \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

In particular, we will see that (H1') is self-evident in the context of classical homogenisation. In Section 5.4, we shall see that (H1') does not only imply (H1) but has other important implications.

3 The case of a continuous V_θ (uniform spectral gap)

As we shall see, the asymptotics of the solution to (2.4) crucially depend on certain continuity properties of the degeneracy subspace V_θ with respect to θ . We begin with the simple case of the spectral gap ν_θ being uniform in θ and then we shall characterise this condition in terms of the continuity of V_θ .

3.1 The case of uniform in θ gap

The spaces V_θ and W_θ are not only orthogonal with respect to $(\cdot, \cdot)_\theta$, they are also orthogonal with respect to $A_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ (cf. (2.5), (2.2) and (2.7)). Furthermore, it is clear that the restriction of $A_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ to V_θ is b_θ . Consequently, by choosing in (2.4) as the test functions first $\tilde{u} = \tilde{v} \in V_\theta$ and then $\tilde{u} = \tilde{w} \in W_\theta$, the problem uncouples as follows: $u_{\varepsilon, \theta} = v_\theta + w_{\varepsilon, \theta}$, where $v_\theta \in V_\theta$ solves

$$(3.1) \quad b_\theta(v_\theta, \tilde{v}) = \langle f, \tilde{v} \rangle, \quad \forall \tilde{v} \in V_\theta,$$

and $w_{\varepsilon, \theta} \in W_\theta$ solves

$$(3.2) \quad A_{\varepsilon, \theta}(w_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \tilde{w}) = \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta(w_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \tilde{w}) + b_\theta(w_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \tilde{w}) = \langle f, \tilde{w} \rangle, \quad \forall \tilde{w} \in W_\theta.$$

Problems (3.1) and (3.2) are well-posed in their own right: in particular, (3.1) is well-posed as b_θ is coercive on V_θ : for all $v \in V_\theta$, $b_\theta[v] = b_\theta[v] + a_\theta[v] = \|v\|_\theta^2$ (recalling also that both V_θ and W_θ are closed in H).

Now, in a standard way, setting in (3.2) $\tilde{w} = w_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ and recalling the spectral gap condition (H1),

$$A_{\varepsilon, \theta}[w_{\varepsilon, \theta}] = \langle f, w_{\varepsilon, \theta} \rangle \leq \|f\|_{*\theta} \|w_{\varepsilon, \theta}\|_\theta \leq \|f\|_{*\theta} \nu_\theta^{-1/2} a_\theta^{1/2}[w_{\varepsilon, \theta}] \leq \|f\|_{*\theta} \nu_\theta^{-1/2} \varepsilon A_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{1/2}[w_{\varepsilon, \theta}],$$

where

$$(3.3) \quad \|f\|_{*\theta} := \sup_{u \in H \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|\langle f, u \rangle|}{\|u\|_\theta}.$$

As a result, for $w_{\varepsilon, \theta} = u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - v_\theta$,

$$(3.4) \quad A_{\varepsilon, \theta}[w_{\varepsilon, \theta}] = \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta[w_{\varepsilon, \theta}] + b_\theta[w_{\varepsilon, \theta}] \leq \varepsilon^2 \nu_\theta^{-1} \|f\|_{*\theta}^2, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

Moreover, another application of (H1) and (3.4) give

$$(3.5) \quad \|w_{\varepsilon, \theta}\|_\theta^2 \leq \nu_\theta^{-1} a_\theta[w_{\varepsilon, \theta}] \leq \nu_\theta^{-1} \varepsilon^2 A_{\varepsilon, \theta}[w_{\varepsilon, \theta}] \leq \varepsilon^4 \nu_\theta^{-2} \|f\|_{*\theta}^2.$$

If the spectral gap is uniform in θ , regarding (3.1) as an approximate problem, (3.4) and (3.5) immediately provide the following error estimates.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that*

$$(3.6) \quad \exists \nu > 0 \text{ such that } a_\theta[w] \geq \nu \|w\|_\theta^2, \quad \forall w \in W_\theta, \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

Then for $u_{\varepsilon, \theta} \in H$ the solution to (2.4) and $v_\theta \in V_\theta$ the solution to (3.1),

$$(3.7) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta [u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - v_\theta] + b_\theta [u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - v_\theta] \leq \varepsilon^2 \nu^{-1} \|f\|_{*\theta}^2,$$

$$(3.8) \quad \|u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - v_\theta\|_\theta^2 \leq \varepsilon^4 \nu^{-2} \|f\|_{*\theta}^2.$$

Remark 3.2. *Theorem 3.1 also holds ‘locally’, i.e. with Θ replaced by any of its subsets Θ' such that assumption (3.6) is satisfied only on Θ' rather than on the whole of Θ . Also, the theorem and its proof remain valid for all $\varepsilon > 0$ (i.e. not only for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, as assumed above). These simple observations will be useful for some of our subsequent constructions.*

Remark 3.3. *Note that while the right-hand-sides of (3.7) and (3.8) formally depend on θ , this dependence is easily removed by (2.1) : $\|f\|_{*\theta_1} \leq K \|f\|_{*\theta_2}$, $\forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$. Therefore (3.7) and (3.8) provide desired error estimates for small ε , which are uniform in both θ and f .*

3.2 A characterisation of forms a_θ with uniform gap condition

In applications, the direct verification of (3.6) can be complicated. An equivalent but often more transparent condition relies on a notion of continuity of the degeneracy subspace V_θ in θ that we shall introduce now. Namely, we say that V_θ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to θ on Θ if

$$(3.9) \quad \exists L_V > 0 \text{ such that } \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta, \forall v_1 \in V_{\theta_1}, \quad \inf_{v_2 \in V_{\theta_2}} \|v_1 - v_2\|_{\theta_2} \leq L_V |\theta_1 - \theta_2| \|v_1\|_{\theta_1}.$$

By the identity $\|P_{W_{\theta_2}} v_1\|_{\theta_2} = \inf_{v_2 \in V_{\theta_2}} \|v_1 - v_2\|_{\theta_2}$, where $P_{W_\theta} : H \rightarrow W_\theta$ is the orthogonal projection on W_θ with respect to $(\cdot, \cdot)_\theta$, the inequality in (3.9) can be equivalently rewritten as

$$(3.10) \quad \|P_{W_{\theta_2}} v_1\|_{\theta_2} \leq L_V |\theta_1 - \theta_2| \|v_1\|_{\theta_1}, \quad \forall v_1 \in V_{\theta_1}, \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta.$$

The following result establishing, under assumption (H1), the equivalence of the uniformity of the gap property (3.6) and of the continuity of V_θ property (3.9) holds. An intuition behind is that the θ -continuity property (2.3) of a_θ implies certain regular behaviour of the related spectra, see Remark 2.1. So, as long as the spectral gap remains uniformly positive, the zero eigenspace V_θ can vary with θ only continuously, while if the uniformity is violated on θ approaching a point θ_0 this can be only be due to an instant addition of a non-trivial subspace to V_θ at $\theta = \theta_0$.

Theorem 3.4. *Assume (H1). Then (3.6) holds if and only if (3.9) holds.*

Proof. *Proof of (3.6) \implies (3.9).* Fix $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$ and $v_1 \in V_{\theta_1}$. By (3.6), the definition of $P_{W_{\theta_2}}$, (2.7) (first for $\theta = \theta_2$, $v = v_1 - P_{W_{\theta_2}} v_1 \in V_{\theta_2}$, $u = P_{W_{\theta_2}} v_1$, and then for $\theta = \theta_1$, $v = v_1$, $u = P_{W_{\theta_2}} v_1$), and (2.3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{W_{\theta_2}} v_1\|_{\theta_2}^2 &\leq \nu^{-1} a_{\theta_2} [P_{W_{\theta_2}} v_1] = \nu^{-1} a_{\theta_2} (P_{W_{\theta_2}} v_1, v_1) = \nu^{-1} \left(a_{\theta_2} (P_{W_{\theta_2}} v_1, v_1) - a_{\theta_1} (P_{W_{\theta_2}} v_1, v_1) \right) \\ &\leq \nu^{-1} L_a |\theta_1 - \theta_2| \|P_{W_{\theta_2}} v_1\|_{\theta_1} \|v_1\|_{\theta_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, after an application of (2.1), (3.10) holds with $L_V = \nu^{-1} L_a K$ and therefore so does (3.9).

Proof of (3.9) \implies (3.6). Let us suppose that (3.6) does not hold. Then there exists a convergent sequence $\theta_n \in \Theta$ with limit $\theta_0 \in \Theta$, and a sequence $w_n \in W_{\theta_n}$ such that $\|w_n\|_{\theta_n} = 1$ and $\lim_n a_{\theta_n} [w_n] = 0$. Now

$$(3.11) \quad 1 = \|w_n\|_{\theta_n}^2 = (P_{V_{\theta_0}} w_n, w_n)_{\theta_n} + (P_{W_{\theta_0}} w_n, w_n)_{\theta_n},$$

where $P_{V_{\theta_0}}$ is the orthogonal projector on V_{θ_0} with respect to $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\theta_0}$. We will show that each term on the right of (3.11) converges to zero. First we observe that by (2.1)

$$|(P_{W_{\theta_0}} w_n, w_n)_{\theta_n}| \leq \|P_{W_{\theta_0}} w_n\|_{\theta_n} \|w_n\|_{\theta_n} = \|P_{W_{\theta_0}} w_n\|_{\theta_n} \leq K \|P_{W_{\theta_0}} w_n\|_{\theta_0},$$

and we claim that $\lim_n \|P_{W_{\theta_0}} w_n\|_{\theta_0} = 0$. Indeed, by (H1) for $\theta = \theta_0$, (2.7) and (2.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{W_{\theta_0}} w_n\|_{\theta_0}^2 &\leq \nu_0^{-1} a_{\theta_0} [P_{W_{\theta_0}} w_n] = \nu_0^{-1} a_{\theta_0} [w_n] \leq \nu_0^{-1} a_{\theta_n} [w_n] + \nu_0^{-1} L_a |\theta_n - \theta_0| \|w_n\|_{\theta_n}^2 \\ &= \nu_0^{-1} a_{\theta_n} [w_n] + \nu_0^{-1} L_a |\theta_n - \theta_0| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the last term in (3.11) converges to zero. On the other hand, by the definition of $P_{W_{\theta_n}}$ and assumed (3.10) (for $\theta_1 = \theta_0$, $\theta_2 = \theta_n$ and $v_1 = P_{V_{\theta_0}} w_n$) we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (P_{V_{\theta_0}} w_n, w_n)_{\theta_n} \right| &= \left| (P_{W_{\theta_n}} P_{V_{\theta_0}} w_n, w_n)_{\theta_n} \right| \leq \|P_{W_{\theta_n}} P_{V_{\theta_0}} w_n\|_{\theta_n} \|w_n\|_{\theta_n} = \|P_{W_{\theta_n}} P_{V_{\theta_0}} w_n\|_{\theta_n} \\ &\leq L_V |\theta_n - \theta_0| \|P_{V_{\theta_0}} w_n\|_{\theta_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\|P_{V_{\theta_0}} w_n\|_{\theta_0} \leq \|w_n\|_{\theta_0} \leq K \|w_n\|_{\theta_n} = K$, and therefore the first term on the right hand side of (3.11) also converges to zero. Whence, we arrive at the contradiction in (3.11), and so (3.6) holds. \square

Remark 3.5. *The above proof demonstrates that an analogous version of Theorem 3.4 can be proved if we merely require both a_θ and V_θ to be say Hölder continuous (rather than Lipschitz continuous) in θ , with appropriate modification of (2.3) and (3.9). Also, a ‘local’ analogue of Theorem 3.4 holds, i.e. when in both (3.6) and (3.9) Θ is replaced by its closed subset Θ' .*

4 The case of discontinuous V_θ (non-uniform gap)

Typically, in applications (see Section 7) the space V_θ violates (3.9) and has isolated discontinuities. Moreover, these are special approximations near those discontinuity points which often characterise the key asymptotic properties of the solutions. Henceforth, we consider this situation and begin with an analysis in the neighbourhood of a given point $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ that, without loss of generality, we consider to be the origin² $\theta_0 = 0$.

4.1 Local estimates

While Theorem 3.1 is not anymore directly applicable, the idea behind it is. The essential part of Theorem 3.1 was to identify two ε -independent complementary subspaces of H , V_θ and W_θ , that are orthogonal with respect to $A_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ whilst having a_θ uniformly coercive on one of them. Staring with the latter, as a consequence of (H1) held at $\theta = \theta_0 = 0$ together with the continuity of a_θ due to (2.3), W_0 remains available as a subspace of H with the uniform coercivity condition still held in a small enough neighbourhood of θ_0 :

Proposition 4.1. *Assume (H1). Then*

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{\nu_0}{2K^2} \|w_0\|_\theta^2 \leq a_\theta [w_0], \quad \forall w_0 \in W_0, \forall \theta \in \Theta \text{ such that } |\theta| \leq \frac{1}{2} \nu_0 L_a^{-1}.$$

Proof. For $w_0 \in W_0$, as follows from (H1) (for $\theta = 0$), (2.3) (for $\theta_1 = 0$ and $\theta_2 = \theta$) and $L_a |\theta| < \frac{1}{2} \nu_0$,

$$\nu_0 \|w_0\|_0^2 \leq a_0 [w_0] \leq a_\theta [w_0] + L_a |\theta| \|w_0\|_0^2 \leq a_\theta [w_0] + \frac{1}{2} \nu_0 \|w_0\|_0^2,$$

which implies

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{\nu_0}{2} \|w_0\|_0^2 \leq a_\theta [w_0], \quad \forall w_0 \in W_0.$$

The latter, along with (2.1), implies (4.1). \square

²We comment in passing that most of the analysis and results that follow extend in a straightforward manner to the case when the discontinuity set is an arbitrary set of isolated points. This is because most of our subsequent methods are local in nature.

Turning now to the orthogonality issue, recall that, at $\theta = 0$, V_0 is the orthogonal complement of W_0 with respect to $A_{\varepsilon, \theta}$. However for $\theta \neq 0$, in general, the direct sum decomposition $H = V_0 \dot{+} W_0$ is not anymore orthogonal with respect to $A_{\varepsilon, \theta}$. Nevertheless, it is possible to partially rectify this as follows. The idea is, for small enough $\theta \neq 0$, to “correct” V_0 slightly to maintain the desired orthogonality at least to the main order in small ε , i.e. with regards to the “singular” part a_θ of $A_{\varepsilon, \theta}$. To that end, given $v_0 \in V_0$, seek a “corrector” $\mathcal{N}_\theta v_0 \in W_0$ such that for $\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0 := v_0 + \mathcal{N}_\theta v_0$,

$$(4.3) \quad a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0, w_0) = 0, \quad \forall v_0 \in V_0, \quad \forall w_0 \in W_0,$$

i.e. so that $\mathcal{M}_\theta V_0$ and W_0 are “orthogonal with respect to a_θ ”. Equivalently, we seek $\mathcal{N}_\theta v_0 \in W_0$ solving

$$(4.4) \quad a_\theta(\mathcal{N}_\theta v_0, \tilde{w}_0) = -a_\theta(v_0, \tilde{w}_0), \quad \forall \tilde{w}_0 \in W_0.$$

The above problem is well-posed for $|\theta| \leq \frac{1}{2}\nu_0 L_a^{-1}$ by Proposition 4.1, and determines a linear map $\mathcal{N}_\theta : V_0 \rightarrow W_0$. Let us show that the following estimate holds:

$$(4.5) \quad \|\mathcal{N}_\theta v_0\|_0 \leq 2L_a \nu_0^{-1} |\theta| \|v_0\|_0, \quad \forall v_0 \in V_0, \quad |\theta| \leq \frac{1}{2}\nu_0 L_a^{-1}.$$

Indeed, it follows from (4.2), (4.4), (2.3) and (2.7) (for $\theta = 0$):

$$\frac{\nu_0}{2} \|\mathcal{N}_\theta v_0\|_0^2 \leq a_\theta[\mathcal{N}_\theta v_0] = -a_\theta(v_0, \mathcal{N}_\theta v_0) \leq |a_0(v_0, \mathcal{N}_\theta v_0)| + L_a |\theta| \|v_0\|_0 \|\mathcal{N}_\theta v_0\|_0 = L_a |\theta| \|v_0\|_0 \|\mathcal{N}_\theta v_0\|_0.$$

Additionally, since $\mathcal{N}_\theta V_0 \subseteq W_0$, it readily follows that $H = \mathcal{M}_\theta V_0 \dot{+} W_0$, i.e. H is a direct sum³ of $\mathcal{M}_\theta V_0$ and W_0 . Further, from the orthogonality of V_0 and W_0 , and (4.5),

$$(4.6) \quad \|v_0\|_0 \leq \|\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0\|_0 \leq 2 \|v_0\|_0, \quad \forall v_0 \in V_0, \quad |\theta| \leq \frac{1}{2}\nu_0 L_a^{-1}.$$

Notice also that (4.6) implies that $\mathcal{M}_\theta V_0$ is closed in H . Such properties allow us, for sufficiently small θ , to construct a desirable approximation to the solution $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ of variational problem (2.4) by restricting it to $\mathcal{M}_\theta V_0$ which is “almost orthogonal” to W_0 . Indeed, the following modification of Theorem 3.1 holds.

Theorem 4.2. *Assume (H1). Consider $f \in H^*$, and $\theta \in \Theta$, $|\theta| < \nu_0/(2L_a)$. Let $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ solve (2.4), and $v_0 \in V_0$ solve*

$$(4.7) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v}) + b_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v}) = \langle f, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v} \rangle, \quad \forall \tilde{v} \in V_0.$$

Then problem (4.7) is well-posed, and the following error estimates hold:

$$(4.8) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - \mathcal{M}_\theta v_0] + b_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - \mathcal{M}_\theta v_0] \leq 8K^2 \nu_0^{-1} \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2,$$

$$(4.9) \quad b_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - \mathcal{M}_\theta v_0] \leq 16K^4 \nu_0^{-2} \varepsilon^4 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2.$$

Proof. The well-posedness of (4.7) follows e.g. from its left-hand side specifying an equivalent inner product on V_0 , as implied by (4.6). For the difference $r := u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - \mathcal{M}_\theta v_0$, the left-hand-side of (4.8) equals $A_{\varepsilon, \theta}[r]$ (see (2.5)) and expanding this out (and dropping the subscripts in notation) gives $A[r] = A(u_{\varepsilon, \theta}, r) - A(\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0, r)$. Note $u_{\varepsilon, \theta} = \mathcal{M}_\theta v + w$ for some unique $v \in V_0$ and $w \in W_0$, and hence $r = \mathcal{M}_\theta v_r + w$ where $v_r := v - v_0 \in V_0$, and so

$$A[r] = A(u_{\varepsilon, \theta}, r) - A(\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0, \mathcal{M}_\theta v_r) - A(\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0, w).$$

Now, (2.4) gives $A(u_{\varepsilon, \theta}, r) = \langle f, r \rangle$, (4.7) gives $A(\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0, \mathcal{M}_\theta v_r) = \langle f, \mathcal{M}_\theta v_r \rangle$ and the almost-orthogonality due to (4.3) implies $A(\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0, w) = b_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0, w)$. Therefore,

$$A[r] = \langle f, r \rangle - \langle f, \mathcal{M}_\theta v_r \rangle - b_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0, w) = \langle f, w \rangle - b_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0, w) \leq \left(\|f\|_{*\theta} + b_\theta^{1/2}[\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0] \right) \|w\|_\theta,$$

³Indeed, for $u \in H$, with unique $\tilde{v}_0 \in V_0$ and $\tilde{w}_0 \in W_0$ such that $u = \tilde{v}_0 + \tilde{w}_0$, seek $v_0 \in V_0$ and $w_0 \in W_0$ so that $u = \mathcal{M}_\theta v_0 + w_0 = v_0 + (\mathcal{N}_\theta v_0 + w_0)$. Hence $v_0 = \tilde{v}_0$ and $w_0 = \tilde{w}_0 - \mathcal{N}_\theta \tilde{v}_0$. Also, on this way, $\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0 + w_0 = 0$ implies $v_0 = 0$ and $w_0 = -\mathcal{N}_\theta v_0 = 0$.

via (3.3), and having applied Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to b_θ and then recalling (2.2). Setting $\tilde{v} = v_0$ in (4.7) and recalling that $\varepsilon < 1$ implies $b_\theta[\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0] \leq \|\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0\|_\theta^2 \leq A[\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0] \leq \|f\|_{*\theta} \|\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0\|_\theta \leq \|f\|_{*\theta}^2$ and as a result $A[r] \leq 2\|f\|_{*\theta}\|w\|_\theta$. So for proving (4.8) one needs to bound $\|w\|_\theta$ in terms of $A[r]$. Now (4.1) gives $\frac{\nu_0}{2K^2}\|w\|_\theta^2 \leq a_\theta[w]$, and noticing that $a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v_r, w) = 0$ by (4.3) and $r = \mathcal{M}_\theta v_r + w$ implies

$$(4.10) \quad a_\theta[w] \leq a_\theta[r].$$

Therefore, $\frac{\nu_0}{2K^2}\|w\|_\theta^2 \leq a_\theta[r] \leq \varepsilon^2 A[r]$, and as a result

$$(4.11) \quad \|w\|_\theta^2 \leq 2K^2\nu_0^{-1}\varepsilon^2 A[r],$$

implying (4.8).

It remains to prove (4.9), whose left-hand-side equals $b_\theta[r]$. Then, from (4.11) and (4.8) it suffices to show that

$$(4.12) \quad b_\theta[r] \leq \|w\|_\theta^2.$$

Since (4.7) is a restriction of (2.4) to $\mathcal{M}_\theta V_0$, r is orthogonal to $\mathcal{M}_\theta V_0$ with respect to A (indeed setting $\tilde{u} = \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v}$ in (2.4) and subtracting (4.7) gives $A(r, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v}) = 0$ for any $\tilde{v} \in V_0$). Consequently, since $w = r - \mathcal{M}_\theta v_r$, one infers $A[r] \leq A[w]$. This inequality along with (4.10) yields $b_\theta[r] \leq b_\theta[w]$ which clearly implies (4.12), see (2.2). The proof is complete. \square

We finish this subsection with a comparison between Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 3.1. In the continuous case we restrict variational problem (2.4) to the subspace V_θ , but for the general (possibly discontinuous) case this may be not anymore sufficient for maintaining the same order of the approximation's accuracy, and we restrict instead (locally near $\theta = \theta_0 = 0$) to $\mathcal{M}_\theta V_0$. From this observation one may expect that V_θ is a subset of $\mathcal{M}_\theta V_0$. Indeed, the following proposition holds.

Proposition 4.3. *Assume (H1). Let $\theta \in \Theta$, $|\theta| \leq \nu_0/(2L_a)$. Then*

$$(4.13) \quad V_\theta \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\theta V_0.$$

In fact,

$$(4.14) \quad v_\theta = \mathcal{M}_\theta P_{V_0} v_\theta, \quad \forall v_\theta \in V_\theta.$$

Proof. For (4.13), for any fixed $v_\theta \in V_\theta$ we need to find $v_0 \in V_0$ such that $v_\theta = \mathcal{M}_\theta v_0 = v_0 + \mathcal{N}_\theta v_0$. As $\mathcal{N}_\theta v_0 \in W_0$, necessarily, $v_0 = P_{V_0} v_\theta$. Hence, for both (4.13) and (4.14), it remains to show that $v_\theta - P_{V_0} v_\theta = \mathcal{N}_\theta P_{V_0} v_\theta$. Clearly $v_\theta - P_{V_0} v_\theta = P_{W_0} v_\theta \in W_0$, and

$$a_\theta(v_\theta - P_{V_0} v_\theta, \tilde{w}_0) = -a_\theta(P_{V_0} v_\theta, \tilde{w}_0), \quad \forall \tilde{w}_0 \in W_0$$

(having used (2.7) for $v_\theta \in V_\theta$). Hence, by (4.4), $v_\theta - P_{V_0} v_\theta = \mathcal{N}_\theta P_{V_0} v_\theta$, which completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.4. *Observe that the proofs in this subsection only require that (H1) holds at $\theta = 0$, that (2.3) holds for $\theta_1 = 0$ and that (2.1) holds in a neighbourhood of $\theta = 0$.*

4.2 On the class of V_θ with a removable singularity

So far we have made no assumptions on the nature of the singularity of V_θ , and so one could apply Theorem 4.2 for any singularity (and even for any non-singular point). However, in a large class of relevant examples (Section 7), the singularity of V_θ has some additional structures which allow to significantly simplify the sought approximations further. In the remainder of the article we mostly focus on developing Theorem 4.2 further for such singularities. Namely, we assume that $\theta_0 = 0$ is not an isolated point of Θ and V_θ has a *removable singularity* at θ_0 in the following sense: there exists a closed subspace V_\star of H and constant $L_\star \geq 0$ such that (cf. (3.9))

$$(H2) \quad V_\theta^\star := \begin{cases} V_\theta & \theta \neq 0, \\ V_\star & \theta = 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{satisfies} \quad \inf_{v_2 \in V_{\theta_2}^\star} \|v_1 - v_2\|_{\theta_2} \leq L_\star |\theta_1 - \theta_2| \|v_1\|_{\theta_1}, \quad \forall v_1 \in V_{\theta_1}^\star, \quad \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta,$$

or equivalently satisfies

$$(4.15) \quad \|P_{W_{\theta_2}^*} v_1\|_{\theta_2} \leq L_* |\theta_1 - \theta_2| \|v_1\|_{\theta_1}, \quad \forall v_1 \in V_{\theta_1}^*, \quad \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta,$$

where W_θ^* is the orthogonal complement of V_θ^* in H with respect to $(\cdot, \cdot)_\theta$. Note that (H2) formally covers also the case without singularity when $V_* = V_0$.

Remark 4.5. For a wide class of examples (cf. Section 7) V_θ is independent of θ away from the discontinuity, i.e. $V_\theta = V$ for $\theta \neq 0$. In this situation (H2) trivially holds with $V_* = V$ and $L_* = 0$.

First, we observe that $V_* \subset V_0$. Indeed, for $v_* \in V_*$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, $\theta \neq 0$ and $\theta \rightarrow 0$, by (2.3), the definition of P_{W_θ} , (2.2) and (4.15) (for $\theta_1 = 0$ and $\theta_2 = \theta$) we obtain

$$a_0[v_*] = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} a_\theta[v_*] = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} a_\theta [P_{W_\theta^*} v_*] \leq \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \|P_{W_\theta^*} v_*\|_\theta^2 \leq \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} L_*^2 |\theta|^2 \|v_*\|_0^2 = 0.$$

A key role in our subsequent constructions will be played by a “defect” subspace Z of V_0 , which characterises the discontinuity gap between V_* and V_0 . Namely, let Z be a closed linear subspace of V_0 , such that

$$(4.16) \quad V_0 = V_* \dot{+} Z,$$

and for some constant $0 \leq K_Z < 1$,

$$(4.17) \quad |(v_*, z)_0| \leq K_Z \|v_*\|_0 \|z\|_0, \quad \forall v_* \in V_*, \quad \forall z \in Z,$$

or equivalently

$$(4.18) \quad (1 - K_Z^2)^{1/2} \|v_*\|_0 \leq \|v_* + z\|_0, \quad \forall v_* \in V_*, \quad \forall z \in Z.$$

Remark 4.6. Note that such Z always exist, in particular Z could be the orthogonal complement of V_* in the Hilbert space $(V_0, (\cdot, \cdot)_0)$, in which case $K_Z = 0$. In the regular case $V_* = V_0$, trivially $Z = \{0\}$.

Now we are ready to provide an alternative representation of $\mathcal{M}_\theta V_0$ in terms of V_θ^* and Z , which is useful for a further simplification of the approximating problem (4.7) as the singular form a_θ vanishes on V_θ^* . The following technical lemma, important for our consequent constructions, holds.

Lemma 4.7. Assume (H1) and (H2). If $\theta \in \Theta$ satisfies $KL_* |\theta| < \frac{1}{3}(1 - K_Z)$ then

$$(4.19) \quad \|v_\theta^* + z + w_0\|_0^2 \geq \frac{1 - K_Z}{3} \left(\|v_\theta^*\|_0^2 + \|z\|_0^2 + \|w_0\|_0^2 \right), \quad \forall v_\theta^* \in V_\theta^*, \quad \forall z \in Z, \quad \forall w_0 \in W_0;$$

and if additionally $|\theta| < \nu_0 / (2L_a)$ then

$$(4.20) \quad \mathcal{M}_\theta V_0 = V_\theta^* \dot{+} \mathcal{M}_\theta Z.$$

Proof of (4.19). Set $\kappa_0 := 1 - K_Z$, so $0 < \kappa_0 \leq 1$. Assumption (4.17) and the fact that W_0 is orthogonal to $V_0 = V_* \dot{+} Z$ imply

$$(4.21) \quad \|v_* + z + w_0\|_0^2 \geq \kappa_0 \left(\|v_*\|_0^2 + \|z\|_0^2 + \|w_0\|_0^2 \right), \quad \forall v_* \in V_*, \quad \forall z \in Z, \quad \forall w_0 \in W_0.$$

Thus, for any $v_\theta^* \in V_\theta^*$, $z \in Z$ and $w_0 \in W_0$, with $W_* := W_0^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_\theta^* + z + w_0\|_0^2 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|P_{V_*} v_\theta^* + z + w_0\|_0^2 - \|P_{W_*} v_\theta^*\|_0^2 \geq \frac{\kappa_0}{2} \left(\|P_{V_*} v_\theta^*\|_0^2 + \|z\|_0^2 + \|w_0\|_0^2 \right) - \|P_{W_*} v_\theta^*\|_0^2 \\ &= \frac{\kappa_0}{2} \left(\|v_\theta^*\|_0^2 + \|z\|_0^2 + \|w_0\|_0^2 \right) - \left(\frac{\kappa_0}{2} + 1 \right) \|P_{W_*} v_\theta^*\|_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, (4.15) (for $\theta_1 = \theta$, $\theta_2 = 0$), (2.1) and the assumption on $|\theta|$ gives

$$\left(\frac{\kappa_0}{2} + 1 \right) \|P_{W_*} v_\theta^*\|_0^2 \leq \left(\frac{\kappa_0}{2} + 1 \right) (KL_* |\theta|)^2 \|v_\theta^*\|_0^2 \leq \left(\frac{\kappa_0}{2} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{\kappa_0}{3} \right)^2 \|v_\theta^*\|_0^2 \leq \frac{1}{6} \kappa_0 \|v_\theta^*\|_0^2,$$

and (4.19) follows.

Proof of (4.20). The inclusion $V_\theta^* \subseteq V_\theta$ and (4.13) show $V_\theta^* + \mathcal{M}_\theta Z \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\theta V_0$. Furthermore, (4.19) for $w_0 = \mathcal{N}_\theta z$ together with the closedness of $\mathcal{M}_\theta Z$ (following e.g. from (4.6)) implies that this sum is a direct sum and closed.

It remains to show that $V_\theta^* \dot{+} \mathcal{M}_\theta Z$ is not a proper subset of $\mathcal{M}_\theta V_0$. If it were, there would exist a non-zero $v_0 = v_* + z$, $v_* \in V_*$, $z \in Z$, such that $\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0$ is orthogonal (with respect to $(\cdot, \cdot)_0$) to $V_\theta^* \dot{+} \mathcal{M}_\theta Z$. Seeking a contradiction to this orthogonality, a natural choice of an element of $V_\theta^* \dot{+} \mathcal{M}_\theta Z$ expected to be close to $\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0 = \mathcal{M}_\theta v_* + \mathcal{M}_\theta z$ is $u = P_{V_\theta^*} v_* + \mathcal{M}_\theta z$. Since (4.14) gives $P_{V_\theta^*} v_* = \mathcal{M}_\theta P_{V_0} P_{V_\theta^*} v_* = \mathcal{M}_\theta P_{V_0} v_* - \mathcal{M}_\theta P_{V_0} P_{W_\theta^*} v_* = \mathcal{M}_\theta v_* - \mathcal{M}_\theta P_{V_0} P_{W_\theta^*} v_*$ (as $v_* \in V_0$), we conclude that $\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0$ is orthogonal to $u = \mathcal{M}_\theta v_* - \mathcal{M}_\theta P_{V_0} P_{W_\theta^*} v_* + \mathcal{M}_\theta z = \mathcal{M}_\theta v_0 - \mathcal{M}_\theta P_{V_0} P_{W_\theta^*} v_*$. Now, by (4.6) and the latter orthogonality, one has

$$\|v_0\|_0 \leq \|\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0\|_0 \leq \|\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0 - u\|_0 = \|\mathcal{M}_\theta P_{V_0} P_{W_\theta^*} v_*\|_0.$$

Further, by the second inequality in (4.6), the properties of P_{V_0} , (2.1) and (4.15) (for $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_2 = \theta$)

$$\|\mathcal{M}_\theta P_{V_0} P_{W_\theta^*} v_*\|_0 \leq 2 \|P_{V_0} P_{W_\theta^*} v_*\|_0 \leq 2 \|P_{W_\theta^*} v_*\|_0 \leq 2KL_*|\theta| \|v_*\|_0.$$

Moreover (4.18) gives $\|v_*\|_0 \leq (1 - K_Z^2)^{-1/2} \|v_0\|_0$. Consequently $\|v_0\|_0 \leq 2KL_*|\theta| (1 - K_Z^2)^{-1/2} \|v_0\|_0$. This along with the assumed restriction on θ and the inequality $(1 - K_Z^2)^{-1/2} \leq (1 - K_Z)^{-1}$ lead to $\|v_0\|_0 = 0$, which is a contradiction. \square

We now present a global approximation for the case of V_θ with a removable singularity at $\theta = 0$. Let

$$(4.22) \quad r_0 = \nu_0/(2L_a) \text{ if } L_* = 0 \text{ or } r_0 = \min \left\{ \nu_0/(2L_a), (1 - K_Z)/(3KL_*) \right\} \text{ otherwise,}$$

and fix positive $r_1 \leq r_0$. The direct sum representation (4.20) and Theorem 4.2 show that, for $|\theta| < r_1$, the solution $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ to (2.4) is approximated in terms of the solution v_0 of the simplified problem (4.7) by $\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0 = v_{\varepsilon, \theta} + \mathcal{M}_\theta z_{\varepsilon, \theta}$, with unique $v_{\varepsilon, \theta} \in V_\theta^*$ and $z_{\varepsilon, \theta} \in Z$. Recalling (2.7), we conclude that $(v_{\varepsilon, \theta}, z_{\varepsilon, \theta})$ is the unique solution to

$$(4.23) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta z_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{z}) + b_\theta(v_{\varepsilon, \theta} + \mathcal{M}_\theta z_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \tilde{v} + \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{z}) = \langle f, \tilde{v} + \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{z} \rangle, \quad \forall \tilde{v} \in V_\theta^*, \forall \tilde{z} \in Z.$$

Furthermore, the solution v_θ to (3.1) approximates $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ outside this neighbourhood of the origin: indeed (H2) implies that V_θ is Lipschitz continuous on the compact set $\Theta_{r_1} = \{\theta \in \Theta : |\theta| \geq r_1\}$; therefore Theorem 3.4 (applied for Θ replaced by Θ_{r_1} , cf. Remark 3.5) implies that the assumption of Theorem 3.1 (namely (3.6)) holds on Θ_{r_1} with a positive constant $\nu(r_1) = \inf_{\theta \in \Theta_{r_1}} \nu_\theta$. More precisely, we have proved the following result:

Theorem 4.8. *Assume (H1)–(H2) and let $0 < r_1 \leq r_0$ (see (4.22)). Consider $f \in H^*$, $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ the solution to (2.4) and an approximation*

$$u_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(0)} := \begin{cases} v_{\varepsilon, \theta} + \mathcal{M}_\theta z_{\varepsilon, \theta} & |\theta| < r_1, \\ v_\theta & |\theta| \geq r_1, \end{cases}$$

where the pair $(v_{\varepsilon, \theta}, z_{\varepsilon, \theta}) \in V_\theta^* \times Z$ solves (4.23) and $v_\theta \in V_\theta = V_\theta^*$ solves (3.1). Then, the following error estimates hold for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$:

$$(4.24) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta \left[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - u_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(0)} \right] + b_\theta \left[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - u_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(0)} \right] \leq C_1 \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2, \quad C_1 = \max \{8K^2 \nu_0^{-1}, 1/\nu(r_1)\},$$

$$(4.25) \quad b_\theta \left[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - u_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(0)} \right] \leq C_2 \varepsilon^4 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2, \quad C_2 = \max \{16K^4 \nu_0^{-2}, 1/\nu^2(r_1)\}.$$

We emphasise that the ‘‘inner’’ approximate problem (4.23) provides a significant further simplification compared to (4.7), as its singular part a_θ is now a form on the defect subspace Z only.

5 Further refinements of Theorem 4.8

The results of Section 4 approximate the original problem by simpler ones, for example Theorem 4.8 reduces problem (2.4) on H to those on the generally smaller subspaces V_θ^* and Z . However, the price to pay for this is the more complicated dependence on θ , in particular through the operator \mathcal{M}_θ . The purpose of this section is to simplify the approximate problems further, in particular their dependence on θ , as much as possible under certain readily verifiable additional assumptions. In particular, this ultimately

allows to approximate the original problem by one which in turn leads in Section 6 to construction of an abstract version of a two-scale limit operator, possessing certain important properties which is in turn illustrated by new results for a number of examples in Section 7.

We begin by noting that (4.19) implies that V_θ^* and Z form a closed direct sum in H for small enough θ . Furthermore, one can see that b_θ generates an equivalent norm on $V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z$. Indeed, since $Z \subseteq V_0$, we use (2.3) and (4.19) to obtain $a_\theta[z] \leq \frac{3L_a}{1-K_Z}|\theta| \|v_\theta^* + z\|_0^2$, and consequently, via (2.2),

$$(5.1) \quad \|v_\theta^* + z\|_\theta^2 \leq 2b_\theta[v_\theta^* + z], \quad \forall v_\theta^* \in V_\theta^*, \forall z \in Z, \forall \theta \in \Theta, |\theta| \leq r_1 := \min \left\{ r_0, \frac{1-K_Z}{6K^2L_a} \right\},$$

with r_0 given by (4.22).

5.1 Case of quadratically degenerating spectral gap width

Here, we additionally assume that there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that, for ν_θ defined in (H1),

$$(H3) \quad \nu_\theta \geq \gamma|\theta|^2, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta, \quad \text{i.e. } a_\theta[w] \geq \gamma|\theta|^2 \|w\|_\theta^2, \quad \forall w \in W_\theta.$$

This is a generalisation of the well-known property of non-degeneracy of homogenised matrix in classical homogenisation. Condition (H3) allows us to characterise the non-degeneracy of the form $a_\theta[\mathcal{M}_\theta \cdot]$ on Z .

Proposition 5.1. *Assume (H1)–(H3) and $\theta \in \Theta$, $|\theta| < r_0$, for r_0 as in Theorem 4.8, see (4.22). Then*

$$(5.2) \quad a_\theta[\mathcal{M}_\theta z] \geq \nu_\star |\theta|^2 \|z\|_0^2, \quad \forall z \in Z, \quad \text{with } \nu_\star = \frac{\gamma(1-K_Z)}{3K^2}.$$

Proof. It is enough to consider the case $\theta \neq 0$. Then $W_\theta = W_\theta^*$ and (H1) implies $a_\theta[\mathcal{M}_\theta z] = a_\theta[P_{W_\theta^*} \mathcal{M}_\theta z] \geq \nu_\theta \|P_{W_\theta^*} \mathcal{M}_\theta z\|_\theta^2$. Moreover, (4.19) for $w_0 = \mathcal{N}_\theta z$ and $v_\theta^* = -P_{V_\theta^*} \mathcal{M}_\theta z$ implies $\|P_{W_\theta^*} \mathcal{M}_\theta z\|_\theta^2 \geq \frac{1-K_Z}{3} \|z\|_0^2$. Now, (5.2) readily follows upon recalling (2.1) and (H3). \square

Corollary 5.2. *By (2.1), (4.5) and (5.2) one has*

$$(5.3) \quad \|\mathcal{N}_\theta z\|_\theta^2 \leq \kappa_1^2 a_\theta[\mathcal{M}_\theta z], \quad \forall z \in Z, \quad \kappa_1 = 2KL_a \nu_0^{-1} \nu_\star^{-1/2}.$$

The next theorem demonstrates that the extra assumption (H3) and specifically its implication (5.3) allow us to further simplify approximate problem (4.23) by removing \mathcal{M}_θ (i.e replacing it by unity operator) in both b_θ and f terms (but not in the a_θ term).

Theorem 5.3. *Assume (H1)–(H3), and consider the objects as in Theorem 4.8 with r_1 as in (5.1). Then, for each $\theta \in \Theta$, $|\theta| < r_1$, there exists a unique solution $v + z \in V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z$ to*

$$(5.4) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta z, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{z}) + b_\theta(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) = \langle f, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z} \rangle, \quad \forall \tilde{v} + \tilde{z} \in V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z.$$

Furthermore, the following error estimates hold:

$$(5.5) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (v + \mathcal{M}_\theta z)] + b_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (v + \mathcal{M}_\theta z)] \leq C_3 \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2, \quad C_3 = 2C_1 + 12\kappa_1^2.$$

$$(5.6) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (v + \mathcal{M}_\theta z)] + b_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (v + z)] \leq C_4 \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2, \quad C_4 = 2C_3 + \kappa_1^2,$$

where C_1 is given by (4.24) and κ_1 is given by (5.3).

Proof. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, the sesquilinear form

$$(5.7) \quad B(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) := \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta z, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{z}) + b_\theta(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}), \quad v, \tilde{v} \in V_\theta^*, \quad z, \tilde{z} \in Z,$$

is bounded and coercive in the Hilbert space $(V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z, (\cdot, \cdot)_\theta)$ (see (5.1), (4.6) and (4.19)) and so problem (5.4) is well-posed. Furthermore, setting $\tilde{v} = v$ and $\tilde{z} = z$ in (5.4) and utilising (5.1) gives $B[v + z] \leq \|f\|_{*\theta} \sqrt{2b_\theta[v + z]}$ from which we can readily deduce

$$(5.8) \quad B[v + z] \leq 2\|f\|_{*\theta}^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta[\mathcal{M}_\theta z] \leq \|f\|_{*\theta} \sqrt{2b_\theta[v + z]} - b_\theta[v + z] \leq \frac{1}{2} \|f\|_{*\theta}^2.$$

Proof of (5.5). Notice that the left-hand-side of (5.5) equals $A_{\varepsilon,\theta}[u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - (v + \mathcal{M}_\theta z)]$ (see (2.5)) and that Theorem 4.8, see (4.24), states $A_{\varepsilon,\theta}[u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - (v_{\varepsilon,\theta} + \mathcal{M}_\theta z_{\varepsilon,\theta})] \leq C_1 \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2$ for $v_{\varepsilon,\theta} + z_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ the solution to (4.23). Thus, it remains to bound $A_{\varepsilon,\theta}[r_v + \mathcal{M}_\theta r_z]$ where $r_v := v_{\varepsilon,\theta} - v$ and $r_z := z_{\varepsilon,\theta} - z$. Subtracting (5.4) from (4.23) for $\tilde{v} = r_v$ and $\tilde{z} = r_z$ gives

$$\varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta[\mathcal{M}_\theta r_z] + b_\theta(v_{\varepsilon,\theta} + \mathcal{M}_\theta z_{\varepsilon,\theta}, r_v + \mathcal{M}_\theta r_z) - b_\theta(v + z, r_v + r_z) = \langle f, \mathcal{N}_\theta r_z \rangle,$$

which upon further direct calculation (and noticing $a_\theta[\mathcal{M}_\theta r_z] = a_\theta[r_v + \mathcal{M}_\theta r_z]$) yields

$$A_{\varepsilon,\theta}[r_v + \mathcal{M}_\theta r_z] = \langle f, \mathcal{N}_\theta r_z \rangle - b_\theta(\mathcal{N}_\theta z, r_v + \mathcal{M}_\theta r_z) - b_\theta(v + z, \mathcal{N}_\theta r_z).$$

From this identity, along with (5.3), Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and (2.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\varepsilon,\theta}[r_v + \mathcal{M}_\theta r_z] &\leq \kappa_1 \left(\|f\|_{*\theta} a_\theta^{1/2}[\mathcal{M}_\theta r_z] + a_\theta^{1/2}[\mathcal{M}_\theta z] b_\theta^{1/2}[r_v + \mathcal{M}_\theta r_z] + b_\theta^{1/2}[v + z] a_\theta^{1/2}[\mathcal{M}_\theta r_z] \right) \\ &\leq \varepsilon \kappa_1 \left(\|f\|_{*\theta} A_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{1/2}[r_v + \mathcal{M}_\theta r_z] + B^{1/2}[v + z] A_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{1/2}[r_v + \mathcal{M}_\theta r_z] \right). \end{aligned}$$

(In the last inequality, along with the definitions (2.5) and (5.7) for $A_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ and B respectively and the fact that $a_\theta[r_v] = 0$, discrete Cauchy-Schwarz inequality was also used.) This along with the first inequality in (5.8) gives $A_{\varepsilon,\theta}[r_v + \mathcal{M}_\theta r_z] \leq 6\kappa_1^2 \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2$, and (5.5) follows via (4.24) and the triangle-type inequality. *Proof of (5.6).* From (5.5) we only need showing $b_\theta[\mathcal{N}_\theta z] \leq \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \kappa_1^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2$ and this follows from (5.3) and the second inequality in (5.8). \square

5.2 Case of a_θ with additional regularity

While (H3) was sufficient for removing \mathcal{M}_θ from b_θ and the right-hand-side (cf. problems (4.23) and (5.4)), in general one cannot remove \mathcal{M}_θ from a_θ . However in the majority of examples, Section 7, a_θ has an additional regularity in θ which allows one to approximate $a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta \cdot, \mathcal{M}_\theta \cdot)$ up to quadratic terms in small θ and thereby further simplify problem (5.4).

In this subsection we assume that $\theta_0 = 0$ is an interior point of Θ , and a_θ additionally satisfies the following ‘‘differentiability’’ properties with respect to θ at $\theta = 0$. There exist sesquilinear maps $a'_0 : V_0 \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ and $a''_0 : V_0 \times V_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, i.e. vector-valued and matrix-valued maps respectively, such that

$$(H4) \quad \begin{cases} |a_\theta(v, u) - a'_0(v, u) \cdot \theta| \leq K_{a'} |\theta|^2 \|v\|_0 \|u\|_0, & \forall v \in V_0, \forall u \in H, \forall \theta \in \Theta; \\ |a_\theta(v, \tilde{v}) - a''_0(v, \tilde{v}) \theta \cdot \theta| \leq K_{a''} |\theta|^3 \|v\|_0 \|\tilde{v}\|_0, & \forall v, \tilde{v} \in V_0, \forall \theta \in \Theta, \end{cases}$$

for some non-negative constants $K_{a'}, K_{a''}$. Notice that (H4) and (2.3) gives $|a'_0(v, u) \cdot \theta| \leq (L_a |\theta| + K_{a'} |\theta|^2) \|v\|_0 \|u\|_0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$. Dividing this by $|\theta|$ and taking the limit $\theta \rightarrow 0$ yields

$$(5.9) \quad |a'_0(v, u) \cdot \theta| \leq L_a |\theta| \|v\|_0 \|u\|_0, \quad \forall v \in V_0, \forall u \in H, \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Notice that the non-negativity of a_θ implies $a'_0(v, \tilde{v}) = 0, \forall v, \tilde{v} \in V_0$.

We now demonstrate that assertion (H4) allows us to approximate \mathcal{N}_θ near $\theta = 0$ by some N_θ which is linear in θ . To that end, in problem (4.4) defining \mathcal{N}_θ , approximate a_θ on its left hand side by a_0 and a_θ on the right hand side according to (H4) by $a'_0(v_0, \tilde{w}_0) \cdot \theta$. As a result, for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define $N_\theta : V_0 \rightarrow W_0$ so that $N_\theta v$ for $v \in V_0$ is a solution to

$$(5.10) \quad a_0(N_\theta v, \tilde{w}_0) = -a'_0(v, \tilde{w}_0) \cdot \theta, \quad \forall \tilde{w}_0 \in W_0.$$

The unique solvability of (5.10) is ensured by (H1) and (5.9); in particular, one has

$$(5.11) \quad \|N_\theta v\|_0 \leq L_a \nu_0^{-1} |\theta| \|v\|_0, \quad \forall v \in V_0.$$

As the right hand side of (5.10) is linear in θ , $N_\theta v = \theta \cdot Nv$, where $N : V_0 \rightarrow [W_0]^n$ is a bounded linear mapping. The following proposition establishes closeness of N_θ to \mathcal{N}_θ for small θ .

Proposition 5.4. *Assume (H1), (H4) and $\theta \in \Theta$, $|\theta| \leq \nu_0 / (2L_a)$. Then, the following inequality holds:*

$$(5.12) \quad \|\mathcal{N}_\theta v - N_\theta v\|_0 \leq \kappa_2 |\theta|^2 \|v\|_0, \quad \forall v \in V_0, \quad \text{with } \kappa_2 = \nu_0^{-1} (2L_a^2 \nu_0^{-1} + K_{a'}).$$

Proof. For $R = \mathcal{N}_\theta v - N_\theta v \in W_0$, by (4.4) and (5.10) we compute

$$a_0[R] = a_0(\mathcal{N}_\theta v, R) - a_0(N_\theta v, R) = a_0(\mathcal{N}_\theta v, R) - a_\theta(\mathcal{N}_\theta v, R) - a_\theta(v, R) + a'_0(v, R) \cdot \theta.$$

Now, (2.3) and (4.5) give $|a_0(\mathcal{N}_\theta v, R) - a_\theta(\mathcal{N}_\theta v, R)| \leq 2L_a^2 \nu_0^{-1} |\theta|^2 \|v\|_0 \|R\|_0$, and the first inequality in (H4) gives $|a_\theta(v, R) - a'_0(v, R) \cdot \theta| \leq K_{a'} |\theta|^2 \|v\|_0 \|R\|_0$. Therefore $a_0[R] \leq \nu_0 \kappa_2 |\theta|^2 \|v\|_0 \|R\|_0$ which along with (H1) gives (5.12). \square

Now, we are in a position to further approximate $a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v})$ as entering the approximations in e.g. Theorem 5.3, see (5.4). To that end, recalling first that $\mathcal{M}_\theta = I + \mathcal{N}_\theta$ and applying (4.3) for $v_0 = v$ and $w_0 = \mathcal{N}_\theta \tilde{v} \in W_0$, and similarly for $v_0 = \tilde{v}$ and $w_0 = \mathcal{N}_\theta v$, we observe that $a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v, \mathcal{N}_\theta \tilde{v}) = a_\theta(\mathcal{N}_\theta v, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v}) = 0$, and hence via $a_\theta(v, \tilde{v}) = a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v - \mathcal{N}_\theta v, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v} - \mathcal{N}_\theta \tilde{v})$,

$$(5.13) \quad a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v}) = a_\theta(v, \tilde{v}) - a_\theta(\mathcal{N}_\theta v, \mathcal{N}_\theta \tilde{v}).$$

Now, according to (H4) approximate $a_\theta(v, \tilde{v})$ by $a''_0(v, \tilde{v}) \theta \cdot \theta$, and $a_\theta(\mathcal{N}_\theta v, \mathcal{N}_\theta \tilde{v})$ by $a_0(N_\theta v, N_\theta \tilde{v})$. As a result, $a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v})$ is approximated by the sesquilinear form $a_\theta^h : V_0 \times V_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, given by

$$(5.14) \quad a_\theta^h(v, \tilde{v}) := a''_0(v, \tilde{v}) \theta \cdot \theta - a_0(N_\theta v, N_\theta \tilde{v}) = a''_0(v, \tilde{v}) \theta \cdot \theta - a_0(\theta \cdot Nv, \theta \cdot N\tilde{v}), \quad \forall v, \tilde{v} \in V_0,$$

which is a quadratic form in θ . We call a_θ^h a ‘‘homogenised’’ form, for reasons to become clear later. The following proposition establishes the closeness of this approximation, and a $|\theta|^2$ -coercivity of a_θ^h on Z .

Proposition 5.5. *Assume (H1)–(H4). Then, the following inequalities hold:*

$$(5.15) \quad \left| a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v}) - a_\theta^h(v, \tilde{v}) \right| \leq \kappa_3 |\theta|^3 \|v\|_0 \|\tilde{v}\|_0, \quad \forall v, \tilde{v} \in V_0, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta, \quad |\theta| < \nu_0 / (2L_a);$$

$$(5.16) \quad a_\theta^h[z] \geq \nu_\star |\theta|^2 \|z\|_0^2, \quad \forall z \in Z, \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\kappa_3 = K_{a''} + \nu_0^{-1} L_a K_{a'} + L_a \kappa_2$, and ν_\star is given in (5.2).

Proof of (5.15). From (5.13) and (5.14),

$$a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v}) - a_\theta^h(v, \tilde{v}) = [a_\theta(v, \tilde{v}) - a''_0(v, \tilde{v}) \theta \cdot \theta] + [a_0(N_\theta v, N_\theta \tilde{v}) - a_\theta(\mathcal{N}_\theta v, \mathcal{N}_\theta \tilde{v})].$$

Note that the second inequality in (H4) provides the desired estimate for the first bracketed term on the right. Let us consider the second term: applying (5.10) and (4.4),

$$\begin{aligned} a_0(N_\theta v, N_\theta \tilde{v}) - a_\theta(\mathcal{N}_\theta v, \mathcal{N}_\theta \tilde{v}) &= -a'_0(v, N_\theta \tilde{v}) \cdot \theta + a_\theta(v, \mathcal{N}_\theta \tilde{v}) = \\ &= \{a_\theta(v, N_\theta \tilde{v}) - a'_0(v, N_\theta \tilde{v}) \cdot \theta\} + a_\theta(v, \mathcal{N}_\theta \tilde{v} - N_\theta \tilde{v}). \end{aligned}$$

By the first inequality in (H4) and (5.11) we obtain

$$|a_\theta(v, N_\theta \tilde{v}) - a'_0(v, N_\theta \tilde{v}) \cdot \theta| \leq K_{a'} |\theta|^2 \|v\|_0 \|N_\theta \tilde{v}\|_0 \leq L_a \nu_0^{-1} K_{a'} |\theta|^3 \|v\|_0 \|\tilde{v}\|_0.$$

Also, by (2.3) and (5.12) we deduce that

$$|a_\theta(v, \mathcal{N}_\theta \tilde{v} - N_\theta \tilde{v})| \leq L_a |\theta| \|v\|_0 \|\mathcal{N}_\theta \tilde{v} - N_\theta \tilde{v}\|_0 \leq L_a \kappa_2 |\theta|^3 \|v\|_0 \|\tilde{v}\|_0.$$

Combining the above estimates yields (5.15).

Proof of (5.16). For fixed $z \neq 0$, $a_\theta^h[z]$ as defined by (5.14) is quadratic in θ , and so for each fixed ‘‘direction’’ $\theta |\theta|^{-1}$ ($\theta \neq 0$) the ratio $a_\theta^h[z] / (|\theta|^2 \|z\|_0^2)$ is independent of $|\theta|$. Moreover, we recall that 0 in an interior point of Θ . So to prove (5.16), for a chosen $\theta \neq 0$ we bound the ratio via passing to the limit as $|\theta| \rightarrow 0$ along the corresponding direction and successively using (5.15) and (5.2), as follows:

$$\frac{a_\theta^h[z]}{|\theta|^2 \|z\|_0^2} = \lim_{|\theta| \rightarrow 0} \frac{a_\theta^h[z]}{|\theta|^2 \|z\|_0^2} = \lim_{|\theta| \rightarrow 0} \frac{a_\theta[\mathcal{M}_\theta z]}{|\theta|^2 \|z\|_0^2} \geq \lim_{|\theta| \rightarrow 0} \nu_\star = \nu_\star. \quad \square$$

Now, we are ready to further simplify approximate problem (5.4).

Theorem 5.6. Assume (H1)–(H4) and let $\theta \in \Theta$, $|\theta| < r_1$ for r_1 as in (5.1). Then, there exists a unique solution $v^h + z^h \in V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z$ to

$$(5.17) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta^h(z^h, \tilde{z}) + b_\theta(v^h + z^h, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) = \langle f, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z} \rangle, \quad \forall \tilde{v} + \tilde{z} \in V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z.$$

Furthermore, $v^h + (I + N_\theta)z^h$ approximates $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$, the solution to (2.4), in the following sense:

$$(5.18) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (v^h + (I + N_\theta)z^h)] + b_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (v^h + (I + N_\theta)z^h)] \leq C_5 \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2,$$

for $C_5 = 3C_4 + 3K^4 \kappa_2^2 \nu_\star^{-2} + \frac{3}{2} K^2 L_a^2 \nu_0^{-2} \nu_\star^{-1} + 3K^2 \kappa_3^2 \nu_\star^{-3}$. Moreover, $v^h + z^h$ approximates $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ as follows:

$$(5.19) \quad b_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (v^h + z^h)] \leq C_6 \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2, \quad C_6 = 2C_4 + 2K^2 \kappa_3^2 \nu_\star^{-3}.$$

Proof. Since a_θ^h is bounded (e.g. via (5.14), (H4) and (5.11)) and non-negative on Z (see Proposition 5.5), by arguing as in the beginning of the proof of Theorem 5.3, it follows that (5.17) is well-posed and

$$(5.20) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta^h[z^h] \leq \frac{1}{2} \|f\|_{*\theta}^2.$$

As a further preparation, we need a more refined estimate for z^h rather than the one implied by e.g. (5.20) with (5.16). To that end, we set in (5.17) $\tilde{z} = z^h$ and $\tilde{v} = -P_{V_\theta^*} z^h$, and note that $\tilde{v} + \tilde{z} = P_{W_\theta^*} z^h$ and (as for $v \in V_\theta^*$ and $w \in W_\theta^*$, $b_\theta(v, w) = (v, w)_\theta = 0$) that $b_\theta(v^h + z^h, P_{W_\theta^*} z^h) = b_\theta[P_{W_\theta^*} z^h]$. This gives

$$\varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta^h[z^h] + b_\theta[P_{W_\theta^*} z^h] = \langle f, P_{W_\theta^*} z^h \rangle \leq \|f\|_{*\theta} \|P_{W_\theta^*} z^h\|_\theta \leq \|f\|_{*\theta} \|z^h\|_\theta \leq K \|f\|_{*\theta} \|z^h\|_0.$$

Along with (5.16) this yields

$$(5.21) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} |\theta|^2 \|z^h\|_0 \leq K \nu_\star^{-1} \|f\|_{*\theta}.$$

Proof of (5.18). With the aim of exploiting (5.6), decompose the argument in the square brackets on left-hand-side of (5.18) in two slightly different ways as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (v^h + (I + N_\theta)z^h) &= [u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (v + \mathcal{M}_\theta z)] + [(v - v^h) + \mathcal{M}_\theta(z - z^h)] + (\mathcal{N}_\theta z^h - N_\theta z^h) = \\ &= [u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (v + z)] + [(v - v^h) + (z - z^h)] - N_\theta z^h. \end{aligned}$$

Applying e.g. a squared triangle inequality to the first of the above decompositions for the a_θ -term on the left-hand-side of (5.18) and to the second decomposition for the b_θ -term results in bounding the whole left-hand side of (5.18) from above by

$$3\left(\varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (v + \mathcal{M}_\theta z)] + b_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (v + z)]\right) + 3B[(v - v^h) + (z - z^h)] + 3\varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta[\mathcal{N}_\theta z^h - N_\theta z^h] + 3b_\theta[N_\theta z^h],$$

where $v + z$ solves (5.4) and B is given by (5.7). By (5.6) the first term is bounded by $3C_4 \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2$. By (2.1), (5.12) and (5.21), the third term is bounded by $3K^4 \kappa_2^2 \nu_\star^{-2} \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2$. By (5.11), (5.16) and (5.20), the last term is bounded by $\frac{3}{2} K^2 L_a^2 \nu_0^{-2} \nu_\star^{-1} \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2$. So it remains to bound the second term. By subtracting (5.17) from (5.4) (both with $\tilde{v} = v - v^h$ and $\tilde{z} = z - z^h$) we deduce that

$$B[v - v^h + z - z^h] = \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta^h(z^h, z - z^h) - \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta z^h, \mathcal{M}_\theta(z - z^h)).$$

Now, by sequentially applying (5.15), (5.2) and (5.21) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} B[v - v^h + z - z^h] &\leq \varepsilon^{-2} |\theta|^3 \kappa_3 \|z^h\|_0 \|z - z^h\|_0 \leq \varepsilon^{-2} |\theta|^2 \kappa_3 \|z^h\|_0 \nu_\star^{-1/2} a_\theta^{1/2}[\mathcal{M}_\theta(z - z^h)] \\ &\leq K \nu_\star^{-3/2} \kappa_3 \|f\|_{*\theta} a_\theta^{1/2}[\mathcal{M}_\theta(z - z^h)] \leq \varepsilon K \nu_\star^{-3/2} \kappa_3 \|f\|_{*\theta} B^{1/2}[v - v^h + z - z^h]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(5.22) \quad B[v - v^h + z - z^h] \leq K^2 \kappa_3^2 \nu_\star^{-3} \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2$$

and (5.18) follows by combining the above bounds.

Proof of (5.19). Since the left-hand-side of (5.19) is bounded by $2b_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (v + z)] + 2b_\theta[v + z - (v^h + z^h)]$ then the desired inequality immediately follows from (5.6) and (5.22). \square

5.3 Case of continuous b_θ

The last in our hierarchy of simplified problems, problem (5.17), has two main advantages: restriction to a smaller subspace $V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z$, and replacement of the singular form a_θ by the ‘‘homogenised form’’ a_θ^h which has a quadratic dependence on θ (as well as is restricted further to the defect subspace Z only). The dependence of b_θ on θ remains so far unspecified, however as we will later see, if it were possible to approximate it for small θ by a θ -independent b_0 that would provide significant additional benefits for properties of the approximate problem. In particular, as we will see in Section 6, such an approximate problem will motivate construction of an abstract version of a two-scale limit operator with important further implications.

To that end, we make here the following additional assumption: Θ is connected, and b_θ is Lipschitz continuous at $\theta = 0$ i.e. there exists $L_b \geq 0$ such that

$$(H5) \quad |b_\theta(v, \tilde{v}) - b_0(v, \tilde{v})| \leq L_b |\theta| \|v\|_0 \|\tilde{v}\|_\theta, \quad \forall v, \tilde{v} \in V_0, \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

First, we observe that (H5) implies existence of a transfer operator \mathcal{E}_θ which plays an important role by allowing to state the forthcoming approximate problem on θ -independent subspace $V_\star \dot{+} Z$.

Lemma 5.7. *Conditions (H2) and (H5) imply $\forall \theta \in \Theta$ existence of a bijection $\mathcal{E}_\theta : V_\star \rightarrow V_\theta^*$ such that*

$$(5.23) \quad b_\theta(\mathcal{E}_\theta v, \mathcal{E}_\theta \tilde{v}) = b_0(v, \tilde{v}), \quad \forall v, \tilde{v} \in V_\star,$$

and

$$(5.24) \quad |b_\theta(\mathcal{E}_\theta v, z) - b_0(v, z)| \leq K_b |\theta| \|v\|_0 \|z\|_0, \quad \forall v \in V_\star, \forall z \in Z,$$

for some constant $K_b \geq 0$ independent of θ .

In most of the relevant examples (Section 7), such a \mathcal{E}_θ will be naturally identified. In its abstract form, a proof of the lemma is given in the Appendix A. Notice that (5.24) is equivalent to

$$(5.25) \quad |b_\theta(z, v') - b_0(z, \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1} v')| \leq K_b |\theta| \|v'\|_\theta \|z\|_0, \quad \forall v' \in V_\theta^*, \forall z \in Z.$$

Our aim is to simplify further the last approximate problem (5.17) by stating it on the θ -independent subspace $V_\star \dot{+} Z$ instead of $V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z$, as well as approximating b_θ by b_0 . The former can be achieved via the above transfer operator \mathcal{E}_θ by replacing in (5.17) v^h and \tilde{v} (both in V_θ^*) by respectively $\mathcal{E}_\theta v$ and $\mathcal{E}_\theta \tilde{v}$, with both v and \tilde{v} now in V_\star . For the latter, the hope is to use (H5). Properties (5.23) and (5.24) of \mathcal{E}_θ suggest that it can actually be dropped from the b_0 -term, but not from the right-hand side, see the resulting simplified approximate problem (5.26) below. As a result, the following theorem providing an approximation to the original problem (2.4) by the simplified problem holds, and is of special importance to us.

Theorem 5.8. *Assume (H1)–(H5) and consider $f \in H^*$, $\theta \in \Theta$, $|\theta| < r_1$ for r_1 as in (5.1), and $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ the solution to (2.4), and let $\mathcal{E}_\theta : V_\star \rightarrow V_\theta^*$ be as in Lemma 5.7 i.e. such that (5.23) and (5.24) hold. Then, there exists a unique solution $v + z \in V_\star \dot{+} Z$ to*

$$(5.26) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta^h(z, \tilde{z}) + b_0(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) = \langle f, \mathcal{E}_\theta \tilde{v} + \tilde{z} \rangle, \quad \forall \tilde{v} + \tilde{z} \in V_\star \dot{+} Z,$$

and, there exist constants C_7 and C_8 , independent of ε , r_1 , θ and f , such that

$$(5.27) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta [u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (\mathcal{E}_\theta v + (I + N_\theta)z)] + b_\theta [u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (\mathcal{E}_\theta v + (I + N_\theta)z)] \leq C_7 \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{\star\theta}^2;$$

$$(5.28) \quad b_\theta [u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (\mathcal{E}_\theta v + z)] \leq C_8 \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{\star\theta}^2.$$

Proof. The method of proof is quite similar to that of Theorem 5.6, and so we will be slightly less detailed. The assertions $b_0[\cdot] = \|\cdot\|_0^2$ on $V_\star \dot{+} Z$, (4.18), and the fact that a_θ^h is bounded and non-negative on Z imply that the sesquilinear form given by the left-hand-side of (5.26) is bounded and coercive on $V_\star \dot{+} Z$ and hence, as \mathcal{E}_θ is clearly bounded, problem (5.26) is well-posed. Furthermore, taking in (5.26) $\tilde{v} = v$ and $\tilde{z} = z$, and using (5.16), (4.18) and (5.23), and denoting by C a positive constant independent of θ, ε and f whose precise value may change from line to line, we first obtain $(\varepsilon^{-2} |\theta|^2 + 1) \|z\|_0^2 + \|v\|_0^2 \leq C \|f\|_{\star\theta} (\|z\|_0 + \|v\|_0)$. This immediately bounds $\|v\|_0^2$ and $\|z\|_0^2$ by $C \|f\|_{\star\theta}^2$, and as a result so also $\varepsilon^{-2} |\theta|^2 \|z\|_0^2$. We also obtain an additional estimate for z analogous to (5.21) by

taking in (5.26) $\tilde{z} = z$ and $\tilde{v} = -P_{V_*} z$, concluding that $\varepsilon^{-4}|\theta|^4\|z\|_0^2$ is also bounded by $C\|f\|_{*\theta}^2$, cf. the derivation of (5.21). Combining the above estimates, we obtain

$$(5.29) \quad (\varepsilon^{-4}|\theta|^4 + \varepsilon^{-2}|\theta|^2 + 1)\|z\|_0^2 + \|v\|_0^2 \leq \kappa_4\|f\|_{*\theta}^2,$$

with some $\kappa_4 > 0$ independent of θ , ε and f . By Theorem 5.6 to prove both (5.27) and (5.28) we only need bounding related difference terms:

$$(5.30) \quad \varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta[N_\theta(z^h - z)] + b_\theta[N_\theta(z^h - z)] + \varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta[z^h - z] + b_\theta[v^h + z^h - (\mathcal{E}_\theta v + z)],$$

where $v^h + z^h$ is the solution to (5.17). Now, (recalling $\varepsilon < 1$) by (5.11) and (5.16),

$$\varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta[N_\theta(z^h - z)] + b_\theta[N_\theta(z^h - z)] \leq K^2 L_a^2 \nu_0^{-2} \nu_*^{-1} \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta^h [z^h - z].$$

Next, (4.3), (5.15) and (4.5) first show that $\varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta[z^h - z] = \varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta[\mathcal{M}_\theta(z^h - z)] + \varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta[\mathcal{N}_\theta(z^h - z)]$ is bounded by a multiple of $\varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta^h[z^h - z] + \varepsilon^{-2}|\theta|^3\|z^h - z\|_0^2 + \varepsilon^{-2}|\theta|^2\|z^h - z\|_0^2$. Then, via $|\theta|^3 \leq (|\theta|^2 + |\theta|^4)/2$ and bounding the resulting $|\theta|^2$ -terms via the a_θ^h -term using (5.16), we conclude that $\varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta[z^h - z]$ is bounded by a multiple of

$$\varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta^h[z^h - z] + \varepsilon^{-2}|\theta|^4(\|z^h\|_0^2 + \|z\|_0^2).$$

Consequently, via (5.21) and (5.29), we appropriately bound (5.30) if we bound

$$(5.31) \quad \varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta^h[z^h - z] + b_\theta[v^h + z^h - (\mathcal{E}_\theta v + z)].$$

To this end, we shall demonstrate that replacing in (5.17) $v^h + z^h$ by $\mathcal{E}_\theta v + z$ produces a small error on the right-hand side. For $\tilde{v} \in V_\theta^*$ and $\tilde{z} \in Z$, utilising (5.23), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} b_\theta(\mathcal{E}_\theta v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) &= b_\theta(\mathcal{E}_\theta v, \mathcal{E}_\theta \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1} \tilde{v}) + b_\theta(\mathcal{E}_\theta v, \tilde{z}) + b_\theta(z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) \\ &= b_0(v, \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1} \tilde{v}) + b_\theta(\mathcal{E}_\theta v, \tilde{z}) + b_\theta(z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) = b_0(v + z, \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1} \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) + J, \end{aligned}$$

where $J = (b_\theta(\mathcal{E}_\theta v, \tilde{z}) - b_0(v, \tilde{z})) + (b_\theta(z, \tilde{v}) - b_0(z, \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1} \tilde{v})) + (b_\theta(z, \tilde{z}) - b_0(z, \tilde{z}))$. Thus, via (5.26),

$$(5.32) \quad \varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta^h(z, \tilde{z}) + b_\theta(\mathcal{E}_\theta v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) = \langle f, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z} \rangle + J, \quad \forall (\tilde{v}, \tilde{z}) \in V_\theta^* \times Z.$$

Note J is small. Indeed, (5.24), (5.25), (H5) and estimates (5.29) provide the following bound:

$$(5.33) \quad |J| \leq \kappa_5 \varepsilon \|f\|_{*\theta} (\varepsilon^{-2}|\theta|^2 \|\tilde{z}\|_0^2 + \|\tilde{v}\|_0^2)^{1/2}, \quad \forall \tilde{v} \in V_\theta^*, \forall \tilde{z} \in Z,$$

for some $\kappa_5 > 0$ independent of θ, ε and f . Comparing (5.32) with (5.17) we conclude that

$$(5.34) \quad \varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta^h(z - z^h, \tilde{z}) + b_\theta(\mathcal{E}_\theta v + z - (v^h + z^h), \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) = J, \quad \forall (\tilde{v}, \tilde{z}) \in V_\theta^* \times Z.$$

Finally, to bound (5.31), we can set in (5.34) $\tilde{z} = z - z^h$ and $\tilde{v} = \mathcal{E}_\theta v - v^h$, and then use (5.33) followed by (5.16), (4.19) and (5.1). \square

We end this subsection by noting that one can produce a global in θ approximation to $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ by combining an approximation for $|\theta| < r_1$, given by Theorem 5.3, 5.6 or 5.8, with the approximation v_θ for $|\theta| \geq r_1$ given by Theorem 4.8 (with $1/\nu(r_1) \leq \gamma^{-1}r_1^{-2}$, cf. (H3)). However, it turns out that the solution $v + z$ to (5.26) is well-defined also when $|\theta| \geq r_1$, and can be seen to still approximate $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ up to leading order. Such global approximations will play a vital role for some of our subsequent constructions in Section 6, as well as in some examples of Section 7. Following theorem holds.

Theorem 5.9. *Assume (H1)–(H5) and consider $f \in H^*$, $\theta \in \Theta$, $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ the solution to (2.4). Then, there exists a unique solution $v + z \in V_* + Z$ to (5.26), and there exist constants C_9 and C_{10} , independent of ε , θ and f , such that*

$$(5.35) \quad \varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (\mathcal{E}_\theta v + (I + N_\theta)z)] + b_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (\mathcal{E}_\theta v + (I + N_\theta)z)] \leq C_9 \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2,$$

$$(5.36) \quad b_\theta[u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (\mathcal{E}_\theta v + z)] \leq C_{10} \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2.$$

Proof. Due to Theorem 5.8 we only need to consider the case $|\theta| \geq r_1$. Note that the well-posedness of (5.26) and estimates (5.29) presented in the proof of Theorem 5.8 remain valid for all $\theta \in \Theta$. In particular, for $|\theta| \geq r_1$, (5.29) implies

$$(5.37) \quad \|z\|_0^2 \leq \kappa_4 r_1^{-4} \varepsilon^4 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2,$$

and so to prove (5.35) and (5.36) we only need bounding the difference $\varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta[u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - \mathcal{E}_\theta v] + b_\theta[u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - \mathcal{E}_\theta v]$. Now by recalling Theorem 3.1 we see that it remains to bound the difference

$$\varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta[v_\theta - \mathcal{E}_\theta v] + b_\theta[v_\theta - \mathcal{E}_\theta v] = b_\theta[v_\theta - \mathcal{E}_\theta v],$$

where $v_\theta \in V_\theta = V_\theta^*$ solves (3.1). Setting $\tilde{z} = 0$ in (5.26) and utilising (5.23) implies that $\mathcal{E}_\theta v \in V_\theta^*$ solves

$$b_\theta(\mathcal{E}_\theta v, \tilde{v}) = \langle f, \tilde{v} \rangle - b_0(z, \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1} \tilde{v}), \quad \forall \tilde{v} \in V_\theta^*.$$

Comparing this to (3.1) and using (5.37) implies $b_\theta[v_\theta - \mathcal{E}_\theta v] \leq \kappa_4 r_1^{-4} \varepsilon^4 \|f\|_{*\theta}^2$, completing the proof. \square

5.4 A strengthening of condition (H1)

In conclusion of this section, we provide a sufficient condition for (H1) which on the one hand is quite simple to verify for a broad class of examples, and on the other hand assures an important additional property of finite dimensionality of the defect subspace Z . The latter provides a substantial further simplification, as the singular form $a_\theta^h[z]$ that appears in the approximate problem (5.17) can then be represented as a finite dimensional matrix (the homogenised matrix).

Recall (H1') from Remark 2.2, that is there exists $C > 0$ and a non-negative sesquilinear form $c, \|\cdot\|_\theta$ -compact⁴ for all $\theta \in \Theta$, such that

$$(H1') \quad \|w\|_\theta^2 \leq C a_\theta[w] + c[w], \quad \forall w \in W_\theta, \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

The next result follows from standard arguments that we present here for the reader's convenience.

Proposition 5.10. *Assertion (H1') implies (H1).*

Proof. Suppose (H1) does not hold for some $\theta \in \Theta$. Then there exists a sequence $w_n \in W_\theta$ such that $a_\theta[w_n] < \frac{1}{n} \|w_n\|_\theta^2$. Notice that (H1') implies $c[w_n] > 0$ for $n > C$, so we can assume $c[w_n] = 1$. Then (H1') implies w_n is bounded in H . Consequently, up to a discarded subsequence, $\lim_n c[w_n - u] = 0$ for some $u \in H$. Moreover (possibly up to another subsequence) w_n weakly converges to some $w \in H$. The $\|\cdot\|_\theta$ -compactness of c implies that c is bounded in H (i.e. $c[u] \leq C' \|u\|_\theta^2, \forall u \in H$, for some $C' > 0$). Hence, $\forall \tilde{u} \in H, c(u - w, \tilde{u}) = \lim_n c(w_n - w, \tilde{u}) - \lim_n c(w_n - u, \tilde{u}) = 0$, and so $c[u - w] = 0$. Therefore $c[w] = c[u] = \lim_n c[w_n] = 1$. We now demonstrate that $w \in W_\theta \cap V_\theta = \{0\}$ which contradicts the fact $c[w] = 1$. Clearly $w \in W_\theta$ since W_θ is weakly closed (being an orthogonal complement). On the other hand, since a_θ is non-negative and bounded in H (see (2.2)) it is clearly weakly lower semi-continuous, and therefore, $a_\theta[w] \leq \liminf_n a_\theta[w_n] = 0$, i.e. $w \in V_\theta$. The proof is complete. \square

One advantage of (H1') is that it provides a direct means to verify (H1). We finally turn the other important implication of (H1'), the finite dimensionality of the defect subspace Z .

Proposition 5.11. *Assume (H1') and (H2). Then any space Z satisfying (4.16)-(4.17) is finite dimensional.*

Proof. To prove Z is finite dimensional we show first that since c is $\|\cdot\|_\theta$ -compact it is sufficient to prove that there exists some $0 \neq \theta \in \Theta$ and $\kappa > 0$, such that

$$(5.38) \quad \|z\|_0^2 \leq \kappa c[P_{W_\theta^*} z], \quad \forall z \in Z.$$

Indeed, for a bounded sequence $\{z_n\}$ in Z , $\{w_n\} := \{P_{W_\theta^*} z_n\}$ is also bounded. Hence (up to a subsequence) $c[w_n - u] \rightarrow 0$ for some $u \in H$, and so $c[w_n - w_m] \rightarrow 0$ as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$. Then (5.38) implies

⁴A form c is $\|\cdot\|_\theta$ -compact if every sequence $\{u_n\}$, bounded in $\|\cdot\|_\theta$, has a convergent subsequence $\{u_{n_k}\}$ with respect to c , i.e. $c[u_{n_k} - u] \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for some u . Notice that, by the uniform equivalence of the norms $\|\cdot\|_\theta$, then compactness need only be established for one θ to hold for all θ .

$\{z_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and hence $z_n \rightarrow z \in Z$. So every bounded sequence in Z has a convergent subsequence and hence Z must be finite-dimensional.

Let us now show (5.38). Fixing $z \in Z$, for small enough $\theta \in \Theta \setminus \{0\}$, by (4.19) for $v_\theta^* = -P_{V_\theta^*} z$ and $w_0 = 0$, (2.1) and (H1'), we obtain

$$(5.39) \quad \frac{1}{3}(1 - K_Z)\|z\|_0^2 \leq \|P_{W_\theta^*} z\|_0^2 \leq K^2 \|P_{W_\theta^*} z\|_\theta^2 \leq K^2 (Ca_\theta[z] + c[P_{W_\theta^*} z]).$$

Now it remains to note that (2.3) gives $a_\theta[z] \leq L_a|\theta| \|z\|_0^2$. Hence, for small enough θ , (5.39) implies (5.38). \square

6 Approximations with uniform error estimates for related operators and their spectra

In this section, we develop certain approximations for general classes of self-adjoint operators generated by the forms $A_{\varepsilon,\theta} = \varepsilon^{-2}a_\theta + b_\theta$ and for their spectra, with uniform in $\theta \in \Theta$ error estimates as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. An abstract setup for wide classes of examples, see Section 7, is as follows. Let \mathcal{H} be a complex separable Hilbert space with a family of uniformly equivalent inner products d_θ for each $\theta \in \Theta$, i.e.

$$(6.1) \quad d_{\theta_1}[u] \leq K_d d_{\theta_2}[u], \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta, \quad \text{for some } K_d > 0.$$

Assume that H is a compactly embedded⁵ dense subset of \mathcal{H} . Furthermore, we assume that

$$(6.2) \quad d_\theta[u] \leq b_\theta[u], \quad \forall u \in H, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

Consider the self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ in \mathcal{H} with inner product d_θ , generated according to the standard Friedrichs extension procedure by the (non-negative, closed, densely-defined) sesquilinear form $A_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ with the form domain H . Note that $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ has compact resolvent and therefore has a discrete spectrum which consists of the sequence of positive real eigenvalues $\{\lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ (which may accumulate only at infinity if \mathcal{H} is infinite-dimensional) labelled in ascending order and repeated according to multiplicity:

$$1 \leq \lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(1)} \leq \lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(2)} \leq \dots \leq \lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k)} \leq \lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k+1)} \leq \dots$$

In this section we provide approximations to the operators $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ with corresponding quantitative asymptotic approximations for the eigenvalues $\lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k)}$, for small $\varepsilon > 0$, that are uniform in $\theta \in \Theta$.

Throughout this section we use the following notation. For a linear subset \mathcal{U} of \mathcal{H} , $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$ denotes the closure of \mathcal{U} in \mathcal{H} and $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{U}}}^\theta$ is the orthogonal projection onto $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$ with respect to d_θ . Where appropriate, we use the notation (\mathcal{V}, d) to denote the Hilbert space formed by equipping the vector space \mathcal{V} with the inner product d . We denote the spectrum of a linear operator \mathbf{L} by $\text{Sp } \mathbf{L}$.

6.1 The case of continuous V_θ

In this subsection we suppose that the assumption of Theorem 3.1 holds. Consider original problem (2.4) with the functional f given by

$$(6.3) \quad \langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle := d_\theta(g, \tilde{u}), \quad \forall \tilde{u} \in H,$$

for any $g \in \mathcal{H}$. Notice that by (6.2) $f \in H^*$, and the solution $u_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ to (2.4) is in the domain $\text{dom } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta} \subset H$ of operator $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta} u_{\varepsilon,\theta} = g$. Then Theorem 3.1, in particular (3.8), along with (6.2), (6.3) and (3.3), for the solution v_θ of the approximate problem (3.1), imply

$$(6.4) \quad d_\theta[u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - v_\theta] \leq \|u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - v_\theta\|_\theta^2 \leq \varepsilon^4 \nu^{-2} \|f\|_{*\theta}^2 \leq \varepsilon^4 \nu^{-2} d_\theta[g], \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

Let us give an operator-theoretic interpretation of (6.4). Let \mathbf{B}_θ be the self-adjoint operator in Hilbert space $(\overline{V_\theta}, d_\theta)$, generated by the closed positive sesquilinear form b_θ with form domain V_θ . In particular,

$$(6.5) \quad d_\theta(\mathbf{B}_\theta v, \tilde{v}) = b_\theta(v, \tilde{v}), \quad \forall v \in \text{dom } \mathbf{B}_\theta, \quad \forall \tilde{v} \in V_\theta,$$

⁵That is, for any sequence $\{u_n\} \in H \subset \mathcal{H}$ with bounded $\|u_n\|_\theta$, up to a subsequence, $d_\theta[u_n - u] \rightarrow 0$ for some $u \in H$.

where $\text{dom } \mathbf{B}_\theta \subset V_\theta$ is the domain of \mathbf{B}_θ . Then, via (6.3) and (6.5), the approximate problem (3.1) can be rewritten as $\mathbf{B}_\theta v_\theta = \mathcal{P}_{V_\theta}^\theta g$, and so (6.4) can equivalently be re-stated as the following norm-operator estimate:

$$(6.6) \quad \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} - \mathbf{B}_\theta^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{V_\theta}^\theta \right\|_{(\mathcal{H}, d_\theta) \rightarrow (\mathcal{H}, d_\theta)} \leq \varepsilon^2 \nu^{-1}.$$

Next we observe that $\mathbf{B}_\theta^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{V_\theta}^\theta$ is compact, non-negative and self-adjoint in (\mathcal{H}, d_θ) . Therefore, the spectrum of $\mathbf{B}_\theta^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{V_\theta}^\theta$ consists of real non-negative eigenvalues with only a possible accumulation point at zero. Let us put these eigenvalues in descending order:

$$\alpha_\theta^{(1)} \geq \alpha_\theta^{(2)} \geq \alpha_\theta^{(3)} \geq \dots$$

(Here we are assuming for definiteness that $\dim \mathcal{H} = \infty$.) Now, the key standard step is in noticing that the operator estimate (6.6) implies similar estimates for the spectra via the min-max principle (see e.g. [48]). Namely, uniformly for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$(6.7) \quad |1/\lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(k)} - \alpha_\theta^{(k)}| \leq \varepsilon^2 \nu^{-1}.$$

Finally, we notice that all non-zero eigenvalues of $\mathbf{B}_\theta^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{V_\theta}^\theta$ are the inverses of the eigenvalues of \mathbf{B}_θ and vice versa. Therefore we have the following relations between the eigenvalues $\{\mu_\theta^{(k)}\}$ of \mathbf{B}_θ and the eigenvalues $\lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(k)}$ of $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$:

$$(6.8) \quad \left| 1/\lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(k)} - 1/\mu_\theta^{(k)} \right| \leq \varepsilon^2 \nu^{-1}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta, \quad \text{if } \dim V_\theta = \infty,$$

or

$$(6.9) \quad \left| 1/\lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(k)} - 1/\mu_\theta^{(k)} \right| \leq \varepsilon^2 \nu^{-1}, \quad \left| 1/\lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(p)} \right| \leq \varepsilon^2 \nu^{-1}, \quad \forall k \leq N, \quad \forall p \geq N+1, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta, \quad \text{if } \dim V_\theta = N.$$

Inequalities (6.6), (6.8) and (6.9) provide the desired estimates on the closeness for small ε of the “resolvents” and of the spectra of the exact and approximate operators, $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ and \mathbf{B}_θ respectively, uniform in θ .

6.2 The case of discontinuous V_θ with removable singularities

Here, we suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 5.6 hold, establishing the closeness of the solution $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ to the original problem (2.4) to the solution $v^h + z^h \in V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z$ to the approximate problem (5.17). We shall follow the pattern of the previous subsection, aiming first at recasting (5.17) in an operator form. To that end, for $\theta \in \Theta$, $|\theta| < r_1$, define on $V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z$ an inner product s by

$$(6.10) \quad s(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) := \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta^h(z, \tilde{z}) + b_\theta(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}), \quad \forall v, \tilde{v} \in V_\theta^*, \quad \forall z, \tilde{z} \in Z.$$

As follows for example from (5.1) and (5.16), $V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z$ endowed with the inner product s is a Hilbert space that is continuously embedded in H and therefore compactly embedded in \mathcal{H} ; we denote this Hilbert space by \mathbf{H} . Set $\mathcal{H}_\theta := \overline{(V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z, d_\theta)}$ and let $\mathbf{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta} : \text{dom } \mathbf{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\theta$ be the self-adjoint operator in \mathbf{H} generated by the closed positive sesquilinear form s with the form domain $V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z$. The spectrum of $\mathbf{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ consists of positive isolated eigenvalues (which may only accumulate at infinity if $V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z$ is infinite-dimensional). Consider problem (2.4) with functional f given by (6.3). Then, for the solution to the approximate problem (5.17), $v^h + z^h = \mathbf{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_\theta}^\theta g$. By Theorem 5.6 (see (5.19)) and (6.2) one has

$$d_\theta [u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (v^h + z^h)] \leq C_6 \varepsilon^2 d_\theta [g],$$

which can be rewritten in the operator language as

$$(6.11) \quad \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} - \mathbf{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_\theta}^\theta \right\|_{(\mathcal{H}, d_\theta) \rightarrow (\mathcal{H}, d_\theta)} \leq C_6^{1/2} \varepsilon,$$

where $\mathbf{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_\theta}^\theta$ is a self-adjoint operator in (\mathcal{H}, d_θ) . Arguing then as in the previous subsection we arrive at the following result.

Theorem 6.1. Assume (H1)–(H4). Let $\{\lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\Lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the eigenvalues of the operators $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ and $\mathbf{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ respectively. Then

$$\left| 1/\lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k)} - 1/\Lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k)} \right| \leq C_6^{1/2} \varepsilon, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta, \quad |\theta| < r_1, \quad \text{if } \dim(V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z) = \infty,$$

or

$$\left| 1/\lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k)} - 1/\Lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k)} \right| \leq C_6^{1/2} \varepsilon, \quad \left| 1/\lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(p)} \right| \leq C_6^{1/2} \varepsilon, \quad \forall k \leq N, \quad \forall p \geq N+1, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta, \quad |\theta| < r_1, \quad \text{if } \dim(V_\theta^* \dot{+} Z) = N.$$

Remark 6.2. The approximations for the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ given by Theorem 6.1 for $|\theta| < r_1$ can be combined with the results of Section 6.1 for $|\theta| \geq r_1$. Indeed, under (H2)–(H3), the estimates (6.8) and (6.9) hold for $|\theta| \geq r_1 > 0$ with ν replaced by γr_1^2 (as seen directly from the proof of Theorem 4.8 for $\nu(r_1) = \gamma r_1^2$ as implied by (H3)).

6.3 The case of Lipschitz continuous b_θ

Let us now suppose the assumptions of Theorem 5.9 hold, establishing the closeness of the solution $u_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ of the original problem (2.4) to the approximations based on the solution $v+z \in V_\star \dot{+} Z$ of the simplified problem (5.26). With the aim of rewriting (a further approximation to) (5.26) and the resulting estimate (5.36) in an operator form, notice first that the left-hand side of (5.26) has the following important self-similarity property: since a_θ^h is quadratic in θ and b_0 is θ -independent, it depends on ε and θ only via $\theta/\varepsilon =: \xi$ and in particular $\varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta^h = a_\xi^h$. For each $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let \mathbb{L}_ξ be the self-adjoint operator in $\mathcal{H}_0 = (\overline{V_\star \dot{+} Z}, d_0)$ generated by the following inner product on $V_\star \dot{+} Z$:

$$(6.12) \quad \mathbb{S}_\xi(v+z, \tilde{v}+\tilde{z}) := a_\xi^h(z, \tilde{z}) + b_0(v+z, \tilde{v}+\tilde{z}), \quad \forall v+z, \tilde{v}+\tilde{z} \in V_\star \dot{+} Z.$$

Similarly to the previous subsections, for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, \mathbb{L}_ξ has a compact resolvent and hence a discrete positive spectrum which can only accumulate at infinity.

In addition, let us suppose that \mathcal{E}_θ (that satisfies (5.23)–(5.24)) and d_θ also satisfy

$$(H6) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathcal{E}_\theta \text{ extends to a bijection in } \mathcal{H} \text{ such that } d_\theta(\mathcal{E}_\theta u, \mathcal{E}_\theta \tilde{u}) = d_0(u, \tilde{u}), \quad \forall u, \tilde{u} \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \theta \in \Theta, \\ &\mathcal{E}_0 = I \text{ and } \|\mathcal{E}_{\theta_1} - \mathcal{E}_{\theta_2}\|_{(\mathcal{H}, d_0) \rightarrow (\mathcal{H}, d_{\theta_1})} \leq K_e |\theta_1 - \theta_2|, \quad \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta, \quad \text{for some } K_e > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 6.3. Assumption (H6) appears to be restrictive but, as we will see, this condition often trivially holds in examples, Section 7.

Let the right-hand-sides of (2.4) be again given by (6.3). Aiming at recasting (5.36) in an operator form, we observe that this is prevented by the presence of the transfer operator \mathcal{E}_θ , in both (5.36) and in the right-hand side of (5.26), in the “ v -terms” but not in the “ z -terms”. As we will see, this can be rectified by replacing \tilde{z} on the right-hand side of (5.26) by $\mathcal{E}_\theta \tilde{z}$ as well as z in (5.36) by $\mathcal{E}_\theta z$. On the one hand, as we will see, this introduces a small additional error in (5.36), but on the other hand allows to express the amended approximation $\mathcal{E}_\theta(v+z)$ in an operator form. Indeed, $v+z$ now solves the amended (5.26) which via (6.12) and (H6) reads $\mathbb{S}_{\theta/\varepsilon}(v+z, \tilde{v}+\tilde{z}) = d_\theta(g, \mathcal{E}_\theta(\tilde{v}+\tilde{z})) = d_0(\mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1}g, \tilde{v}+\tilde{z})$. Hence $\mathcal{E}_\theta(v+z) = \mathcal{E}_\theta \mathbb{L}_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1}g$. Notice that (H6) implies that \mathcal{E}_θ^{-1} is the adjoint of \mathcal{E}_θ when the latter is considered as a (unitary) map from (\mathcal{H}, d_0) to (\mathcal{H}, d_θ) , so the emerging operator $\mathcal{E}_\theta \mathbb{L}_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1}$ is self-adjoint and non-negative in (\mathcal{H}, d_θ) . As a result, the following theorem holds.

Theorem 6.4. Assume (H1)–(H6). For all $\theta \in \Theta$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ one has:

$$\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{-1} - \mathcal{E}_\theta \mathbb{L}_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1} \right\|_{(\mathcal{H}, d_\theta) \rightarrow (\mathcal{H}, d_\theta)} \leq C_{11} \varepsilon, \quad C_{11} = C_{10}^{1/2} + \frac{1}{2} K_e \nu_\star^{-1/2} \left(1 + \left(\frac{1+K^2}{2(1-Kz)} \right)^{1/2} \right).$$

Proof. Estimate (5.36) of Theorem 5.9 informs us via (6.2) that $d_\theta[\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{-1}g - (\mathcal{E}_\theta v+z)] \leq C_{10} \varepsilon^2 d_\theta[g]$, where $v+z$ is the solution to (5.26) with functional (6.3). It remains to bound $(\mathcal{E}_\theta v+z) - \mathcal{E}_\theta \mathbb{L}_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1}g$. Let $v_1+z_1 = \mathbb{L}_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1}g$, that is (see (6.12) and (H6)) $v_1+z_1 \in V_\star \dot{+} Z$ solves

$$(6.13) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta^h(z_1, \tilde{z}) + b_0(v_1+z_1, \tilde{v}+\tilde{z}) = d_\theta(g, \mathcal{E}_\theta(\tilde{v}+\tilde{z})), \quad \forall \tilde{v}+\tilde{z} \in V_\star \dot{+} Z.$$

Then

$$(6.14) \quad (\mathcal{E}_\theta v + z) - \mathcal{E}_\theta \mathbb{L}_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1} g = \mathcal{E}_\theta v + z - \mathcal{E}_\theta(v_1 + z_1) = (I - \mathcal{E}_\theta)z + \mathcal{E}_\theta(v + z - (v_1 + z_1)).$$

Let us bound $d_\theta[(I - \mathcal{E}_\theta)z]$. By (4.17) one has $2(1 - K_Z)(b_0[v] + b_0[z]) \leq b_0[v + z]$ which combined with (6.2), (2.1), (5.16), (5.26) and (H6) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_\star \varepsilon^{-2} |\theta|^2 d_0[z] + 2(1 - K_Z)(d_0[v] + K^{-2} d_\theta[z]) &\leq \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta^h[z] + b_0[v + z] = d_\theta(g, \mathcal{E}_\theta v + z) \\ &\leq d_\theta^{1/2}[g] \left(d_\theta^{1/2}[\mathcal{E}_\theta v] + d_\theta^{1/2}[z] \right) = d_\theta^{1/2}[g] \left(d_0^{1/2}[v] + d_\theta^{1/2}[z] \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8} (1 - K_Z)^{-1} (1 + K^2) d_\theta[g] + 2(1 - K_Z)(d_0[v] + K^{-2} d_\theta[z]). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\nu_\star \varepsilon^{-2} |\theta|^2 d_0[z] \leq \frac{1}{8} (1 - K_Z)^{-1} (1 + K^2) d_\theta[g]$ and therefore, via (H6), one has

$$d_\theta[(I - \mathcal{E}_\theta)z] \leq K_e^2 |\theta|^2 d_0[z] \leq \frac{1}{8} K_e^2 \nu_\star^{-1} (1 - K_Z)^{-1} (1 + K^2) \varepsilon^2 d_\theta[g].$$

It remains to bound the last term in (6.14) via $d_\theta[g]$. By (H6) it is equivalent to bounding $d_0[v + z - (v_1 + z_1)]$. Subtracting (6.13) from (5.26) (with f from (6.3), $\tilde{v} = v - v_1$ and $\tilde{z} = z - z_1$) and utilising (H6), (6.2) and (5.16) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta^h[z - z_1] + b_0[v + z - (v_1 + z_1)] &= d_\theta(g, (I - \mathcal{E}_\theta)(z - z_1)) \leq \\ &d_\theta^{1/2}[g] K_e |\theta| d_0^{1/2}[z - z_1] \leq K_e \nu_\star^{-1/2} d_\theta^{1/2}[g] (a_\theta^h[z - z_1])^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $b_0[v + z - (v_1 + z_1)] \leq \frac{1}{4} \nu_\star^{-1} K_e^2 \varepsilon^2 d_\theta[g]$ and so $d_0[v + z - (v_1 + z_1)] \leq \frac{1}{4} \nu_\star^{-1} K_e^2 \varepsilon^2 d_\theta[g]$. Applying finally the triangle inequality completes the proof. \square

Theorem 6.4, together with the fact that $\mathcal{E}_\theta : (\mathcal{H}, d_0) \rightarrow (\mathcal{H}, d_\theta)$ is unitary by (H6), provides the following analogue of Theorem 6.1:

Theorem 6.5. *Assume (H1)–(H6). Let $\{\lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\lambda_\xi^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the eigenvalues of the operators $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ and \mathbb{L}_ξ respectively. Then, for some $C_{11} > 0$ independent of ε and θ ,*

$$(6.15) \quad \left| 1/\lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(k)} - 1/\lambda_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{(k)} \right| \leq C_{11} \varepsilon, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta, \quad \text{if } \dim(V_\star \dot{+} Z) = \infty,$$

or

$$(6.16) \quad \left| 1/\lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(k)} - 1/\lambda_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{(k)} \right| \leq C_{11} \varepsilon, \quad \left| 1/\lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(p)} \right| \leq C_{11} \varepsilon, \quad \forall k \leq N, \quad \forall p \geq N + 1, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta, \quad \text{if } \dim(V_\star \dot{+} Z) = N.$$

We next aim at approximating the collective spectrum $\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta} =: \text{Sp}_\varepsilon$. The importance of Sp_ε is due to the fact that in many examples (Section 7) operators $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$, $\theta \in \Theta$, serve as fibers in a decomposition of an (appropriately transformed) original operator whose spectrum of interest is (the closure of) Sp_ε . Theorem 6.5 provides one approximation to Sp_ε , however, this approximation still depends on the parameter ε . We will now rectify this to produce an important ε -independent approximation of the above collective spectrum.

Theorem 6.6. *Assume (H1)–(H6). Then*

$$(6.17) \quad \text{dist}_s \left(\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} \cup \{0\}, \bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi^{-1} \cup \{0\} \right) \leq C_{12} \varepsilon,$$

where for non-empty $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}$, $\text{dist}_s(X, Y) := \max(\sup_{x \in X} \text{dist}(x, Y), \sup_{y \in Y} \text{dist}(y, X))$ is the symmetric Hausdorff distance and C_{12} is a positive constant independent of ε .

Before proving the theorem, we state its corollary providing an ε -independent approximation of the set $\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ in any finite interval.

Corollary 6.7. *For every interval $[a, b] \subset (-\infty, \infty)$ one has*

$$(6.18) \quad d_{[a,b]} \left(\overline{\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}}, \overline{\bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_{\xi}} \right) \leq C_b \varepsilon, \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon < 1,$$

with a constant C_b independent of ε and a . In (6.18), $d_{[a,b]}(X, Y) := \max(\text{dist}([a, b] \cap X, Y), \text{dist}([a, b] \cap Y, X))$ where $\text{dist}(X, Y) := \sup_{x \in X} \text{dist}(x, Y)$ is the (non-symmetric) distance, and we adopt the convention that $\text{dist}(\emptyset, A) = \text{dist}(A, \emptyset) = 0$ for any set A . In particular, this can be interpreted as that $\overline{\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}}$ converges when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to $\overline{\bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_{\xi}}$ in the Fell topology (see e.g. [6, p. 142]), with a “rate” specified by (6.18).

Proof. Since, for any $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta} \cup \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_{\xi} \subset [1, \infty)$, for $b < 1$ the left-hand side of (6.18) vanishes and so we can set $C_b = 0$ for $b < 1$. Let $b \geq 1$, and let for some $\theta \in \Theta$, $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq \lambda := \lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(k)} \in [a, b] \cap \text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$. (The case of $\lambda := \lambda_{\xi}^{(k)} \in [a, b] \cap \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_{\xi}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, is considered in a similar way.) Then, by (6.17), either $1/\lambda \leq C_{12} \varepsilon$ or for some $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $|1/\lambda - 1/\mu| \leq 2C_{12} \varepsilon$ where $\mu := \lambda_{\xi}^{(l)} \geq 1$. Assuming first the latter,

$$|\lambda - \mu| = |\lambda^{-1} - \mu^{-1}| \lambda \mu \leq 2C_{12} \varepsilon b (|\lambda - \mu| + b).$$

Therefore, if $\varepsilon < \min\{1, (4C_{12}b)^{-1}\} =: \varepsilon_b$ then $2C_{12} \varepsilon b < 1/2$ and it follows that $|\lambda - \mu| \leq 4C_{12}b^2 \varepsilon$. Notice that, as $\lambda \leq b$, the former case ($1/\lambda \leq C_{12} \varepsilon$) is not possible for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_b$. On the other hand, if $\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_b$, we notice that as $V_0 \neq \{0\}$, $\lambda_0^{(1)} < +\infty$. (Similarly, from the variational principle, $\lambda_{\varepsilon, 0}^{(1)} \leq \lambda_0^{(1)} < +\infty$.) So, taking instead $\mu = \lambda_0^{(1)}$ (similarly, $\mu = \lambda_{\varepsilon, 0}^{(1)}$),

$$|\lambda - \mu| \leq \max\{b, \lambda_0^{(1)}\} \leq \max\{b, \lambda_0^{(1)}\} \varepsilon_b^{-1} \varepsilon.$$

So it would suffice, for $b \geq 1$, to take $C_b = \max\{b, \lambda_0^{(1)}\} \varepsilon_b^{-1} = \max\{b, \lambda_0^{(1)}\} \max\{4C_{12}b, 1\} \geq 4C_{12}b^2$. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.6. Note that (6.17) follows if we establish that:

$$(6.19) \quad \text{for every } l_{\varepsilon} \in \bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} \cup \{0\} \text{ there exists } l_0 \in \bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_{\xi}^{-1} \cup \{0\} \text{ such that } |l_{\varepsilon} - l_0| \leq C_{12} \varepsilon;$$

$$(6.20) \quad \text{for every } l_0 \in \bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_{\xi}^{-1} \cup \{0\} \text{ there exists } l_{\varepsilon} \in \bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} \cup \{0\} \text{ such that } |l_0 - l_{\varepsilon}| \leq C_{12} \varepsilon.$$

Now Theorem 6.5 implies (6.19) and additionally implies (6.20) for all $l_0 \in \bigcup_{\xi \in \varepsilon^{-1}\Theta} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_{\xi}^{-1} \cup \{0\}$. Therefore, in order to establish (6.20) it remains to consider arbitrary $l_0 \in \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_{\xi}^{-1}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \varepsilon^{-1}\Theta$. Recalling that $\theta = 0$ is assumed to be an interior point of Θ , let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \varepsilon^{-1}\Theta$ i.e. $|\xi| > \varepsilon^{-1}R$ where $R > 0$ is radius of the largest closed ball centred at the origin that is contained in Θ . So, for small ε , we are interested in approximating the spectrum $\text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_{\xi}^{-1}$ for large $|\xi|$.

The plan is first to use for such a case of \mathbb{L}_{ξ}^{-1} with a large $|\xi|$ the methods and results of Section 6.1, regarding $\tilde{\varepsilon} = |\xi|^{-1}$ as a small parameter. As a result, we will see that the spectrum of \mathbb{L}_{ξ}^{-1} is approximated by that of an operator whose spectrum is identical to the one of another operator approximating in turn $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1}$.

To that end, for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, introduce “wiggled” objects as follows. Let $\tilde{\varepsilon} := |\xi|^{-1}$ and $\tilde{\theta} := \xi/|\xi|$, and so $\xi = \tilde{\theta}/\tilde{\varepsilon}$ with $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ and $\tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta} = S^{n-1}$ the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n centered at the origin. We also set

$$(6.21) \quad \tilde{H} = V_{\star} \dot{+} Z, \quad \tilde{A}_{\tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\theta}}[v + z] := \tilde{\varepsilon}^{-2} a_{\tilde{\theta}}^h[z] + b_0[v + z] = \mathbb{S}_{\tilde{\theta}/\tilde{\varepsilon}}[v + z] = \mathbb{S}_{\xi}[v + z], \quad \tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta},$$

i.e., for any $\tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta}$, we set $\tilde{a}_{\tilde{\theta}}(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) = a_{\tilde{\theta}}^h(z, \tilde{z})$, $\tilde{b}_{\tilde{\theta}}(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) = b_0(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z})$, with respective inner product $(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z})_{\tilde{\theta}} = a_{\tilde{\theta}}^h(z, \tilde{z}) + b_0(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z})$. Then $\tilde{V}_{\tilde{\theta}} = V_{\star}$ and $\tilde{W}_{\tilde{\theta}} = \{v + z \in V_{\star} \dot{+} Z \mid b_0(v + z, \tilde{v}) =$

$0, \forall \tilde{v} \in V_\star\}$. Now we notice that for the above wiggled objects all the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 hold. In particular, (3.6) can be seen to hold as follows. For $\tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta}$ and $w = v + z \in \widetilde{W}_{\tilde{\theta}}$, via (5.16),

$$a_{\tilde{\theta}}^h[z] \geq \nu_\star \|z\|_0^2 = \nu_\star b_0[z] = \nu_\star b_0[(v+z) - v] \geq \nu_\star b_0[v+z].$$

(In the last inequality we used that $w = v + z$ and v are orthogonal with respect to b_0 .) As a result, for any $0 < \tilde{\nu} < 1$,

$$\tilde{a}_{\tilde{\theta}}[w] = a_{\tilde{\theta}}^h[w] \geq \tilde{\nu} a_{\tilde{\theta}}^h[z] + (1 - \tilde{\nu}) \nu_\star b_0[v+z].$$

Hence choosing $\tilde{\nu}$ so that $\tilde{\nu} = (1 - \tilde{\nu}) \nu_\star$, i.e. $\tilde{\nu} := \nu_\star / (1 + \nu_\star)$, implies

$$\tilde{a}_{\tilde{\theta}}[w] \geq \tilde{\nu} \left(a_{\tilde{\theta}}^h[z] + b_0[v+z] \right) = \tilde{\nu} \|w\|_{\tilde{\theta}}^2,$$

and therefore (3.6) holds with $\nu = \tilde{\nu}$.

Next, for the assumptions of Section 6.1, we set $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} := \overline{V_\star \dot{+} Z}$ with $d_{\tilde{\theta}} = d_0, \forall \theta \in \Theta$. So $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\theta}}$ is the self-adjoint operator in $(\overline{V_\star \dot{+} Z}, d_0)$ generated by $\tilde{A}_{\tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\theta}}$ with form domain $V_\star \dot{+} Z$. Further, $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\tilde{\theta}}$ becomes in this setting the $\tilde{\theta}$ -independent self-adjoint operator \mathbf{B} in $(\overline{V_\star}, d_0)$ generated by b_0 with form domain V_\star , i.e. (cf. (6.5)),

$$(6.22) \quad d_0(\mathbf{B}v, \tilde{v}) = b_0(v, \tilde{v}), \quad \forall v \in \text{dom } \mathbf{B} \subset V_\star, \quad \forall \tilde{v} \in V_\star.$$

Recall that Theorem 3.1 holds for all $\varepsilon > 0$ (see Remark 3.2), and hence so are the results of Section 6.1. Consequently, via (6.8)–(6.9), we have

$$(6.23) \quad \text{dist}_s \left(\text{Sp } \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\theta}}^{-1} \cup \{0\}, \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}^{-1} \cup \{0\} \right) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}^2 \tilde{\nu}^{-1}, \quad \forall \tilde{\varepsilon} > 0, \quad \forall \tilde{\theta} \in S^{n-1}.$$

Notice that, see (6.21), $\mathbb{L}_\xi^{-1} = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\theta}}^{-1}$, and therefore (6.23) implies

$$(6.24) \quad \text{dist}_s \left(\text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi^{-1} \cup \{0\}, \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}^{-1} \cup \{0\} \right) \leq |\xi|^{-2} \tilde{\nu}^{-1}, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}.$$

In particular, for every $l_0 \in \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi^{-1}, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \varepsilon^{-1}\Theta$ (hence $|\xi| > \varepsilon^{-1}R$), there exists $\mu \in \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}^{-1} \cup \{0\}$ such that

$$(6.25) \quad |l_0 - \mu| \leq |\xi|^{-2} \tilde{\nu}^{-1} < \varepsilon^2 R^{-2} \tilde{\nu}^{-1}.$$

On the other hand, from (6.5) and (6.22) we observe via (5.23) and (H6) that, for every $\theta \in \Theta \setminus \{0\}$, $\mathbf{B}_\theta^{-1} = \mathcal{E}_\theta \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1}$ and thus $\text{Sp } \mathbf{B}_\theta^{-1} = \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}^{-1}$. Consequently, Remark 6.2 implies that for the above $\mu \in \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}^{-1} \cup \{0\} = \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}_\theta^{-1} \cup \{0\}$ with any chosen $\theta \in \Theta$ with $|\theta| = R$, there exists $l_\varepsilon \in \text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} \cup \{0\}$, such that

$$(6.26) \quad |\mu - l_\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon^2 \gamma^{-1} R^{-2}.$$

Thus, (6.25) and (6.26) imply that (6.20) holds for $l_0 \in \bigcup_{\xi \notin \varepsilon^{-1}\Theta} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi^{-1}$ and the proof is complete. \square

6.4 Characterisation of the limit collective spectrum $\overline{\bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi}$

As Corollary 6.7 provides an approximation of the collective spectrum for the original problem $\overline{\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}}$ in terms of the “limit collective spectrum” $\overline{\bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi}$, we aim here at characterising the latter limit spectrum.

If λ is an eigenvalue of \mathbb{L}_ξ with some eigenvector $0 \neq v + z \in V_\star \dot{+} Z$, then by (6.12) the spectral problem reads

$$(6.27) \quad \mathbb{S}_\xi(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) = a_\xi^h(z, \tilde{z}) + b_0(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) = \lambda d_0(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}), \quad \forall \tilde{v} + \tilde{z} \in V_\star \dot{+} Z.$$

For deriving useful expressions for the above eigenvalues λ , it would help if it were possible to eliminate v from (6.27) by expressing it in terms of a self-adjoint operator acting on z . This is prevented by the

coupling terms $b_0(z, \tilde{v})$ and $d_0(z, \tilde{v})$, and we aim at overcoming this by first showing that the defect subspace Z (satisfying (4.16) and (4.17)) can always be chosen so that

$$(6.28) \quad b_0(z, v_\star) = d_0(z, v_\star), \quad \forall z \in Z, \quad \forall v_\star \in V_\star.$$

In most of the specific examples, Section 7, (6.28) naturally holds. In our general abstract setting, we show that (6.28) can always be achieved by selecting Z appropriately. With this aim, we assume without loss of generality that

$$(6.29) \quad d_0[v_0] \leq M_d b_0[v_0], \quad \forall v_0 \in V_0 = V_\star \dot{+} Z, \quad 0 < M_d < 1.$$

(This is a small strengthening of (6.2) for $\theta = 0$, which can always be achieved by re-defining d_θ via multiplying it by any positive constant factor smaller than 1, with corresponding rescaling of the spectrum.)

Aiming at (6.28), let first Z' be the orthogonal complement of V_\star in V_0 (with respect to $b_0 = (\cdot, \cdot)_0$ on V_0), cf Remark 4.6. So, for any $z' \in Z'$ and $v_\star \in V_\star$, $b_0(z', v_\star) = 0$ and the idea is to construct Z by ‘‘correcting’’ Z' via adding to z' some $Tz' \in V_\star$, i.e. to seek $Z \ni z = z' + Tz'$. Then (6.28) reads $b_0(z' + Tz', v_\star) = d_0(z' + Tz', v_\star)$, which can be restated as a problem for $T : Z' \rightarrow V_\star$ as follows:

$$(6.30) \quad b_0(Tz', \tilde{v}) - d_0(Tz', \tilde{v}) = d_0(z', \tilde{v}) - b_0(z', \tilde{v}) = d_0(z', \tilde{v}), \quad \forall \tilde{v} \in V_\star.$$

Notice that problem (6.30) is well-posed on V_\star due to the coercivity implied by (6.29), and so uniquely determines a $\|\cdot\|_0$ -bounded injective linear operator $T : Z' \rightarrow V_\star$, and $Z := (I + T)Z'$ satisfies (6.28). Show now that $V_0 = V_\star \dot{+} Z$. For any $v_0 \in V_0$, seek $v_\star \in V_\star$ and $z \in Z$ i.e. $z' \in Z'$ such that for $z = z' + Tz'$, $v_0 = v_\star + z = (v_\star + Tz') + z' = P_{V_\star} v_0 + P_{Z'} v_0$. This uniquely determines $z' = P_{Z'} v_0$, $v_\star = P_{V_\star} v_0 - T P_{Z'} v_0$ and $z = v_0 - v_\star$, so $V_0 = V_\star \dot{+} Z$.

Furthermore, via (6.28) and (6.29), for all $z \in Z$ and $v_\star \in V_\star$,

$$|(v_\star, z)_0| = |b_0(v_\star, z)| = |d_0(v_\star, z)| \leq d_0^{1/2}[v_\star] d_0^{1/2}[z] \leq M_d b_0^{1/2}[v_\star] b_0^{1/2}[z] = M_d \|v_\star\|_0 \|z\|_0.$$

Therefore (4.16) and (4.17) hold with $K_Z = M_d$. Notice that Z is closed (and therefore also weakly closed) linear subspace, as follows e.g. from the closedness of Z' and the boundedness of T .

Now, by (6.28), the spectral problem (6.27) can be rewritten as

$$a_\xi^h(z, \tilde{z}) + b_0(z, \tilde{z}) + b_0(v, \tilde{v}) + d_0(z, \tilde{v}) + d_0(v, \tilde{z}) = \lambda d_0(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}), \quad \forall \tilde{v} + \tilde{z} \in V_\star \dot{+} Z,$$

or equivalently,

$$(6.31) \quad b_0(v, \tilde{v}) - \lambda d_0(v, \tilde{v}) = (\lambda - 1) d_0(z, \tilde{v}), \quad \forall \tilde{v} \in V_\star;$$

$$(6.32) \quad a_\xi^h(z, \tilde{z}) = -b_0(z, \tilde{z}) + \lambda d_0(z, \tilde{z}) + (\lambda - 1) d_0(v, \tilde{z}), \quad \forall \tilde{z} \in Z.$$

It follows from (6.31) that $v \in \text{dom } \mathbf{B}$ where \mathbf{B} is the operator introduced in Section 6.3, see (6.22), i.e. self-adjoint operator in $\overline{V_\star}$ generated by b_0 with form domain V_\star . Furthermore, if $\lambda \notin \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}$, $v = v_\lambda(z)$ is uniquely found from z :

$$(6.33) \quad v = v_\lambda(z) = (\lambda - 1)(\mathbf{B} - \lambda I)^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{V_\star}^0 z.$$

For such λ , (6.32) implies that $z \in Z \setminus \{0\}$ solves

$$(6.34) \quad a_\xi^h(z, \tilde{z}) = \beta_\lambda(z, \tilde{z}), \quad \forall \tilde{z} \in Z,$$

where, for $\lambda \notin \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}$, $\beta_\lambda : Z \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is the sesquilinear form

$$(6.35) \quad \beta_\lambda(z, \tilde{z}) := -b_0(z, \tilde{z}) + \lambda d_0(z, \tilde{z}) + (\lambda - 1) d_0(v_\lambda(z), \tilde{z}),$$

where $v_\lambda(z)$ is the unique solution to (6.31). Show that, for real $\lambda \notin \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}$, form β_λ is complex-Hermitian symmetric, i.e. $\beta_\lambda(\tilde{z}, z) = \overline{\beta_\lambda(z, \tilde{z})}$ for all $z, \tilde{z} \in Z$; in particular $\beta_\lambda[z] := \beta_\lambda(z, z)$ is real-valued. Indeed, given $z, \tilde{z} \in Z$, by setting in (6.31) $z = \tilde{z}$ and $\tilde{v} = v_\lambda(z)$ and combing with (6.35) and using the symmetry of b_0 and d_0 , we conclude

$$\beta_\lambda(z, \tilde{z}) = -b_0(z, \tilde{z}) + \lambda d_0(z, \tilde{z}) + b_0(v_\lambda(z), v_\lambda(\tilde{z})) - \lambda d_0(v_\lambda(z), v_\lambda(\tilde{z})) = \overline{\beta_\lambda(\tilde{z}, z)}.$$

For an equivalent operator interpretation of β_λ , from (6.35) and (6.33),

$$(6.36) \quad \beta_\lambda(z, \tilde{z}) = -b_0(z, \tilde{z}) + d_0(\beta(\lambda)z, \tilde{z})$$

for $\beta(\lambda) : \overline{Z} \rightarrow \overline{Z}$ the bounded linear operator

$$(6.37) \quad \beta(\lambda) := \lambda I + (\lambda - 1)^2 \mathcal{P}_{\overline{Z}}^0 (\mathbf{B} - \lambda I)^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\overline{V}_*}^0.$$

Now notice that, since $a_\xi^h[z]$ is non-negative real for all ξ and z , (6.34) immediately implies the following inclusion:

$$(6.38) \quad \bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi \subseteq \left\{ \lambda \notin \text{Sp } \mathbf{B} : \beta_\lambda[z] \geq 0 \text{ for some } 0 \neq z \in Z \right\} \cup \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}.$$

In fact we have a stronger assertion, providing the following important characterisation of the limit spectrum in terms of the form β_λ .

Theorem 6.8. *The following characterisation of the collective limit spectrum holds:*

$$\overline{\bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi} = \left\{ \lambda \notin \text{Sp } \mathbf{B} : \beta_\lambda[z] \geq 0 \text{ for some } 0 \neq z \in Z \right\} \cup \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}.$$

Proof. Step 1. Here we prove

$$\overline{\bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi} \subseteq \mathcal{C} := \left\{ \lambda \notin \text{Sp } \mathbf{B} : \beta_\lambda[z] \geq 0 \text{ for some } 0 \neq z \in Z \right\} \cup \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}.$$

By (6.38) it is sufficient to show that \mathcal{C} is closed. Recalling that $\text{Sp } \mathbf{B}$ is closed, let $\lambda_n \in \mathcal{C}$ be such that $\lim_n \lambda_n = \lambda \notin \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}$, and consider n large enough so that $\text{dist}(\lambda_n, \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}) \geq \delta > 0$. Then $\|(B - \lambda_n I)^{-1}\|_{(V_*, d_0) \rightarrow (V_*, d_0)} \leq \delta^{-1}$, and so by (6.37) $\|\beta(\lambda_n)\|_{(\mathcal{H}, d_0) \rightarrow (\mathcal{H}, d_0)}$ is bounded, and there exists $z_n \in Z$, $d_0[z_n] = 1$ and $\beta_{\lambda_n}[z_n] \geq 0$. Via (6.36) these assertions imply that $b_0[z_n]$ is bounded, and so (up to a subsequence) z_n converges weakly in H , and strongly in \mathcal{H} , to some $z \in Z$, $d_0[z] = 1$ and by weak lower semi-continuity of b_0 , $b_0[z] \leq \liminf_n b_0[z_n] =: \underline{\lim}_n b_0[z_n]$. We show that all these assertions imply that $\beta_\lambda[z] \geq 0$. Indeed, for $\mathcal{R}_\mu := (\mathbf{B} - \mu I)^{-1}$, we calculate via (6.35) and (6.33)

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\lambda_n}[z_n] &= -b_0[z_n] + \lambda_n d_0[z_n] + (\lambda_n - 1)^2 d_0 \left(\mathcal{R}_{\lambda_n} \mathcal{P}_{\overline{V}_*}^0 z_n, z_n \right) = \\ &= -b_0[z_n] + \lambda_n d_0[z_n] + (\lambda_n - 1)^2 d_0 \left(\mathcal{R}_\lambda \mathcal{P}_{\overline{V}_*}^0 z_n, z_n \right) + (\lambda_n - \lambda)(\lambda_n - 1)^2 d_0 \left(\mathcal{R}_{\lambda_n} \mathcal{R}_\lambda \mathcal{P}_{\overline{V}_*}^0 z_n, z_n \right), \end{aligned}$$

having used in the last equality the standard resolvent identity $\mathcal{R}_{\lambda_n} - \mathcal{R}_\lambda = (\lambda_n - \lambda) \mathcal{R}_{\lambda_n} \mathcal{R}_\lambda$. By taking the limit superior (and recalling $\beta_{\lambda_n}[z_n] \geq 0$) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \overline{\lim}_n \beta_{\lambda_n}[z_n] &\leq -\underline{\lim}_n b_0[z_n] + \lambda d_0[z] + (\lambda - 1)^2 d_0 \left(\mathcal{R}_\lambda \mathcal{P}_{\overline{V}_*}^0 z, z \right) \leq \\ &= -b_0[z] + \lambda d_0[z] + (\lambda - 1)^2 d_0 \left(\mathcal{R}_\lambda \mathcal{P}_{\overline{V}_*}^0 z, z \right) = \beta_\lambda[z]. \end{aligned}$$

That is $\beta_\lambda[z] \geq 0$ and since $0 \neq z \in Z$ it follows that $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}$. Hence \mathcal{C} is closed, as required.

Step 2. Let us now prove

$$\mathcal{C} \subseteq \overline{\bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi}.$$

We shall consider two cases. First, consider $\lambda \in \text{Sp } \mathbf{B} \subset [1, +\infty)$. Notice that, by (6.24), for every $\lambda \in \text{Sp } \mathbf{B} = \text{Sp } \tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ and for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $|\xi| > (\lambda/\tilde{\nu})^{1/2}$ there is a $\lambda_\xi \in \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi$ such that $|\lambda^{-1} - \lambda_\xi^{-1}| \leq |\xi|^{-2} \tilde{\nu}^{-1}$. Consequently $\lim_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_\xi = \lambda$, i.e. $\lambda \in \overline{\bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi}$.

Now, we suppose $\lambda \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}$. Then, there exists $0 \neq z' \in Z$ such that $\beta_\lambda[z'] \geq 0$. Let us fix $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|\eta| = 1$, and consider

$$k := \sup_{z \in Z \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\beta_\lambda[z]}{a_\eta^h[z]}.$$

By the definition (6.36)–(6.37) of the form β_λ implying that $\beta_\lambda[z]/\|z\|_0^2$ is bounded, and by coercivity of a_η^h , see (5.16), we see that k is finite and, as $\beta_\lambda[z'] \geq 0$, k is non-negative. We aim at showing that the above supremum is attained by some point $z_0 \in Z \setminus \{0\}$. If $k = 0$ we can set $z_0 = z'$. Let $k > 0$, and let $z_n \in Z$, $d_0[z_n] = 1$, be such that $\beta_\lambda[z_n]/a_\eta^h[z_n]$ converges to k . Then, for large enough n , $\beta_\lambda[z_n] \geq 0$, and similarly to Step 1 we conclude from (6.36)–(6.37) that $b_0[z_n]$ is bounded. Then, by arguing further similarly to Step 1, we see that (up to a subsequence) z_n weakly converges in H to some $0 \neq z_0 \in Z$ and that $\beta_\lambda[z_0] \geq \overline{\lim}_n \beta_\lambda[z_n]$. Furthermore, since the sesquilinear form a_η^h is bounded and positive (see Proposition 5.5) it is weakly lower semi-continuous and so one has $a_\eta^h[z_0] \leq \underline{\lim}_n a_\eta^h[z_n]$. Thus we obtain

$$k \geq \frac{\beta_\lambda[z_0]}{a_\eta^h[z_0]} \geq \frac{\overline{\lim}_n \beta_\lambda[z_n]}{\underline{\lim}_n a_\eta^h[z_n]} \geq \overline{\lim}_n \frac{\beta_\lambda[z_n]}{a_\eta^h[z_n]} = k.$$

Therefore k is attained by z_0 , as desired. So the sesquilinear form $\widehat{A}(z, \tilde{z}) := k a_\eta^h(z, \tilde{z}) - \beta_\lambda(z, \tilde{z})$ is non-negative on Z (i.e. $\widehat{A}[z] \geq 0$, $\forall z \in Z$) and vanishes at $z_0 \neq 0$, $A[z_0] = 0$. Therefore, cf. (2.7), $\widehat{A}(z_0, \tilde{z}) = 0$ for all $\tilde{z} \in Z$, i.e.

$$\beta_\lambda(z_0, \tilde{z}) = k a_\eta^h(z_0, \tilde{z}) = a_{k^{1/2}\eta}^h(z_0, \tilde{z}), \quad \forall \tilde{z} \in Z.$$

Hence, cf. (6.34), $\lambda \in \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi$ for $\xi = k^{1/2}\eta$ with, according to (6.33), non-zero eigenvector $v_0 + z_0 = (\lambda - 1)(\mathbf{B} - \lambda I)^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{V_\star}^0 z_0 + z_0$. The proof is complete. \square

6.5 An approximation by a bivariate operator

Here we will provide alternative representations to the approximations in Theorem 6.4 for the “resolvent” $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1}$ and in Corollary 6.7 for the collective spectrum of the original operators $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ in terms of those of an operator defined on the Bochner space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0)$, i.e. on a separable Hilbert space-valued functional space with $\mathcal{H}_0 = (\overline{V_\star \dot{+} Z}, d_0)$. This operator, as examples in Section 7 will illustrate, can be viewed as an abstract version of a two-scale limit operator. Some basic facts from the theory of Bochner spaces, see e.g. [33], which are relevant to our exposition are collected in Appendix B. With the right-hand-side given by (6.3) for any $g \in \mathcal{H}$, according to Theorem 6.4 the solution $u_{\varepsilon, \theta} = \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} g$ to the original problem (2.4) is approximated by $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}^\alpha = \mathcal{E}_\theta \mathbb{L}_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1} g$. Denoting $h := \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1} g \in \mathcal{H}_0$, one observes that $v + z := \mathbb{L}_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{-1} h \in \text{dom } \mathbb{L}_{\theta/\varepsilon} \subset V_\star \dot{+} Z = V_0$ depends on θ and ε only via their ratio $\xi := \theta/\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^n$ where according to (5.14) the dependence of \mathbb{L}_ξ on ξ is quadratic. The idea is to try and represent it via an appropriate (inverse) Fourier transformed problem with a transformed variable $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of ξ . To that end, first recall that according to (6.12) the above $v + z \in V_0$ is the solution to

$$(6.39) \quad a_\xi^h(z, \tilde{z}) + b_0(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) = d_0(h, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}), \quad \forall \tilde{v} + \tilde{z} \in V_\star \dot{+} Z; \quad \xi := \theta/\varepsilon, \quad \theta \in \Theta.$$

Regard now $h = h(\theta)$, $\theta \in \Theta$, as belonging to the Bochner space $L^2(\Theta; \mathcal{H}_0)$ with the standard \mathbb{R}^n -Lebesgue measure induced on Θ . By extending $h(\theta)$ by zero outside Θ for the whole of \mathbb{R}^n , we can assume $h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0)$. The quadratic dependence of a_ξ^h on ξ in (5.14) can be represented as follows: for any $z, \tilde{z} \in Z$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$(6.40) \quad a_\xi^h(z, \tilde{z}) = \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk}^h(z, \tilde{z}) \xi_j \xi_k = \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk}^h(\xi_j z, \xi_k \tilde{z}).$$

Here

$$(6.41) \quad a_{jk}^h(z, \tilde{z}) := a''_{0,jk}(z, \tilde{z}) - a_0(N^j z, N^k \tilde{z}),$$

where $N^j := N e_j = e^j \cdot N$ and e^1, \dots, e^n is the canonical basis in \mathbb{R}^n , i.e. $N^j = N_\theta$ with $\theta = e^j$, cf. (5.10). Let us now, given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, make in (6.39) a change of variable $\theta \rightarrow \xi = \theta/\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and with the aim of formally integrating (6.39) over \mathbb{R}^n in ξ and recalling (6.2) assume $v, \tilde{v} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; V_\star)$. (Remind that we regard V_\star and Z as Hilbert spaces with norm $\|\cdot\|_0^2 = b_0[\cdot]$.) Regarding $h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0)$ as arbitrary, and bearing in mind the boundedness of a_ξ^h in $z, \tilde{z} \in Z$ as well as its quadratic growth in ξ , we need to take

$z(\xi), \tilde{z}(\xi) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; Z)$ so that also $\xi_j z(\xi), \xi_k \tilde{z}(\xi) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; Z), \forall j, k = 1, \dots, n$. In other words, z and \tilde{z} can be said to belong to weighted Bochner space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \xi \rangle^2 d\xi; Z)$ with the weight $\langle \xi \rangle^2 := 1 + |\xi|^2$. The resulting problem is to find $v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; V_\star)$ and $z \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \xi \rangle^2 d\xi; Z)$, such that

$$(6.42) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} a_\xi^h(z, \tilde{z}) d\xi + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} b_0(v+z, \tilde{v}+\tilde{z}) d\xi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} d_0(h(\varepsilon\xi), \tilde{v}+\tilde{z}) d\xi, \quad \forall \tilde{v}+\tilde{z} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; V_\star) \dot{+} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \xi \rangle^2 d\xi; Z).$$

(Notice that the above is obviously a direct sum: if $v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; V_\star)$ and $z \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \xi \rangle^2 d\xi; Z)$ and $v+z=0$ in $\mathbb{H}_0 := L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0)$, then $v(\xi) + z(\xi) = 0$ for a.e. $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, since $V_\star + Z$ is a direct sum, $v(\xi) = z(\xi) = 0$ for a.e. ξ , i.e. $v = z = 0$ in \mathbb{H}_0 .)

We next argue that, for arbitrary $h \in \mathbb{H}_0$, problem (6.42) is well-posed on its own right, and the form \mathbb{A} on its left-hand side generates a self-adjoint operator \mathbb{L} in Bochner (Hilbert) space \mathbb{H}_0 . Indeed, the form is non-negative and has domain $\mathbb{D} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; V_\star) \dot{+} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \xi \rangle^2 d\xi; Z)$ which, see Proposition B.1 of Appendix B, is dense in \mathbb{H}_0 and is closed with respect to the form (Proposition B.2). Since, as implied by (6.2), $\text{Sp } \mathbb{L} \subset [1, +\infty)$, for any $h \in \mathbb{H}_0$ problem (6.42) is well-posed and has a unique solution $v+z \in \mathbb{D}$. Moreover, given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, as shown in Proposition B.3, (6.42) holds if and only if (6.39) holds for a.e. $\theta \in \Theta$. Therefore (see Definition B.4 and Proposition B.5), the latter immediately implies that the newly defined operator \mathbb{L} is a direct integral of \mathbb{L}_ξ which serve as its fibers: $\mathbb{L} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}^{\oplus} \mathbb{L}_\xi d\xi$. Similarly, for the resolvents, $\mathbb{L}^{-1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}^{\oplus} \mathbb{L}_\xi^{-1} d\xi$.

We now aim at equivalently reformulating problem (6.42) in a Fourier transformed setting, i.e. for $(\tilde{v} + u) := \mathcal{F}^{-1}(v+z)$ where $v+z$ is the solution to (6.42) with $h(\varepsilon\xi)$ replaced for a moment by arbitrary $f \in \mathbb{H}_0 = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0)$, i.e. $v+z = \mathbb{L}^{-1}f$, and \mathcal{F}^{-1} being the inverse Fourier transform in the sense of Definition B.6 for $\mathbb{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (\mathcal{H}, d_0))$. As immediately follows from (B.3), \mathcal{F} restricted to the closed subspace \mathbb{H}_0 of \mathbb{H} coincides with the Fourier transform as given by Definition B.6 directly for Bochner space \mathbb{H}_0 . Then, $\tilde{v} + u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\mathbb{L}^{-1}f = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\mathbb{L}^{-1}\mathcal{F}F = \mathcal{L}^{-1}F$, where $F := \mathcal{F}^{-1}f \in \mathbb{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{F}^{-1}\mathbb{L}\mathcal{F}$. We will show that \mathcal{L} is a self-adjoint operator in \mathbb{H}_0 generated by a form which is a formal (inverse) Fourier transform of the one in (6.42).

To that end, let $u, \tilde{u} \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n; (Z, b_0))$, see Definition B.7, and introduce $a^h(\nabla u(x), \nabla \tilde{u}(x))$ by formally replacing ξ_j on the right-hand side of (6.40) by $-i\partial_{x_j}$, i.e. by their Fourier-transformed counterparts:

$$a^h(\nabla u(x), \nabla \tilde{u}(x)) := a_{-i\nabla}^h(u, \tilde{u}) := \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk}^h(\partial_{x_j} u, \partial_{x_k} \tilde{u}).$$

This motivates considering the subspace $\check{\mathbb{D}} = H^1(\mathbb{R}^n; Z) \dot{+} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; V_\star)$ of \mathbb{H}_0 , on which we define the bivariate form

$$(6.43) \quad Q(u+v, \tilde{u}+\tilde{v}) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} a^h(\nabla u(x), \nabla \tilde{u}(x)) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} b_0(u(x)+v(x), \tilde{u}(x)+\tilde{v}(x)) dx,$$

where $u, \tilde{u} \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n; (Z, b_0))$ and $v, \tilde{v} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (V_\star, b_0))$.

Lemma B.8 establishes that the form Q specifies a self-adjoint ‘‘bivariate’’ operator \mathcal{L} in Hilbert space \mathbb{H}_0 , which is a Fourier-transformed counterpart of \mathbb{L} , namely $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\mathbb{L}\mathcal{F}$.

Remark 6.9. *We shall see in the examples that \mathcal{L} often coincides with the two-scale limit operator, e.g. in the homogenisation theory for elliptic differential operators with rapidly oscillating high-contrast coefficients, see Section 7.2.*

Aiming at restating Theorem 6.4 in terms of operator \mathcal{L} , we first observe that from Lemma B.8 and Proposition B.5 (see Definition B.4)

$$(6.44) \quad \mathbb{L}_\xi^{-1}f(\xi) = (\mathcal{F}\mathcal{L}^{-1}\mathcal{F}^{-1}f)(\xi) \quad \text{for a.e. } \xi, \quad f \in \mathbb{H}_0 = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0).$$

Relation (6.44) signifies the important fact that, while the bi-variate resolvent \mathcal{L}^{-1} is generally not decomposable into a direct integral, its Fourier transformed counterpart $\mathcal{F}\mathcal{L}^{-1}\mathcal{F}^{-1}$ is. Further, we observe that the orthogonal projectors $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 : (\mathcal{H}, d_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{P} : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (\mathcal{H}, d_0)) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0)$ are related by the identity (Proposition B.9)

$$(6.45) \quad \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 f(\xi) = (\mathcal{F}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{F}^{-1}f)(\xi) \quad \text{for a.e. } \xi, \quad f \in \mathbb{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (\mathcal{H}, d_0)).$$

Next, introduce in \mathbb{H} a normalised rescaling operator $\Gamma_\varepsilon : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ and its inverse Γ_ε^{-1} by

$$(6.46) \quad (\Gamma_\varepsilon f)(x) := \varepsilon^{n/2} f(\varepsilon x), \quad (\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} f)(x) = \varepsilon^{-n/2} f(\varepsilon^{-1} x).$$

Notice that Γ_ε and Γ_ε^{-1} are unitary operators in \mathbb{H} . Then, via (6.44) and (6.45),

$$(6.47) \quad \mathbb{L}_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 f(\theta) = \left(\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathbb{L}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 \Gamma_\varepsilon f \right)(\theta) = \left(\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F} \mathcal{L}^{-1} \mathcal{P} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \Gamma_\varepsilon f \right)(\theta), \quad \text{for a.e. } \theta, \quad f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (\mathcal{H}, d_0)).$$

Finally, for reformulating Theorem 6.4, we recall that it approximates the exact solution $u_{\varepsilon, \theta} = \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} g$, where according to (6.3) $g \in \mathcal{H}$ for any $\theta \in \Theta$. We now assume $g \in L^2(\Theta; (\mathcal{H}, d_0))$, and comparing with the approximation $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}^a = \mathcal{E}_\theta \mathbb{L}_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 \mathcal{E}_\theta^{-1} g$ of Theorem 6.4 suggests taking in (6.47) $f = \chi \mathcal{E}^{-1} g$, where \mathcal{E} is given by $f(\theta) \mapsto \mathcal{E}_\theta f(\theta)$, for a.e. $\theta \in \Theta$, and $\chi : L^2(\Theta; (\mathcal{H}, d_0)) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (\mathcal{H}, d_0))$ is the operator of extension by zero outside Θ . We notice that bounded operator \mathcal{E} acts from $\mathbb{H}_\Theta := L^2(\Theta; (\mathcal{H}, d_0))$ into itself as, due to (H6), \mathcal{E}_θ is continuous in θ and so is θ -(weakly) measurable. Further, in combination with (6.1), (H6) assures that d_θ is also continuous in θ and hence $(u, \tilde{u}) = \int_\Theta d_\theta(u(\theta), \tilde{u}(\theta)) d\theta$ forms an equivalent inner product in \mathbb{H}_Θ . When endowed with such an inner product, we conveniently denote this space by $L^2(\Theta; (\mathcal{H}, d_\theta))$, and notice that because of (H6) operator \mathcal{E} is unitary when viewed as acting from $L^2(\Theta; (\mathcal{H}, d_0))$ to $L^2(\Theta; (\mathcal{H}, d_\theta))$. Assembling all this together and also noticing that $\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F} \Gamma_\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{F}^{-1} \Gamma_\varepsilon = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{-1}$, for the above approximation, $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}^a = \mathcal{E} \chi^* \mathcal{F} \Gamma_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}^{-1} \mathcal{P} \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi \mathcal{E}^{-1} g$, where $\chi^* : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (\mathcal{H}, d_0)) \rightarrow L^2(\Theta; (\mathcal{H}, d_\theta))$ is the operator of restriction from \mathbb{R}^n to Θ and is the adjoint of χ . As a result, Theorem 6.4 implies the following.

Theorem 6.10. *Assume (H1)–(H6). Then, for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, one has*

$$d_\theta^{1/2} \left[\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} g(\theta) - (A_\varepsilon^* \mathcal{L}^{-1} \mathcal{P} A_\varepsilon g)(\theta) \right] \leq C_{11} \varepsilon d_\theta^{1/2} [g(\theta)], \quad \forall g \in L^2(\Theta; (\mathcal{H}, d_\theta)), \quad \text{for a.e. } \theta \in \Theta,$$

where operator $A_\varepsilon : L^2(\Theta; (\mathcal{H}, d_\theta)) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (\mathcal{H}, d_0))$ is the composition $A_\varepsilon := \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi \mathcal{E}^{-1}$, and $A_\varepsilon^* : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (\mathcal{H}, d_0)) \rightarrow L^2(\Theta; (\mathcal{H}, d_\theta))$ is its adjoint given by $A_\varepsilon^* := \mathcal{E} \chi^* \mathcal{F} \Gamma_\varepsilon$. Furthermore, A_ε is an L^2 -isometry and the following identities hold:

$$(6.48) \quad A_\varepsilon^* A_\varepsilon = I \quad \text{and} \quad A_\varepsilon A_\varepsilon^* = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi_\Theta \mathcal{F} \Gamma_\varepsilon = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \Gamma_\varepsilon \chi_\Theta \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F},$$

where χ_Θ is operator of multiplication by the characteristic function of Θ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (\mathcal{H}, d_0))$.

(Identities (6.48) immediately follow via obvious relations $\chi^* \chi = I$ and $\chi \chi^* = \chi_\Theta$.) Notice that, by (6.48), $A_\varepsilon A_\varepsilon^*$ is the operator of projection onto $\varepsilon^{-1} \chi_\Theta$ in the Fourier space. Notice also that all the above implies that the approximating operator $A_\varepsilon^* \mathcal{L}^{-1} \mathcal{P} A_\varepsilon g$ is self-adjoint in $L^2(\Theta; (\mathcal{H}, d_\theta))$, and is in the form of a direct integral along its fibers as given for a.e. $\theta \in \Theta$.

Turning now to approximation of the collective spectrum of $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ in terms of that of the bivariate operator \mathcal{L} , we first observe that because of the unitary equivalence of \mathcal{L} and \mathbb{L} (Lemma B.8) the spectra of the latter two coincide. On the other hand, recalling that \mathbb{L} is the direct integral of \mathbb{L}_ξ , $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, notice that the eigenvalues $\lambda_k(\xi)$ of \mathbb{L}_ξ continuously depend on ξ . (This directly follows e.g. from (6.12), continuous dependence of a_ξ^h on ξ and the min-max arguments.) Then, by e.g. Theorem XIII.85 (d) of [48], the spectrum of \mathbb{L} is the closure of the union of the spectra of \mathbb{L}_ξ . As a result, $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L} = \overline{\bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi}$ and Theorem 6.8 and Corollary 6.7 give together the following result.

Theorem 6.11. *One has*

$$\text{Sp } \mathcal{L} = \left\{ \lambda \notin \text{Sp } \mathbf{B} : \beta_\lambda[z] \geq 0 \text{ for some } 0 \neq z \in Z \right\} \cup \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}.$$

Furthermore, for every interval $[a, b] \subset (-\infty, \infty)$ one has

$$d_{[a, b]} \left(\overline{\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}}, \text{Sp } \mathcal{L} \right) \leq C_b \varepsilon, \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon < 1,$$

with C_b as given in Corollary 6.7. In particular, if (a, b) is a gap in the spectrum of \mathcal{L} , i.e. $(a, b) \cap \text{Sp } \mathcal{L} = \emptyset$ then $[a + C_b \varepsilon, b - C_b \varepsilon]$ is in a gap of the collective spectrum $\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ when $\varepsilon < (b - a)/(2C_b)$.

Remark 6.12. Under additional assumptions on the regularity of b_θ and d_θ in θ , one can identify $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ and $\overline{\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta}}$ respectively as the fibres and spectrum of a decomposable operator $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon = \int_{\Theta}^{\oplus} \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta} d\theta$ acting in the space $L^2(\Theta; (\mathcal{H}, d_0))$, see the examples section below.

We end this section by discussing the possibility of gaps in the spectrum $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}$. We know from Theorem 6.11 that an interval I is in a gap of $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}$ if, and only if, $\text{Sp } \mathbf{B} \cap I = \emptyset$ and for every $\lambda \in I$ the form β_λ is negative-definite on Z . When Z is one-dimensional it is straightforward to verify the existence of such intervals. Indeed, for such Z and $\lambda \notin \text{Sp } \mathbf{B}$, one has via (6.35) and (6.33) the representation

$$(6.49) \quad \beta_\lambda(z, \tilde{z}) = -b_0(z, \tilde{z}) + \lambda d_0(z, \tilde{z}) + (\lambda - 1)^2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{d_0(z, \varphi^{(k)}) d_0(\varphi^{(k)}, \tilde{z})}{\mu^{(k)} - \lambda}, \quad \forall z, \tilde{z} \in Z,$$

where $\{\varphi^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are the eigenvectors of \mathbf{B} , corresponding to the eigenvalues $\{\mu^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, that form an orthonormal basis in $(\overline{V_\star}, d_0)$, assumed here for definiteness infinite-dimensional. Now we can see that if $\mu^{(n)}$ is a single eigenvalue and $\varphi^{(n)}$ is not orthogonal to Z then, for $0 \neq z \in Z$, $\beta_\lambda[z]$ is positive just to the left, and negative just to the right, of $\mu^{(n)}$. Consequently, there is some interval to the left (respectively the right) of $\mu^{(n)}$ in $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}$ (respectively the gap). In general, there maybe infinitely many such eigenvalues and thus there are infinitely many spectral gaps. This situation occurs, for example, in the double-porosity type problem studied by V. Zhikov in [52, 53], wherein \mathcal{L}^{-1} coincides with the homogenised two-scale limit operator resolvent $(\mathcal{L}_0 + I)^{-1}$ and $\beta_{\lambda-1}$ coincides with the Zhikov β -function, see Example 7.2.

The situation is more complicated when Z is not one-dimensional. Whilst (6.49) still holds and one identifies intervals in $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}$ just to the left of eigenvalues $\mu^{(n)}$ with eigenvector $\varphi^{(n)}$ not orthogonal to Z , as there will always exist $0 \neq z \in Z$ such that $d_0(z, \varphi^{(n)}) = 0$ it is not necessarily the case that the right of this point is in the gap. There may even be no gaps. For example, if $\dim Z > 1$, $\dim V_\star = 1$ and say b_0 coincides with d_0 on Z , then one can always find a $0 \neq z \in Z$ such that $\beta_\lambda[z] \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \geq 1$; thus $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L} = [1, \infty)$.

7 Examples

Here we aim at demonstrating the power and versatility of the abstract results obtained above by applying them to a diverse set of problems. We provide examples of homogenisation-type models that can be reformulated as problems of the type (2.4) and satisfy (some of) the main assumptions (H1)–(H6). We shall begin our demonstration with the classical and by now “almost” classical (‘high-contrast’) homogenisation problems, where our approach already leads to some new results. Then, we shall study various other physically-relevant models of interest, each chosen to showcase the relevance and utility of the main abstract assumptions and results.

7.1 Uniformly elliptic PDEs with rapidly oscillating periodic coefficients

We begin our examples with the classical homogenisation problem for elliptic PDE systems with rapidly oscillating periodic coefficients. For the convenience of the reader, we consider scalar PDEs with matrix-valued coefficients and comment here that the subsequent exposition readily extends in a directly analogous manner for systems with tensor-valued coefficients. For the present example, it would suffice restricting the application of the above developed general theory up to and including Section 5.2, based on assumption (H1)–(H4). (The results of Section 6 are also formally applicable although, in contrast with some of the subsequent “non-classical” examples where they play a key role, are of limited further value in the classical homogenisation.)

Consider the following “resolvent” problem in the whole of \mathbb{R}^n :

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } u_\varepsilon \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ such that} \\ -\text{div}\left(A\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \nabla u_\varepsilon(x)\right) + u_\varepsilon(x) = F(x), \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

for a given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, $F \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and measurable possibly complex-valued $n \times n$ matrix A that satisfies

the following standard conditions of Hermitian symmetry, uniform ellipticity and boundedness:

$$(7.2) \quad A = A^* := \overline{A^T}, \quad \gamma_0^{-1}|\eta|^2 \leq A(y)\eta \cdot \bar{\eta} \leq \gamma_0|\eta|^2 \quad \text{a.e. } y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \forall \eta \in \mathbb{C}^n, \text{ for some constant } \gamma_0 \geq 1.$$

We assume that $A(y)$ is periodic with period 1 with respect to each variable y_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, that is $\square = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^n$ is the periodicity cell and $\square^* = [-\pi, \pi]^n$ is the associated Bloch-dual cell (the Brillouin zone). Our goal is to construct approximations of u_ε with ‘‘operator-type’’ error bounds (in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ norms) of order ε , i.e. those that linearly depend on $\|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$.

In this and most of subsequent examples a key role will be played by Floquet-Bloch or Gelfand transform, which reduces problems like (7.1) to an equivalent one of the type (2.4) via a decomposition into quasi-periodic functions. Henceforth, we shall mostly use for the latter the definitions and notation in a form close to e.g. [38], [55]. Namely, Gelfand (or Floquet-Bloch) transform $U : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^2(\square^* \times \square)$ and its inverse are unitary maps that can be defined, for example, as the continuous extensions of the (L^2 -isometric) mappings

$$(7.3) \quad UF(\theta, y) := (2\pi)^{-n/2} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^n} F(y+m)e^{-i\theta \cdot (y+m)}, \quad F \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

$$(7.4) \quad U^{-1}G(x) = (2\pi)^{-n/2} \int_{\square^*} G(\theta, \{x\}) e^{i\theta \cdot x} d\theta, \quad G \in C(\square^*; C_{per}(\square)),$$

cf e.g. [28] or [38]. ($C_{per}(\square)$ is here the space of functions on \square which allow a \square -periodic continuous extension on \mathbb{R}^n ; $\{x\} \in \square$ denotes a ‘‘fractional part’’ of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$: e.g. $\{x\} := x - m$ for the unique $m \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $x - m \in [-1/2, 1/2)^n \subset \square$.)

Fix $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and apply to (7.1) first the normalised (unitary) rescaling operator $\Gamma_\varepsilon : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $(\Gamma_\varepsilon F)(y) := \varepsilon^{n/2} F(\varepsilon y)$, and then the Gelfand transform. It is a key property of the Gelfand transform that it reduces a PDE problem with periodic coefficients in \mathbb{R}^n like (7.1) into an equivalent θ -parametrised family of problems on the periodic cell \square . Namely via the properties of Gelfand transform, cf. in particular (7.4), we determine that for a.e. $\theta \in \square^*$, $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}(\cdot) := U\Gamma_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(\theta, \cdot)$ belongs to $H_{per}^1(\square)$ the Hilbert space of functions in $H^1(\square)$ admitting a locally- H^1 \square -periodic extension on \mathbb{R}^n , and solves

$$(7.5) \quad -e^{-i\theta \cdot y} \varepsilon^{-2} \operatorname{div} \left(A(y) \nabla (e^{i\theta \cdot y} u_{\varepsilon, \theta}(y)) \right) + u_{\varepsilon, \theta}(y) = F_{\varepsilon, \theta}(y), \quad \text{a.e. } y \in \square,$$

where $F_{\varepsilon, \theta}(\cdot) := U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, \cdot) \in L^2(\square)$. The standard equivalent weak formulation of (7.5) is:

$$(7.6) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } u_{\varepsilon, \theta} \in H_{per}^1(\square) \text{ the solution to} \\ \varepsilon^{-2} \int_{\square} A(\nabla + i\theta)u_{\varepsilon, \theta} \cdot \overline{(\nabla + i\theta)\tilde{u}} + \int_{\square} u_{\varepsilon, \theta} \bar{\tilde{u}} = \int_{\square} F_{\varepsilon, \theta} \bar{\tilde{u}}, \quad \forall \tilde{u} \in H_{per}^1(\square). \end{cases}$$

Problem (7.6) is of the type (2.4). Indeed, with chosen Hilbert space $H = H_{per}^1(\square)$, it can be restated as:

$$(7.7) \quad \text{Find } u_{\varepsilon, \theta} \in H \text{ such that } \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta(u_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \tilde{u}) + b_\theta(u_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \tilde{u}) = \langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle, \quad \forall \tilde{u} \in H, \text{ a.e. } \theta \in \Theta,$$

for $\Theta = \square^*$, $\langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle := \int_{\square} F_{\varepsilon, \theta} \bar{\tilde{u}}$,

$$(7.8) \quad a_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) := \int_{\square} A(\nabla + i\theta)u \cdot \overline{(\nabla + i\theta)\tilde{u}}, \quad \text{and} \quad b_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) := \int_{\square} u \bar{\tilde{u}}, \quad u, \tilde{u} \in H_{per}^1(\square).$$

Recall that, according to (2.2), for the inner products in H , $(u, \tilde{u})_\theta := a_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) + b_\theta(u, \tilde{u})$. Assumption (2.1) then easily follows: for $u \in H$, via assumptions (7.2) on the coefficients A ,

$$(7.9) \quad a_{\theta_1}[u] \leq \gamma_0 \|(\nabla + i\theta_1)u\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 \leq 2\gamma_0 \|(\nabla + i\theta_2)u\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 + 2\gamma_0 |\theta_1 - \theta_2|^2 \|u\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 \leq 2\gamma_0^2 a_{\theta_2}[u] + 8\pi\gamma_0 \|u\|_{L^2(\square)}^2,$$

and (2.1) holds e.g. with $K = (2\gamma_0^2 + 8\pi\gamma_0 + 1)^{1/2}$. It is then straightforward to show that (2.3) is also satisfied.

Let us next determine the spaces V_θ and W_θ , cf. (2.6) and (2.8). Notice that the form $a_\theta[\cdot]$ satisfies

$$(7.10) \quad a_\theta[u] \geq \gamma_0^{-1} \int_{\square} |(\nabla + i\theta)u|^2 \geq \gamma_0^{-1} |\theta|^2 \int_{\square} |u|^2, \quad \forall u \in H_{per}^1(\square), \quad \forall \theta \in \square^*,$$

where the last inequality follows e.g. via expansion into Fourier series on \square . Indeed, for $u \in H$, $u(y) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^n} c(m) e^{2\pi i m \cdot y}$. Then $|2\pi m + \theta| \geq |\theta|$, $\forall \theta \in \Theta$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Therefore, from (2.6) and (2.8) via (7.10) and (7.8),

$$(7.11) \quad V_\theta = \begin{cases} \{0\}, & \theta \neq 0, \\ \text{Span}(\mathbf{e}), & \theta = 0, \end{cases} \quad W_\theta = \begin{cases} H_{per}^1(\square), & \theta \neq 0, \\ H_{per,0}^1 := \{w \in H_{per}^1(\square) \mid \int_{\square} w = 0\}, & \theta = 0. \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{e} = 1$ is the constant unity function on \square . We clearly see that V_θ is discontinuous with respect to θ (only) at the origin, and we are in the context of Sections 4 and 5. Now let us demonstrate that the related main assumptions (H1)–(H4) hold.

- The proof of (H1) follows from noticing that the stronger assertion (H1') (see Proposition 5.10) trivially holds with $C = 1$ upon choosing $c = b_\theta$ (recall that b_θ is in fact θ -independent, see (7.8), and b_θ is $\|\cdot\|_\theta$ -compact by the Rellich compactness theorem).
- Hypothesis (H2) holds trivially for $V_\star = \{0\}$ with $L_\star = 0$; see Remark 4.5.
- Let us show that hypothesis (H3) holds with $\gamma = (n\pi^2 + \gamma_0)^{-1}$. Indeed, it follows from (7.10) that, for $\theta \neq 0$,

$$\|u\|_\theta^2 = a_\theta[u] + b_\theta[u] \leq (1 + \gamma_0 |\theta|^{-2}) a_\theta[u],$$

and consequently (recalling that $|\theta|^2 \leq n\pi^2$)

$$\nu_\theta := \inf_{w \in W_\theta \setminus \{0\}} \frac{a_\theta[w]}{\|w\|_\theta^2} \geq (1 + \gamma_0 |\theta|^{-2})^{-1} = |\theta|^2 (|\theta|^2 + \gamma_0)^{-1} \geq |\theta|^2 (n\pi^2 + \gamma_0)^{-1},$$

as required. Notice also that, for any $r > 0$, Theorem 3.1 (with $\Theta = \square^*$ replaced by $\Theta \cap \{|\theta| \geq r\}$, cf. Remark 3.2) implies

$$(7.12) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} \gamma_0^{-1} \|(\nabla + i\theta)u_{\varepsilon,\theta}\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 + \|u_{\varepsilon,\theta}\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 \leq \varepsilon^2 (n\pi^2 + \gamma_0) |r|^{-2} \|U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, \cdot)\|^2, \quad \text{a.e. } \theta \in \square^*, \quad |\theta| \geq |r|.$$

since $V_\theta = \{0\}$ for $\theta \neq 0$.

- Assumption (H4) is obviously satisfied with $K_{a'} = \gamma_0$, $K_{a''} = 0$ and

$$(7.13) \quad a'_0(v, u) \cdot \theta := i \int_{\square} A \theta v \cdot \overline{\nabla u}, \quad a''_0(v, \tilde{v}) \theta \cdot \theta := \int_{\square} A \theta \cdot \theta v \tilde{v}.$$

As (H1)–(H4) hold we can apply our general theory and, in particular, we conclude that Theorem 5.6 holds. Let us now specify the objects appearing therein. In this setting $V_\theta^* = \{0\} =: V_\star$ for all $\theta \in \square$, and the space Z in (4.16) is simply the one-dimensional space $V_0 = \text{Span}(\mathbf{e})$. Therefore, in the notation of Theorem 5.6, $v^h = 0$, $z^h = z_{\varepsilon,\theta} \mathbf{e}$, where $z_{\varepsilon,\theta} \in \mathbb{C}$, and (5.17) becomes the scalar linear algebraic equation

$$(7.14) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta^h(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e}) z_{\varepsilon,\theta} + b_\theta(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e}) z_{\varepsilon,\theta} = \langle f, \mathbf{e} \rangle.$$

Let us rewrite the coefficients of this equation in more explicit terms. Clearly, $\langle f, \mathbf{e} \rangle = \int_{\square} U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, y) dy$ and $b_\theta(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e}) = 1$. As for the first coefficient, recalling (5.14) and (5.10):

$$(7.15) \quad a_\theta^h(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e}) = a''_0(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e}) \theta \cdot \theta - a_0(N_\theta \mathbf{e}, N_\theta \mathbf{e}) = a''_0(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e}) \theta \cdot \theta + a'_0(\mathbf{e}, N_\theta \mathbf{e}) \cdot \theta,$$

where $N_\theta \mathbf{e} \in H_{per,0}^1(\square)$ solves (via (5.10) and (7.13) and recalling $A = A^*$)

$$(7.16) \quad a_0(N_\theta \mathbf{e}, w) = -a'_0(\mathbf{e}, w) \cdot \theta = -i \theta \cdot \int_{\square} \overline{A \nabla w}, \quad \forall w \in H_{per,0}^1(\square), \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

As a result, $N_\theta \mathbf{e} = i \theta \cdot \mathbf{N}$ where $\mathbf{N} \in H_{per,0}^1(\square; \mathbb{C}^n)$ solves

$$(7.17) \quad \int_{\square} A \left(\nabla(\theta \cdot \mathbf{N}) + \theta \right) \cdot \overline{\nabla w} = 0, \quad \forall w \in H_{per,0}^1(\square), \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Thus \mathbf{N} is the classical corrector, see e.g. [34].

Remark 7.1. If we introduce the components of \mathbf{N} , $\mathbf{N} = (\mathbf{N}^1, \dots, \mathbf{N}^n)$, then (7.17) can be equivalently rewritten in a more traditional form:

$$(7.18) \quad \begin{cases} \text{For } j = 1, \dots, n, \text{ find } \mathbf{N}^j \in H_{per,0}^1(\square) \text{ such that} \\ \int_{\square} A(\nabla \mathbf{N}^j + e^j) \cdot \overline{\nabla w} = 0, \quad \forall w \in H_{per,0}^1(\square), \end{cases}$$

where e^1, \dots, e^n is the canonical basis in \mathbb{R}^n .

Now we express $a_{\theta}^h(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e})$ in terms of \mathbf{N} : via (7.15) and (7.13) and using $\text{Im}(a_{\theta}^h(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e})) = 0$,

$$a_{\theta}^h(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e}) = a_0''(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e}) \theta \cdot \theta + a_0'(\mathbf{e}, N_{\theta} \mathbf{e}) \cdot \theta = \int_{\square} A \theta \cdot \theta + i \int_{\square} A \theta \cdot \overline{\nabla N_{\theta} \mathbf{e}} = \int_{\square} A \theta \cdot \theta + \int_{\square} A \nabla(\theta \cdot \mathbf{N}) \cdot \theta.$$

Thus we can represent $a_{\theta}^h(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e})$ as

$$(7.19) \quad a_{\theta}^h(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e}) = A^{\text{hom}} \theta \cdot \theta,$$

where A^{hom} is the classical homogenised matrix with components

$$(7.20) \quad A_{ij}^{\text{hom}} := \int_{\square} \left(A_{ij} + \sum_{k=1}^n A_{ik} \partial_k \mathbf{N}^j \right), \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

Matrix A^{hom} is well-known to be positive definite (which can also directly be seen from (7.19), (5.16)) and Hermitian (which can be checked using (7.20) and (7.18)).

Putting all of this together, we conclude from (7.14)

$$(7.21) \quad z_{\varepsilon, \theta} = \frac{\int_{\square} U \Gamma_{\varepsilon} F(\theta, y) dy}{\varepsilon^{-2} A^{\text{hom}} \theta \cdot \theta + 1}.$$

Finally, using (3.3) and (7.8) we observe that $\|f\|_{* \theta} \leq \|U \Gamma_{\varepsilon} F(\theta, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\square)}$. Now from Theorem 5.6 and (7.12), we readily deduce the following result.

Proposition 7.2. Consider the objects of Theorem 5.6. Let $u_{\varepsilon, \theta} \in H_{per}^1(\square)$ solve (7.5), $z_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ be given by (7.21). Then for some $r_1 > 0$ and χ the characteristic function for the ball of radius r_1 ,

$$(7.22) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} \left\| (\nabla + i\theta) \left(u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - \chi(\theta) (1 + i\theta \cdot \mathbf{N}) z_{\varepsilon, \theta} \right) \right\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 + \|u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - \chi(\theta) (1 + i\theta \cdot \mathbf{N}) z_{\varepsilon, \theta}\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 \leq \varepsilon^2 c_0^2 \|U \Gamma_{\varepsilon} F(\theta, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\square)}^2,$$

$$(7.23) \quad \|u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - \chi(\theta) z_{\varepsilon, \theta}\|_{L^2(\square)} \leq \varepsilon c_1 \|U \Gamma_{\varepsilon} F(\theta, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\square)},$$

for some positive constants c_0, c_1 independent of ε, θ and F .

We now show that, via the inverse Gelfand and scaling transforms, inequalities (7.22) and (7.23) provide respectively the desired H^1 and L^2 operator estimates for certain approximations of u_{ε} , the solution to (7.1). To this end, recall that according to (7.23) $\chi z_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ serves as an approximation to the transformation $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ of the original solution u_{ε} of (7.1) where $u_{\varepsilon} = \Gamma_{\varepsilon}^{-1} U^{-1} u_{\varepsilon, \theta}$. So set the (inverse) transformed approximation

$$(7.24) \quad u_{\varepsilon}^{(0)} := \Gamma_{\varepsilon}^{-1} U^{-1} \chi z_{\varepsilon, \theta},$$

and notice that as $\chi(\theta) z_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ does not depend on y , by (7.4) and (7.21), $u_{\varepsilon}^{(0)} \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\nabla u_{\varepsilon}^{(0)} \in L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Next, for the ‘‘corrector’’ term in (7.22), by the properties of the Gelfand transform, cf. (7.4),

$$(7.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\varepsilon}^{-1} U^{-1} \chi i \theta \cdot \mathbf{N} z_{\varepsilon, \theta} &= \Gamma_{\varepsilon}^{-1} (\mathbf{N} \cdot U^{-1} i \theta \chi z_{\varepsilon, \theta}) = \Gamma_{\varepsilon}^{-1} (\mathbf{N} \cdot \nabla U^{-1} \chi z_{\varepsilon, \theta}) = \\ &= \varepsilon (\tilde{\Gamma}_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathbf{N}) \cdot (\Gamma_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \nabla U^{-1} \chi z_{\varepsilon, \theta}) = \varepsilon (\tilde{\Gamma}_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathbf{N}) \cdot \nabla (\Gamma_{\varepsilon}^{-1} U^{-1} \chi z_{\varepsilon, \theta}) = \varepsilon (\tilde{\Gamma}_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \mathbf{N}) \cdot \nabla u_{\varepsilon}^{(0)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $(\tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon^{-1}f)(y) := f(y/\varepsilon)$ denotes “ordinary” rescaling. [In (7.25) we have used sequentially that: \mathbf{N} does not depend on θ and $U^{-1}(f(y)g) = f(y)U^{-1}g$, $U^{-1}(i\theta f(\theta)) = \nabla(U^{-1}f)$, $\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}(fg) = (\tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon^{-1}f)\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}g$, and $\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}(\nabla f) = \varepsilon\nabla(\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}f)$.] As a result (7.22) and (7.23), upon application of the L^2 -unitary inverse Gelfand transform U^{-1} and inverse rescaling Γ_ε^{-1} (and noticing that $\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}U^{-1}((\nabla + i\theta)f) = \varepsilon\nabla(\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}U^{-1}f)$), lead to the following.

Theorem 7.3. *Let u_ε solve (7.1) and $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$ be given by (7.24) with $z_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ specified by (7.21). Then*

$$(7.26) \quad \left\| u_\varepsilon - \left(u_\varepsilon^{(0)} + \varepsilon(\tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{N}) \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon^{(0)} \right) \right\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \varepsilon c_0 \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

$$(7.27) \quad \|u_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon^{(0)}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \varepsilon c_1 \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

The above theorem already provides constructive approximations of the solution to (7.1), however it is customary to relate these to the solution of the corresponding *homogenised equation*. We now provide this link. For the homogenised differential operator applied to $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$, by the standard properties of the scaling and Gelfand transformations together with (7.24) and the fact that $\chi_{z_{\varepsilon,\theta}}$ is independent of y ,

$$-\operatorname{div}(A^{\operatorname{hom}}\nabla u_\varepsilon^{(0)}) = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}U^{-1}\left(-\varepsilon^{-2}(\nabla + i\theta) \cdot A^{\operatorname{hom}}(\nabla + i\theta)\right)U\Gamma_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon^{(0)} = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}U^{-1}(\varepsilon^{-2}\theta \cdot A^{\operatorname{hom}}\theta)\chi_{z_{\varepsilon,\theta}}.$$

This together with (7.21) implies that $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$ solves

$$-\operatorname{div}(A^{\operatorname{hom}}\nabla u_\varepsilon^{(0)}) + u_\varepsilon^{(0)} = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}U^{-1}\chi \int_{\square} U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, y) dy.$$

Now notice that the standard Fourier transform⁶ \mathcal{F} in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and the Gelfand transform, as directly follows from (7.3) and (7.4), are related by the identities: $\int_{\square} Ug(\theta, y) dy = \mathcal{F}g(\theta)$, $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\theta \in \square^*$, and $U^{-1}(h \otimes \mathbf{e}) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}h$ for $h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with support in \square^* . Consequently, we determine that $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$ is the solution to

$$(7.28) \quad -\operatorname{div}(A^{\operatorname{hom}}\nabla u_\varepsilon^{(0)}) + u_\varepsilon^{(0)} = \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon F,$$

for the smoothing operator $\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ given by

$$(7.29) \quad \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon F = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\chi\mathcal{F}\Gamma_\varepsilon F = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon\chi)\mathcal{F}F.$$

(In the latter equality we have used that $\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}\mathcal{F}^{-1} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\Gamma_\varepsilon$, $\mathcal{F}\Gamma_\varepsilon = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}\mathcal{F}$ and $\Gamma_\varepsilon\chi\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}g = (\tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon\chi)g$.) Let $u \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the solution to the classical homogenised equation

$$(7.30) \quad -\operatorname{div}(A^{\operatorname{hom}}\nabla u(x)) + u(x) = F(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Applying \mathcal{S}_ε to (7.30) and using the standard properties of the Fourier transform, it is easy to see that $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$ solving (7.28) and u are related by the identity $u_\varepsilon^{(0)} = \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon u$. Further, let us show that one has the inequality

$$(7.31) \quad \|u_\varepsilon^{(0)} - u\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \varepsilon r_1^{-1}\gamma_0 \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Indeed, by (7.29), the Plancherel identity and (7.30),

$$(7.32) \quad \|u_\varepsilon^{(0)} - u\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \left\| (1 + |\xi|^2)^{1/2}(\tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon\chi - 1)\mathcal{F}u(\xi) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \left\| \frac{(1 + |\xi|^2)^{1/2}}{A^{\operatorname{hom}}\xi \cdot \xi + 1} (\tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon\chi - 1)\mathcal{F}F(\xi) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Noticing that $|\tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon\chi - 1|$ vanishes for $|\xi| < \varepsilon^{-1}r_1$ and equals -1 otherwise, and recalling that (7.2) implies $A^{\operatorname{hom}}\xi \cdot \xi \geq \gamma_0^{-1}|\xi|^2$ (see e.g. [34]) leads to (7.31).

Combining (7.31) with inequalities (7.26) and (7.27) provides the following result.

⁶The conventional Fourier transform in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is here specified by

$$(\mathcal{F}g)(\theta) := (2\pi)^{-n/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-i\theta \cdot y} g(y) dy, \quad g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Proposition 7.4. *Let u_ε solve (7.1) and u solve (7.30). Then*

$$(7.33) \quad \left\| u_\varepsilon - \left(u + \varepsilon(\tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathbf{N}) \cdot \nabla \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon u \right) \right\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \varepsilon (c_0 + r_1^{-1} \gamma_0) \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

$$(7.34) \quad \|u_\varepsilon - u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \varepsilon (c_1 + r_1^{-1} \gamma_0) \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

The result of type (7.34) was obtained for the first time in [8], see also [56]. The result (7.33) was obtained in [57], [58] although with different smoothing operator and in [9] with the same smoothing operator \mathcal{S}_ε . Finally, we reiterate that the operator and spectral results of Section 6 are also formally applicable for this example (with $\mathcal{E}_\theta = I$), but will not be developed here as are of limited further value (since the spectrum of the homogenised operator has a simple structure with no gaps). This is in sharp contrast with the following example, where the general results of Section 6 play a key role.

7.2 High-contrast elliptic PDE with rapidly oscillating periodic coefficients

Here we demonstrate our method's applicability to scalar high-contrast elliptic PDEs with periodic coefficients. The present example has formed a key motivation for the general approach developed in the present work. We comment here that the approach below could be extended to a wider class of PDE systems, cf [37], in particular would be essentially the same for the analogous high-contrast problems of linear elasticity⁷. We assume here $n > 1$; the case $n = 1$ is qualitatively different and much simpler, cf. Example 7.3 below. We follow the example of [53] and focus on the simplest geometric model:

$$(7.35) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } u_\varepsilon \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ such that} \\ -\operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}) \nabla u_\varepsilon(x)) + u_\varepsilon(x) = F(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{cases}$$

for a given $F \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and \square -periodic coefficients A_ε of the form

$$A_\varepsilon(y) = \begin{cases} 1 & y \in \square \setminus B, \\ \varepsilon^2 & y \in B. \end{cases}$$

Here the set B has Lipschitz boundary, $\overline{B} \subset (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})^n$ for simplicity, and $\square \setminus B$ is connected. Following the steps in Example 7.1, for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ after an application of the rescaling Γ_ε and the Gelfand transform U , we determine that $u_{\varepsilon, \theta}(\cdot) := U\Gamma_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(\theta, \cdot) \in H_{per}^1(\square)$ for a.e. $\theta \in \Theta := \square^*$, and solves

$$(7.36) \quad -e^{-i\theta \cdot y} \varepsilon^{-2} \operatorname{div} \left(A_\varepsilon(y) \nabla (e^{i\theta \cdot y} u_{\varepsilon, \theta}(y)) \right) + u_{\varepsilon, \theta}(y) = U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, y), \quad \text{a.e. } y \in \square.$$

This has the equivalent weak formulation

$$(7.37) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} \int_{\square \setminus B} (\nabla + i\theta) u_{\varepsilon, \theta} \cdot \overline{(\nabla + i\theta) \tilde{u}} + \int_B (\nabla + i\theta) u_{\varepsilon, \theta} \cdot \overline{(\nabla + i\theta) \tilde{u}} + \int_{\square} u_{\varepsilon, \theta} \tilde{u} = \langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle, \\ \forall \tilde{u} \in H_{per}^1(\square),$$

where

$$(7.38) \quad \langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle := \int_{\square} U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, y) \overline{\tilde{u}(y)} \, dy.$$

We note (7.37) is a problem of the form (2.4) with $H := H_{per}^1(\square)$, $\Theta := \square^*$,

$$(7.39) \quad a_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) := \int_{\square \setminus B} (\nabla + i\theta) u \cdot \overline{(\nabla + i\theta) \tilde{u}}, \quad \text{and} \quad b_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) := \int_B (\nabla + i\theta) u \cdot \overline{(\nabla + i\theta) \tilde{u}} + \int_{\square} u \tilde{u}.$$

Then the same argument as in Example 7.1, cf (7.9), assures that assumptions (2.1) and (2.3) hold. Next, for determining the subspaces V_θ but also for some later purposes, we notice that the assumptions on the 'soft' phase B ensure the following extension result (see e.g. [53, Proposition 4.3]).

⁷The only substantive difference in the case of linear elasticity is that we would need to replace the extension Proposition 7.5 with analogous extension property in linear elasticity, see Proposition 7.24 below.

Proposition 7.5. *There exists an extension operator $E : H^1(\square \setminus B) \rightarrow H^1(\square)$ with the following properties: $E u|_{\square \setminus B} = u$, $\|E u\|_{H^1(\square)} \leq C_E \|u\|_{H^1(\square \setminus B)}$, and*

$$(7.40) \quad \int_{\square} |\nabla E u|^2 \leq C_E^2 \int_{\square \setminus B} |\nabla u|^2, \quad \forall u \in H^1(\square \setminus B),$$

with some constant $C_E > 0$ independent of u .

Using Proposition 7.5 we argue

$$(7.41) \quad \begin{aligned} a_{\theta}[u] &= \int_{\square \setminus B} |(\nabla + i\theta)u|^2 = \int_{\square \setminus B} |\nabla(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u)|^2 \geq C_E^{-2} \int_{\square} |\nabla E(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u)|^2 \geq C_E^{-2} |\theta|^2 \int_{\square} |E(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u)|^2 \\ &\geq C_E^{-2} |\theta|^2 \int_{\square \setminus B} |u|^2, \quad \forall u \in H_{per}^1(\square \setminus B), \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds due to (7.40), the second (c.f. (7.10)) by expanding $e^{-i\theta \cdot y} E(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u) \in H_{per}^1(\square)$ in Fourier series in \square , and the last from the extension property $E|_{\square \setminus B} = I$. Therefore, we deduce via (2.6) that

$$(7.42) \quad V_{\theta} = \begin{cases} H_0^1(B), & \theta \neq 0, \\ \{v \in H_{per}^1(\square) \mid v \text{ is constant in } \square \setminus B\} = \mathbb{C} + H_0^1(B), & \theta = 0, \end{cases}$$

where elements of $H_0^1(B)$ are understood as those of $H_{per}^1(\square)$ which are identically zero in $\square \setminus B$. Hence, recalling (2.8) and (2.2) with (7.39),

$$W_{\theta} = \begin{cases} \{w \in H_{per}^1(\square) \mid -(\nabla + i\theta) \cdot (\nabla + i\theta)w + w = 0 \text{ in } B\}, & \theta \neq 0, \\ \{w \in H_{per}^1(\square) \mid -\Delta w + w = 0 \text{ in } B \ \& \ \int_{\square} w = 0\}, & \theta = 0. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, V_{θ} is discontinuous with respect to θ (only) at the origin. Now, proceeding as in Example 7.1, let us demonstrate that the main assumptions (H1)–(H6) hold for the setting (7.39) and identify the principal objects associated with each assumption.

- To prove (H1) we shall demonstrate that the stronger assertion (H1') holds for $C = C_E^2$ and $c(u, \tilde{u}) := C_E^2 \int_{\square \setminus B} u \tilde{u}$, with the latter clearly being $\|\cdot\|_{\theta}$ -compact by the Rellich theorem. For fixed $\theta \in \Theta$ and $u \in H$, we find that $v := u - e^{-i\theta \cdot y} E(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u) \in H_0^1(B) \subseteq V_{\theta}$ satisfies

$$\|u - v\|_{\theta}^2 = \|u - v\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 + \|(\nabla + i\theta)(u - v)\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 =$$

$$(7.43) \quad \|E(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u)\|_{H^1(\square)}^2 \leq C_E^2 \|e^{i\theta \cdot y} u\|_{H^1(\square \setminus B)}^2 = C_E^2 \int_{\square \setminus B} (|\nabla + i\theta|u|^2 + |u|^2).$$

Since, for any $w \in W_{\theta}$ and $v \in V_{\theta}$, $\|w\|_{\theta} \leq \|w - v\|_{\theta}$, the above inequality with $u = w$ implies that

$$(7.44) \quad \|w\|_{\theta}^2 \leq C_E^2 \left(a_{\theta}[w] + \int_{\square \setminus B} |w|^2 \right), \quad \forall w \in W_{\theta}, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta,$$

which establishes (H1').

- The validity of (H2) is immediate for $V_{\star} = H_0^1(B)$ and $L_{\star} = 0$; see Remark 4.5. Furthermore, one can choose the defect subspace $Z = \text{Span}\{\mathbf{e}\}$ where $\mathbf{e} \in H_{per}^1(\square)$ is the constant unity: indeed, $V_0 = H_0^1(B) \dot{+} \mathbb{C}$ implying (4.16), and for $\phi \in H_0^1(B)$,

$$(7.45) \quad |(\phi, \mathbf{e})_0| = \left| \int_B \phi \right| \leq |B|^{1/2} \left(\int_B |\phi|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq |B|^{1/2} \|\phi\|_0 = |B|^{1/2} \|\phi\|_0 \|\mathbf{e}\|_0,$$

i.e. (4.17) holds with $K_Z = |B|^{1/2} < 1$.

• Assumption (H3) holds with $\nu_\star = C_E^{-2}(\pi^2 n + C_E^2)^{-1}$. Indeed, (7.44) and (7.41) imply for $w \in W_\theta$ and $\theta \neq 0$, $\|w\|_\theta^2 \leq C_E^2(1 + C_E^2|\theta|^{-2})a_\theta[w]$, and consequently

$$\nu_\theta = \inf_{w \in W_\theta \setminus \{0\}} \frac{a_\theta[w]}{\|w\|_\theta^2} \geq C_E^{-2}(1 + C_E^2|\theta|^{-2})^{-1} \geq |\theta|^2 C_E^{-2}(\pi^2 n + C_E^2)^{-1}.$$

• Assumption (H4) is obviously satisfied, cf. (7.13), with $K_{a'} = 1$, $K_{a''} = 0$ and

$$(7.46) \quad a'_0(v, u) \cdot \theta := i \int_{\square \setminus B} \theta v \cdot \overline{\nabla u}, \quad a''_0(v, \tilde{v}) \theta \cdot \theta := |\theta|^2 \int_{\square \setminus B} v \overline{\tilde{v}}.$$

Now let us calculate $a_\theta^h[\mathbf{e}]$. Recalling (5.14), (5.10) and (7.46), we obtain:

$$(7.47) \quad a_\theta^h[\mathbf{e}] = a''_0[\mathbf{e}]\theta \cdot \theta + a'_0(\mathbf{e}, N_\theta \mathbf{e}) \cdot \theta = \int_{\square \setminus B} |\theta|^2 + i \int_{\square \setminus B} \theta \cdot \overline{\nabla(N_\theta \mathbf{e})},$$

where $N_\theta \mathbf{e} \in W_0$ solves (see (5.10))

$$(7.48) \quad \int_{\square \setminus B} \nabla(N_\theta \mathbf{e}) \cdot \overline{\nabla w} = -i \int_{\square \setminus B} \theta \cdot \overline{\nabla w}, \quad \forall w \in W_0, \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

It is clear (since $V_0 = \mathbb{C} \dot{+} H_0^1(B)$ and $H_{per}^1(\square) = V_0 \oplus W_0$) that the above equality holds in fact for test functions $\phi \in H_{per}^1(\square)$. Therefore,

$$(7.49) \quad N_\theta \mathbf{e} = i\theta \cdot (\mathbb{N}_1^{\text{pd}}, \dots, \mathbb{N}_n^{\text{pd}}) \text{ in } \square \setminus B, \text{ where real-valued } \mathbb{N}_j^{\text{pd}} \in H_{per}^1(\square \setminus B), j = 1, \dots, n, \text{ solve}$$

$$\int_{\square \setminus B} \nabla \mathbb{N}_j^{\text{pd}} \cdot \overline{\nabla \phi} = - \int_{\square \setminus B} e^j \cdot \overline{\nabla \phi}, \quad \forall \phi \in H_{per}^1(\square \setminus B),$$

with e^1, \dots, e^n denoting the canonical basis in \mathbb{R}^n . Thus $\mathbb{N}^{\text{pd}} = (\mathbb{N}_1^{\text{pd}}, \dots, \mathbb{N}_n^{\text{pd}})$ is (up to an additive constant) the perforated domain corrector, see e.g. [34, Section 3.1]. As a result (7.47) and (7.49) allow us to rewrite $a_\theta^h[\mathbf{e}]$ as

$$(7.50) \quad a_\theta^h[\mathbf{e}] = A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}} \theta \cdot \theta,$$

where $A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}}$ is the perforated domain homogenised matrix with components

$$(7.51) \quad \{A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}}\}_{ij} = \int_{\square \setminus B} \delta_{ij} + \int_{\square \setminus B} \partial_i \mathbb{N}_j^{\text{pd}}, \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

Matrix $A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}}$ is well-known to be positive definite and symmetric (see e.g. [34, Section 3.1]); these can also be seen directly, respectively via (7.50) and (5.16), and (7.51) and (7.49) with $\phi = N_i$.

• Assumption (H5) is immediate for $L_b = 1$: indeed, via (7.39),

$$\begin{aligned} |b_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) - b_0(u, \tilde{u})| &= \left| \int_B i\theta u \cdot \overline{(\nabla + i\theta)\tilde{u}} + \int_B \nabla u \cdot i\theta \tilde{u} \right| \\ &\leq |\theta| \left(\|u\|_{L^2(B)} \|(\nabla + i\theta)\tilde{u}\|_{L^2(B)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B)} \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^2(B)} \right) \leq |\theta| \|u\|_0 \|\tilde{u}\|_\theta, \quad \forall u, \tilde{u} \in H_{per}^1(\square). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we can take as the operator \mathcal{E}_θ , see Lemma 5.7, multiplication by $e^{-i\theta \cdot y}$. Indeed, for $\phi, \tilde{\phi} \in H_0^1(B) = V_\star$,

$$b_\theta(e^{-i\theta \cdot y} \phi, e^{-i\theta \cdot y} \tilde{\phi}) := \int_B (\nabla + i\theta) e^{-i\theta \cdot y} \phi \cdot \overline{(\nabla + i\theta) e^{-i\theta \cdot y} \tilde{\phi}} + \int_\square e^{-i\theta \cdot y} \nabla \phi \cdot \overline{e^{-i\theta \cdot y} \tilde{\phi}} = \int_B \nabla \phi \cdot \overline{\nabla \tilde{\phi}} + \int_\square \phi \cdot \overline{\tilde{\phi}} = b_0(\phi, \tilde{\phi}),$$

i.e. (5.23) holds. One can also readily verify (5.24) with $K_b = \sqrt{|B|(1 + n/4)}$ as follows:

$$\left| b_\theta(e^{-i\theta \cdot y} \phi, \mathbf{e}) - b_0(\phi, \mathbf{e}) \right| = \left| \int_B e^{-i\theta \cdot y} \nabla \phi \cdot i\theta + \int_B (e^{-i\theta \cdot y} - 1) \phi \right| \leq |\theta| \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(B)} |B|^{1/2} +$$

$$\sqrt{|B|n/4} |\theta| \|\phi\|_{L^2(B)} \leq \sqrt{|B|(1 + n/4)} |\theta| \|\phi\|_0 = \sqrt{|B|(1 + n/4)} |\theta| \|\phi\|_0 \|\mathbf{e}\|_0, \quad \forall \phi \in H_0^1(B).$$

• Finally, we can see that (H6) holds for $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\square)$ with θ -independent $d_\theta = d_0$ the standard $L^2(\square)$ inner product and \mathcal{E}_θ multiplication by $e^{-i\theta \cdot y}$. Indeed, $H = H_{per}^1(\square)$ is compactly embedded into and dense in \mathcal{H} and (6.2) holds, and $K_e = \sqrt{n}/2$ in (H6).

As (H1)–(H6) hold we can apply the results of Sections 4 - 6, and we detail below implications of the relevant approximation theorems for the present example.

7.2.1 Application of Theorem 5.9

We begin with specifying the approximations given in Theorem 5.9. Therein, $V_\star = H_0^1(B)$ and $Z = \text{Span}\{\mathbf{e}\}$ (recalling $\mathbf{e}(y) \equiv 1$) and consequently, $v = v_{\varepsilon,\theta} \in H_0^1(B)$, $z = c_{\varepsilon,\theta}\mathbf{e}$, $c_{\varepsilon,\theta} \in \mathbb{C}$, and problem (5.26), via (7.50), (7.39) and (7.38), specialises to

$$(7.52) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} (A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}} \theta \cdot \theta) c_{\varepsilon,\theta} \bar{c} + \int_B \nabla v_{\varepsilon,\theta} \cdot \overline{\nabla \phi} + \int_{\square} (v_{\varepsilon,\theta} + c_{\varepsilon,\theta}) \overline{(\phi + \bar{c})} = \int_{\square} U \Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, y) \overline{(e^{-i\theta \cdot y} \phi(y) + \bar{c})} dy, \\ \forall \phi \in H_0^1(B), \quad \forall \bar{c} \in \mathbb{C}.$$

This can equivalently be re-written as

$$(7.53) \quad \begin{cases} \left(\varepsilon^{-2} A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}} \theta \cdot \theta + 1 \right) c_{\varepsilon,\theta} + \int_B v_{\varepsilon,\theta}(y) dy = \int_{\square} U \Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, y) dy, & \theta \in \square^\star; \\ -\Delta v_{\varepsilon,\theta}(y) + v_{\varepsilon,\theta}(y) + c_{\varepsilon,\theta} = e^{i\theta \cdot y} U \Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, y), & y \in B, \quad \theta \in \square^\star. \end{cases}$$

Applying Theorem 5.9 and noticing that, by (3.3) and (7.38), (7.39), $\|f\|_{\star\theta} \leq \|U \Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\square)}$, we conclude that inequalities (5.35) and (5.36) imply the following result.

Proposition 7.6. *Let $u_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ solve (7.36) and $c_{\varepsilon,\theta}$, $v_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ solve (7.53). Then*

$$(7.54) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} \int_{\square \setminus B} \left| (\nabla + i\theta) \left(u_{\varepsilon,\theta}(y) - (1 + i\theta \cdot \mathbf{N}^{\text{pd}}(y)) c_{\varepsilon,\theta} \right) \right|^2 + \int_{\square \setminus B} |u_{\varepsilon,\theta}(y) - (1 + i\theta \cdot \mathbf{N}^{\text{pd}}(y)) c_{\varepsilon,\theta}|^2 dy \\ \leq C_9 \varepsilon^2 \int_{\square} |U \Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, y)|^2 dy,$$

$$(7.55) \quad \int_{\square} |u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - (c_{\varepsilon,\theta} + e^{-i\theta \cdot y} v_{\varepsilon,\theta})|^2 \leq C_{10} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\square} |U \Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, y)|^2 dy.$$

Inequalities (7.54) and (7.55) provide L^2 estimates for the corresponding approximations of u_ε , the solution to (7.35), and its gradient on the ‘‘stiff’’ phase. Indeed, applying the inverse transforms to the approximation $c_{\varepsilon,\theta}\mathbf{e} + e^{-i\theta \cdot y} v_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ to $u_{\varepsilon,\theta} = U \Gamma_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon$ in (7.55), set

$$(7.56) \quad u_\varepsilon^{(0)} := \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} U^{-1} c_{\varepsilon,\theta} \mathbf{e}, \quad v_\varepsilon^{(0)} := \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} U^{-1} e^{-i\theta \cdot y} v_{\varepsilon,\theta}.$$

Note that, cf (7.24) and (7.25), as $c_{\varepsilon,\theta}\mathbf{e}$ is y -independent $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$ is smooth and

$$\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} U^{-1} (1 + i\theta \cdot \mathbf{N}^{\text{pd}}) c_{\varepsilon,\theta} \mathbf{e} = u_\varepsilon^{(0)} + \varepsilon \left(\tilde{\Gamma}_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathbf{N}^{\text{pd}} \right) \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon^{(0)} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_\varepsilon}, \text{ where } B_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \varepsilon(B + m).$$

Then inequalities (7.54), (7.55), via the L_2 -unitarity of the above inverse transform $\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} U^{-1}$, lead to the following theorem.

Theorem 7.7. *Let u_ε solve (7.35) and $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$, $v_\varepsilon^{(0)}$ be as in (7.56) where $c_{\varepsilon,\theta}$, $v_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ solve (7.53). Then there exist positive constants c_0 and c_1 independent of ε and of $F \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, such that*

$$(7.57) \quad \|u_\varepsilon - (u_\varepsilon^{(0)} + \varepsilon \mathbf{N}^{\text{pd}} \left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon} \right) \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon^{(0)})\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_\varepsilon})} \leq c_0 \varepsilon \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

$$(7.58) \quad \|u_\varepsilon - (u_\varepsilon^{(0)} + v_\varepsilon^{(0)} \left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon} \right))\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq c_1 \varepsilon \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

An estimate similar to the L^2 -estimate (7.58) (more precisely to that based on (5.19) with $\langle f, \phi \rangle = \int_{\square} f \bar{\phi}$) was first derived in [15] by different means. The H^1 -estimate (7.57) is believed to be new. We remark that, like Proposition 7.4 re-expresses estimates (7.26) and (7.27) in terms of the solution of the homogenised equation (7.30), estimates akin to (7.57) and (7.58) can be re-expressed in terms of appropriate solutions to the two-scale limit problem, cf. the next subsection.

7.2.2 Approximation via the two-scale limit operator and an associated two-scale interpolation operator

Let us recall, see e.g. [53, 37], that for problem (7.35) the following property of (strong) two-scale (pseudo-)resolvent convergence is held. If $F_\varepsilon \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ weakly or strongly two-scale converges as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to $F_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square)$ then u_ε the solution to (7.35) (for $F = F_\varepsilon$) respectively weakly or strongly two-scale converges to $u_0(x, y) = u(x) + v(x, y)$ the solution to the two-scale limit system $\mathcal{L}_0 u_0 = \mathcal{P}F_0$. Here \mathcal{L}_0 is the self-adjoint *two-scale operator* in the closed subspace $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{C} \dot{+} L^2(B)) = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \dot{+} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; L^2(B))$ of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; L^2(\square)) = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square)$ generated by the *two-scale form*

$$(7.59) \quad Q_0(u + v, \phi + \psi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}} \nabla u(x) \cdot \overline{\nabla \phi(x)} \, dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_B \nabla_y v(x, y) \cdot \overline{\nabla_y \psi(x, y)} \, dy \, dx,$$

for $u, \phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $v, \psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; H_0^1(B))$, with dense form domain $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \dot{+} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; H_0^1(B))$, and $\mathcal{P} : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \dot{+} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; L^2(B))$ is the orthogonal projection or simply

$$(7.60) \quad \mathcal{P}g(x, y) = \begin{cases} g(x, y) & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \in B \\ |\square \setminus B|^{-1} \int_{\square \setminus B} g(x, y') \, dy' & x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \in \square \setminus B. \end{cases}$$

Now we observe that the above objects are precisely those that appeared in Section 6.5 when specialised to the present example. Indeed, recall that $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\square)$ with inner product $d_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) = \int_{\square} u \overline{\tilde{u}}$, and notice via (7.39) that (6.28) holds. Further, according to Section 6.5, $\mathcal{H}_0 := \overline{Z \dot{+} V_\star} = \mathbb{C} \dot{+} L^2(B)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H} &= L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (\mathcal{H}, d_\theta)) = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square), & \mathbb{H}_0 &= L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0) = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \dot{+} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; L^2(B)), \\ \text{and } \mathbb{D} &= H^1(\mathbb{R}^n; Z) \dot{+} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; V_\star) = H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \dot{+} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; H_0^1(B)), \end{aligned}$$

all equipped with the standard norms. Therefore, comparing the above two-scale form Q_0 and the bivariate form Q (see (6.43)) and recalling (7.50) we find that

$$Q(u + v, \phi + \psi) = Q_0(u + v, \phi + \psi) + (u + v, \phi + \psi)_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square)}$$

and so $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + I$ for the abstract bivariate operator \mathcal{L} generated by Q as introduced in Section 6.5. In particular, for $g \in \mathbb{H}_0$, the two-scale limit problem $(\mathcal{L}_0 + I)u_0 = g$ is to find such $u_0 = u + v \in \mathbb{D}$ that

$$(7.61) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}_x (A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}} \nabla_x u(x)) + u(x) + \int_{\square} v(x, y) \, dy = \int_{\square} g(x, y) \, dy, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n; \\ -\Delta_y v(x, y) + u(x) + v(x, y) = g(x, y), & y \in B. \end{cases}$$

As a result, Theorem 6.10 via a routine specialisation to the present setting yields the following.

Theorem 7.8. *For $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, one has*

$$\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} g(\theta) - \left(A_\varepsilon^* (\mathcal{L}_0 + I)^{-1} \mathcal{P} A_\varepsilon g \right) (\theta) \right\|_{L^2(\square)} \leq C_{11} \varepsilon \|g(\theta)\|_{L^2(\square)}, \quad \forall g \in L^2(\square^* \times \square), \quad \text{a.e. } \theta \in \square^*,$$

where $A_\varepsilon : L^2(\square^* \times \square) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square)$, $A_\varepsilon = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi \mathcal{E}^{-1}$, and its adjoint $A_\varepsilon^* : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square) \rightarrow L^2(\square^* \times \square)$, $A_\varepsilon^* = \mathcal{E} \chi^* \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}$, are given by the continuous extensions of

$$(7.62) \quad A_\varepsilon g(x, y) = (2\pi)^{-n/2} \varepsilon^{-n/2} \int_{\square^*} e^{i\theta \cdot y} g(\theta, y) e^{i\theta \cdot \frac{x}{\varepsilon}} \, d\theta, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \in \square;$$

$$(7.63) \quad A_\varepsilon^* h(\theta, y) = (2\pi)^{-n/2} \varepsilon^{-n/2} e^{-i\theta \cdot y} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} h(x, y) e^{-i\frac{\theta}{\varepsilon} \cdot x} \, dx, \quad \theta \in \square^*, y \in \square.$$

The above theorem can be re-stated in terms of an operator-type estimate for the original problem (7.35) as follows. Let $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon = -\operatorname{div} \left(A_\varepsilon \left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) \nabla \cdot \right)$ be the non-negative self-adjoint operator defined in a standard way in Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, for the solution of (7.35), $u_\varepsilon = (\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon + I)^{-1} F$. On the other hand, denoting $g = U \Gamma_\varepsilon F$, we observe via (7.38) and (6.3) that $u_{\varepsilon, \theta} = \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} g$ for which in turn $u_{\varepsilon, \theta} = U \Gamma_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon$. Combining this all implies $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} = U \Gamma_\varepsilon (\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon + I)^{-1} \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} U^{-1}$, which due to the L_2 -unitarity of U and Γ_ε allows to recast Theorem 7.8 in the following form.

Theorem 7.9. Let \mathcal{L}_ε and \mathcal{L}_0 be respectively the original and the two-scale limit operators as described above, and \mathcal{P} be the projector given by (7.60). Then, for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, one has

$$(7.64) \quad \|(\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon + I)^{-1} - \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^* (\mathcal{L}_0 + I)^{-1} \mathcal{P} \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_{11} \varepsilon.$$

Here $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square)$, which we call “the two-scale interpolation operator” (see Remark 7.10 below), is a bounded operator given by the composition

$$(7.65) \quad \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon := A_\varepsilon U \Gamma_\varepsilon = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi \mathcal{E}^{-1} U \Gamma_\varepsilon.$$

In (7.65), $\Gamma_\varepsilon : F(x) \mapsto \varepsilon^{n/2} F(\varepsilon x)$ is the rescaling operator and $\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} : g(x, y) \mapsto \varepsilon^{-n/2} g(\varepsilon^{-1} x, y)$ is its inverse in x ; $U : F(x) \mapsto g(\theta, y)$ is the Floquet-Bloch-Gelfand transform, see (7.3); \mathcal{E}^{-1} is multiplication by $e^{i\theta \cdot y}$; $\chi : L^2(\square^* \times \square) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square)$ is the extension by zero outside \square^* in the first variable, and $\mathcal{F}^{-1} : h(\xi, y) \mapsto g(x, y)$ is the inverse Fourier transform also in the first variable.

\mathcal{I}_ε is an L^2 -isometry and the continuous extension of

$$(7.66) \quad \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F(x, y) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^n} F(\varepsilon y + \varepsilon m) \operatorname{Sinc}\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon} - m\right);$$

$\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^* : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the adjoint of \mathcal{I}_ε given by $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^* = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} U^{-1} A_\varepsilon^* = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} U^{-1} \mathcal{E} \chi^* \mathcal{F} \Gamma_\varepsilon$, which is the continuous extension of

$$(7.67) \quad \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^* u_0(x) = \varepsilon^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_0\left(s, \left\{\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right\}\right) \operatorname{Sinc}\left(\left[\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right] - \frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) ds,$$

where $\{p\}$ is the fractional part of $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $[p] := p - \{p\}$ is its “entire part”. In (7.66) and (7.67) $\operatorname{Sinc}(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, is the (n -dimensional normalised) sinc-function:

$$\operatorname{Sinc}(z) := \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{\sin(\pi z_j)}{\pi z_j}, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The range of \mathcal{I}_ε consists of all functions $f(x, y) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square)$ whose Fourier transform in x is supported in $[-\pi/\varepsilon, \pi/\varepsilon]^n$ for a.e. $y \in \square$. Moreover,

$$(7.68) \quad \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^* \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon = I, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^* = \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon,$$

where \mathcal{S}_ε is the smoothing operator as given by (7.29) (with χ replaced by the characteristic function of \square^*) applied to the first variable, i.e.

$$(7.69) \quad \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi_{\varepsilon^{-1} \square^*} \mathcal{F},$$

where $\chi_{\varepsilon^{-1} \square^*}$ is multiplication (in the first variable) by characteristic function of $\varepsilon^{-1} \square^*$. $\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon \rightarrow I$ strongly.

Proof. Operator $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi \mathcal{E}^{-1} U \Gamma_\varepsilon$ is an L^2 -isometry from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square)$, as a superposition of L^2 -norm preserving operators. Therefore, at a dense subspace, e.g. $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \ni F$, combining (7.62) with (7.3) and (6.46) we obtain

$$\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F(x, y) := A_\varepsilon U \Gamma_\varepsilon F(x, y) = (2\pi)^{-n} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^n} F(\varepsilon y + \varepsilon m) \int_{\square^*} e^{i\theta \cdot (\frac{x}{\varepsilon} - m)} d\theta,$$

which yields (7.66). Similarly, combining (7.63) with (7.4) and (6.46) gives

$$\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^* u_0(x) = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} U^{-1} A_\varepsilon^* u_0(x) = (2\pi\varepsilon)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_0\left(s, \left\{\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right\}\right) \left(\int_{\square^*} e^{i\theta \cdot ([\frac{x}{\varepsilon}] - \frac{s}{\varepsilon})} d\theta \right) ds,$$

yielding (7.67). Finally, (7.68) immediately follows via (7.64), (6.48) and (7.29); and the strong convergence of \mathcal{S}_ε to the unity operator I directly follows from (7.69). \square

Remark 7.10. Operator \mathcal{I}_ε plays a key role of L^2 -isometrically transferring, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, an input function $F(x)$ from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ into corresponding two-scale function $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F(x, y)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square)$. The latter serves in turn as the input for the two-scale limit problem (7.61), whose solution $u_0(x, y)$ is converted by the adjoint $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^*$ back into a function of x . The whole point is that such a procedure delivers an approximate self-adjoint solution operator, which is the inverse of the two-scale limit operator preceded by the projection operator \mathcal{P} and flanked by the transfer operator \mathcal{I}_ε and its adjoint, delivering the operator-normed error estimate (7.64). Interestingly, (7.66) appears to be a two-scale version of the Whittaker–Shannon interpolation formula, see e.g. [32] for a review. In this respect, operator \mathcal{I}_ε can be viewed as a new two-scale interpolation operator. Indeed for regular enough F , given $y \in \square$, if $x = \varepsilon l$ for $l \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ then (7.66) implies $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F(x, y) = F(x + \varepsilon y)$, interpolating for other $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ between the values of F on the ε -periodic lattice containing εy (i.e. on the lattice $\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^n + \varepsilon y$ of all the points with the chosen “phase” y). In particular, the following can be derived directly from the above definition of \mathcal{I}_ε (cf. Remark 7.28 below) and is also immediately implied by the classical Whittaker-Kotelnikov-Nyquist-Shannon sampling theorem (see e.g. [32]). – If the right hand side F is itself a two-scale function, i.e. $F_\varepsilon(x) = \Phi(x, x/\varepsilon)$ where $\Phi(x, y)$ is sufficiently regular, \square -periodic in y and its Fourier transform in x is uniformly for a.e. y compactly supported in an origin-centred cube Q of size $2R$, i.e. $Q = [-R, R]^n$, then for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \pi R^{-1}$, $(\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon)(x, y) = \Phi(x + \varepsilon y, y)$. On the other hand it is easy to see from (7.65) that, for any $F \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $(\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F)(x, y)$ automatically has the above property of uniformly compact support of the x -Fourier transforms with $R = \pi/\varepsilon$, which property is inherited by the solution $u_0(x, y)$ of the two-scale limit problem (7.61). For such u_0 it follows in turn from noticing that (7.67) is a convolution of u_0 (with respect to its first variable) with the rescaled Sinc-function whose Fourier transform is the characteristic function of $\varepsilon^{-1}\square^*$, that $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^* u_0(x) = u_0(x - \varepsilon y, y)$ where $y := \{x/\varepsilon\}$.

Remark 7.11. It appears that, in contrast to the classical homogenisation (Example 7.1 above), an interpolation operator is necessary for recasting the input F as a two-scale function (to serve in turn as the input for the two-scale limit problem). In this respect, it would be of interest to compare the new interpolation operator \mathcal{I}_ε with any other candidate interpolators. One of these is the periodic unfolding operator see e.g. [21], which has a track record of establishing operator-type error estimates, see e.g. [30], although in classical homogenisation problems. Denoting by $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square)$ the L^2 -isometric unfolding operator, for sufficiently regular F we have $(\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon F)(x, y) := F(\varepsilon \{x/\varepsilon\} + \varepsilon y)$. This means that, for regular enough F , both \mathcal{T}_ε and \mathcal{I}_ε produce on the same ε -periodic lattice $\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^n$ exactly the same values $F(x + \varepsilon y)$, however interpolate between those in different ways. Namely, while \mathcal{T}_ε simply extends the latter value for the whole of the related ε -cell $x \in \varepsilon l + \varepsilon\square$ in piecewise constant way, \mathcal{I}_ε smoothly interpolates between the above points according to (7.66). We briefly discuss here some similarities and differences between \mathcal{I}_ε and \mathcal{T}_ε , postponing a more detailed discussion for another study. Notice that the unfolding operator can be written in a form akin to (7.66). Namely,

$$(7.70) \quad \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon F(x, y) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^n} F(\varepsilon y + \varepsilon m) \chi_\square \left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon} - m \right),$$

where χ_\square is the characteristic function of the periodicity cell \square . Comparing then with (7.65), one observes that \mathcal{T}_ε has the following operator form

$$(7.71) \quad \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \text{Sn} \mathcal{E}^{-1} U \Gamma_\varepsilon,$$

where $\text{Sn} : L^2(\square^* \times \square) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square)$, replacing the extension operator χ in (7.65), is the operator of “ \square^* -periodisation” in the first variable followed by multiplication by a Sinc function. Namely,

$$(\text{Sn} g)(\xi, y) = \text{Sinc} \left(\frac{\xi}{2\pi} \right) g \left(2\pi \left\{ \frac{\xi}{2\pi} \right\}, y \right).$$

It can be seen that, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \text{Sinc}^2(x + l) = 1$, which implies that operator Sn is an L^2 -isometry (and so is \mathcal{T}_ε , as a composition (7.71)); and in particular $\text{Sn}^* \text{Sn} = I$.

As we have seen, our new two-scale interpolation operator \mathcal{I}_ε delivers a desired approximation with an operator norm error estimate (7.64), uniformly valid in ε and F . However one can show from the above using the structure of the two-scale limit operator (and in fact of more general bivariate operators⁸) that

⁸In the notation of Section 6, the difference of the two approximating operators on the left hand side of (7.72) is

the approximations based on \mathcal{I}_ε and on the unfolding operator \mathcal{T}_ε (i.e. when \mathcal{I}_ε is replaced in (7.64) by \mathcal{T}_ε) are ε^2 -close, i.e.

$$(7.72) \quad \left\| \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^* (\mathcal{L}_0 + I)^{-1} \mathcal{P} \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F - \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon^* (\mathcal{L}_0 + I)^{-1} \mathcal{P} \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon F \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \varepsilon^2 \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \quad \forall F \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

(We remark that the above estimate holds despite \mathcal{I}_ε and \mathcal{T}_ε not being L_2 -close to each other.) Estimate (7.72) implies that both approximations give operator estimate (7.64), and the underlying reasoning suggests a possibility for constructing similar approximations based on other extension operators with properties similar to those of χ and Sn for a broader class of examples. Still, we believe that our new two-scale interpolation operator \mathcal{I}_ε appears here most naturally. Indeed, the extension operator χ (being the prototype of \mathcal{I}_ε) naturally appears in the abstract setting of Theorem 6.10 for arbitrary Θ .

Remark finally that, like the unfolding operator, the new two-scale interpolation operator \mathcal{I}_ε provides an equivalence link between two-scale convergence [41, 2] and “conventional” convergence: one can show that $F_\varepsilon \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ weakly (resp strongly) two-scale converges to $f_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \square)$ if and only if $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon$ weakly (resp strongly) two-scale converges to f_0 .

Remark 7.12. One potential disadvantage of the above constructed operator \mathcal{I}_ε , suffered in fact also by \mathcal{T}_ε , is that for a given x e.g. $x \in \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}^n$, even for smooth $F(x)$ it produces a discontinuity on the boundary of \square in the \square -periodic extension in y of $(\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F)(x, y) = F(x + \varepsilon y)$. We recall however that, according to (7.64), $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F$ is immediately followed by the projection operator \mathcal{P} , see (7.60), which in a sense regularises this discontinuity. Indeed from (7.66), for $x = \varepsilon l$, $l \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, and $y \in \square \setminus B$, $g(x) := \mathcal{P} \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F(x, y) = |\square \setminus B|^{-1} \int_{\square \setminus B} F(\varepsilon l + \varepsilon y') dy'$ i.e. $g(\varepsilon l)$ is the average of F over the matrix part of the cube $\varepsilon l + \varepsilon \square$. In other words, $g(\varepsilon l)$ is (up to a pre-factor) the Steklov smoothing (see e.g. [60]) at $x = \varepsilon l$ of $\chi_\varepsilon^m F$ where χ_ε^m is the characteristic function of the matrix phase $M_\varepsilon = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \varepsilon(B + m)$. For $x \notin \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}$, (7.66) implies that $g(x)$ is the (classical) Whittaker interpolation: $g(x) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^n} g(\varepsilon m) \text{Sinc}(x/\varepsilon - m)$. On the other hand, we notice that the operator \mathcal{E}_θ could be chosen in a slightly modified form. Namely, keeping it as the multiplication by $e^{-i\theta \cdot y}$ for $y \in B$ i.e. in the inclusion, set it to be identity (i.e. a multiplication by unity) in the surrounding ‘matrix’ $\square \setminus B$. One can then easily check that all the assumptions in Lemma 5.7 and hypothesis (H6) remain valid. Therefore a minor modification of Theorem 7.9 holds, where $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F$ is still given by (7.66) for $y \in B$, however with y additionally subtracted in the argument of Sinc for $y \in \square \setminus B$:

$$(7.73) \quad \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F(x, y) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^n} F(\varepsilon y + \varepsilon m) \text{Sinc}\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon} - m - y\right), \quad y \in \square \setminus B.$$

As a result, given a regular F , while for y in the inclusion $(\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F)(x, y)$ remains unchanged, for y in the matrix and for $x \in \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}^n + \varepsilon y$ it is simply $F(x)$ with Whittaker interpolation in between. Since the isolated inclusions do not intersect the boundary of the periodicity cell \square , no discontinuities are anymore introduced in the periodic extension of (7.73) on artificial boundaries like that of \square . Moreover, as directly follows from (7.60) and (7.73), for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y \in \square \setminus B$,

$$\mathcal{P} \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F(x, y) = |\square \setminus B|^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \varepsilon(B + m)} F(z) \varepsilon^{-n} \text{Sinc}\left(\frac{x - z}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

Since, up to the constant pre-factor, the latter is a convolution of $\chi_\varepsilon^m F$ with the rescaled Sinc -function, this shows that for $y \in \square \setminus B$, $\mathcal{P} \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F(x, y) = |\square \setminus B|^{-1} \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon \chi_\varepsilon^m F(x)$ where \mathcal{S}_ε is the smoothing operator (7.69). One can also see that for the modified choice of \mathcal{I}_ε the approximation delivered as a result by (7.64) has a particularly simple form. Namely, given any $F \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with related $u_0 = (\mathcal{L}_0 + I)^{-1} \mathcal{P} \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F$ one has $u_0(x, y) = u(x) + v(x, y)$ and $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^* u_0(x) = u(x)$ in the matrix phase $M_\varepsilon = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\varepsilon$ while $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^* u_0(x) = u_0(x - \varepsilon\{x/\varepsilon\}, \{x/\varepsilon\})$ in the inclusion phase $B_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \varepsilon(B + m)$.

Finally we emphasise again that, for both choices of \mathcal{I}_ε , in the inclusion phase i.e. for $y \in B$ it has to be the same and as in (7.66). As mentioned in Remark 7.10, for regular enough two-scale inputs

$\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} U^{-1} \mathcal{E} \left[\chi^* \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathbb{L}^{-1} \mathcal{P} \Gamma_\varepsilon \chi - \text{Sn}^* \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathbb{L}^{-1} \mathcal{P} \Gamma_\varepsilon \text{Sn} \right] \mathcal{E}^{-1} U \Gamma_\varepsilon$. Operator $\mathbb{L}^{-1} \mathcal{P}$ is direct integral of $\mathbb{L}_\xi^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and one can show from its special structure that its “symbol” stabilises for large ξ , namely $\mathbb{L}_\xi^{-1} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 = A_0 + R(\xi)$ where A_0 is ξ -independent and $\|R(\xi)\|_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}} \leq C/(1 + |\xi|^2)$. Then the parts corresponding to A_0 are seen to cancel, and the remaining parts via some further estimates yield (7.72).

$F_\varepsilon(x) = \Phi(x, x/\varepsilon)$ this yields $(\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon)(x, y) = \Phi(x + \varepsilon y, y)$. Although the εy shift in the x -variable might look unnatural from the first sight, in fact it is not. – In the two-scale limit problem (7.61), x and y are regarded as independent variables and given $u(x)$ the equation for $v(x, y)$ would have to be solved on the inclusion B for every fixed x with the right hand side $(\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon)(x, y)$. Any “true” inclusion centered at $x_l = \varepsilon l$, $l \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, can be parametrised as $x = x_l + \varepsilon y$, $y \in B$, and so for the related true right hand side $F_\varepsilon(x) = \Phi(x, x/\varepsilon) = \Phi(x_l + \varepsilon y, y)$. For a fixed $x = x_l \in \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}^n$ the latter coincides with the “shifted” $(\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon)(x, y)$ as above, and for $x \notin \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}^n$ these are smoothly interpolated. So it is no surprise the shifted interpolation gives a more accurate approximation in the inclusions.

7.2.3 Estimates on the rate of convergence of the spectrum

Finally, the following important result on the approximation of spectra holds by adopting Theorem 6.11 to the present example.

Theorem 7.13. *For every real b there exists a non-negative constant C_b such that for every interval $[a, b] \subset (-\infty, \infty)$ one has*

$$(7.74) \quad d_{[a,b]}(\mathrm{Sp} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon, \mathrm{Sp} \mathcal{L}_0) \leq C_b \varepsilon, \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon < 1.$$

Further, for the spectrum of the above two-scale limit operator \mathcal{L}_0 ,

$$\mathrm{Sp} \mathcal{L}_0 = \left\{ \lambda \notin \mathrm{Sp} \left(-\Delta_{H_0^1(B)} \right) : \beta_B(\lambda) \geq 0 \right\} \cup \mathrm{Sp} \left(-\Delta_{H_0^1(B)} \right).$$

Here $-\Delta_{H_0^1(B)}$ is the Dirichlet Laplacian on the inclusion B and $\beta_B(\lambda) = \lambda + \lambda^2 \int_B \left(-\Delta_{H_0^1(B)} - \lambda \right)^{-1} \mathbf{e}$ is the β -function associated with B which was probably first introduced by Zhikov, see e.g. [52, 53]. In particular, when (a, b) is a gap in $\mathrm{Sp} \mathcal{L}_0$ then $[a + C_b \varepsilon, b - C_b \varepsilon]$ is in a gap of $\mathrm{Sp} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ when $\varepsilon < (b - a)/(2C_b)$.

The proof immediately follows from Theorem 6.11 upon noting the following specialisations for the present example:

$$\mathrm{Sp} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon = \overline{\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathrm{Sp} \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}}, \quad \mathbf{B} = -\Delta_{H_0^1(B)} + I, \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_\lambda[\mathbf{e}] = \beta_B(\lambda - 1),$$

see (6.36)–(6.37). Notice further that (6.49) specialises to

$$\beta_B(\lambda) = \lambda + \lambda^2 \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left| \int_B \phi_m(y) dy \right|^2}{\lambda_m - \lambda},$$

where λ_m and ϕ_m , $m = 1, 2, \dots$, are respectively all the simple eigenvalues and the L^2 -orthonormalised eigenfunctions of Dirichlet Laplacian $-\Delta_{H_0^1(B)}$ on the inclusion B . This implies, cf. [52, 53], that the spectrum of the limit operator \mathcal{L}_0 typically has infinitely many gaps. It was shown in [53] that the Floquet-Bloch spectrum of the original operator \mathcal{L}_ε converges to that of \mathcal{L}_0 in the sense of Hausdorff. The estimate (7.74) provides a new result on the rate of the convergence of the spectrum. We remark that it, as well as (7.64), appears to improve recent results of [17, 18]: while the latter references have similar estimates in terms a certain ε -dependent approximate operator $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon^{app}$, the above approach of ours allows to construct an approximation with the desired error estimates in terms the ε -independent two-scale limit operator \mathcal{L}_0 .

Remark 7.14. *The general spectral results of Section 6 imply also error estimates for convergence of corresponding eigenfunctions, and in the present example of the Bloch waves. Not attempting here any detailed investigation of this, we remark that Theorems 6.4 and 6.5 in combination with general methods found e.g. in [51] imply the following. Let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\lambda_\xi^{(k)}$ be (for simplicity) a simple eigenvalue of \mathbb{L}_ξ with associated eigenfunction $\psi_\xi^{(k)} = z_\xi^{(k)} + v_\xi^{(k)}$ where $z_\xi^{(k)} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $v_\xi^{(k)} \in H_0^1(B)$. Then there exists $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq 1$ and $\delta > 0$ such that for all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and for $\theta = \varepsilon \xi \in \square^*$ there exists*

a single isolated eigenvalue $\lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k)}$ of $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ in the δ -neighbourhood of $\lambda_{\xi}^{(k)}$ and associated eigenfunction $\varphi_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k)} \in H_{per}^1(\square)$ such that

$$(7.75) \quad \left\| \varphi_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k)} - \psi_{\xi}^{(k)} \right\|_{L^2(\square)} \leq C\varepsilon,$$

with a constant $C > 0$ independent of ε . A converse property also holds: for an appropriate sequence of eigenvalues $\lambda_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k)}$ it necessarily converges as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to $\lambda_{\xi}^{(k)}$ with associated eigenfunctions, up to scalar pre-factors, obeying (7.75). As $e^{i\theta \cdot y} \varphi_{\varepsilon,\theta}^{(k)}(y)$ is a θ -quasiperiodic Bloch wave associated with the original (rescaled) operator, (7.75) implies approximation of the latter by $e^{i\theta \cdot y} \psi_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{(k)}(y)$, where $\psi_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{(k)}$ is explicitly found from the two-scale limit problem. More detailed analysis, in particular of any uniformity properties of (7.75) with respect to ξ and k , may deserve a separate investigation.

7.3 ‘Inverted’ high-contrast model

Here we provide an example for which the form a_{θ} has θ -regular associated spaces V_{θ} , that is the assumption (3.6) of Theorem 3.1 of Section 3 holds. A simple example of such a case is the ‘inverted high-contrast’ problem: the case where the roles of the isolated inclusions and connected matrix sets B and $\square \setminus B$ respectively in Example 7.2 above are switched. As we will see, this results in an approximation of the original problem, with error bounds, in terms of a limit problem which in contrast to the previous two examples is not anymore homogenised or two-scale but is instead with an “infinite” contrast inclusions (e.g. with rigid inclusions in case of linear elasticity). We will consider here slightly less general elliptic systems⁹, i.e. we set $H = H_{per}^1(\square; \mathbb{C}^m)$, $m \geq 1$, $\Theta = \square^* := [-\pi, \pi]^n$, $n \geq 1$,

$$a_{\theta}(u, \tilde{u}) = \int_B a^{(0)}(\nabla u + i\theta \otimes u) : \overline{(\nabla \tilde{u} + i\theta \otimes \tilde{u})}, \quad b_{\theta}(u, \tilde{u}) = \int_{\square \setminus B} a^{(1)}(\nabla u + i\theta \otimes u) : \overline{(\nabla \tilde{u} + i\theta \otimes \tilde{u})} + \int_{\square} u \cdot \bar{\tilde{u}}.$$

Here $a^{(0)}$ and $a^{(1)}$ are Hermitian \square -periodic tensor-valued bounded coefficients that satisfy

$$(7.76) \quad \begin{aligned} \gamma_0^{-1} \int_{\square \setminus B} |\nabla \phi|^2 &\leq \int_{\square \setminus B} a^{(1)} \nabla \phi : \overline{\nabla \phi} \leq \gamma_0 \int_{\square \setminus B} |\nabla \phi|^2, & \phi \in H^1(\square \setminus B; \mathbb{C}^m), \\ \gamma_0^{-1} \int_B |\nabla \phi|^2 &\leq \int_B a^{(0)} \nabla \phi : \overline{\nabla \phi} \leq \gamma_0 \int_B |\nabla \phi|^2, & \phi \in H^1(B; \mathbb{C}^m), \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $\gamma_0 \geq 1$. In this setting, for each $\theta \in \square^*$ and $u \in H$, one has

$$a_{\theta}[u] = \int_B a^{(0)} \nabla(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u) : \overline{\nabla(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u)} \geq \gamma_0^{-1} \int_B |\nabla(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u)|^2$$

whence, assuming for simplicity B connected,

$$V_{\theta} = \left\{ v \in H_{per}^1(\square; \mathbb{C}^m) \mid v(y) = e^{-i\theta \cdot y} c, \quad y \in B, \text{ for some constant } c \in \mathbb{C}^m \right\},$$

and W_{θ} is the orthogonal complement of V_{θ} in $H = H_{per}^1(\square; \mathbb{C}^m)$ with respect to the inner product $a_{\theta} + b_{\theta}$. Let us now show that (H1) holds uniformly on \square^* , i.e. condition (3.6) is satisfied.

Proposition 7.15. *There exists a constant $\nu > 0$ independent of $\theta \in \Theta = \square^*$ such that*

$$\nu(a_{\theta}[w] + b_{\theta}[w]) \leq a_{\theta}[w], \quad \forall w \in W_{\theta}, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

Proof. Let $E : H^1(B) \rightarrow H_0^1(\square)$ be a Sobolev extension, cf. Proposition 7.5, and for any fixed $u \in H_{per}^1(\square; \mathbb{C}^m)$ and $\theta \in \square^*$, consider $v = u - e^{-i\theta \cdot y} E(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u - |B|^{-1} \int_B e^{i\theta \cdot y} u(y) dy)$ with the extension E acting component-wise. Clearly $v \in V_{\theta}$ and we readily estimate

$$\|u - v\|_{\theta}^2 = a_{\theta}[u - v] + b_{\theta}[u - v] \leq \gamma_0 \left\| E \left(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u - |B|^{-1} \int_B e^{i\theta \cdot y} u(y) dy \right) \right\|_{H^1(\square)}^2 \leq$$

⁹This could be routinely extended to the case of linear elasticity for example, by appropriate modifications in the ellipticity conditions (7.76) and in the related extension operator, cf. Example 7.6 below.

$$\gamma_0 C_E^2 \left\| e^{i\theta \cdot y} u - |B|^{-1} \int_B e^{i\theta \cdot y} u(y) dy \right\|_{H^1(B)}^2 \leq \gamma_0 C_E^2 C_B^2 \left\| \nabla (e^{i\theta \cdot y} u) \right\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \leq \gamma_0^2 C_E^2 C_B^2 a_\theta[u],$$

where C_E and C_B , respectively, are the H^1 -operator norm of E and the Poincaré-Wirtinger (Poincaré inequality with mean) constant for domain B . Hence, for $u = w \in W_\theta$, $\|w\|_\theta^2 \leq \|w - v\|_\theta^2 \leq \gamma_0^2 C_E^2 C_B^2 a_\theta[w]$, and the desired inequality holds with $\nu = (\gamma_0 C_E C_B)^{-2}$. \square

Consequently, for these class of problems, the main approximation result is given by Theorem 3.1. Employing like in the previous examples the scaling and Gelfand transforms, it implies in the present context the following.

Theorem 7.16. *For fixed $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ let $u_\varepsilon \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^m)$ solve the elliptic PDE system*

$$(7.77) \quad -\operatorname{div} \left(a_\varepsilon \left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) \nabla u_\varepsilon(x) \right) + u_\varepsilon(x) = F(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $a_\varepsilon(y) = \chi_B(y) a^{(0)}(y) + \varepsilon^2 (1 - \chi_B(y)) a^{(1)}(y)$, χ_B the characteristic function of B , $F \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Consider $v_\varepsilon(\theta, \cdot) \in V_\theta$ the (unique) solution to

$$\int_{\square \setminus B} a^{(1)}(y) (\nabla v_\varepsilon(\theta, y) + i\theta \otimes v_\varepsilon(\theta, y)) : \overline{(\nabla \phi(y) + i\theta \otimes \phi(y))} dy + \int_{\square} v_\varepsilon(\theta, y) \cdot \overline{\phi(y)} dy = \int_{\square} U \Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, y) \cdot \overline{\phi(y)} dy,$$

for all $\phi \in V_\theta$, a.e. $\theta \in \square^*$. Then, for the approximation $u_\varepsilon^{(0)} := \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} U^{-1} v_\varepsilon$, inequality (3.8) implies the following:

$$(7.78) \quad \varepsilon^2 \gamma_0^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla u_\varepsilon^{(0)}|^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_\varepsilon - u_\varepsilon^{(0)}|^2 \leq \nu^{-2} \varepsilon^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |F|^2.$$

Notice that $\nabla u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$ vanishes in the inclusions $B_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \varepsilon(B + l)$ i.e. has support in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_\varepsilon}$, and in particular one has $\int_{B_\varepsilon} |\nabla u_\varepsilon|^2 \leq \gamma_0 \nu^{-2} \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |F|^2$.

To the authors' knowledge, the above result is not found in previous literature. In dimension $n = 1$, the inverted high-porosity model is equivalent to the one-dimensional double-porosity model. The quantitative homogenisation of the scalar ($m = 1$) one-dimensional double-porosity model was studied, by different means, in the works [14, 16].

Remark 7.17. *We remark that, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, the above approximation $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}$ appears to be the solution of a “stiff” problem associated with (7.77), cf. e.g. [34] §4.2. Namely, if one makes in (7.77) change of variable $y = x/\varepsilon$ and introduces contrast $\delta := \varepsilon^2$ then it becomes $-\operatorname{div}_y (a^{(\delta)}(y) \nabla_y u_\varepsilon(\varepsilon y)) + u_\varepsilon(\varepsilon y) = F(\varepsilon y)$, where $a^{(\delta)}(y) = \delta^{-1} \chi_B(y) a^{(0)}(y) + (1 - \chi_B(y)) a^{(1)}(y)$. Now if, for a fixed ε , one takes a “stiff inclusion” limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$, then one can see that $u_\varepsilon^{(0)}(\varepsilon y)$ is the limit of the solution $u_\varepsilon(\varepsilon y)$. Therefore (7.78) can be viewed as providing new operator-type estimates for the solution of the problem for large contrast δ in terms of its stiff limit with an infinite contrast as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Amongst other things, this also provides an approximation with error estimates for the Floquet-Bloch spectrum of the high-contrast problem (see Section 6.1) in terms of that for the limit stiff problem.*

7.4 A problem with concentrated perturbations

In this section we demonstrate that the parameter θ does not necessarily have to come from the Gelfand transform only. Let $F \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, $0 \leq \delta \leq 1/2$, and $B_r(x)$ denote the ball of radius r centred at x , with $B_r(0)$ denoted by B_r . Consider the problem, in the weak form,

$$(7.79) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Find } U_{\varepsilon, \delta} \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ the solution to} \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla U_{\varepsilon, \delta} \cdot \nabla \overline{\phi} + \varepsilon^{-2} \delta^{-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \int_{B_{\delta \varepsilon}(\varepsilon j)} U_{\varepsilon, \delta} \overline{\phi} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} U_{\varepsilon, \delta} \overline{\phi} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F \overline{\phi}, \quad \forall \phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3), \end{array} \right.$$

where we make a convention that if $\delta = 0$ the singular term (i.e. the second term on the left hand side of (7.79)) is absent. Related problems with different scalings for “concentrated perturbations” were considered, for example, in [29, 40].

Our aim is to construct, for small ε , approximations to the solution $U_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ which would be uniform in δ . The idea here is to reduce problem (7.79) to the general form (2.4) by regarding δ as another component in the abstract parameter θ . Namely, let $\theta = (k, \delta) \in \Theta = \square^* \times [0, 1/2] \subset \mathbb{R}^4$, where $k \in \square^* = [-\pi, \pi]^3$ is the usual Floquet-Bloch quasiperiodicity parameter. Then, as in the preceding examples, after rescaling and application of Gelfand transform, we arrive at the equivalent problem:

$$(7.80) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } u_{\varepsilon,\theta} \in H_{per}^1(\square), \square = [-1/2, 1/2]^3, \text{ the solution to} \\ \varepsilon^{-2} \int_{\square} (\nabla + ik)u_{\varepsilon,\theta} \cdot \overline{(\nabla + ik)\phi} + \varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-1} \int_{B_\delta} u_{\varepsilon,\theta} \bar{\phi} + \int_{\square} u_{\varepsilon,\theta} \bar{\phi} = \int_{\square} g_{\varepsilon,k} \bar{\phi}, \quad \forall \phi \in H_{per}^1(\square), \end{cases}$$

where $g_{\varepsilon,k} = UT_\varepsilon F(k, \cdot)$. Thus (7.80) is of the form (2.4) with $H = H_{per}^1(\square)$, $n = 4$, $\langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle = \int_{\square} g_{\varepsilon,k} \bar{\tilde{u}}$,

$$(7.81) \quad a_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) = \int_{\square} (\nabla + ik)u \cdot \overline{(\nabla + ik)\tilde{u}} + \delta^{-1} \int_{B_\delta} u \bar{\tilde{u}}, \quad \text{and} \quad b_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) = \int_{\square} u \bar{\tilde{u}}.$$

To check (2.1) we notice that, by Hölder inequality and standard Sobolev embeddings, there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$(7.82) \quad \delta^{-1} \int_{B_\delta} |\phi|^2 \leq \delta^{-1} \left(\int_{\square} |\phi|^6 \right)^{1/3} |B_\delta|^{2/3} = \left(\frac{4}{3}\pi \right)^{2/3} \delta \|\phi\|_{L^6(\square)}^2 \leq c_0 \delta \|\phi\|_{H^1(\square)}^2, \quad \forall \delta > 0, \forall \phi \in H_{per}^1(\square).$$

This, together with the arguments as in Section 7.1, cf (7.9), implies that (2.1) holds. Further, as $\delta \leq |\theta|$ inequality (7.82) also implies that a_θ is Lipschitz in θ at the origin, i.e. (2.3) is satisfied for $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_2 \in \Theta$. Notice however that (2.3) does not hold globally on Θ (it can be shown by estimates similar to (7.82) that a_θ is merely $\frac{2}{3}$ -Hölder continuous in δ and hence in θ), and that (H4) fails to hold for similar reasons. Still, we can proceed here with our general method in its relevant parts.

First notice that as follows from (7.81) the spaces V_θ and W_θ are as in the classical setting (Example 7.1, see (7.11), with \mathbf{e} denotes the identical unity function):

$$V_\theta = \begin{cases} \{0\}, & \theta \neq 0, \\ \text{Span}(\mathbf{e}), & \theta = 0, \end{cases} \quad W_\theta = \begin{cases} H_{per}^1(\square), & \theta \neq 0, \\ H_{per,0}^1 := \{u \in H_{per}^1(\square) \mid \int_{\square} u = 0\}, & \theta = 0. \end{cases}$$

Observe next that the key condition (H1) holds: this can be seen by noting (H1') is obviously valid with $C = 1$ and $c[u] = \int_{\square} |u|^2$. Hypothesis (H2) is trivially satisfied (with $V_\theta^* = \{0\}$ and $L_* = 0$), and moreover we will prove at the end of the subsection that (H3) also holds.

In applying our abstract results based on hypotheses (H1)–(H3), certain care needs to be exercised as some of these results may be based on global version of (2.3) while in the present example the latter is only assured when $\theta_1 = 0$. In any case, our aim here is also to show that our earlier theorems may already lead to meaningful approximations, and thanks to Remark 4.4 Theorem 4.2 is applicable and states that $u_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ is approximated when $|\theta| < \nu_0/(2L_a)$ by $\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0$, where $v_0 \in V_0$ is the solution to (4.7). On the other hand, due to (H3), for each $r > 0$ (3.6) is satisfied on $\Theta_r := \{\theta \in \Theta : |\theta| \geq r\}$ with $\nu = \gamma r^2$. Therefore, Theorem 3.1 applies when $\theta \in \Theta_r$ (see Remark 3.2), and states in this setting that the solution $u_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ to (7.80) satisfies (3.7) and (3.8) with $v_\theta = 0$ and $\nu = \gamma r^2$.

Specialising (4.3) and (4.4) to the present example, $v_0 = z_{\varepsilon,\theta} \mathbf{e}$ for some $z_{\varepsilon,\theta} \in \mathbb{C}$, $\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0 = v_0 + \mathcal{N}_\theta v_0 = z_{\varepsilon,\theta}(\mathbf{e} + \mathcal{N}_\theta)$ where $\mathcal{N}_\theta := \mathcal{N}_\theta \mathbf{e} \in H_{per,0}^1$ is the unique solution to

$$(7.83) \quad a_\theta(\mathcal{N}_\theta, \tilde{w}_0) = -\delta^{-1} \int_{B_\delta} \overline{\tilde{w}_0}, \quad \forall \tilde{w}_0 \in H_{per,0}^1.$$

Equation (4.7) reduces then to an algebraic equation for $z_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ as follows. Setting $\tilde{v} = \tilde{z} \mathbf{e}$, $\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{C}$, and e.g. using (5.13), one obtains: $a_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v}) = (|k|^2 + 4\pi\delta^2/3 - a_\theta[\mathcal{N}_\theta]) z_{\varepsilon,\theta} \bar{\tilde{z}}$, $b_\theta(\mathcal{M}_\theta v_0, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v}) = (1 + \|\mathcal{N}_\theta\|_{L^2(\square)}^2) z_{\varepsilon,\theta} \bar{\tilde{z}}$, $\langle f, \mathcal{M}_\theta \tilde{v} \rangle = \left(\int_{\square} g_{\varepsilon,k}(y) \overline{(1 + \mathcal{N}_\theta(y))} dy \right) \bar{\tilde{z}}$. Then (4.7) results in

$$(7.84) \quad z_{\varepsilon,\theta} = \frac{\int_{\square} g_{\varepsilon,k}(y) \overline{(1 + \mathcal{N}_\theta(y))} dy}{\varepsilon^{-2} \left(|k|^2 + 4\pi\delta^2/3 - a_\theta[\mathcal{N}_\theta] \right) + 1 + \|\mathcal{N}_\theta\|_{L^2(\square)}^2},$$

where $\mathbf{N}_\theta \in H_{per,0}^1$ is the solution to the ‘‘cell problem’’ (7.83). (Notice that the bracketed term in the denominator coincides with $a_\theta[\mathcal{M}_\theta \mathbf{e}]$ which via (H3) is bounded from below by e.g. $\gamma|\theta|^2$.) The above approximates $u_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ when $\theta \in \Theta$, $|\theta| < \nu_0/(2L_a)$. Namely, for

$$A_{\varepsilon,\theta}(u, \tilde{u}) := \varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) + b_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) = \varepsilon^{-2} \left(\int_{\square} (\nabla + ik)u \cdot \overline{(\nabla + ik)\tilde{u}} + \delta^{-1} \int_{B_\delta} u \overline{\tilde{u}} \right) + \int_{\square} u \overline{\tilde{u}},$$

(4.8)–(4.9) imply:

(7.85)

$$A_{\varepsilon,\theta} \left[u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - z_{\varepsilon,\theta}(\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{N}_\theta) \right] \leq c_1 \varepsilon^2 \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)}^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - z_{\varepsilon,\theta}(\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{N}_\theta)\|_{L^2(\square)} \leq c_1 \varepsilon^2 \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)}, \quad \forall |\theta| < \frac{\nu_0}{2L_a},$$

with some constant $c_1 > 0$ independent of ε , θ and F . In principle this, together with (3.7)–(3.8) for $|\theta| \geq r_0 = \nu_0/(2L_a)$, provides us after the inverse Gelfand and scaling transforms with an approximation to the solution $U_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ of (7.79) for small ε , uniform with respect to both F and δ . This is quite inexplicit though as requires in particular solving the cell problem (7.83) for a range of k and δ . However, we can construct a more explicit further approximation of (7.84) as follows.

First notice that \mathbf{N}_θ is small for small δ . Indeed, by (7.83) with $\tilde{u}_0 = \mathbf{N}_\theta$, $a_\theta[\mathbf{N}_\theta] \leq |\delta^{-1} \int_{B_\delta} \mathbf{N}_\theta|$. On the other hand, arguing similarly to (7.82) and employing the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality we observe that

$$(7.86) \quad \left| \delta^{-1} \int_{B_\delta} \phi_0 \right| \leq c_2 \delta^{3/2} \|\nabla \phi_0\|_{L^2(\square)}, \quad \forall \phi_0 \in H^1(\square), \quad \int_{\square} \phi_0 = 0,$$

for some $c_2 > 0$. Thus, by sequentially using (7.86), (7.81) and (4.2) one has $a_\theta[\mathbf{N}_\theta] \leq 2c_2^2 \nu_0^{-1} \delta^3$, and recalling (4.1) also $\|\mathbf{N}_\theta\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 \leq 4c_2^2 K^2 \nu_0^{-2} \delta^3$.

So estimating, in terms of both $|\theta| = (\delta^2 + |k|^2)^{1/2}$ and ε , the error of neglecting in (7.84) all the terms containing \mathbf{N}_θ , and recalling (H3) for bounding from below the denominator of (7.84), we obtain

(7.87)

$$\left| z_{\varepsilon,\theta} - c_{\varepsilon,\theta} \right| \leq c_3 \frac{\varepsilon^{-2} |\theta|^3}{(\varepsilon^{-2} |\theta|^2 + 1)^2} \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)}, \quad \text{where} \quad c_{\varepsilon,\theta} = \frac{\int_{\square} g_{\varepsilon,k}(y) dy}{\varepsilon^{-2} (|k|^2 + 4\pi\delta^2/3) + 1}, \quad g_{\varepsilon,k} = U \Gamma_\varepsilon F(k, \cdot),$$

and c_3 is some positive constant independent of ε , δ , k and F . Now replace in (7.85) the approximation $z_{\varepsilon,\theta}(\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{N}_\theta)$ by $c_{\varepsilon,\theta} \mathbf{e}$. As a result, for the first estimate,

$$(7.88) \quad A_{\varepsilon,\theta} [u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - c_{\varepsilon,\theta} \mathbf{e}] \leq 3 A_{\varepsilon,\theta} [u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - z_{\varepsilon,\theta}(\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{N}_\theta)] + 3 A_{\varepsilon,\theta} [(z_{\varepsilon,\theta} - c_{\varepsilon,\theta}) \mathbf{e}] + 3 A_{\varepsilon,\theta} [z_{\varepsilon,\theta} \mathbf{N}_\theta].$$

With the first term on the right hand side bounded by (7.85), for the second term via (7.87)

$$A_{\varepsilon,\theta} [(z_{\varepsilon,\theta} - c_{\varepsilon,\theta}) \mathbf{e}] = |z_{\varepsilon,\theta} - c_{\varepsilon,\theta}|^2 \left[\varepsilon^{-2} \left(|k|^2 + \frac{4}{3} \pi \delta^2 \right) + 1 \right] \leq \frac{4}{3} \pi c_3^2 \frac{\varepsilon^{-4} |\theta|^6}{(\varepsilon^{-2} |\theta|^2 + 1)^3} \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 \leq c_4 \varepsilon^2 \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)}^2,$$

with constant $c_4 = 4\pi c_3^2/3$. (In the last inequality we used that for $0 \leq t := |\theta|/\varepsilon < +\infty$, $t^6/(1+t^2)^3 < 1$.) Finally, for the last term in (7.88), via (7.84) together with the above estimates for $a_\theta[\mathbf{N}_\theta]$ and $\|\mathbf{N}_\theta\|_{L^2(\square)}$,

$$A_{\varepsilon,\theta} [z_{\varepsilon,\theta} \mathbf{N}_\theta] = |z_{\varepsilon,\theta}|^2 \left(\varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta[\mathbf{N}_\theta] + \|\mathbf{N}_\theta\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 \right) \leq c_5 \frac{\|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)}^2}{(\varepsilon^{-2} |\theta|^2 + 1)^2} (\varepsilon^{-2} \delta^3 + \delta^3) \leq c_6 \varepsilon \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)}^2,$$

with positive constants c_5 and c_6 independent of ε , θ and F (having used in the last inequality the boundedness of $t^3/(1+t^2)^2$, $0 \leq t < +\infty$). Combining the above we bound (7.88), for $|\theta| < r_0 := \nu_0/(2L_a)$, by a constant times $\varepsilon \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)}^2$. On the other hand, for $\theta \geq r_0$, it immediately follows from (7.87) that $|c_{\varepsilon,\theta}| \leq r_0^{-2} \varepsilon^2 \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)}$ and as a result $A_{\varepsilon,\theta} [c_{\varepsilon,\theta} \mathbf{e}] = |c_{\varepsilon,\theta}|^2 (\varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta[\mathbf{e}] + 1)$ is bounded by a constant times $\varepsilon^2 \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)}^2$. Also, for $|\theta| \geq r_0$, by (3.7) and (H3) $A_{\varepsilon,\theta} [u_{\varepsilon,\theta}] \leq \gamma^{-1} r_0^{-2} \varepsilon^2 \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)}^2$. As a result, the left hand side of (7.88) is bounded by a constant times $\varepsilon^2 \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)}^2$ for $|\theta| \geq r_0$.

Repeating the above arguments for the second estimate in (7.85) with the approximation $z_{\varepsilon,\theta}(\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{N}_\theta)$ again replaced by $c_{\varepsilon,\theta} \mathbf{e}$, we observe that the corresponding estimate is dominated by the term analogous to the second term on the right hand side of (7.88). Namely, recalling (7.87),

$$\| (z_{\varepsilon,\theta} - c_{\varepsilon,\theta}) \mathbf{e} \|_{L^2(\square)} = |z_{\varepsilon,\theta} - c_{\varepsilon,\theta}| \leq c_3 \frac{\varepsilon^{-2} |\theta|^3}{(\varepsilon^{-2} |\theta|^2 + 1)^2} \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)} \leq c_7 \varepsilon \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)},$$

with $c_7 > 0$ independent of ε , θ and F .

Combining all the above estimates we deduce that

$$\varepsilon^{-2} \left(\int_{\square} |(\nabla + ik)(u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - c_{\varepsilon,\theta}\mathbf{e})|^2 + \delta^{-1} \int_{B_\delta} |u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - c_{\varepsilon,\theta}\mathbf{e}|^2 \right) + \|u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - c_{\varepsilon,\theta}\mathbf{e}\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 \leq c_8 \varepsilon \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)}^2,$$

(7.89)

$$\text{and} \quad \|u_{\varepsilon,\theta} - c_{\varepsilon,\theta}\mathbf{e}\|_{L^2(\square)} \leq c_8 \varepsilon \|g_{\varepsilon,k}\|_{L^2(\square)}, \quad g_{\varepsilon,k} = U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(k, \cdot), \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta,$$

for some constant $c_8 > 0$ independent of ε , $\theta = (k, \delta)$ and F . Comparing the above estimates with (7.85), we observe that replacing the approximation $z_{\varepsilon,\theta}(\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{N}_\theta)$ by the simplified one, $c_{\varepsilon,\theta}\mathbf{e}$, results in a ‘‘one power of ε ’’ loss in the accuracy.

Then, arguing as in Example 7.1 (cf (7.87) with (7.21) leading to (7.28)), we deduce that the approximation $U_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(0)} = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}U^{-1}c_{\varepsilon,\theta}\mathbf{e}$ to the exact solution $U_{\varepsilon,\delta} = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}U^{-1}u_{\varepsilon,\theta}$ of the original problem (7.79), is itself the solution to

$$(7.90) \quad \left(-\Delta + \frac{4}{3}\pi \frac{\delta^2}{\varepsilon^2} + 1 \right) U_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(0)} = \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon F, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3,$$

with \mathcal{S}_ε given by (7.29) where χ stands for the characteristic function of \square^* . Further, estimates (7.89) imply similar estimates for $U_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(0)}$, cf. (7.26)–(7.27):

$$(7.91) \quad \|U_{\varepsilon,\delta} - U_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(0)}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq c_8 \varepsilon^{1/2} \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|U_{\varepsilon,\delta} - U_{\varepsilon,\delta}^{(0)}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq c_8 \varepsilon \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

Finally, as (7.29) implies (cf. (7.32) leading to (7.32)) that $\|\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon F - F\|_{H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \varepsilon \pi^{-1} \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}$, it follows that the estimates analogous to (7.91) remain valid if \mathcal{S}_ε is removed in (7.90). We collect all of the above observations to state the following theorem.

Theorem 7.18. *Let $U_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ solve (7.79) and, for each $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$, let $U_\alpha \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ solve*

$$\left(-\Delta + \frac{4}{3}\pi \alpha^2 + 1 \right) U_\alpha = F \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Then there exists a positive constant c independent of ε , δ and F such that

$$(7.92) \quad \|U_{\varepsilon,\delta} - U_{\delta/\varepsilon}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq c \varepsilon^{1/2} \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|U_{\varepsilon,\delta} - U_{\delta/\varepsilon}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq c \varepsilon \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

for all $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq 1/2$.

Remark 7.19. *Notice that estimates (7.92), uniform in both ε and δ , hold in particular for the ‘critical scaling’ $\delta = O(\varepsilon)$. For example, for $\delta = \varepsilon$ Theorem 7.18 states that u_ε , the solution to the concentrated perturbation problem*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \overline{\nabla \phi} + \varepsilon^{-3} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \int_{B_{\varepsilon/2}(\varepsilon j)} u_\varepsilon \overline{\phi} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_\varepsilon \overline{\phi} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F \overline{\phi}, \quad \forall \phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3),$$

i.e. with ε -periodic inclusions of size ε^2 and of ‘density’ ε^{-3} , is approximated with operator-type error estimates by u_0 the solution to the averaged problem

$$(-\Delta + \mu + 1)u_0 = F, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3,$$

where $\mu = 4\pi/3$. Indeed, (7.92) gives

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u_0\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq c \varepsilon^{1/2} \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \quad \|u_\varepsilon - u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq c \varepsilon \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}.$$

We conclude this example with the proof of (H3).

Proof. For proving (H3) it is sufficient to show that

$$\|(\nabla + ik)u\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 + \delta^{-1} \int_{B_\delta} |u|^2 \geq \tilde{\gamma} (|k|^2 + \delta^2) \|u\|_{L^2(\square)}^2, \quad \forall u \in H_{per}^1(\square), \quad \forall (k, \delta) \in \Theta,$$

for some $\tilde{\gamma} > 0$. Clearly, cf. e.g. (7.10) and from the triangle inequality,

$$\|(\nabla + ik)u\|_{L^2(\square)} \geq |k| \|u\|_{L^2(\square)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|(\nabla + ik)u\|_{L^2(\square)} + |k| \|u\|_{L^2(\square)} \geq \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\square)}, \quad \forall u \in H_{per}^1(\square), \quad \forall k \in \square^*.$$

Combining these implies $3 \|(\nabla + ik)u\|_{L^2(\square)} \geq |k| \|u\|_{L^2(\square)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\square)}$, and so it suffices to show that

$$(7.93) \quad \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 + \delta^{-1} \int_{B_\delta} |u|^2 \geq c \delta^2 \|u\|_{L^2(\square)}^2, \quad \forall u \in H_{per}^1(\square), \quad \forall \delta \in (0, 1/2],$$

with some $c > 0$.

To prove (7.93), for $u = c + u_0$ with $c = \int_{\square} u$ and so $\int_{\square} u_0 = 0$, using (7.86) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{-1} \int_{B_\delta} |u|^2 &\geq \frac{4}{3} \pi \delta^2 |c|^2 + 2 \delta^{-1} \operatorname{Re} \int_{B_\delta} u_0 \bar{c} \geq \frac{4}{3} \pi \delta^2 |c|^2 - 2 c_2 \delta^{3/2} |c| \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\square)} \geq \\ &\frac{2}{3} \pi \delta^2 |c|^2 - \frac{3 c_2^2}{2\pi} \delta \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 = \frac{2}{3} \pi \delta^2 \left(|c|^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 \right) - \left(\frac{2}{3} \pi \delta^2 + \frac{3 c_2^2}{2\pi} \delta \right) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\square)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies (as $\delta \leq 1/2$) that

$$\left(\frac{\pi}{6} + \frac{3 c_2^2}{4\pi} \right) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 + \delta^{-1} \int_{B_\delta} |u|^2 \geq \frac{2}{3} \pi \delta^2 \left(\left| \int_{\square} u \right|^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\square)}^2 \right), \quad \forall u \in H^1(\square).$$

Then, after application of the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality, one arrives at (7.93). \square

7.5 Periodic inclusions with imperfect interfaces

Here we consider a problem where the space V_θ has a removable singularity at the origin but V_θ is not piece-wise constant, i.e. (H2) holds but the conditions of Remark 4.5 do not¹⁰. Such a situation arises, for example, in composites whose inclusions are not in perfect contact with the surrounding ‘matrix’.

Let the reference inclusion $B \subset \square$ be as in Example 7.2, $B_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \varepsilon(B + z)$ be the set of associated ε -periodic inclusions and its complement $M_\varepsilon := \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_\varepsilon}$ be the connected matrix, and let n_ε be the outer unit normal to the interface $I_\varepsilon = \partial B_\varepsilon$. For $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, consider the problem: Given $F \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, find in the matrix and in the inclusions u_1^ε and u_2^ε respectively, such that

$$(7.94) \quad -\Delta u_1^\varepsilon + u_1^\varepsilon = F \text{ in } M_\varepsilon, \quad -\Delta u_2^\varepsilon + u_2^\varepsilon = F \text{ in } B_\varepsilon, \quad \partial_{n_\varepsilon} u_1^\varepsilon = \partial_{n_\varepsilon} u_2^\varepsilon = \varepsilon (u_2^\varepsilon - u_1^\varepsilon) \text{ on } I_\varepsilon,$$

where ∂_{n_ε} denotes the normal derivative. This problem admits equivalent variational formulation: Find $u_\varepsilon \in W_\varepsilon := L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H^1(M_\varepsilon) \cap H^1(B_\varepsilon)$ such that

$$(7.95) \quad \int_{M_\varepsilon} \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \overline{\nabla \phi} + \int_{B_\varepsilon} \nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \overline{\nabla \phi} + \varepsilon \int_{I_\varepsilon} [u_\varepsilon]_\varepsilon \overline{[\phi]_\varepsilon} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u_\varepsilon \overline{\phi} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F \overline{\phi}, \quad \forall \phi \in W_\varepsilon,$$

where $[u]_\varepsilon$ denotes the jump in u across I_ε , i.e. $[u]_\varepsilon := T_\varepsilon^+ u - T_\varepsilon^- u$ where $T_\varepsilon^+ : H^1(M_\varepsilon) \rightarrow L^2(I_\varepsilon)$ and $T_\varepsilon^- : H^1(B_\varepsilon) \rightarrow L^2(I_\varepsilon)$ are the trace operators.

We take our usual approach and restate problem (7.95) in the form (2.4) via the transforms Γ_ε and U (see Example 7.1). Then $u_{\varepsilon, \theta} := U \Gamma_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(\theta, \cdot)$ is the solution to

$$\varepsilon^{-2} a_\theta(u_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \tilde{u}) + b_\theta(u_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \tilde{u}) = \langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle, \quad \forall \tilde{u} \in H, \text{ a.e. } \theta \in \Theta,$$

where $u_{\varepsilon, \theta} \in H = L^2(\square) \cap H_{per}^1(\square \setminus B) \cap H^1(B)$, $\Theta := \square^*$, $\langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle := (U \Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, \cdot), \tilde{u})$ for (\cdot, \cdot) the standard $L^2(\square)$ inner product,

$$(7.96) \quad a_\theta[u] = \int_{\square \setminus B} |(\nabla + i\theta)u|^2 + \int_B |(\nabla + i\theta)u|^2, \quad \text{and} \quad b_\theta[u] = b[u] := \int_{\partial B} |[u]|^2 + \int_\square |u|^2,$$

¹⁰Another such example, in the context of linear elasticity, is Example 7.6 below.

where $[u]$ denotes the jump in u across the interface ∂B .

Let us now show that all our general assumptions hold. It is clear, cf. (7.9), that the basic assumptions (2.1) and (2.3) hold. Next note that, denoting χ_B the characteristic function of the inclusion B ,

$$(7.97) \quad V_\theta = \begin{cases} \text{Span} (e^{-i\theta \cdot y} \chi_B) & \theta \neq 0, \\ \text{Span} (\mathbf{e}, \chi_B) & \theta = 0, \end{cases} \quad W_\theta = \begin{cases} \left\{ w \in H \mid \int_{\partial B} [w] e^{i\theta \cdot y} = \int_B w e^{i\theta \cdot y} \right\} & \theta \neq 0, \\ \left\{ w \in H \mid \int_{\partial B} [w] = \int_B w \text{ and } \int_\square w = 0 \right\} & \theta = 0. \end{cases}$$

Therefore V_θ has a discontinuity at $\theta = 0$ and varies with θ in $\square^* \setminus \{0\}$. Now check that for this example (H1)–(H6) all hold.

• *Proof of (H1).* Standard arguments show that there exists a constant $C_B > 0$ such that

$$(7.98) \quad b[\phi] \leq C_B \left(a_0[\phi] + \left| \int_{\square \setminus B} \phi \right|^2 + \left| \int_B \phi - \int_{\partial B} [\phi] \right|^2 \right), \quad \forall \phi \in L^2(\square) \cap H^1(\square \setminus B) \cap H^1(B).$$

Indeed, if ϕ_n with $b[\phi_n] = 1$ are such that (7.98) is violated with C_B replaced by n , then $a_0[\phi_n] \rightarrow 0$ and so $\{\phi_n\}$ are bounded in $H^1(\square \setminus B)$ and $H^1(B)$. So, up to a subsequence, $\{\phi_n\}$ converges H^1 -weakly and L^2 -strongly to some ϕ_0 . Then $b[\phi_0] = 1$ by the L^2 -compactness of the trace operators, and by the weak lower-semicontinuity $a_0[\phi_0] = 0$ so $\phi_0 \in V_0$ i.e. $\phi_0 = c_1 + c_2 \chi_B$. On the other hand, by the compactness, for $\phi = \phi_0$ both other terms on the right hand side of (7.98) are zero, which implies $c_1 = c_2 = 0$ i.e. $b[\phi_0] = 0$ which is a contradiction.

We then show that (H1') holds for $c(u, \tilde{u}) = C_B |\square \setminus B| \int_{\square \setminus B} u \bar{\tilde{u}}$ and $C = C_B + 1$. Indeed for fixed $\theta \in \Theta$ and $w \in W_\theta$, see (7.97), $\int_B w e^{i\theta \cdot y} - \int_{\partial B} [w e^{i\theta \cdot y}] = 0$ and so (7.98) for $\phi = e^{i\theta \cdot y} w$ gives

$$(7.99) \quad b[w] = b[e^{i\theta \cdot y} w] \leq C_B \left(a_0[e^{i\theta \cdot y} w] + \left| \int_{\square \setminus B} e^{i\theta \cdot y} w \right|^2 \right) \leq C_B \left(a_\theta[w] + |\square \setminus B| \int_{\square \setminus B} |w|^2 \right).$$

Hence (H1') holds (as $c[\cdot]$ is clearly $\|\cdot\|_\theta$ -compact), and so (H1) holds too by Proposition 5.10.

• *Proof of (H2).* We set $V_\star = \text{Span}(\chi_B)$, and so $V_\theta^\star := \text{Span}(e^{-i\theta \cdot y} \chi_0)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta = \square^*$. Then, for given $V_{\theta_1}^\star \ni v_1 = c_1 e^{-i\theta_1 \cdot y} \chi_B$, $c_1 \in \mathbb{C}$, set $v_2 = c_1 e^{-i\theta_2 \cdot y} \chi_B \in V_{\theta_2}^\star$ and so $|v_1(y) - v_2(y)| \leq (n^{1/2}/2) |\theta_1 - \theta_2| |v_1(y)|$, $y \in \square$. Therefore, since for $i = 1, 2$, $a_{\theta_i}[v_i] = 0$ and $[v_i] = -v_i$,

$$\|v_1 - v_2\|_{\theta_2}^2 = |\theta_1 - \theta_2|^2 \int_\square |v_1|^2 + \int_{\partial B} |v_1 - v_2|^2 + \int_\square |v_1 - v_2|^2 \leq \left(\frac{n}{4} + 1\right) |\theta_1 - \theta_2|^2 \|v_1\|_{\theta_1}^2,$$

and so (H2) holds with $L_\star = (n/4 + 1)^{1/2}$. Furthermore, one can naturally choose $Z = \text{Span}(\mathbf{e})$ so that (4.16) and (4.17) hold with $K_Z = |B|/(|B| + |\partial B|)^{1/2} < 1$.

• Assumption (H3) follows by applying (7.99) and then (7.41), with e.g. $\gamma = (1 + C_B)^{-1} (n\pi^2 + |\square \setminus B| C_E^2)^{-1}$.
 • Assumption (H4) is obviously satisfied, see (7.96), with $K_{a'} = 1, K_{a''} = 0$, and

$$(7.100) \quad a'_0(v, u) \cdot \theta := \int_{\square \setminus B} i\theta v \cdot \overline{\nabla u} + \int_B i\theta v \cdot \overline{\nabla u}, \quad \text{and} \quad a''_0(v, \tilde{v}) \theta \cdot \theta := |\theta|^2 \int_\square v \bar{\tilde{v}}.$$

• Assumption (H5) trivially holds for $L_b = 0$ since b_θ is independent of θ . Furthermore, it is clear that (5.23) and (5.24) with $K_b = n^{1/2}/2$ hold for \mathcal{E}_θ defined as multiplication by $e^{-i\theta \cdot y}$.

• Finally, (H6) also trivially holds with $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\square)$, d_θ the standard L^2 -inner product, \mathcal{E}_θ multiplication by $e^{-i\theta \cdot y}$ on $L^2(\square)$ and $K_e = n^{1/2}/2$. Notice that the above choice of $Z = \text{Span}(\mathbf{e})$ satisfies (6.28).

As all the main assumptions (H1)–(H6) hold, our general results are applicable to the present example, in particular Theorems 5.9 and Theorem 6.5. We will illustrate below the spectral results related to the latter, leaving it to the reader specialising any of our other general results to the present setting.

Notice first that for the solution u_ε to (7.94), equivalently (7.95), $u_\varepsilon = (\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon + I)^{-1} F$, where \mathcal{L}_ε is the self-adjoint operator in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with standard inner product, which is generated by the form

$$Q_\varepsilon(u, \tilde{u}) = \int_{M_\varepsilon} \nabla u \cdot \overline{\nabla \tilde{u}} + \int_{B_\varepsilon} \nabla u \cdot \overline{\nabla \tilde{u}} + \varepsilon \int_{I_\varepsilon} [u_\varepsilon] \overline{[\tilde{u}_\varepsilon]},$$

with the form domain W_ε . We are interested in the spectrum $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ of \mathcal{L}_ε .

Upon applying the unitary rescaling Γ_ε and the Gelfand transform U , it follows that the spectrum $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ is equal to $\bigcup_{\theta \in \square^*} \mathbf{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ where $\mathbf{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ is the self-adjoint operator generated in $L^2(\square)$ by the form

$$q_{\varepsilon, \theta}(u, \tilde{u}) = \varepsilon^{-2} \left(\int_{\square \setminus B} (\nabla + i\theta)u \cdot \overline{(\nabla + i\theta)\tilde{u}} + \int_B (\nabla + i\theta)u \cdot \overline{(\nabla + i\theta)\tilde{u}} \right) + \int_{\partial B} [u] \overline{\tilde{u}}$$

with the form domain $H = L^2(\square) \cap H_{\text{per}}^1(\square \setminus B) \cap H^1(B)$. The spectrum of $\mathbf{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ consists of countably many nonnegative real eigenvalues $\{\lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ labelled in the increasing order accounting for their multiplicity. The functions $E_\varepsilon^{(k)}(\theta) := \lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(k)}$, $\theta \in \square$, are the spectral band functions of \mathcal{L}_ε .

In short, Theorem 6.5 provides the asymptotics of the spectral bands $E_\varepsilon^{(k)}$ in terms of the eigenvalues of $\mathbb{L}_{\theta/\varepsilon}$ which, in turn, describes the approximation of $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ in terms of $\overline{\bigcup_{\xi \in \varepsilon^{-1}\square^*} \text{Sp } (\mathbb{L}_\xi - I)}$ or, via Corollary 6.7, by $\overline{\bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } (\mathbb{L}_\xi - I)}$. Finally, we have the characterisation of $\overline{\bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp } \mathbb{L}_\xi}$ given in Theorem 6.8 thus completing our asymptotic analysis with error estimates for $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon$ and its spectral band functions.

Now, we follow the above steps with more detail. First we need to specify the limit operator \mathbb{L}_ξ given by the form (6.12). To determine the homogenised form a^h , defined by (5.14), we first need the corrector $N_\theta = \theta \cdot N$, as specified by (5.10), on Z . For this, one can see from (5.10) and (7.100), cf. (7.48), that (up to an element of V_0) $\mathbf{e} \mapsto (N\mathbf{e})(y) = i(1 - \chi_B) \text{N}^{\text{pd}}(y) - iy\chi_B$ where N^{pd} solves (7.49). As a result a^h , which is on Z fully determined by $a_\theta^h[\mathbf{e}]$, is found, cf (7.47), to be in the form $a_\theta^h[\mathbf{e}] = A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}} \theta \cdot \theta$ where $A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}}$ is the perforated domain homogenised matrix given by (7.51) in Example 7.2.

Further, in this setting we have $V_\star + Z = \overline{V_\star + Z} = \mathcal{H}_0 = \{c_1 + c_2 \chi_B \mid c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{C}\}$. Putting all this together, form (6.12) specialises to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{S}_\xi(c_1 + c_2 \chi_B, \tilde{c}_1 + \tilde{c}_2 \chi_B) &= M_\xi \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \overline{\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{c}_1 \\ \tilde{c}_2 \end{pmatrix}}, \quad \text{where } M_\xi = \begin{pmatrix} A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}} \xi \cdot \xi + 1 & |B| \\ |B| & |\partial B| + |B| \end{pmatrix}, \\ d_0(c_1 + c_2 \chi_B, \tilde{c}_1 + \tilde{c}_2 \chi_B) &= D \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \overline{\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{c}_1 \\ \tilde{c}_2 \end{pmatrix}}, \quad \text{where } D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & |B| \\ |B| & |B| \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, see (6.27), the eigenvalues of \mathbb{L}_ξ are the solutions of the generalised (real-valued) eigenvalue problem

$$M_\xi c = \lambda D c \quad \text{for some non-trivial } c \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Hence λ are roots of the polynomial $\det(M_\xi - \lambda D) = \det(\text{diag}(A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}} \xi \cdot \xi, |\partial B|) - (\lambda - 1)D)$, however we shall determine λ by using the representation (6.34) with β_λ given by (6.36)–(6.37). We note that $V_\star = \overline{V_\star} = \text{Span}(\chi_B)$, $b_0[\chi_B] = |\partial B| + |B|$ and $d_0[\chi_B] = |B|$. Therefore, the operator \mathbf{B} (defined in (6.22), i.e. as the operator in $\overline{V_\star}$ with inner product d_0 generated by b_0 with form domain V_\star) is simply the multiplication by $1 + |\partial B|/|B|$. Hence $\text{Sp } \mathbf{B} = \{1 + \mu_0\}$, where $\mu_0 := |\partial B|/|B|$. Further, $\overline{Z} = Z = \text{Span}(\mathbf{e})$, $b_0[\mathbf{e}] = d_0[\mathbf{e}] = 1$, $\mathcal{P}_{V_\star}^0 \mathbf{e} = \chi_B$, $(\mathbf{B} - \lambda I)^{-1}$ is multiplication by $(1 + \mu_0 - \lambda)^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{Z}}^0 \chi_B = |B|\mathbf{e}$. Thus, via (6.37), $d_0(\beta(\lambda)\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{e}) = \lambda + (\lambda - 1)^2(1 + \mu_0 - \lambda)^{-1}|B|$ and so (see (6.36))

$$(7.101) \quad \beta_\lambda[\mathbf{e}] = \Phi(\lambda - 1), \quad \text{for } \Phi(\mu) := \frac{\mu}{\mu_0 - \mu} (\mu_0 - \mu(1 - |B|)).$$

Then, from (6.34), for each ξ the eigenvalues λ of \mathbb{L}_ξ are the two solutions of the dispersion relation

$$(7.102) \quad A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}} \xi \cdot \xi = \Phi(\lambda - 1),$$

i.e. $\lambda - 1$ are the roots of quadratic polynomial $p(\mu) = |\square \setminus B| \mu^2 - \mu(A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}} \xi \cdot \xi + \mu_0) + \mu_0 A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}} \xi \cdot \xi$. (Note that for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $p(\mu)$ has two distinct nonnegative roots, and $p(\lambda - 1) = |B|^{-1} \det(M_\xi - \lambda D)$.)

Theorem 6.5, wherein consistently with our notation in the present example $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta} = \mathbf{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta} + I$, now implies the following for the spectral bands of \mathcal{L}_ε :

Theorem 7.20. Let $\{\lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ and $1 \leq \Lambda_{\xi}^{(1)} < \Lambda_{\xi}^{(2)}$ the eigenvalues of \mathbb{L}_{ξ} , equivalently the roots of (7.102). Then, there exists a positive constant C independent of ε , θ and k such that

(7.103)

$$\left| 1/(\lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(k)} + 1) - 1/\Lambda_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{(k)} \right| \leq C\varepsilon, \quad k = 1, 2, \quad \text{and} \quad \left| 1/(\lambda_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{(k)} + 1) \right| \leq C\varepsilon, \quad \forall k \geq 3, \quad \forall \theta \in \square^*.$$

By direct inspection of (7.102) we can determine the behaviour of $\Lambda_{\xi}^{(k)}$ in ξ . Indeed, we see from (7.101) that F has zeros at $\mu = 0$ and $\mu = \mu_0/(1 - |B|) = \mu_0 + \mu_1$ where $\mu_1 = |\partial B|/|\square \setminus B| > 0$, and blows up (indicating at a ‘‘resonance’’) at $\mu = \mu_0$. Further, F is non-negative and strictly increases from 0 to $+\infty$ on $[0, \mu_0)$ and on $[\mu_0 + \mu_1, +\infty)$, and F is negative on $(-\infty, 0)$ and $(\mu_0, \mu_0 + \mu_1)$. Therefore, as $A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}}$ is positive definite, it follows from (7.102) that $\Lambda_{\xi}^{(k)}$ are strictly increasing in $|\xi|$ with $0 \leq \Lambda_{\xi}^{(1)} - 1 < \mu_0$ and $\mu_0 + \mu_1 \leq \Lambda_{\xi}^{(2)} - 1 < +\infty$.

Now, we can use F to approximate $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}$. Indeed, recalling $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon} = \overline{\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \text{Sp}(\mathbf{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta})}$, Theorem 6.8 for the present β_{λ} and \mathbf{B} gives

$$\bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \overline{\text{Sp}(\mathbb{L}_{\xi} - I)} = \{\mu \mid F(\mu) \geq 0\} \cup \{\mu_0\} = \overline{\{\mu \mid \Phi(\mu) \geq 0\}} = [0, \mu_0] \cup [\mu_0 + \mu_1, +\infty),$$

i.e. $(\mu_0, \mu_0 + \mu_1)$ is a gap in the limit collective spectrum $\overline{\bigcup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{Sp}(\mathbb{L}_{\xi} - I)}$. Combining this with Corollary (6.7) provides the following results on the structure of $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}$:

Theorem 7.21. For every interval $[a, b] \subset (-\infty, \infty)$ there exists $C_b \geq 0$, such that

$$d_{[a, b]}(\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}, [0, \mu_0] \cup [\mu_0 + \mu_1, +\infty)) \leq C_b \varepsilon, \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon < 1.$$

In particular, if $\varepsilon < \mu_1/(2C_b)$ then $[\mu_0 + C_b \varepsilon, \mu_0 + \mu_1 - C_b \varepsilon]$ is in a gap in the spectrum $\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}$.

We finish this example by observing that, routinely specialising to the present context the constructions of Section 6.5 leads to the associated bivariate operator of the form $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + I$, where \mathcal{L}_0 is the operator in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \dot{+} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \text{Span}(\chi_B))$, equipped with the standard $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square)$ inner product, generated by the form

$$(7.104) \quad \mathbb{Q}(u + v\chi_B, \tilde{u} + \tilde{v}\chi_B) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} A_{\text{pd}}^{\text{hom}} \nabla u(x) \cdot \overline{\nabla \tilde{u}(x)} dx + |\partial B| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v(x) \overline{\tilde{v}(x)} dx,$$

with the form domain $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \dot{+} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \text{Span}(\chi_B))$. Adjusting the derivation leading to Theorem 7.9 for the present example, we have the following result.

Theorem 7.22. For $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ one has

$$(7.105) \quad \left\| (\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon} + I)^{-1} - \mathcal{I}_{\varepsilon}^* (\mathcal{L}_0 + I)^{-1} \mathcal{P} \mathcal{I}_{\varepsilon} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C_{11} \varepsilon,$$

where the two-scale interpolation operator $\mathcal{I}_{\varepsilon}$ and its adjoint $\mathcal{I}_{\varepsilon}^*$ are given by (7.66) and (7.67) respectively, and $\mathcal{P} : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \dot{+} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \text{Span}(\chi_B))$ is the orthogonal projection.

Remark 7.23. Notice that, as follows from (7.104), for $f_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \square)$, $(\mathcal{L}_0 + I)^{-1} \mathcal{P} f_0 = u(x) + v(x)\chi_0(y)$ where $(u, v) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ solve the coupled system

$$\begin{cases} -\text{div } A_{\text{dp}}^{\text{hom}} \nabla u(x) + u(x) + |B|v(x) = \int_{\square} f_0(x, y) dy, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n; \\ |B|u(x) + (|\partial B| + |B|)v(x) = \int_B f_0(x, y) dy, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases}$$

We remark in passing that the above is nothing but the two-scale limit system for the original problem (7.94). Furthermore, Theorem 7.21 immediately implies the following estimate on the closeness of the spectra of the original and the limit problems:

$$d_{[a, b]}(\text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon}, \text{Sp } \mathcal{L}_0) \leq C_b \varepsilon.$$

7.6 An example with a ‘partial’ high-contrast

Here we consider an example of a high-contrast linear elasticity problem with so-called ‘partial degeneracy’. Consider the following resolvent problem:

$$(7.106) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } u_\varepsilon \in [H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3 \text{ such that} \\ -\operatorname{div} \sigma_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) + u_\varepsilon = F \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3, \end{cases}$$

where the matrix is assumed stiff but the ε -periodic inclusions are stiff in compression but soft in shear. Namely, for the stress-strain constitutive relation,

$$\sigma_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)(x) = \lambda\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) (\operatorname{div} u_\varepsilon)I + 2\mu_\varepsilon\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) e(u_\varepsilon), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad e(u) = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla u + \nabla u^T),$$

with \square -periodic Lamé coefficients of the form

$$\lambda(y) = \begin{cases} \lambda_1(y), & y \in \square \setminus B, \\ \lambda_2(y), & y \in B, \end{cases} \quad \mu_\varepsilon(y) = \begin{cases} \mu_1(y), & y \in \square \setminus B, \\ \varepsilon^2 \mu_2(y), & y \in B. \end{cases}$$

Here as before the reference inclusion set B is assumed to have Lipschitz boundary, $\overline{B} \subset (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})^n$ and $\square \setminus B$ is connected, and the coefficients $\lambda_i, \mu_i, i = 1, 2$, are uniformly positive and bounded. Now, we proceed as in the above examples, to find that $u_{\varepsilon, \theta} = U\Gamma_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(\theta, \cdot)$ solves (2.4) with the following identifications: $H = [H_{per}^1(\square)]^3$, $\Theta = [-\pi, \pi]^3$, $\langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle = \int_\square U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, y) \cdot \overline{\tilde{u}(y)} dy$, and

$$(7.107) \quad a_\theta[u] = \int_{\square \setminus B} \left(\lambda_1 |\operatorname{div} u + i\theta \cdot u|^2 + 2\mu_1 |e(u) + i\theta \odot u|^2 \right) + \int_B \lambda_2 |\operatorname{div} u + i\theta \cdot u|^2,$$

$$(7.108) \quad b_\theta[u] = \int_B 2\mu_2 |e(u) + i\theta \odot u|^2 + \int_\square |u|^2, \quad \theta \odot u := \frac{1}{2}(\theta \otimes u + u \otimes \theta).$$

Let us now check the main abstract assumptions. We begin by recalling the elasticity theory variant of extension Proposition 7.5, whose proof we shall provide for the reader’s convenience.

Proposition 7.24. *There exists an extension operator $E : [H^1(\square \setminus B)]^3 \rightarrow [H^1(\square)]^3$ with the following properties: $Eu|_{\square \setminus B} = u$, $\|Eu\|_{[H^1(\square)]^3} \leq C_E \|u\|_{[H^1(\square \setminus B)]^3}$, and*

$$(7.109) \quad \int_\square |e(Eu)|^2 \leq C_E^2 \int_{\square \setminus B} |e(u)|^2,$$

for some constant $C_E > 0$ independent of u .

Proof. For fixed $u \in [H^1(\square \setminus B)]^3$ let $Ru = c + d \times y$ be the $[H^1(\square \setminus B)]^3$ -projection of u onto the subspace $\mathcal{R} = \{ \tilde{c} + \tilde{d} \times y \mid \tilde{c}, \tilde{d} \in \mathbb{C}^3 \}$ of rigid body motions of $\square \setminus B$ (so in particular $\|Ru\|_{[H^1(\square \setminus B)]^3} \leq \|u\|_{[H^1(\square \setminus B)]^3}$). Recall Korn inequality in the following form:

$$(7.110) \quad \|u - Ru\|_{[H^1(\square \setminus B)]^3} \leq C_K \|e(u)\|_{[L^2(\square \setminus B)]^{3 \times 3}}$$

for some $C_K > 0$ independent of u . Let $P : [H^1(\square \setminus B)]^3 \rightarrow [H^1(B)]^3$ be the standard Sobolev extension (applied component-wise), i.e. $Pu = u$ in $\square \setminus B$ and there exists $C_P > 0$ such that

$$(7.111) \quad \|Pu\|_{[H^1(\square)]^3} \leq C_P \|u\|_{[H^1(\square \setminus B)]^3}, \quad \forall u \in [H^1(\square \setminus B)]^3.$$

We construct E as follows: $Eu := Ru + P(u - Ru)$, where $Ru = c + d \times y$ for all $y \in \square$. As \mathcal{R} is finite-dimensional and a direct sum of ‘translational’ ($d = 0$) and ‘rotational’ ($c = 0$) subspaces, one can see that $c_1 \|Ru\|_{[H^1(\square)]^3} \leq |c|^2 + |d|^2 \leq c_2 \|Ru\|_{[H^1(\square \setminus B)]^3}$ with positive constants c_1 and c_2 independent of u . It is then straightforward to check via (7.111) and (7.110) that all the stated properties of E hold. \square

Now, the above uniform positivity assumptions on the Lamé coefficients imply that

$$a_\theta[u] \geq C \left(\int_{\square} |\operatorname{div} u + i\theta \cdot u|^2 + \int_{\square \setminus B} |e(u) + i\theta \odot u|^2 \right), \quad \forall u \in [H_{per}^1(\square)]^3,$$

for some positive constant C . Next, by Proposition 7.24, and arguing as in (7.41), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\square \setminus B} |e(u) + i\theta \odot u|^2 &= \int_{\square \setminus B} |e(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u)|^2 \geq C_E^{-2} \int_{\square} |e(E(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u))|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} C_E^{-2} \int_{\square} |\nabla(E(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u))|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} C_E^{-2} |\theta|^2 \int_{\square} |E(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u)|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} C_E^{-2} |\theta|^2 \int_{\square \setminus B} |u|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows e.g. from integration by parts and the \square -periodicity of u . Consequently, one has

$$(7.112) \quad a_\theta[u] \geq C \left(\int_{\square} |\operatorname{div} u + i\theta \cdot u|^2 + \frac{1}{2} C_E^{-2} |\theta|^2 \int_{\square \setminus B} |u|^2 \right), \quad \forall u \in [H_{per}^1(\square)]^3.$$

Thus, from (7.107) and (7.112), the space V_θ is

$$(7.113) \quad V_\theta = \begin{cases} \left\{ v \in [H_0^1(B)]^3 \mid \operatorname{div} v + i\theta \cdot v = 0 \text{ in } B \right\}, & \theta \neq 0, \\ \left\{ v \in [H_{per}^1(\square)]^3 \mid v \text{ constant in } \square \setminus B \text{ and } \operatorname{div} v = 0 \text{ in } B \right\}, & \theta = 0. \end{cases}$$

As before, we regard $H_0^1(B)$ as a subspace of $H_{per}^1(\square)$ by extending by zero into $\square \setminus B$. For proving the key spectral gap condition (H1) we shall be using the following ‘Sobolev Modification’ lemma.

Proposition 7.25. *There exists linear operator $M : [H^1(\square)]^3 \rightarrow [H^1(\square)]^3$ and a positive constant C_M such that*

- (i) $Mu = u$ in $\square \setminus B$;
- (ii) $\operatorname{div} Mu = \operatorname{div} u$ in B ;
- (iii) $\|Mu\|_{[H^1(\square)]^3}^2 \leq C_M \left(\|u\|_{[L^2(\square \setminus B)]^3}^2 + \|e(u)\|_{[L^2(\square \setminus B)]^{3 \times 3}}^2 + \|\operatorname{div} u\|_{L^2(B)}^2 \right), \quad \forall u \in [H^1(\square)]^3.$

Proof. It is well known that the divergence operator $\operatorname{div} : [H_0^1(B)]^3 \rightarrow L_0^2(B) := \{f \in [L^2(B)]^3 \mid \int_B f = 0\}$ is surjective, see for example [39, Chapter 1, Section 2.1]. Moreover,

$$(7.114) \quad \begin{cases} \text{there exists a linear map } U : L_0^2(B) \rightarrow [H_0^1(B)]^3 \text{ such that for each } f \in L_0^2(B) \\ \operatorname{div} Uf = f, \quad \text{and} \quad \|Uf\|_{[H^1(B)]^3} \leq C_B \|f\|_{[L^2(B)]^3} \text{ for some } C_B > 0 \text{ independent of } f. \end{cases}$$

Let us now construct M . For fixed $u \in [H^1(\square)]^3$, $u - Pu \in [H_0^1(B)]^3$ for P as in (7.111) and so $\operatorname{div}(u - Pu) \in L_0^2(B)$. Now let $f = \operatorname{div}(u - Pu)$ and set $Mu = Uf + Pu$ (where Uf is continuously extended by zero into $\square \setminus B$). Now, the desired properties (i) and (ii) immediately follow by construction. For property (iii), via (7.111) and (7.114) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|Mu\|_{[H^1(\square)]^3} &\leq \|Pu\|_{[H^1(\square)]^3} + \|Uf\|_{[H^1(B)]^3} \leq C_P \|u\|_{[H^1(\square \setminus B)]^3} + C_B \|\operatorname{div}(u - Pu)\|_{L^2(B)} \\ &\leq C_P \left(1 + \sqrt{3}C_B\right) \|u\|_{[H^1(\square \setminus B)]^3} + C_B \|\operatorname{div} u\|_{L^2(B)}, \end{aligned}$$

and then (iii) follows from this last inequality and Korn’s second inequality in $\square \setminus B$. \square

Now, one can readily prove that the main assumptions of the article hold by arguing as in the previous examples (in particular Example 7.2). We sketch the details below.

First, (2.1) and (2.3) hold by essentially the same arguments as in the previous examples, cf. e.g. (7.9).

• *Proof of (H1).* We argue that (H1’) holds with $c[w]$ chosen as a constant times $\int_{\square \setminus B} |w|^2$ (which is $\|\cdot\|_\theta$ -compact via Korn inequality). Indeed, for given $u \in [H_{per}^1(\square)]^3$, it follows by properties of M that

$v := u - e^{-i\theta \cdot y} M(e^{i\theta \cdot y} u)$ belongs to V_θ . Hence, for any $w \in W_\theta$ and v chosen as above for $u = w$, we have $\|w\|_\theta \leq \|w - v\|_\theta$ and arguing similarly to (7.43) we readily see via Proposition 7.25 that (H1') holds.

• *Proof of (H2).* It is straightforward to show that (H2) holds for

$$(7.115) \quad V_\theta^* := \left\{ v \in [H_0^1(B)]^3 \mid \operatorname{div} v + i\theta \cdot v = 0 \text{ in } B \right\}.$$

Indeed, for each $v_1 \in V_{\theta_1}^*$ it is sufficient to consider $v_2 = e^{i(\theta_1 - \theta_2) \cdot y} v_1 \in V_{\theta_2}^*$.

• *Proof of (H3)* follows from combining (H1') where $c[w] = k \int_{\square \setminus B} |w|^2$ with some $k > 0$, and (7.112).

• *Proof of (H4).* This is immediate in the present setting with

$$a'_0(v, u) \cdot \theta = \int_{\square \setminus B} \lambda_1 i\theta \cdot v \overline{\operatorname{div} u} + \int_{\square \setminus B} 2\mu_1 i\theta \odot v : \overline{e(u)} + \int_B \lambda_2 i\theta \cdot v \overline{\operatorname{div} u}$$

and

$$a''_0(v, v)\theta \cdot \theta = \int_{\square \setminus B} \lambda_1 |\theta \cdot v|^2 + \int_{\square \setminus B} 2\mu_1 |\theta \odot v|^2 + \int_B \lambda_2 |\theta \cdot v|^2.$$

Now, from (7.113) and (7.115) we see that one can choose the defect space Z to be the 3-dimensional vector space of constant functions. Indeed, with $V_\star := V_0^*$, (4.16) clearly holds, and (4.17) holds with $K_Z = 0$:

$$(7.116) \quad (v_\star, z)_0 = b_0(v_\star, z) = \int_B v_\star \cdot z = 0, \quad \forall v_\star \in V_\star, \forall z \in Z,$$

where the latter equality can be seen e.g. by integrating $(z \cdot y) \operatorname{div} v_\star$ over B by parts. It then routinely follows via a derivation similar to that leading to (7.50) that

$$a_\theta^h(z, \tilde{z}) = A_p^{\text{hom}} z \odot \theta : \overline{\tilde{z} \odot \theta}, \quad \forall z, \tilde{z} \in Z, \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$

where A_p^{hom} is the homogenised tensor for the natural analogue of perforated elastic domain for the present example. Namely, A_p^{hom} correspond to the periodic matrix-inclusion composite with $\lambda = \lambda_1$ and $\mu = \mu_1$ in the matrix $\square \setminus B$, and with $\lambda = \lambda_2$ but zero shear modulus $\mu = 0$ in the inclusion B .

• The proof of (H5) is immediate from (7.108), and (H6) holds for $\mathcal{H} = [L^2(\square)]^3$, d_θ the standard (θ -independent) $[L^2(\square)]^3$ inner product and \mathcal{E}_θ multiplication by $e^{-i\theta \cdot y}$. In this setting, we observe that the bivariate operator (see Section 6.5) is the (shifted for unity) two-scale homogenised limit operator, found in [24], and therefore its spectrum is the semi-axis $[1, +\infty)$.

In what remains we shall specify our approximation given by general Theorem 5.9 and provide some new results in the context of homogenisation theory for the present example. Estimate (5.36) in particular implies

$$\|u_{\varepsilon, \theta} - (z + e^{-i\theta \cdot y} v)\|_{[L^2(\square)]^3} \leq C_{10}^{1/2} \varepsilon \|U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, \cdot)\|_{[L^2(\square)]^3},$$

where $z + v \in Z \dot{+} V_\star = V_0$ solves (5.26). Therefore, exploiting as in the earlier examples the L^2 -unitarity of the scaling and Gelfand transforms, one has

$$\|u_\varepsilon - (\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon + \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon)\|_{[L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3} \leq C_{10}^{1/2} \varepsilon \|F\|_{[L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3},$$

where $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} U^{-1} z$ and $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} U^{-1} e^{-i\theta \cdot y} v$. Let us determine the problems that \mathbf{u}_ε and \mathbf{v}_ε solve. First note, see (7.116), that V_\star and Z are orthogonal with respect to b_0 and so problem (5.26) decouples. Thus, $z \in Z$ solves

$$(7.117) \quad A_p^{\text{hom}} z \odot \frac{\theta}{\varepsilon} : \overline{\tilde{z} \odot \frac{\theta}{\varepsilon}} + z \cdot \tilde{z} = (U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, \cdot), \tilde{z})_{[L^2(\square)]^3}, \quad \forall \tilde{z} \in Z,$$

and $v \in V_\star$ solves

$$(7.118) \quad \int_B 2\mu_2 e(v) : \overline{e(\tilde{v})} + \int_B v \cdot \tilde{v} = \int_B e^{i\theta \cdot y} U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, y) \cdot \overline{\tilde{v}(y)} dy, \quad \forall \tilde{v} \in V_\star.$$

Now, similarly to Example 7.1, we take the inverse Gelfand and scaling transforms in (7.117) to find that $\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \in [H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3$ solves, cf. (7.28),

$$-\operatorname{div} \sigma_0(\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon) + \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon F \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3, \quad \sigma_0(u) = A_p^{\text{hom}} e(u),$$

for the smoothing operator $\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\chi(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon})\mathcal{F}$, where χ is the characteristic function of \square^* . Furthermore, as we saw in Example 7.1, cf (7.31), one can remove \mathcal{S}_ε for $F \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3$. Namely, one has

$$\|\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon - u_0\|_{[L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3} \leq \varepsilon\pi^{-1}\gamma_0\|F\|_{[L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3},$$

where $u_0 \in [H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3$ solves

$$(7.119) \quad -\operatorname{div}\sigma_0(u_0) + u_0 = F \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3,$$

and $\gamma_0 > 0$ is a strong ellipticity constant of A_p^{hom} (i.e. $A_p^{\text{hom}}z \odot \xi : z \odot \bar{\xi} \geq \gamma_0^{-1}|z||\xi|, \forall z, \xi \in \mathbb{C}^3$).

Let us now turn to \mathbf{v}_ε . By (7.118) and the properties of the Gelfand transform we conclude that \mathbf{v}_ε belongs to $V_\varepsilon := \left\{u \in [H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3 \mid u = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_\varepsilon \text{ and } \operatorname{div} u = 0 \text{ in } B_\varepsilon\right\}$, $B_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \varepsilon(B + m)$. Moreover, from (7.118) we readily deduce that \mathbf{v}_ε solves

$$(7.120) \quad \varepsilon^2 \int_{B_\varepsilon} 2\mu_0\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) e(\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon) : \overline{e(\tilde{v})} + \int_{B_\varepsilon} \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \cdot \tilde{v} = \int_{B_\varepsilon} F \cdot \tilde{v} \quad \forall \tilde{v} \in V_\varepsilon,$$

which is nothing but a collection of Stokes problems on each inclusion $\varepsilon(B + m)$ of B_ε . In general, \mathbf{v}_ε is not negligible and the solution u_ε to (7.106) is approximated up to leading order by $u_0 + \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon$. However, if F does not rapidly vary over F_0^ε (for simplicity if $\|F\|_{[H^1(F_0^\varepsilon)]^3}$ is bounded) we can see that \mathbf{v}_ε is ε small in L^2 -norm. Indeed as, cf. (7.116), $\int_{\varepsilon(B+m)} \tilde{v} = 0$ for each m , one has

$$\|\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon\|_{[L^2(\varepsilon(B+m))]^3} \leq \left\| F - \frac{1}{|\varepsilon(B+m)|} \int_{\varepsilon(B+m)} F \right\|_{[L^2(\varepsilon(B+m))]^3} \leq \varepsilon C_B \|\nabla f\|_{[L^2(\varepsilon(B+m))]^{3 \times 3}}$$

where C_B is the Poincaré-Wirtinger constant for B .

Putting all this together gives the following approximation results.

Theorem 7.26. *For $F \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3$, the solution u_ε to (7.106), the solution u_0 to the classical homogenised system (7.119) and the solution \mathbf{v}_ε to the inclusion Stokes problems (7.120) satisfy the estimate*

$$\|u_\varepsilon - (u_0 + \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon)\|_{[L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3} \leq \varepsilon C \|F\|_{[L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3}.$$

for the constant $C = C_{10}^{1/2} + \pi^{-1}\gamma_0$ that is independent of ε and F . If additionally $F \in [H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3$, then

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u_0\|_{[L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3} \leq \varepsilon C \|F\|_{[H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)]^3}$$

with $C = C_{10}^{1/2} + \pi^{-1}\gamma_0 + C_B$ independent of ε and F .

7.7 Schrödinger equation with a ‘strong’ periodic magnetic field

Up until now, in the examples, the space V_θ has either been continuous in θ or possessed an isolated discontinuity at the origin $\theta = 0$. Here, we give a simple one-dimensional example demonstrating that for certain physically motivated models it is possible to have isolated discontinuities appear at non-zero points in the θ -space.

For a given periodic magnetic field $A : C_{per}^1[0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\int_0^1 A(y) dy \notin 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, a uniformly positive periodic potential $V \in L_{per}^\infty(0, 1)$ and $F \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ we consider the solution u_ε to the one-dimensional Magnetic-Schrödinger equation

$$-\left(\frac{d}{dx} - \frac{i}{\varepsilon}A\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)^2 u_\varepsilon + V\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right)u_\varepsilon = F, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

with small parameter $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. After the spatial rescaling Γ_ε and the Gelfand transform U , we find that $u_{\varepsilon, \theta} := U\Gamma_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(\theta, \cdot)$ is the $[0, 1]$ -periodic solution to

$$-\varepsilon^{-2}\left(\frac{d}{dy} + i\theta - iA(y)\right)^2 u_{\varepsilon, \theta} + V(y)u_{\varepsilon, \theta} = U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, \cdot), \quad a.e. \theta \in \Theta = [-\pi, \pi].$$

The variational formulation of this problem is of type (2.4) for $H = H_{per}^1(0, 1)$, $\langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle = \int_0^1 U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, y) \overline{\tilde{u}(y)} dy$, and

$$a_\theta[u] = \int_0^1 \left| u'(y) + i\theta u(y) - iA(y)u(y) \right|^2 dy, \quad b_\theta[u] \equiv b_0[u] = \int_0^1 V(y) |u(y)|^2 dy, \quad u \in H_{per}^1(0, 1).$$

Upon observing that

$$a_\theta[u] = \int_0^1 \left| \frac{d}{dy} \left(u(y) \exp \left[i\theta y - i \int_0^y A(y') dy' \right] \right) \right|^2 dy,$$

we can readily see that

$$V_\theta = \begin{cases} \{0\} & \theta \neq \theta_0, \\ \left\{ c \exp \left[-i \left(\theta_0 y - \int_0^y A(y') dy' \right) \right] \mid c \in \mathbb{C} \right\} & \theta = \theta_0, \end{cases}$$

where $\theta_0 \in (-\pi, \pi] \setminus \{0\}$ equals $\int_0^1 A(y) dy$ up to an integer multiple of 2π . That is, V_θ is piecewise constant with isolated discontinuity at the point θ_0 determined by the mean value of the magnetic field A . Clearly, θ_0 can take any value in Θ . Moreover, one can readily check that the assumptions (H1')-(H6) hold with straightforward details left to the reader.

7.8 A non-local example/differential-difference equation

Here, we provide an example where the dependence of a_θ on the Floquet-Bloch parameter θ does not have to be quadratic (and not even polynomial). We consider for this a simple model of a nonlocal operator. For recent results on operator estimates in homogenisation of other classes of nonlocal operators see [45]. Let $u_\varepsilon \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ be the solution to one-dimensional problem

$$(7.121) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} A\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) u'_\varepsilon \overline{u'} + \varepsilon^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} D\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) (u_\varepsilon(x+\varepsilon) - u_\varepsilon(x)) \overline{(u_\varepsilon(x+\varepsilon) - u_\varepsilon(x))} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_\varepsilon \overline{u} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} F \overline{u},$$

$$\forall \tilde{u} \in H^1(\mathbb{R}),$$

for given $F \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and uniformly positive bounded 1-periodic functions $A(y)$ and $D(y)$. We apply the usual scaling and Gelfand transforms, noticing via (7.3) that for a function with a shifted argument $\hat{u}(x) = u(x + \varepsilon)$ one has $U\Gamma_\varepsilon \hat{u}(\theta, y) = e^{i\theta} U\Gamma_\varepsilon u(\theta, y)$. As a result, we determine that $u_{\varepsilon, \theta} := U\Gamma_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(\theta, \cdot) \in H_{per}^1(\square)$ solves a problem of the form (2.4) for $H = H_{per}^1(\square)$, $\square = [0, 1]$, $\Theta = [-\pi, \pi]$, $\langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle = \int_{\square} U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, y) \overline{\tilde{u}(y)} dy$, with the sesquilinear forms

$$(7.122) \quad a_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) = \int_{\square} A(y) (u'(y) + i\theta u(y)) \overline{(\tilde{u}'(y) + i\theta \tilde{u}(y))} dy + \int_{\square} D(y) |1 - e^{i\theta}|^2 u(y) \overline{\tilde{u}(y)} dy,$$

$$\text{and } b_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) = \int_{\square} u(y) \overline{\tilde{u}(y)} dy.$$

Here, as in the classical homogenisation Example 7.1, we have

$$V_\theta = \begin{cases} \{0\}, & \theta \neq 0, \\ \text{Span}(\mathbf{e}), & \theta = 0, \end{cases} \quad W_\theta = \begin{cases} H_{per}^1(\square), & \theta \neq 0, \\ H_{per,0}^1 := \{u \in H_{per}^1(\square) \mid \int_{\square} u = 0\}, & \theta = 0. \end{cases}$$

Further, we can argue with the exact same reasoning as in Example 7.1 to show that (H1'), (H2) and (H3) all hold. In particular, we have $V_\star = \{0\}$ and $Z = \text{Span}(\mathbf{e})$. Next, since $1 - e^{i\theta} = -i\theta + O(\theta^2)$ as $\theta \rightarrow 0$, it is clear that (H4) holds with the forms

$$a'_0(v, u) \cdot \theta = i \int_{\square} A \theta v \overline{u'}, \quad a''_0(v, \tilde{v}) \theta \cdot \theta = |\theta|^2 \int_{\square} A v \overline{\tilde{v}} + |\theta|^2 \int_{\square} D v \overline{\tilde{v}}, \quad v, \tilde{v} \in V_0, u \in H_{per}^1(\square).$$

As a result, Theorem 5.6 is applicable. Arguing again as in Example 7.1, since $a_0(u, \tilde{u}) = \int_{\square} Au' \overline{\tilde{u}'}$ we readily verify that for the corrector N_θ defined by (7.16), $N_\theta \mathbf{e} = i\theta \mathbf{N}$ where \mathbf{N} is the solution to the classical corrector problem (7.18) (for $n = 1$), and applying (7.15)

$$a_\xi^h[\mathbf{e}] = \left(\langle A^{-1} \rangle^{-1} + \langle D \rangle \right) |\xi|^2, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $\langle h \rangle := \int_{\square} h(y) dy$. Following further the pattern of Example 7.1, we observe that the solution u_{ε} to the original problem (7.121) is approximated in terms of the following homogenised problem, cf. (7.30):

$$- \left(\langle A^{-1} \rangle^{-1} + \langle D \rangle \right) u'' + u = F.$$

As a result, estimates directly analogous to those in Proposition 7.4 hold, with one further refinement namely with the possibility of removing in the present example the smoothing operator $\mathcal{S}_{\varepsilon}$ in the analogue of (7.33). (This follows from noticing that in the present one-dimensional case $N'(y)$ is bounded, and then establishing the L^2 -smallness of $N'(x/\varepsilon)((\mathcal{S}_{\varepsilon} - I)u)'(x)$ via an argument similar to (7.32).) Consequently, the following estimates are satisfied:

$$\left\| u_{\varepsilon} - \left(u + \varepsilon \mathbf{N} \left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon} \right) u' \right) \right\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq \varepsilon C \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_{\varepsilon} - u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq \varepsilon C \|F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})},$$

with some constant C independent of ε and F .

7.9 A difference equation ¹¹

Here we provide an example where our general theory remains applicable while the defect space Z is infinite dimensional. Notice that, consistently with Proposition 5.11, this can only happen when the weaker hypothesis (H1) holds in the absence of its stronger version (H1'). For that, we consider the problem which resembles (7.121) with the term involving derivatives being dropped. Namely, let $u_{\varepsilon} \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ be the solution to the difference equation

$$(7.123) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} D\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) (u_{\varepsilon}(x + \varepsilon) - u_{\varepsilon}(x)) \overline{(u_{\varepsilon}(x + \varepsilon) - u_{\varepsilon}(x))} dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_{\varepsilon} \bar{u} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} F \bar{u}, \quad \forall \tilde{u} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}),$$

for given $F \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $D \in L_{per}^{\infty}(0, 1)$ satisfying

$$D(y) \geq m, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R},$$

with some positive constant m . Arguing as in the last example we arrive at a problem of the form (2.4):

$$(7.124) \quad \varepsilon^{-2} a_{\theta}(u_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \tilde{u}) + b_{\theta}(u_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \tilde{u}) = \langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle, \quad \forall \tilde{u} \in H,$$

for $H = L^2(\square)$, $\square = [0, 1]$, $\Theta = [-\pi, \pi]$, $\langle f, \tilde{u} \rangle = \int_{\square} U \Gamma_{\varepsilon} F(\theta, y) \bar{u}(y) dy$, with the sesquilinear forms

$$a_{\theta}(u, \tilde{u}) = \int_{\square} D(y) |1 - e^{i\theta}|^2 u(y) \overline{\tilde{u}(y)} dy = 4 \sin^2(\theta/2) \int_{\square} D(y) u(y) \overline{\tilde{u}(y)} dy,$$

$$\text{and } b_{\theta}(u, \tilde{u}) = \int_{\square} u(y) \overline{\tilde{u}(y)} dy.$$

Hence we have

$$V_{\theta} = \begin{cases} \{0\}, & \theta \neq 0, \\ L^2(\square), & \theta = 0, \end{cases} \quad W_{\theta} = \begin{cases} L^2(\square), & \theta \neq 0, \\ \{0\}, & \theta = 0. \end{cases}$$

Obviously (H1) holds, with for example $\nu_{\theta} = \frac{4m}{4m+1} \sin^2(\theta/2)$ for $\theta \neq 0$ and ν_0 any positive number. Further (H2) trivially holds with $V_{\star} = \{0\}$, and so $Z = L^2(\square)$. Elementary estimates then show that (H3) holds with $\gamma = \frac{4m}{\pi^2(4m+1)}$, as well as (H4) holds with

$$a'_{\theta}(u, \tilde{u}) \cdot \theta = 0, \quad a''_{\theta}(u, \tilde{u}) \theta \cdot \theta = |\theta|^2 \int_{\square} D u \bar{u}, \quad u, \tilde{u} \in L^2(\square).$$

As a result, N_{θ} is zero (since $W_0 = 0$) and Theorem 5.6 is applicable with

$$a_{\theta}^h(z, \tilde{z}) = |\theta|^2 \int_{\square} D(y) z(y) \overline{\tilde{z}(y)} dy, \quad \forall z, \tilde{z} \in L^2(\square).$$

¹¹The authors are grateful to Prof. Igor Velčić (University of Zagreb) for bringing this example to their attention

Notice next that (H5) is obviously valid, since b_θ does not depend on θ . Moreover, as $V_\theta^* = V_* = \{0\}$ are trivial so are $\mathcal{E}_\theta : V_* \rightarrow V_\theta^*$, and Theorem 5.8 coincides with Theorem 5.6.

We next adjust this example to the framework of Section 6. First we observe that the right hand side of (7.124) has the form as in (6.3), with $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\square)$, $d_\theta(u, \tilde{u}) = \int_\square u \overline{\tilde{u}}$ and $g = U\Gamma_\varepsilon F(\theta, \cdot)$. At the beginning of Section 6, we made an assumption of compactness of embedding of H into \mathcal{H} for the purpose of investigation of the spectra. In the present example however H coincides with \mathcal{H} , and therefore there is no compactness of the embedding. Nevertheless hypothesis (H6) trivially holds with \mathcal{E}_θ chosen to be the identity operator, and inspecting the proof of Theorem 6.4 shows that on its own it does not actually require the embedding compactness. As a result, the theorem takes the form of the following inequality

$$(7.125) \quad \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} - \mathbb{L}_{\theta/\varepsilon}^{-1} \right\|_{L^2(\square) \rightarrow L^2(\square)} \leq C\varepsilon, \quad 0 < \varepsilon < 1, \quad \forall \theta \in [-\pi, \pi],$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ is the self-adjoint operator in $L^2(\square)$, generated by the form on the left hand side of (7.124) and \mathbb{L}_ξ is the self-adjoint operator generated by the form

$$|\xi|^2 \int_\square D(y) z(y) \overline{\tilde{z}(y)} dy + \int_\square z(y) \overline{\tilde{z}(y)} dy, \quad z, \tilde{z} \in L^2(\square), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The simplification in (7.125) compared to Theorem 6.4 is due to the facts that \mathcal{E}_θ is chosen the identity operator, and $\mathcal{H}_0 := \overline{V_0} = L^2(\square)$ (and therefore the projector appearing in Theorem 6.4 is also the identity operator).

Now Theorem 6.10 takes the form¹²

$$\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon, \theta}^{-1} - (B_\varepsilon^* \mathcal{L}^{-1} B_\varepsilon)(\theta) \right\|_{L^2(\square) \rightarrow L^2(\square)} \leq C\varepsilon, \quad \text{for a.e. } \theta \in [-\pi, \pi].$$

Here $B_\varepsilon^* \mathcal{L}^{-1} B_\varepsilon$ is a self-adjoint operator in $L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^2(\square))$ decomposable into a direct integral in θ , the bivariate (two-scale) limit operator \mathcal{L} is an unbounded self-adjoint operator in $L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \square)$ generated by the form

$$(7.126) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_\square D(y) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}(x, y) \overline{\frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial x}(x, y)} dy dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_\square u(x, y) \overline{\tilde{u}(x, y)} dy dx, \quad u, \tilde{u} \in H^1(\mathbb{R}; L^2(\square));$$

$B_\varepsilon : L^2(\Theta; L^2(\square)) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^2(\square))$ is the composition $B_\varepsilon := \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi$ and $\chi : L^2(\Theta; L^2(\square)) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}; L^2(\square))$ is the operator of extension by zero outside Θ . We notice that, while the original problem (7.123) is nonlocal, the limit problem (7.126) is local (although two-scale).

Further, following the pattern of Subsection 7.2.2 we observe that the analog of Theorem 7.9 for the self-adjoint operator \mathcal{L}_ε in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ corresponding to the original problem, i.e. generated by the form on the left hand side of (7.123), is:

Theorem 7.27. *For $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ one has*

$$(7.127) \quad \left\| \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon^{-1} - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon^* \mathcal{L}^{-1} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\varepsilon$$

for some positive constant C independent of ε . Here $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon : L^2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \square)$, which is a modified “two-scale interpolation operator” (see Remark 7.12, and Remark 7.28 below), is the bounded operator given by the composition

$$(7.128) \quad \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon := B_\varepsilon U \Gamma_\varepsilon = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi U \Gamma_\varepsilon,$$

which is an L^2 -isometry and the continuous extension of

$$(7.129) \quad \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon F(x, y) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} F(\varepsilon y + \varepsilon m) \operatorname{Sinc} \left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon} - m - y \right);$$

¹²Theorem 6.10 relies on Appendix B, which in turn uses the assumption of compactness of embedding. In particular this assumption allowed us to pick up a special basis in both V_0 and \mathcal{H}_0 , see the proof of Proposition B.1. However the results of Appendix B are still valid in the present setup (in fact their proofs are simpler) since $Z = V_0 = \mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}$, $b_0 = d_0$ and any basis in V_0 will serve the purpose.

$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon^* : L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \square) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})$ is the adjoint of \mathcal{J}_ε given by $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon^* = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} U^{-1} B_\varepsilon^* = \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} U^{-1} \chi^* \mathcal{F} \Gamma_\varepsilon$, which is the continuous extension of

$$(7.130) \quad \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon^* u(x) = \varepsilon^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} u\left(s, \left\{\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right\}\right) \text{Sinc}\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon} - \frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) ds.$$

Moreover,

$$(7.131) \quad \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon^* \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon = I, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon^* = \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon,$$

where \mathcal{S}_ε is the smoothing operator given by (7.69) (applied to the first variable), and $\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon \rightarrow I$ strongly.

Remark 7.28. The key properties of \mathcal{J}_ε are already encoded in its operator representation (7.128). For sufficiently regular $G \in L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \square)$, let \mathcal{R}_ε denote the mapping $G(x, y) \mapsto G(x, \{x/\varepsilon\})$. We observe from the inversion formula (7.4) for Gelfand transform that $U^{-1} = \mathcal{R}_1 \mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi$ which implies $\mathcal{R}_1 \mathcal{F}^{-1} \chi U = I$. Next, since $\Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{R}_1 = \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon \Gamma_\varepsilon^{-1}$, in combination with (7.128) this yields

$$(7.132) \quad \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon = I,$$

i.e. (for sufficiently regular $F \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$) $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon F(x, \{x/\varepsilon\}) = F(x)$ which is a two-scale interpolation property of \mathcal{J}_ε : if x has ‘‘phase’’ y i.e. $x = \varepsilon l + y$ for $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $y \in \square$, then simply $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon F(x, y) = F(x)$. Further, combining (7.132) with the second identity in (7.131), one obtains $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon^* = \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon$. Applying \mathcal{J}_ε to both sides and then using (7.131) again results in $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon$, which recovers the two-scale Whittaker-Shannon sampling theorem. Namely, if $F_\varepsilon(x) = \Phi(x, x/\varepsilon)$ (so $F_\varepsilon = \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon \Phi$) where $\Phi(x, y) \in L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \square)$ is \square -periodic in y and for every y its Fourier transform in x is supported within a bounded segment $[-R, R]$, cf. Remark 7.10, then for $\varepsilon \leq \pi/R$ simply $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon(x) = \Phi(x, y)$.

This allows a particularly simple specialisation of estimate (7.127) for such a class of two-scale right hand sides $F_\varepsilon(x) = \Phi(x, x/\varepsilon)$. Indeed, as \mathcal{L}^{-1} commutes with \mathcal{S}_ε , for the solution $u = \mathcal{L}^{-1} \Phi$ of the two-scale limit problem $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon^* u(x) = u(x, x/\varepsilon)$. As a result, for the exact solution $u_\varepsilon = \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon^{-1} F_\varepsilon$, (7.127) yields

$$\|u_\varepsilon - u(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \varepsilon \|\Phi(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})},$$

with a constant C independent of ε and Φ .

We finally notice that Theorem 7.27 remains valid if we replace \mathcal{J}_ε by \mathcal{I}_ε as originally introduced in (7.65) and (7.66). Indeed, the only difference is the absence in (7.128) of the operator \mathcal{E}^{-1} of multiplication by $e^{i\theta y}$, which corresponds to the choice of \mathcal{E}_θ in Section 7.2. In the present example we were able to choose \mathcal{E}_θ to be identity, however we could choose it to be multiplication by $e^{-i\theta y}$ as well, thus arriving at (7.127) with \mathcal{I}_ε instead of \mathcal{J}_ε . Notice however that, for the present example, the two resulting approximations coincide. Indeed, e.g. comparing (7.129) and (7.66), we observe that $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon F(x, y) = \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon F(x + \varepsilon y, y)$. Similarly, from (7.130) and (7.67), for $\hat{u}(x, y) = u(x + \varepsilon y, y)$ one has $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon^* \hat{u}(x) = \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^* u(x)$. Further, it follows from (7.126) that \mathcal{L}^{-1} commutes with the x -variable shift operation $x \rightarrow x + \varepsilon y$. Combining these implies $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^* \mathcal{L}^{-1} \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon^* \mathcal{L}^{-1} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$. We remind that in Section 7.2 form b_θ in (7.39) was genuinely θ -dependent and so we could not have taken \mathcal{E}_θ to be the identity operator. This illustrates that our choice of the interpolation operator \mathcal{I}_ε appears more generic for some wide class of periodic problems.

Appendix A

We prove here Lemma 5.7, i.e. the existence of \mathcal{E}_θ satisfying (5.23) and (5.24) (or equivalently (5.25)). We shall prove it in the following form:

Proposition A.1. Assume (H2) and (H5). Then, there exists a bijection $\mathcal{E}_\theta : V_\star \rightarrow V_\star^*$ such that

$$(A.1) \quad b_\theta(\mathcal{E}_\theta v_\star, \mathcal{E}_\theta \tilde{v}_\star) = b_0(v_\star, \tilde{v}_\star), \quad \forall v_\star, \tilde{v}_\star \in V_\star;$$

and there exists a constant $K'_b \geq 0$ such that

$$(A.2) \quad \|\mathcal{E}_\theta v_\star - v_\star\|_\theta \leq K'_b \|\theta\| \|v_\star\|_0, \quad \forall v_\star \in V_\star.$$

Notice that combining (H5) with (A.2) implies (5.24) and (5.25) (for $K_b = L_b + K K'_b$).

Before proving this proposition, let us first demonstrate that under (H2) the subspace $V_{\theta_1}^*$ is isomorphic to $V_{\theta_2}^*$ when θ_1 and θ_2 are close.

Proposition A.2. *Assume (H2). Then, for $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$, $P(\theta_1, \theta_2) : V_{\theta_1}^* \rightarrow V_{\theta_2}^*$, given by $v \mapsto P_{V_{\theta_2}^*} v$, is a bijection when $KL_*|\theta_1 - \theta_2| < 1$.*

Proof. Fix $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$, $KL_*|\theta_1 - \theta_2| < 1$, and $v_1 \in V_{\theta_1}^*$. By (4.15) and (2.1) we have $\|P_{W_{\theta_2}^*} v_1\|_{\theta_2} \leq KL_*|\theta_1 - \theta_2| \|v_1\|_{\theta_2}$ and so

$$(A.3) \quad \|P_{V_{\theta_2}^*} v_1\|_{\theta_2}^2 = \|v_1\|_{\theta_2}^2 - \|P_{W_{\theta_2}^*} v_1\|_{\theta_2}^2 \geq \left(1 - (KL_*|\theta_1 - \theta_2|)^2\right) \|v_1\|_{\theta_2}^2.$$

This implies $P(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ is injective and has a closed range. It remains to prove that $P_{V_{\theta_2}^*} V_{\theta_1}^*$ is not a proper subset of $V_{\theta_2}^*$. Suppose there exists $0 \neq v \in V_{\theta_2}^*$ such that v is orthogonal to $P_{V_{\theta_2}^*} V_{\theta_1}^*$ with respect to $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\theta_2}$. Then, $(v, P_{V_{\theta_1}^*} v)_{\theta_2} = (v, P_{V_{\theta_2}^*} P_{V_{\theta_1}^*} v)_{\theta_2} = 0$. Consequently, we compute

$$\|v\|_{\theta_2}^2 = (v, P_{V_{\theta_1}^*} v)_{\theta_2} + (v, P_{W_{\theta_1}^*} v)_{\theta_2} = (v, P_{W_{\theta_1}^*} v)_{\theta_2} \leq \|v\|_{\theta_2} \|P_{W_{\theta_1}^*} v\|_{\theta_2} \leq KL_*|\theta_1 - \theta_2| \|v\|_{\theta_2}^2,$$

where we have used (2.1) and (4.15) in the last inequality. This leads to the contradiction $\|v\|_{\theta_2} = 0$ for $KL_*|\theta_1 - \theta_2| < 1$. Hence $P_{V_{\theta_2}^*} V_{\theta_1}^* = V_{\theta_2}^*$. \square

Proof of Proposition A.1. As H is separable, the dimension (i.e. any basis) of V_{θ}^* is at most countable. Moreover, it follows from Proposition A.2 that the dimension of V_{θ}^* is independent of θ for close enough θ_1 and θ_2 . Since Θ is assumed connected, V_{θ}^* and V_* are isomorphic for any $\theta \in \Theta$, and in particular one can always find a \mathcal{E}_{θ} which satisfies (A.1). Moreover it is clear that, for any such \mathcal{E}_{θ} , and for any chosen $r > 0$ (A.2) holds for $|\theta| \geq r > 0$ (with K'_b replaced by $(1 + K)/r$). As such, we need only establishing (A.2) for the case $KL_*|\theta| < 1/\sqrt{2}$, for which we construct below \mathcal{E}_{θ} in a particular way.

Consider the Hilbert spaces (V_*, b_0) and $(V_{\theta}^*, b_{\theta})$, and let $Q_{\theta} : (V_{\theta}^*, b_{\theta}) \rightarrow (V_*, b_0)$ be the inverse of $P(0, \theta)$, which is bounded (see (A.3)), and let $Q_{\theta}^* : (V_*, b_0) \rightarrow (V_{\theta}^*, b_{\theta})$ be the adjoint of Q_{θ} . Noticing that $Q_{\theta}^* Q_{\theta} : (V_{\theta}^*, b_{\theta}) \rightarrow (V_{\theta}^*, b_{\theta})$ is bounded, self-adjoint and non-negative, set $\mathcal{E}_{\theta} = (Q_{\theta}^* Q_{\theta})^{1/2} P(0, \theta)$ and note that (A.1) holds:

$$\begin{aligned} b_{\theta}(\mathcal{E}_{\theta} v_*, \mathcal{E}_{\theta} \tilde{v}_*) &= (\mathcal{E}_{\theta} v_*, \mathcal{E}_{\theta} \tilde{v}_*)_{\theta} = ((Q_{\theta}^* Q_{\theta})^{1/2} P(0, \theta) v_*, (Q_{\theta}^* Q_{\theta})^{1/2} P(0, \theta) \tilde{v}_*)_{\theta} = \\ &= ((Q_{\theta}^* Q_{\theta}) P(0, \theta) v_*, P(0, \theta) \tilde{v}_*)_{\theta} = (Q_{\theta} P(0, \theta) v_*, Q_{\theta} P(0, \theta) \tilde{v}_*)_0 = (v_*, \tilde{v}_*)_0 = b_0(v_*, \tilde{v}_*). \end{aligned}$$

Let us prove (A.2). For arbitrary $v_* \in V_*$, $v_{\theta} \in V_{\theta}$, recall that $\|v_{\theta}\|_{\theta}^2 = b_{\theta}[v_{\theta}]$, $\|v_*\|_0^2 = b_0[v_*]$. Now, since $(Q_{\theta}^* Q_{\theta})^{1/2}$ is non-negative on $(V_{\theta}^*, b_{\theta})$ one has $\|v_{\theta}\|_{\theta} \leq \|(I + (Q_{\theta}^* Q_{\theta})^{1/2}) v_{\theta}\|_{\theta}$, which (upon setting $v_{\theta} = P_{V_{\theta}^*} v_* - \mathcal{E}_{\theta} v_*$) gives

$$\|P_{V_{\theta}^*} v_* - \mathcal{E}_{\theta} v_*\|_{\theta} \leq \|(I + (Q_{\theta}^* Q_{\theta})^{1/2}) (P_{V_{\theta}^*} v_* - \mathcal{E}_{\theta} v_*)\|_{\theta} = \|(I - Q_{\theta}^* Q_{\theta}) P_{V_{\theta}^*} v_*\|_{\theta} = \|P_{V_{\theta}^*} v_* - Q_{\theta}^* v_*\|_{\theta}, \quad \forall v_* \in V_*.$$

Combining the above inequality with (4.15) gives

$$(A.4) \quad \|v_* - \mathcal{E}_{\theta} v_*\|_{\theta} = \|P_{W_{\theta}^*} v_* + (P_{V_{\theta}^*} v_* - \mathcal{E}_{\theta} v_*)\|_{\theta} \leq L_*|\theta| \|v_*\|_0 + \|P_{V_{\theta}^*} v_* - Q_{\theta}^* v_*\|_{\theta}, \quad \forall v_* \in V_*.$$

It remains to estimate the difference $P_{V_{\theta}^*} - Q_{\theta}^*$ on V_* . For this note that, for any $v_{\theta} \in V_{\theta}^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} b_{\theta}(P_{V_{\theta}^*} v_* - Q_{\theta}^* v_*, v_{\theta}) &= b_{\theta}(v_*, v_{\theta}) - b_0(v_*, Q_{\theta} v_{\theta}) \\ &= b_{\theta}(v_*, v_{\theta} - Q_{\theta} v_{\theta}) + b_{\theta}(v_*, Q_{\theta} v_{\theta}) - b_0(v_*, Q_{\theta} v_{\theta}), \quad \forall v_* \in V_*, \forall v_{\theta} \in V_{\theta}^*. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the first term on the right, we use $P_{V_{\theta}^*} Q_{\theta} v_{\theta} = v_{\theta}$ implying $Q_{\theta} v_{\theta} - v_{\theta} = P_{W_{\theta}^*} Q_{\theta} v_{\theta}$, and (4.15). To bound the difference of the remaining two terms we use (H5). Hence, one has

$$|b_{\theta}(P_{V_{\theta}^*} v_* - Q_{\theta}^* v_*, v_{\theta})| \leq (K^2 L_* + L_b) |\theta| \|v_*\|_0 \|Q_{\theta} v_{\theta}\|_{\theta}, \quad \forall v_* \in V_*, \forall v_{\theta} \in V_{\theta}^*.$$

Now the above inequality and the bound $\|Q_{\theta} v_{\theta}\|_{\theta} \leq \sqrt{2} \|v_{\theta}\|_{\theta}$ (see (A.3) for $KL_*|\theta| \leq 1/\sqrt{2}$) give

$$\|P_{V_{\theta}^*} v_* - Q_{\theta}^* v_*\|_{\theta} \leq \sqrt{2} (K^2 L_* + L_b) |\theta| \|v_*\|_0, \quad \forall v_* \in V_*,$$

which along with (A.4) implies (A.2) with $K'_b = \sqrt{2} (K^2 L_* + L_b)$. \square

Appendix B

We provide here some basic facts from theory of Bochner spaces, see e.g. [47, 33], as relevant and specialised to our setting in Section 6.5, as well as justify some accompanying facts specific to our context. The latter follow quite standard arguments, but are still sketched here for the reader's convenience.

Let \mathcal{H} be a separable complex Hilbert space with inner product (\cdot, \cdot) and associated norm $\|\cdot\|$. Bochner space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}) =: \mathbb{H}$ consists of all (Lebesgue measure zero equivalence classes of) weakly-measurable¹³ maps $u : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, such that $\|u\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \|u(\xi)\|^2 d\xi < \infty$. The latter defines the norm $\|u\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ in \mathbb{H} . With associated inner product

$$(u, \tilde{u})_{\mathbb{H}} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u(\xi), \tilde{u}(\xi)) d\xi,$$

\mathbb{H} is known to become a (separable) Hilbert space. Similarly are defined $L^2(\Theta; \mathcal{H})$ for any measurable $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with induced Lebesgue measure.

Let us now show that the domain \mathbb{D} of the form on the left-hand side of (6.42) is dense in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0)$.

Proposition B.1. $\mathbb{D} := L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; V_{\star}) \dot{+} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \xi \rangle^2 d\xi; Z)$ is dense in $\mathbb{H}_0 := L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0)$.

Proof. Let us show first that $\mathbb{V}_0 := L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; V_0)$, where $V_0 = V_{\star} \dot{+} Z$ is regarded as Hilbert space with inner product b_0 , is dense in \mathbb{H}_0 . Recall that both V_0 and $\mathcal{H}_0 = \overline{V_0}$ are separable, and V_0 is compactly embedded into \mathcal{H}_0 . Let $\lambda_0^{(k)}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, be the eigenvalues of \mathbb{L}_0 , i.e. of \mathbb{L}_{ξ} for $\xi = 0$, cf. Corollary 6.7. Since the domain of \mathbb{L}_0 is in V_0 , the associated eigenfunctions $\psi^{(k)} \in V_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_0$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, can be chosen to form an orthogonal basis in both V_0 and \mathcal{H}_0 . Let $u \in \mathbb{H}_0$. Then, decomposing along this basis, for a.e. $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u(\xi) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k(\xi) \psi^{(k)}$. Considering the truncated sums, $u^N(\xi) := \sum_{k=1}^N c_k(\xi) \psi^{(k)}$, clearly $u^N \rightarrow u$ in \mathbb{H}_0 . On the other hand, since $b_0(\psi^{(k)}, \psi^{(l)}) = \delta_{kl} \lambda_0^{(k)} d_0[\psi^{(k)}]$, $u^N \in \mathbb{V}_0$ for any finite N . ($\delta_{kl} = 1$ if $k = l$ and $\delta_{kl} = 0$ if $k \neq l$ is Kroneker symbol.) Hence \mathbb{V}_0 is dense in \mathbb{H}_0 .

Next we argue that $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \xi \rangle^2 d\xi; V_0)$ is in turn dense in \mathbb{V}_0 . To see this, given $u \in \mathbb{V}_0$ with associated $u(\xi) \in V_0$ for a.e. ξ , we construct u^N by setting $u^N(\xi) := \chi_{B_N}(\xi) u(\xi)$, where χ_{B_N} is the characteristic function of ball of radius N in \mathbb{R}^n centered at the origin. It is easy to check that $u^N \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \xi \rangle^2 d\xi; V_0)$ and $u^N \rightarrow u$ in \mathbb{V}_0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$, hence the stated density.

Combining the above two density statements, we conclude that $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \xi \rangle^2 d\xi; V_0)$ is dense in \mathbb{H}_0 . Finally, it remains to observe that $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \xi \rangle^2 d\xi; V_0)$ is a subset of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; V_{\star}) \dot{+} L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \xi \rangle^2 d\xi; Z)$. Hence the latter is dense in \mathbb{H}_0 , as required. \square

Proposition B.2. The form \mathbb{A} defined by the left-hand side of (6.42) with domain \mathbb{D} is closed.

Proof. Let $\{u_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathbb{D}$, $u_m(\xi) = v_m(\xi) + z_m(\xi)$, be a Cauchy sequence with respect to \mathbb{A} , i.e. $\mathbb{A}[u_m - u_l] \rightarrow 0$ as $m, l \rightarrow \infty$. It follows from (5.16) and (4.21) that

$$\mathbb{A}[u_m - u_l] \geq \nu_{\star} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\xi|^2 b_0[z_m(\xi) - z_l(\xi)] d\xi + (1 - K_Z) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(b_0[z_m(\xi) - z_l(\xi)] + b_0[v_m(\xi) - v_l(\xi)] \right) d\xi.$$

The above implies that $\{v_m\}$ and $\{z_m\}$ are Cauchy sequences in, respectively, $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; V_{\star})$ and $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \xi \rangle^2; Z)$. It follows from the basic theory of Bochner spaces that both of these spaces are complete, and hence there exist $v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; V_{\star})$ and $z \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \xi \rangle^2; Z)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ (1 + |\xi|^2) b_0[z_m(\xi) - z(\xi)] + b_0[v_m(\xi) - v_l(\xi)] \right\} d\xi \rightarrow 0.$$

For $u := v + z \in \mathbb{D}$ this clearly implies that $\mathbb{A}[u_m - u] \rightarrow 0$, which completes the proof. \square

Proposition B.3. Let $h \in L^2(\Theta; \mathcal{H}_0)$ and regard it as an element of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0)$ by setting $h(\theta) = 0$ for $\theta \notin \Theta$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and set $\xi = \theta/\varepsilon$. Then, for a.e. $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the unique solutions $v(\xi) + z(\xi)$ to (6.42) and (6.39) coincide.

¹³i.e. $\forall \tilde{u} \in \mathcal{H}$, $\mathbb{R}^n \ni \xi \mapsto (u(\xi), \tilde{u}) \in \mathbb{C}$ is Lebesgue measurable

Proof. Let $v + z \in \mathbb{D}$ be the solution to (6.42). Let $\tilde{v}_j + \tilde{z}_j \in V_* \dot{+} Z$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$, form a dense set in $(V_* \dot{+} Z, b_0)$. For any j , consider arbitrary $\varphi(\xi) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and set $\tilde{v}(\xi) = \tilde{v}_j \varphi(\xi)$ and $\tilde{z}(\xi) = \tilde{z}_j \varphi(\xi)$. Then from (6.42)

$$(B.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left[a_\xi^h(z(\xi), \tilde{z}_j) + b_0(v(\xi) + z(\xi), \tilde{v}_j + \tilde{z}_j) - d_0(h(\varepsilon\xi), \tilde{v}_j + \tilde{z}_j) \right] \varphi(\xi) d\xi = 0, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Because of the density of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the square bracket in (B.1) must vanish for a.e. $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, for all $j \geq 1$. Finally, because of the density of $\{v_j + z_j\}$ in $V_* \dot{+} Z$ (and hence also in \mathcal{H}_0), the above square bracket must vanish for a.e. $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for all $\tilde{v} + \tilde{z} \in V_* \dot{+} Z$ which is equivalent to (6.39).

The converse statement trivially follows from the uniqueness of the solutions to (6.39) and (6.42). \square

We next recall the notion of a direct integral of operators and specialise it to the context of Section 6.5.

Definition B.4. Let (\mathcal{H}_0, d_0) be a complex Hilbert space and \mathbb{L} be a self-adjoint operator in Bochner space $\mathbb{H}_0 := L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0)$. Let \mathbb{L}_ξ , $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, be a family of self-adjoint operators in \mathcal{H}_0 with their spectra (say) contained in $[1, +\infty)$ and which are weakly-measurable¹⁴ in ξ . We say that \mathbb{L} is a direct integral of \mathbb{L}_ξ over $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, denoted $\mathbb{L} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}^\oplus \mathbb{L}_\xi d\xi$, and \mathbb{L}_ξ are fibers of \mathbb{L} , if

- (i) $u \in \mathbb{H}_0$ is in the domain $\text{dom } \mathbb{L}$ of \mathbb{L} , if and only if $u(\xi) \in \text{dom } \mathbb{L}_\xi$ for a.e. $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} d_0[\mathbb{L}_\xi u(\xi)] d\xi < +\infty$;
- (ii) $\forall u \in \text{dom } \mathbb{L}$, $(\mathbb{L}u)(\xi) = \mathbb{L}_\xi(u(\xi))$, for a.e. $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proposition B.5. For \mathbb{L}_ξ , $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and \mathbb{L} as defined in Sections 6.3 and 6.5 respectively,

$$\mathbb{L} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}^\oplus \mathbb{L}_\xi d\xi, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{L}^{-1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}^\oplus \mathbb{L}_\xi^{-1} d\xi.$$

Proof. First, \mathbb{L}_ξ are weakly-measurable as for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_0$, $d_0[\mathbb{L}_\xi^{-1}g]$ is continuous in ξ . As a brief sketch for proving the latter, consider $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with associated $u_j = \mathbb{L}_{\xi_j}^{-1}g$, $j = 1, 2$. Then, via (6.12), $\mathbb{S}_{\xi_j}(u_j, u_1 - u_2) = d_0(g, u_1 - u_2)$, $j = 1, 2$. Hence, subtracting, $\mathbb{S}_{\xi_1}[u_1 - u_2] = \mathbb{S}_{\xi_2}(u_2, u_1 - u_2) - \mathbb{S}_{\xi_1}(u_2, u_1 - u_2)$. When $\xi_2 \rightarrow \xi_1$, the latter difference form becomes small, see (6.12). Hence, via standard arguments, $d_0[u_1 - u_2] \leq \mathbb{S}_{\xi_1}[u_1 - u_2] \rightarrow 0$ as $\xi_2 \rightarrow \xi_1$, as required. The rest of the proof essentially follows that of Proposition B.3. By definition, $v + z \in \mathbb{D}$ is in $\text{dom } \mathbb{L}$ if there exists $H \in \mathbb{H}_0$ such that

$$(B.2) \quad \mathbb{A}(v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} d_0(H(\xi), \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) d\xi, \quad \forall \tilde{v} + \tilde{z} \in \mathbb{D},$$

where \mathbb{A} is the form on the left-hand side of (6.42). Arguing then as in the proof of Proposition B.3, we conclude that for a.e. $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\forall \tilde{v} + \tilde{z} \in V_* \dot{+} Z$, $\mathbb{S}_\xi(v(\xi) + z(\xi), \tilde{v} + \tilde{z}) = d_0(H(\xi), \tilde{v} + \tilde{z})$ where the form \mathbb{S}_ξ is given by (6.12). The latter implies both conditions in Definition B.4, so \mathbb{L} is the direct integral of \mathbb{L}_ξ . For the inverses, condition (i) in Definition B.4 trivially follows from the well-posedness of (6.42). Also, if $H \in \mathbb{H}_0$ and $u = \mathbb{L}^{-1}H$ then (ii) implies $\mathbb{L}_\xi^{-1}(H(\xi)) = u(\xi) = (\mathbb{L}^{-1}H)(\xi)$ for a.e. $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, as required. \square

Fourier transform \mathcal{F} is known to be a well-defined unitary operator in a Bochner space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H})$, together with its inverse \mathcal{F}^{-1} :

Definition B.6. Given $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}) =: \mathbb{H}$, $\mathcal{F}u =: \hat{u}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{-1}u =: \check{u}$ are such elements of \mathbb{H} that, respectively for a.e. $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$(B.3) \quad (\hat{u}(\xi), \check{u}) = (2\pi)^{-n/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot \xi} (u(x), \check{u}) dx, \quad (\check{u}(x), \hat{u}) = (2\pi)^{-n/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix \cdot \xi} (u(\xi), \hat{u}) d\xi, \quad \forall \check{u} \in \mathcal{H}.$$

[The above integrals denote conventional (inverse) Fourier transforms in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \ni (u(\cdot), \check{u}) =: g$, i.e. by first defining the integrals for $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and then extending by continuity.] Given u ,

¹⁴i.e. $\forall g, \check{u} \in \mathcal{H}_0$, $\xi \mapsto d_0(\mathbb{L}_\xi^{-1}g, \check{u})$ is Lebesgue-measurable as a map from \mathbb{R}^n to \mathbb{C}

the above \hat{u} and \tilde{u} are (uniquely) well-defined. Indeed, e.g. for \hat{u} , for a.e. x decompose $u(x)$ along an orthonormal basis e^j , $j = 1, 2, \dots$, in \mathcal{H} : $u(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j(x)e^j$ where $c_j = (u(\cdot), e^j) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\|u\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|c_j\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2 < \infty$. Then (B.3) for $\tilde{u} = e^j$ implies $\hat{u}(\xi) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \hat{c}_j(\xi)e^j$, where $\hat{c}_j \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the conventional Fourier transform of c_j . Then (B.3) is held for arbitrary $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{H}$ by linearity and continuity, and Plancherel theorem for c_j and the orthogonality imply the unitarity of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}^{-1} :

$$(B.4) \quad (u, \tilde{u})_{\mathbb{H}} = (\mathcal{F}u, \mathcal{F}\tilde{u})_{\mathbb{H}} = (\mathcal{F}^{-1}u, \mathcal{F}^{-1}\tilde{u})_{\mathbb{H}}, \quad \forall u, \tilde{u} \in \mathbb{H}.$$

Bochner Sobolev space $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H})$ can be defined in two equivalent ways, see e.g. [47] and [33]: via generalised derivatives or via Fourier transform. Adopting the former,

Definition B.7. It is said that $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H})$ has a (first order) L^2 -generalised derivative $\partial_{x_j}u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H})$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, if for all $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and all $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u(x), \tilde{u}) \partial_{x_j} \varphi(x) dx = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\partial_{x_j} u(x), \tilde{u}) \varphi(x) dx.$$

$H^1(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H})$ is the space of all $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H})$ having all the first-order L^2 -generalised derivatives.

It is known that $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H})$ is a separable Hilbert space with inner product

$$(u, \tilde{u})_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H})} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left[(u(x), \tilde{u}(x)) + \sum_{j=1}^n (\partial_{x_j} u(x), \partial_{x_j} \tilde{u}(x)) \right] dx.$$

Finally, $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H})$ if and only if $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{F}u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \xi \rangle^2 d\xi; \mathcal{H})$, with obvious definition of the latter weighted Bochner space. For $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H})$, the gradient $\nabla u \in (L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}))^n$ is defined in a standard way, and (in the component-wise sense) $\mathcal{F}(\nabla u)(\xi) = i\xi \mathcal{F}(u)(\xi)$.

Lemma B.8. Form Q on domain $\mathring{\mathbb{D}}$ determines a self-adjoint operator \mathcal{L} in Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}_0 = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0)$, $\mathcal{H}_0 = (\overline{V_0}, d_0)$, $V_0 = V_* \dot{+} Z$. In fact, $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \mathbb{L} \mathcal{F}$, where \mathcal{F} is the Fourier transform in \mathbb{H}_0 .

Proof. Since \mathcal{F} is a unitary operator in \mathbb{H}_0 , see (B.4), it suffices to show that $\mathring{\mathbb{D}} = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \mathbb{D}$ and

$$(B.5) \quad Q(u + v, \tilde{u} + \tilde{v}) = \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}(u + v), \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\tilde{u} + \tilde{v})), \quad \forall u + v, \tilde{u} + \tilde{v} \in \mathbb{D},$$

where \mathbb{A} is the form on the left-hand side of (6.42). First notice that by properties of the Fourier transform $\mathring{\mathbb{D}} = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \mathbb{D}$. To prove (B.5), it would suffice to show that a variant of Plancherel theorem holds for all the forms entering (6.40)–(6.42). Namely, $\forall v + z, \tilde{v} + \tilde{z} \in \mathbb{V}_0 := L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (V_0, b_0))$, $V_0 = V_* \dot{+} Z$,

$$(B.6) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathfrak{b}(v(\xi) + z(\xi), \tilde{v}(\xi) + \tilde{z}(\xi)) d\xi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathfrak{b}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}v(x) + \mathcal{F}^{-1}z(x), \mathcal{F}^{-1}\tilde{v}(x) + \mathcal{F}^{-1}\tilde{z}(x)) dx,$$

for $\mathfrak{b} = b_0$ and $\mathfrak{b} = a_{jk}^h$, $j, k = 1, \dots, n$. (For $\mathfrak{b} = a_{jk}^h$ one has to set in (B.6) $v = \tilde{v} = 0$.)

1. Aiming at (B.6) for $\mathfrak{b} = b_0$, regard \mathbb{V}_0 as a Bochner space in its own and let \mathcal{F}_b be the corresponding Fourier transform according to Definition B.6. By the unitarity of \mathcal{F}_b we immediately have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} b_0(v(\xi) + z(\xi), \tilde{v}(\xi) + \tilde{z}(\xi)) d\xi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} b_0(\mathcal{F}_b^{-1}v(x) + \mathcal{F}_b^{-1}z(x), \mathcal{F}_b^{-1}\tilde{v}(x) + \mathcal{F}_b^{-1}\tilde{z}(x)) dx,$$

So it remains to show that $\mathcal{F}_b v = \mathcal{F}v$, $\forall v \in \mathbb{V}_0$. From (6.2), by the Riesz theorem for Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}_0 := (V_0, b_0)$, there exists a linear map $T : V_0 \rightarrow V_0$ such that $d_0(v, \tilde{v}) = b_0(Tv, \tilde{v}) = b_0(v, T^* \tilde{v})$, $\forall v, \tilde{v} \in V_0$, where T^* is the adjoint of T in \mathcal{V}_0 . (T is a bounded operator in \mathcal{V}_0 , as follows e.g. from setting above $\tilde{v} = Tv$ and using (6.2)). Notice that formula (B.3) of Definition B.6 states that, for a.e. ξ , $(\mathcal{F}u(\xi), \tilde{u}) = \mathcal{F}_c(u(\cdot), \tilde{u})(\xi)$ where \mathcal{F}_c is the conventional Fourier transform in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. So, for any $v \in \mathbb{V}_0 \subset \mathbb{H}_0$ and $v' \in V_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_0$, for a.e. ξ ,

$$d_0(\mathcal{F}v(\xi), v') = \mathcal{F}_c d_0(v(\cdot), v')(\xi) = \mathcal{F}_c b_0(v(\cdot), T^* v')(\xi) = b_0(\mathcal{F}_b v(\xi), T^* v') = d_0(\mathcal{F}_b v(\xi), v'), \quad \forall v' \in V_0.$$

As V_0 is dense in \mathcal{H}_0 , the latter implies $\mathcal{F}_b v = \mathcal{F}v$ for a.e. ξ , as required.

2. To prove (B.6) for $\mathbf{b} = a_{jk}^h$ for any fixed $1 \leq j, k \leq n$, we notice first that the form a_{jk}^h is bounded in terms of b_0 . Namely, with some constant $C > 0$,

$$(B.7) \quad |a_{jk}^h(z, \tilde{z})| \leq C b_0^{1/2}[z] b_0^{1/2}[\tilde{z}], \quad \forall z, \tilde{z} \in Z.$$

(This follows e.g. from (6.41), (H4) and (5.11).) Therefore, by the Riesz theorem for $\mathcal{Z} := (Z, b_0)$, there exists a bounded linear map $T_{jk} : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ such that $a_{jk}^h(z, \tilde{z}) = b_0(T_{jk}z, \tilde{z})$, $\forall z, \tilde{z} \in Z$. Let now $z, \tilde{z} \in \mathbb{Z} := L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{Z})$. Then, using the boundedness of a_{jk}^h and T_{jk} , the isometry of \mathcal{F}_b , and the above established identity $\mathcal{F}_b z = \mathcal{F}z$, $\forall z \in \mathbb{Z} \subset V_0 \subset \mathbb{H}_0$,

$$(B.8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} a_{jk}^h(z(x), \tilde{z}(x)) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} b_0(T_{jk}z(x), \tilde{z}(x)) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} b_0(\mathcal{F}(T_{jk}z)(\xi), \mathcal{F}\tilde{z}(\xi)) d\xi.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{F}z(\xi) = \mathcal{F}_b z(\xi) \in Z$ for a.e. ξ (as immediately follows from (B.3)). We next show that, for a.e. ξ , $\mathcal{F}(T_{jk}z)(\xi) = T_{jk}(\mathcal{F}z(\xi))$. Formula (B.3) of Definition B.6 applied for \mathcal{F}_b , $u = T_{jk}z$, and arbitrary $z' \in Z$ for \tilde{u} implies $b_0(\mathcal{F}_b T_{jk}z(\xi), z') = \mathcal{F}_c b_0(T_{jk}z(\cdot), z')(\xi)$. Then, with T_{jk}^* denoting the adjoint of T_{jk} in \mathcal{Z} , and applying (B.3) again, we obtain:

$$(B.9) \quad b_0(\mathcal{F}T_{jk}z(\xi), z') = \mathcal{F}_c b_0(z(\cdot), T_{jk}^* z')(\xi) = b_0(\mathcal{F}z(\xi), T_{jk}^* z') = b_0(T_{jk}\mathcal{F}z(\xi), z').$$

Since the above holds for arbitrary $z' \in Z$, we conclude that $\mathcal{F}(T_{jk}z)(\xi) = T_{jk}(\mathcal{F}z(\xi))$, as desired. Employing the latter in (B.8) and then using again the definition of T_{jk} , we conclude

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} a_{jk}^h(z(x), \tilde{z}(x)) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} b_0(T_{jk}\mathcal{F}z(\xi), \mathcal{F}\tilde{z}(\xi)) d\xi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} a_{jk}^h(\mathcal{F}z(\xi), \mathcal{F}\tilde{z}(\xi)) d\xi,$$

as required. The proof is complete. \square

Proposition B.9. *Let $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 : (\mathcal{H}, d_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{P} : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (\mathcal{H}, d_0)) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0)$ be the orthogonal projections on the respective subspaces. Then*

$$(B.10) \quad \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 f(\xi) = (\mathcal{F}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{F}^{-1}f)(\xi) \quad \text{for a.e. } \xi, \quad f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (\mathcal{H}, d_0)).$$

Proof. Given $f \in \mathbb{H} := L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; (\mathcal{H}, d_0))$ let $g = \mathcal{F}^{-1}f \in \mathbb{H}$ and notice first that, for a.e. x , $(\mathcal{P}g)(x) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 g(x)$. Indeed, $h = \mathcal{P}g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{H}_0) =: \mathbb{H}_0$ is such that, for any $\tilde{h} \in \mathbb{H}_0$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} d_0(g(x) - h(x), \tilde{h}(x)) dx = 0$, and the latter obviously holds for $h(x) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 g(x)$ for a.e. x . So (B.10) is equivalent to $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 \mathcal{F}g(\xi) = (\mathcal{F}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0 g(\cdot))(\xi)$, for a.e. ξ . The latter can be proved by the argument identical to (B.9), with T_{jk} replaced by (self-adjoint) $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}_0}^0$, b_0 by d_0 and z' by $g' \in \mathcal{H}$. \square

References

- [1] Arbogast, T., Douglas J. Jr. and Hornung, U., 1990. *Derivation of the double porosity model of single phase flow via homogenization theory*. SIAM J. Math. Anal. 21 (4), 823–836.
- [2] Allaire, G. *Homogenization and two-scale convergence*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **23** (1992), 1482-1518.
- [3] Auriault, J.-L., Bonnet, G., 1985. *Dynamique des composites elastiques periodiques*. Arch Mech [Archiwum Mechaniki Stosowanej] 37, 269–284.
- [4] Avila, A., Griso, G., Miara, B. and Rohan, E., 2008. *Multiscale modeling of elastic waves: theoretical justification and numerical simulation of band gaps*. Multiscale Model. Simul. 7 (1), 1–21
- [5] Babych, N.O., Kamotski, I.V. and Smyshlyaev, V.P., 2008. *Homogenization of spectral problems in bounded domains with doubly high contrasts*. Networks & Heterogeneous Media, 3 (3) : 413-436.
- [6] Beer, G. *Topologies on Closed and Closed Convex Sets*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1993.

- [7] Bellieud M. *Torsion Effects in Elastic Composites with High Contrast*. SIAM J. Math. Anal. 2010;41:2514–2553.
- [8] Birman, M. Sh. and Suslina, T. A., 2004. *Second order periodic differential operators. Threshold properties and homogenisation*. St. Petersburg. Math. J. 15(5), pp. 639–714.
- [9] Birman, M. Sh. and Suslina, T. A. 2006. *Averaging of periodic differential operators taking a corrector into account. Approximation of solutions in the Sobolev class $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$* . (Russian) Algebra i Analiz 18, no. 6, 1–130; translation in St. Petersburg Math. J. 18, no. 6, 857–955.
- [10] Bouchitté, G. and Felbacq, D. *Homogenization near resonances and artificial magnetism from dielectrics*. C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 3395, (2004), 377–382.
- [11] Briane M., 2003. *Homogenization of high-conductivity periodic problems: application to a general distribution of one-directional fibers*. SIAM J. Math. Anal. Vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 33–60.
- [12] Camar-Eddine, M. and Milton, G.W., 2005. *Non-local interactions in the homogenization closure of thermoelectric functionals*. Asymptotic Anal. 41 (3–4), 259–276.
- [13] Cherdantsev, M. I. *Spectral convergence for high contrast elliptic periodic problems with a defect via homogenization*. Mathematika, Volume 55, Issue 1-2, (2009), pp. 29–57
- [14] Cherdantsev, M., Cherednichenko, K. and Cooper, S., 2017. *Extreme localisation of eigenfunctions to one-dimensional high-contrast periodic problems with a defect*. SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis, Vol. 50, No. 6, 5825–5856.
- [15] Cherednichenko, K. D. and Cooper S., 2016. Resolvent estimates for high-contrast elliptic problems with periodic coefficients. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 219(3), pp. 1061–1086.
- [16] Cherednichenko, K. D. and Kiselev, A., 2017. Norm-resolvent convergence of one-dimensional high-contrast periodic problems to a Kronig-Penney dipole-type model. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 349, pp. 441–480.
- [17] Cherednichenko, K. D., Ershova, Yu. Yu., and Kiselev, A. V., 2020. Effective behaviour of critical-contrast PDEs: micro-resonances, frequency conversion, and time dispersive properties. I *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 375, pp. 1833–1884.
- [18] Cherednichenko, K., Kiselev, A., Velčić, I., and Žubrinić, J., 2023. Effective behaviour of critical-contrast PDEs: micro-resonances, frequency conversion, and time dispersive properties. II *Arxiv preprint* <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2307.01125.pdf>
- [19] Cherednichenko, K. D. and Velčić, I., 2022. Sharp operator-norm asymptotics for thin elastic plates with rapidly oscillating periodic properties. *J. London Math. Soc.* 105, 1634–1680.
- [20] Cherednichenko, K. D., Velčić, I., and Žubrinić, J., 2023. Operator-norm resolvent estimates for thin elastic periodically heterogeneous rods in moderate contrast. *Calc. Var.* 62:147, 72 pp.
- [21] Cioranescu, D., Damlamian, A. and Griso, G., 2008. *The periodic unfolding method in homogenization*. SIAM J. Math. Anal., 40, No. 6, pp. 1585–1620.
- [22] Conca, C. and Vanninathan, M. 1997 *Homogenization of Periodic Structures via Bloch Decomposition*. SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics, Vol. 57, No. 6, pp. 1639–1659.
- [23] Cooper, S. *Two-scale homogenisation of partially degenerating PDEs with applications to photonic crystals and elasticity*. PhD Thesis, (2012), University of Bath.
<http://salc.azurewebsites.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/PhDThesissalc.pdf>
- [24] Cooper, S., 2013. Homogenisation and spectral convergence of a periodic elastic composite with weakly compressible inclusions. *Applicable Analysis*, 93(7), pp.1401–1430.
- [25] Cooper, S., Kamtoski, I. V. and Smyshlyaev, V. P. (2014). *On band gaps in photonic crystal fibers*. *Preprint*: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1411.0238.pdf>

- [26] Duerinckx, M., Gloria, A. and Ruf, M. (2023). *A spectral ansatz for the long-time homogenization of the wave equation*. Preprint: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2303.07684.pdf>
- [27] Fenchenko, V.N. and Khruslov, E.Ya., 1980. *Asymptotic behaviour for the solutions of differential equations with strongly oscillating and degenerating coefficient matrix*. Dokl. Akad. Nauk Ukrain. SSR Ser. A4, 26–30.
- [28] Gelfand, I. M. *Expansion in characteristic functions of an equation with periodic coefficients*. (Russian) Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.) **73**, (1950). 1117–1120.
- [29] Golovatyj, Yu, D, Nazarov, S.A. and O. A. Oleinik, 1992. *Asymptotic expansions of eigenvalues and eigenfunctions in problems on oscillations of a medium with concentrated perturbations*. Proc. Steklov Inst. Math., 192, 43–63.
- [30] Griso, G., 2004. Error estimate and unfolding for periodic homogenization. *Asymptotic Analysis*, 40, 269–286.
- [31] Hempel, R. and Lienau, K. *Spectral properties of periodic media in the large coupling limit Properties of periodic media*. Communications in Partial Differential Equations, Volume 25, 1999, Issue 7-8.
- [32] Higgins, J.R. *Five short stories about the cardinal series*. Bull. AMS **12**, (1985). 45-89.
- [33] Hytönen, T., Van Neerven, J., Veraar, M. and Weis, L., 2016. *Analysis in Banach spaces I*, Springer.
- [34] Jikov, V. V., Kozlov, S. M. and Olejnik, O. A., 1994. *Homogenization of differential operators and integral functionals*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [35] Kamotski, I. and Smyshlyaev, V. P. 2018. *Localized modes due to defects in high contrast periodic media via two-scale homogenization*. Journal of Mathematical Sciences, 232 (3), 349-337.
- [36] Kamotski, I. V. and Smyshlyaev, V. P. 2019. *Bandgaps in two-dimensional high-contrast periodic elastic beam lattice materials*. Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, Vol 123, 292-304.
- [37] Kamotski, I. V. and Smyshlyaev, V. P. 2019. *Two-scale homogenization for a general class of high contrast PDE systems with periodic coefficients*. Applicable Analysis, An International Journal, Volume 98, Issue 1-2.
- [38] Kuchment, P. *An overview of periodic elliptic operators*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **53** (2016), 343-414.
- [39] Ladyzhenskaya, O. A., 1969. *The Mathematical Theory of Viscous Flows, second edition*, Gordon and Breach, New York.
- [40] Nazarov, S.A, 1993. *Interaction of concentrated masses in a harmonically oscillating spatial body with Neumann boundary conditions*. ESAIM: M2AN, Volume 27, Number 6, 777-799.
- [41] Nguetseng, G. 1989. *A general convergence result for a functional related to the theory of homogenization*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **20**, 608-623.
- [42] Panasenko, G.P., 1991. *Multicomponent homogenization of processes in strongly nonhomogeneous structures*. Math. USSR Sbornik 69 (1),143–153.
- [43] Pastukhova, S.E., 2005. *On the convergence of hyperbolic semigroups in variable Hilbert spaces*. J Math Sci (N Y) 127, 2263–2283.
- [44] Peter, M. A. and Böhm, M. 2008. *Different choices of scaling in homogenization of diffusion and interfacial exchange in a porous medium*. Math. Meth. Appl. Sci., Vol 31 (11), 1257–1282.
- [45] Piatnitski, A., Sloushch, V., Suslina, T. and Zhizhina E. 2023. *On operator estimates in homogenization of nonlocal operators of convolution type*. J. Diff. Equations 352, 153–188.
- [46] Pastukhova, S. E. and Zhikov, V. V., 2013. On gaps in the spectrum of the operator of elasticity theory on a high contrast periodic structure. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 188(3), pp. 227-240.

- [47] Reed, M. and Simon, B., 1980. *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics I: Analysis of Operators*, Academic Press.
- [48] Reed, M. and Simon, B., 1978. *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics IV: Analysis of Operators*, Academic Press.
- [49] Sandrakov, G.V., 1999. *Homogenization of parabolic equations with contrasting coefficients*. *Izv. Math.* 63 (5), 1015–1061.
- [50] Smyshlyaev, V. P., 2009. Propagation and localization of elastic waves in highly anisotropic periodic composites via two-scale homogenization. *Mechanics of Materials*, 41 (4 (Sp. Iss. SI)), pp. 434-447.
- [51] Vishik, M. I. and A. A. Lyusternik, A. A. 1957. Regular degeneration and boundary layer for linear differential equations with small parameter. *Usp. Mat. Nauk*, 12(5), pp. 3–122.
- [52] Zhikov, V. V., 2000. On an extension of the method of two-scale convergence and its applications. *Sb. Math.*, 191(7), pp. 973-1014.
- [53] Zhikov, V. V., 2005. On gaps in the spectrum of some divergence elliptic operators with periodic coefficients. *St. Petersburg Math. J.*, 16(5), pp.773-719.
- [54] Zhikov, V.V. 1989. *Spectral approach to asymptotic diffusion problems*, *Differ. Uravn.*, 25:1, 44–50; *Differ. Equ.*, 25:1, 33–39
- [55] Zhikov, V.V. 2005. *Spectral method in homogenization theory* [in Russian], *Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova* 250, 95–104; English transl.: *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.* 250, 85–94.
- [56] Zhikov, V. V. 2005. *On operator estimates in homogenization theory*. (Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk* 403, no. 3, 305–308.
- [57] Zhikov, V.V. 2006. *Some estimates from homogenization theory*, *Dokl. Math.*, 73:1, 96-99.
- [58] Zhikov, V.V. and Pastukhova, S.E. 2005. *On operator estimates for some problems in homogenization theory*, *Russ. J. Math. Phys.*, 12:4, 515–524.
- [59] Zhikov, V.V. and Pastukhova, S.E. 2007. *On the Trotter-Kato theorem in a variable space*. *Funct Anal Appl.*, 41, 264–270.
- [60] Zhikov, V.V. and Pastukhova, S.E. 2016. *Operator estimates in homogenization theory*. *Russian Math. Surveys*, 71, 417–511.