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Abstract

In this paper, we study an adaptive finite element method for multiple eigenvalue problems. We obtain both convergence rate and quasi-optimal complexity of the adaptive finite element eigenvalue approximation, without any additional assumption to those required in the adaptive finite element analysis for the boundary value problem. Our analysis is based on a certain relationship between the finite element eigenvalue approximation and the associated finite element boundary value approximation and a crucial property of eigenspace approximation which are also presented in the paper.
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1 Introduction

Adaptive finite element computation is one of efficient approaches to solve partial differential equations and has been successfully used in scientific and engineering computing. Its numerical analysis has been also derived much attention from the mathematical community. Since Babuška and Vogelius [4] gave an analysis of an adaptive finite element method (AFEM) for linear symmetric elliptic problems in one dimension, there has been much investigation on the convergence and complexity of AFEMs in literature (see, e.g., [5, 7, 12, 13, 16, 31, 32] and the references cited therein). In the context of the finite element approximations of eigenvalue problems, in particular, we note that there are a number of works concerning a posteriori error estimates [5, 12, 21, 22, 24, 33], AFEM convergence [12, 15, 16] and complexity [12, 15, 20]. Except for the convergence analysis in [16], to our best knowledge, there is no any work about convergence rate and complexity of AFEM for multiple eigenvalue problems. The purpose of this paper is to fill in the gap.

We understand that multiple eigenvalue problems are topics in science and engineering, such as Hartree-Fock equation and Kohn-Sham equation used to model ground state electronic structures of...
molecular systems in quantum chemistry and materials science, in which hundreds of thousands of
eigenvalues and their corresponding eigenfunctions are needed, and among these eigenvalues, most
are multiple [23, 25, 29, 30, 11]. While the central computation in solving Hartree-Fock equation or
Kohn-Sham equation is the repeated solution of linear Schrödinger type equation, of which adaptive
finite element analysis and computation are significant. Hence, we want to study the convergence
and complexity of AFEMs for multiple eigenvalue problems and focus on the following elliptic
eigenvalue problems: find $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ such that
\[
\begin{cases}
-\nabla \cdot (A \nabla u) + cu = \lambda u & \text{in } \Omega, \\
\|u\|_{0,\Omega} = 1 & \text{on } \partial\Omega,
\end{cases}
\]
where $A, c$ are coefficients stated precisely in Section 2.

We see that the analysis technologies for the convergence rate and complicity of AFEM in lit-
erature are only valid for simple eigenvalues and their corresponding eigenfunctions, it can not
be applied directly to multiple eigenvalue cases. The difficulty lies in that in context of multi-
ple eigenvalue cases, it is not practicable to figure out the discreted eigenfunctions obtained over
different meshes so as to approximate the same exact eigenfunctions. As a result, the standard
technology of measuring the error of every eigenfunction does not work well any more, which re-
results in the difficulty when analyzing the reduction for error of the approximate eigenfunction over
two consecutive meshes. Instead, we employ some measure between the eigenspace, the space of
eigenfunctions, and its approximation. By using the similar perturbation argument in [12, 20] to-
gether with eigenspace approximation technology and its crucial property that is also shown in this
paper (see Lemma 3.1), we obtain the convergence rate and quasi-optimal complexity of AFEM for
multiple eigenvalue problems.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we shall describe some basic notation
and review the existing results of finite element approximations to a class of linear second order
elliptic boundary value and eigenvalue problems, which will be used in our analysis. In Section
3, we construct the a posteriori error estimators for finite element eigenvalue problems from the
relationship between the elliptic eigenvalue approximation and the associated boundary value ap-
proximation and then design adaptive finite element algorithm for the elliptic eigenvalue problems.
We analyze the convergence and quasi-optimal complexity of the adaptive finite element eigenvalue
computations in Sections 4 and 5, respectively. We present several numerical examples in Section
6 to illustrate our theory. Finally, we remark how our main results can be expected for the Steklov
eigenvalue problems and inexact numerical solutions.

2 Preliminaries

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d (d \geq 1)$ be a polytopic bounded domain. We shall use the standard notation for Sobolev
spaces $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ and their associated norms and seminorms, see, e.g., [1, 9]. For $p = 2$, we denote
$H^s(\Omega) = W^{s,2}(\Omega)$ and $H^1_0(\Omega) = \{ v \in H^1(\Omega) : v |_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \}$, where $v |_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ is understood in the
sense of trace, $\| \cdot \|_{s,\Omega} = \| \cdot \|_{s,2,\Omega}$, and $(\cdot,\cdot)$ is the standard $L^2$ inner product. Throughout this
paper, we shall use $C$ to denote a generic positive constant which may stand for different values at
its different occurrences. For convenience, the symbol $\lesssim$ will be used in this paper. The notation
that $A \lesssim B$ means that $A \leq CB$ for some constant $C$ that is independent of mesh parameters. All
the constants involved are independent of mesh sizes.

Let $\{T_h\}$ be a shape regular family of nested conforming meshes over $\Omega$: there exists a constant
$\gamma^*$ such that
\[
\frac{h_T}{\rho_T} \leq \gamma^* \quad \forall T \in \bigcup_h T_h,
\]
where, for each $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, $h_T$ is the diameter of $T$, and $\rho_T$ is the diameter of the biggest ball contained in $T$, $h = \max \{ h_T : T \in \mathcal{T}_h \}$. Let $\mathcal{E}_h$ denote the set of interior faces (edges or sides) of $\mathcal{T}_h$.

Let $S^{h,k}(\Omega)$ be a space of continuous functions on $\Omega$ such that for $v \in S^{h,k}(\Omega)$, $v$ restricted to each $T$ is a polynomial of degree not greater than $k$, namely,

$$S^{h,k}(\Omega) = \{ v \in C(\bar{\Omega}) : v|_T \in P^k_T \ \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h \},$$

where $P^k_T$ is the space of polynomials of degree not greater than a positive integer $k$. Set $S_0^{h,k}(\Omega) = S^{h,k}(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$. We shall denote $S_{h,k}^0(\Omega)$ by $S_0^h(\Omega)$ for simplification of notation afterwards.

### 2.1 A linear elliptic boundary value problem

In this subsection, we shall present some basic properties of a second order elliptic boundary value problem and its finite element approximations.

Consider the homogeneous boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases}
L u_i = f_i \text{ in } \Omega, \\
u_i = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega,
\end{cases}$$

(2.1)

where $N$ is a positive integer, $L$ is a linear second order elliptic operator:

$$Lu = -\nabla \cdot (A \nabla u) + cu$$

with $A : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ being piecewise Lipschitz over initial triangulation and symmetric positive definite with smallest eigenvalue uniformly bounded away from 0, and $0 \leq c \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.

The weak form of (2.1) reads: find $U = (u_1, \cdots, u_N) \in (H^1_0(\Omega))^N$ such that

$$a(u_i, v_i) = b(f_i, v_i) \quad \forall v_i \in H^1_0(\Omega), \ i = 1, \cdots, N,$$

(2.2)

where

$$a(u, v) = (A \nabla u, \nabla v) + (cu, v) \quad \text{and} \quad b(u, v) = (u, v).$$

We observe that $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a bounded bilinear form over $H^1_0(\Omega)$:

$$|a(w, v)| \leq C_a \|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \quad \forall w, v \in H^1_0(\Omega)$$

and for energy norm $\| \cdot \|_{a, \Omega}$, which is defined by $\|w\|_{a, \Omega} = \sqrt{a(w, w)}$, there hold

$$c_a \|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq \|w\|_{a, \Omega} \leq C_a \|w\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \quad \forall w \in H^1_0(\Omega),$$

where $c_a$ and $C_a$ are positive constants. We understand that (2.2) is uniquely solvable for any $f_i \in H^{-1}(\Omega)(i = 1, \cdots, N)$.

For $L^2(\Omega)$ with $\| \cdot \|_{b, \Omega} = \sqrt{b(\cdot, \cdot)}$, we see that there is a unique compact operator $K : L^2(\Omega) \to H^1_0(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$a(Kw, v) = b(w, v) \quad \forall w \in L^2(\Omega), v \in H^1_0(\Omega).$$

Define the Galerkin-projection $R_h : H^1_0(\Omega) \to V_h \equiv S_0^h(\Omega)$ by

$$a(u - R_h u, v) = 0 \quad \forall u \in H^1_0(\Omega) \ \forall v \in V_h,$$

(2.3)

then apparently

$$\| R_h u \|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \| u \|_{H^1(\Omega)} \quad \forall u \in H^1_0(\Omega).$$

The following results can be found in [2, 34].
Proposition 2.1. Let
\[
\rho_2(h) = \sup_{f \in L^2(\Omega), \|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = 1} \inf_{v \in V_h} \|Kf - v\|_{1,\Omega}.
\]
Then \(\rho_2(h) \to 0\) as \(h \to 0\) and
\[
\|u - R_hu\|_{b,\Omega} \lesssim \rho_2(h)\|u - R_hu\|_{1,\Omega} \quad \forall u \in H_0^1(\Omega).
\]

A standard finite element scheme for (2.2) reads: find \(U_h = (u_{1,h}, \cdots, u_{N,h}) \in V_h^N\) satisfying
\[
a(u_{i,h}, v_i) = b(f_i, v_i) \quad \forall v_i \in V_h, \ i = 1, \cdots, N. \quad (2.4)
\]

Let \(\mathcal{T}\) denote the class of all conforming refinements by bisection of \(\mathcal{T}_{0,h}\). For \(\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}\), define the element residual \(\bar{R}_T(u_{i,h})\) and the jump residual \(\bar{J}_E(u_{i,h})\) by
\[
\bar{R}_T(u_{i,h}) = f_i - Lu_{i,h} = f_i + \nabla \cdot (A\nabla u_{i,h}) - cu_{i,h} \quad \text{in } T \in \mathcal{T}_{0,h},
\]
\[
\bar{J}_E(u_{i,h}) = -A\nabla u_{i,h}^+ \cdot \nu^+ - A\nabla u_{i,h}^- \cdot \nu^- = [A\nabla u_{i,h}]_E \cdot \nu_E \quad \text{on } E \in \mathcal{E}_h,
\]
where \(E\) is the common side of elements \(T^+\) and \(T^-\) with unit outward normals \(\nu^+\) and \(\nu^-\), respectively, and \(\nu_E = \nu^-\). Let \(\omega_T\) be the union of elements sharing a side with \(T\) and \(\omega_E\) be the union of elements which shares the side \(E\), that is, \(\omega_E = T^+ \cap T^-\).

For \(T \in \mathcal{T}_{0,h}\), we define the local error indicator \(\bar{\eta}_h(u_{i,h}, T)\) by
\[
\bar{\eta}_h^2(u_{i,h}, T) = h_T^2\|\bar{R}_T(u_{i,h})\|_{0,T}^2 + \sum_{E \in E_{h,k}, E \subset \partial T} h_E\|\bar{J}_E(u_{i,h})\|_{0,E}^2
\]
and the oscillation \(\bar{osc}_h(u_{i,h}, T)\) by
\[
\bar{osc}_h^2(u_{i,h}, T) = h_T^2\|\bar{R}_T(u_{i,h}) - \bar{R}_T(u_{i,h})\|_{0,T}^2 + \sum_{E \in E_{h,k}, E \subset \partial T} h_E\|\bar{J}_E(u_{i,h}) - \bar{J}_E(u_{i,h})\|_{0,E}^2,
\]
where \(\bar{w}\) is the \(L^2\)-projection of \(w \in L^2(\Omega)\) to polynomials of some degree on \(T\) or \(E\).

We define the error estimator \(\bar{\eta}_h(u_{i,h}, \Omega)\) and the oscillation \(\bar{osc}_h(u_{i,h}, \Omega)\) by
\[
\bar{\eta}_h^2(u_{i,h}, \Omega) = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{0,h}, T \subset \Omega} \bar{\eta}_h^2(u_{i,h}, T) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{osc}_h^2(u_{i,h}, \Omega) = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{0,h}, T \subset \Omega} \bar{osc}_h^2(u_{i,h}, T).
\]

For any \(U_h = (u_{1,h}, \cdots, u_{N,h}) \in V_h^N\) we set
\[
\bar{\eta}_h^2(U_h, \Omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{\eta}_h^2(u_{i,h}, \Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{osc}_h^2(U_h, \Omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{osc}_h^2(u_{i,h}, \Omega).
\]

In our analysis we need the following lemma \[7\].

Lemma 2.1. There exists a constant \(C_*\) which depends on \(A\), regularity constant \(\gamma^*\), and coefficient \(c\), such that
\[
\bar{osc}_h(v, T) \leq \bar{osc}_h(w, T) + C_*\|v - w\|_{1,\omega_T} \quad \forall v, w \in V_h. \quad (2.5)
\]
We have the standard a posteriori error estimates for the finite element approximation of boundary value problems \[ (2.1) \] as follows (c.f., e.g., [27, 28, 33])

\[ \| u_i - u_{i,h} \|_{a,\Omega} \leq \tilde{C}_1 \tilde{\eta}_h(u_{i,h}, \Omega), \] (2.6)

\[ \tilde{C}_2^2 \tilde{\eta}_h^2(u_{i,h}, \Omega) - \tilde{C}_3^2 \text{osc}_h^2(u_{i,h}, \Omega) \leq \| u_i - u_{i,h} \|_{a,\Omega}^2, \] (2.7)

where \( \tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2 \) and \( \tilde{C}_3 \) are positive constants depending on the shape regularity of the mesh \( T_h \).

The adaptive algorithm for solving \[ (2.4) \] without oscillation marking can be stated as follows.

**Algorithm \( C_0 \)**

Choose a parameter \( 0 < \theta < 1 \).

1. Pick any initial mesh \( T_{h_0} \).
2. Solve the system on \( T_{h_0} \) for the discrete solution \( U_{h_0} \equiv (u_{1,h_0}, \ldots, u_{N,h_0}) \).
3. Let \( k = 0 \).
4. Compute the local indicators \( \tilde{\eta}_h^2 \).
5. Construct \( M_{h_k} \subset T_{h_k} \) by **Marking Strategy \( E_0 \)** and parameter \( \theta \).
6. Refine \( T_{h_k} \) to get a new conforming mesh \( T_{h_{k+1}} \) by Procedure **REFINE**.
7. Solve the system on \( T_{h_{k+1}} \) to get the discrete solution \( U_{h_{k+1}} \equiv (u_{1,h_{k+1}}, \ldots, u_{N,h_{k+1}}) \).
8. Let \( k = k + 1 \) and go to Step 4.

**Marking Strategy \( E_0 \)** in **Algorithm \( C_0 \)** was introduced [13, 28] when \( N = 1 \). It is used to enforce error reduction and can be defined as follows.

**Marking Strategy \( E_0 \)**

Given a parameter \( 0 < \theta < 1 \).

1. Construct a minimal subset \( M_{h_k} \subset T_{h_k} \) by selecting some elements in \( T_{h_k} \) such that

\[ \sum_{T \in M_{h_k}} \tilde{\eta}_h^2(U_{h_k}, T) \geq \theta \tilde{\eta}_h^2(U_{h_k}, \Omega). \]

2. Mark all the elements in \( M_{h_k} \).
The procedure **REFINE** here is not required to satisfy the Interior Node Property of \([27, 28]\). Given a fixed number \(b \geq 1\), for any \(T_{h_k} \in \mathcal{T}\) and a subset \(\mathcal{M}_{h_k} \subset T_{h_k}\) of marked elements,
\[
T_{h_{k+1}} = \text{REFINE}(T_{h_k}, \mathcal{M}_{h_k})
\]
outputs a conforming triangulation \(T_{h_{k+1}} \in \mathcal{T}\), where at least all elements of \(\mathcal{M}_{h_k}\) are bisected \(b\) times. We define \(R_{T_{h_k} \rightarrow T_{h_{k+1}}} = T_{h_k} \setminus (T_{h_k} \cap T_{h_{k+1}})\) as the set of refined elements, thus \(\mathcal{M}_{h_k} \subset R_{T_{h_k} \rightarrow T_{h_{k+1}}}\).

**Lemma 2.2.** Assume that \(T_{h_0}\) verifies condition (b) of Section 4 in \([32]\). Let \(\{T_{h_k}\}_{k \geq 0}\) be any sequence of refinements of \(T_{h_0}\) where \(T_{h_{k+1}}\) is generated from \(T_{h_k}\) by \(T_{h_{k+1}} = \text{REFINE}(T_{h_k}, \mathcal{M}_{h_k})\) with a subset \(\mathcal{M}_{h_k} \subset T_{h_k}\). Then
\[
\#T_{h_k} - \#T_{h_0} \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \#\mathcal{M}_{h_j} \quad \forall k \geq 1
\]
is valid, where the hidden constant depends on \(T_{h_0}\) and \(b\).

By some primary operation, we can easily extend the results about the case of \(N = 1\) in \([7]\) to vector problems, and obtain the following results.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let \(\{U_{h_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}\) be a sequence of finite element solutions of boundary problems produced by Algorithm \(C_0\). Then there exist constants \(\tilde{\gamma} > 0\) and \(\xi \in (0, 1)\), depending only on the shape regularity of meshes, the data, and the parameters used by Algorithm \(C_0\), such that for any two consecutive iterates \(k\) and \(k + 1\) we have
\[
\|U - U_{h_{k+1}}\|_{a, \Omega} + \tilde{\gamma} \eta_{h_{k+1}}^2(U_{h_{k+1}}, \Omega) \leq \xi^2 \left(\|U - U_{h_k}\|_{a, \Omega} + \tilde{\gamma} \eta_{h_k}^2(U_{h_k}, \Omega)\right).
\]
Indeed, the constant \(\tilde{\gamma}\) has the following form
\[
\tilde{\gamma} = \frac{1}{(1 + \delta^{-1})C_0^2}
\]
with some constant \(\delta \in (0, 1)\).

**Lemma 2.3.** Let \(u_{h_{k,l}} \in V_{h_k}\) and \(u_{h_{k+l, l}} \in V_{h_{k+1}}\) (\(l = 1, \ldots, N\)) be discrete solutions of \((2.4)\) over a conforming mesh \(T_{h_k}\) and its refinement \(T_{h_{k+1}}\) with marked element \(\mathcal{M}_{h_k}\). Let \(R = R_{T_{h_k} \rightarrow T_{h_{k+1}}}\) be the set of refined elements, then the following localized upper bound is valid
\[
\|U_{h_k} - U_{h_{k+1}}\|_{a, \Omega} \leq C_1^2 \sum_{T \in R} \eta_{h_k}^2(U_{h_k}, T),
\]
where \(U_{h_k} \equiv (u_{h_{k,1}}, \ldots, u_{h_k, q})\) and \(U_{h_{k+1}} \equiv (u_{h_{k+1,1}}, \ldots, u_{h_{k+1, q}})\).

**Proposition 2.2.** Let \(u_{h_{k,l}} \in V_{h_k}\) and \(u_{h_{k+l, l}} \in V_{h_{k+1}}\) (\(l = 1, \ldots, N\)) be discrete solutions of \((2.4)\) over a conforming mesh \(T_{h_k}\) and its refinement \(T_{h_{k+1}}\) with marked element \(\mathcal{M}_{h_k}\). Suppose that they satisfy the energy decrease property
\[
\|U - U_{h_{k+1}}\|_{a, \Omega} + \tilde{\gamma} \omega \eta_{h_{k+1}}^2(U_{h_{k+1}}, \Omega) \leq C_0^2 \left(\|U - U_{h_k}\|_{a, \Omega} + \tilde{\gamma} \omega \eta_{h_k}^2(U_{h_k}, \Omega)\right)
\]
with \(\omega > 0\) being a constant and \(C_0^2 \in (0, \frac{1}{2})\). Then the set \(R = R_{T_{h_k} \rightarrow T_{h_{k+1}}}\) satisfies the Dörfler property
\[
\sum_{T \in R} \eta_{h_k}^2(U_{h_k}, T) \geq \tilde{\theta} \sum_{T \in T_{h_k}} \eta_{h_k}^2(U_{h_k}, T)
\]
with \(\tilde{\theta} = \frac{C_0^2(1 + 2C_1^2)}{C_0(1 + 2C_1^2)C_0^2}, \) where \(C_0 = \max(1, \frac{C_0^2}{\gamma_0})\).
2.2 A linear eigenvalue problem

A number \( \lambda \) is called an eigenvalue of the form \( a(\cdot, \cdot) \) relative to the form \( b(\cdot, \cdot) \) if there is a nonzero function \( u \in H^1_0(\Omega) \), called an associated eigenfunction, satisfying

\[
a(u, v) = \lambda b(u, v) \quad \forall v \in H^1_0(\Omega).
\]

We see that (2.9) has a countable sequence of real eigenvalues

\[
0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3 \leq \cdots
\]

and corresponding eigenfunctions

\[
u_1, u_2, u_3, \cdots,
\]

which can be assumed to satisfy

\[
b(u_i, u_j) = \delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \cdots
\]

In the sequence \( \{\lambda_i\} \), the \( \lambda_i \)'s are repeated according to geometric multiplicity.

The following property of eigenvalue and eigenfunction approximation is useful (see [3, 35]).

**Proposition 2.3.** Let \((\lambda, u)\) be an eigenpair of (2.9). For any \(w \in H^1_0(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}\),

\[
a(w, w) - \frac{a(w - u, w - u)}{b(w, w)} - \lambda \frac{b(w - u, w - u)}{b(w, w)} = 0.
\]

A standard finite element scheme for (2.9) is: find a pair of \((\lambda_h, u_h)\), where \(\lambda_h\) is a number and \(0 \neq u_h \in V_h\), satisfying

\[
a(u_h, v) = \lambda_h b(u_h, v) \quad \forall v \in V_h.
\]

Let us order the eigenvalues of (2.10) as follows

\[
0 < \lambda_{1,h} \leq \lambda_{2,h} \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{n_h,h}, \quad n_h = \dim V_h,
\]

and assume the corresponding eigenfunctions

\[
u_{1,h}, u_{2,h}, \cdots, u_{n_h,h}
\]

satisfy

\[
b(u_{i,h}, u_{j,h}) = \delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \cdots, n_h.
\]

As a consequence of the minimum-maximum principle (see [3] or [8]) and Proposition 2.3, we have

\[
\lambda_i \leq \lambda_{i,h} \leq \lambda_i + C_i \|u_i - u_{i,h}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, n_h.
\]

(2.11)

Let \(\lambda\) be any eigenvalue of (2.9) with multiplicity \(q\) and \(M(\lambda)\) denote the space of eigenfunctions corresponding to \(\lambda\), that is

\[
M(\lambda) = \{w \in H^1_0(\Omega) : w \text{ is an eigenvector of (2.9) corresponding to } \lambda\}.
\]

We see that \(\lambda\) will be approximated from above by the Galerkin approximate eigenvalues:

\[
\lambda \leq \lambda_{h,1} \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{h,q}.
\]

Set

\[
\delta_h(\lambda) = \sup_{w \in M(\lambda), \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1} \inf_{v \in V_h} \|w - v\|_{\Omega}.
\]

The following results are standard and can be found in literature (see, e.g., [2, 3, 8] or [35]).
Proposition 2.4. Let \( \lambda \) be any eigenvalue of \((2.9)\) with multiplicity \( q \) and \( u_{h,1}, \ldots, u_{h,q} \) with \( \| u_{h,l} \|_{b,\Omega} = 1 (l = 1, \ldots, q) \) be the Galerkin eigenfunctions corresponding to \( \lambda_{h,1}, \ldots, \lambda_{h,q} \), respectively. There hold

\[
\| u - E_h u \|_{b,\Omega} \leq \rho(h) \| u - E_h u \|_{a,\Omega} \quad \forall u \in M(\lambda),
\]

\[
\| u_{h,l} - E_{h,l} u \|_{b,\Omega} \leq \rho(h) \| u_{h,l} - E_{h,l} u \|_{a,\Omega},
\]

where \( E \) denotes the orthogonal projection of the energy space onto \( M(\lambda) \), \( E_{h} \) the orthogonal projection onto \( \text{span}\{u_{h,1}, \ldots, u_{h,q}\} \).

For convenience, here and hereafter, we let \( M_h(\lambda) = \text{span}\{u_{h,1}, \ldots, u_{h,q}\} \).

3 Adaptive finite element method

Here and hereafter we assume that \( \lambda \) is some eigenvalue of \((2.5)\) with multiplicity \( q \) and \( u \in M(\lambda) \), and \((\lambda_{h,l}, u_{h,l}) \in \mathbb{R} \times V_h \) is the associated finite element eigenpairs of \((2.10)\) with \( \| u_{h,l} \|_{b,\Omega} = 1 (l = 1, \ldots, q) \) that satisfy \((2.12)\) and \((2.13)\).

Let \( \lambda^h = a(E_{h} u, E_{h} u) \), we conclude from \((2.11)\) and \((2.12)\) that

\[
\| u - E_{h} u \|_{b,\Omega} + |\lambda - \lambda^h| \leq C(\rho(h) + \| u - E_{h} u \|_{a,\Omega}) \| u - E_{h} u \|_{a,\Omega}.
\]

Note that \((2.9)\) and \((2.10)\) can be rewritten as

\[
u = \lambda K u, \quad u_{h,l} = \lambda_{h,l} R_h K u_{h,l},\]

where \( R_h \) is the Galerkin projection defined by \((2.3)\).

We see from the definition of \( E_{h} \) that for any \( u \in M(\lambda) \), there exist some constants \( \{\alpha_{h,l}(u)\}_{l=1}^q \) satisfying \( \sum_{l=1}^q (\alpha_{h,l}(u))^2 = 1 \) such that \( E_{h} u = \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{h,l}(u) u_{h,l} \). Define \( w^h = \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{h,l}(u) \lambda_{h,l} K u_{h,l} \), and we obtain from a direct calculation that

\[
E_{h} u = R_h w^h.
\]

Theorem 3.1. Given \( u \in M(\lambda) \), let \( r(h) = \rho(h) + \| u - E_{h} u \|_{a,\Omega} \). Then

\[
\| u - E_{h} u \|_{a,\Omega} = \| w^h - R_h w^h \|_{a,\Omega} + O(r(h)) \| u - E_{h} u \|_{a,\Omega}.
\]

Proof. We obtain from the definition of \( w^h \) that

\[
u - w^h = \lambda K u - \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{h,l}(u) \lambda_{h,l} K u_{h,l}
= \lambda K (u - E_{h} u) + \lambda K \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{h,l}(u) u_{h,l} - \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{h,l}(u) \lambda_{h,l} K u_{h,l}
= \lambda K (u - E_{h} u) + \sum_{l=1}^q \alpha_{h,l}(u) (\lambda - \lambda_{h,l}) K u_{h,l}.
\]

Since

\[
\lambda - \lambda^h = \sum_{l=1}^q (\alpha_{h,l}(u))^2 (\lambda - \lambda_{h,l}),
\]
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we have
\[ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{q} \alpha_{h,i}(u)(\lambda - \lambda_{h,i})K_{U,E} \right\|_{a,\Omega} \lesssim \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{q} \alpha_{h,i}(u)(\lambda - \lambda_{h,i}) \right\| \]
\[ \leq \max_{\alpha_{h,i}(u) \neq 0, i=1, \ldots, q} \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha_{h,i}(u)} \right\} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{q} \alpha_{h,i}^{2}(\lambda - \lambda_{h,i}) \right\| \]
\[ \lesssim |\lambda - \lambda^{h}|, \]
which together with the fact \( \|K(u - E_{h}u)\|_{a,\Omega} \lesssim \|u - E_{h}u\|_{b,\Omega} \) and (3.1) leads to
\[ \|u - \theta^{h}\|_{a,\Omega} \leq \check{C}_{T}(h)\|u - E_{h}u\|_{a,\Omega}. \tag{3.4} \]
Note that (3.2) implies
\[ u - E_{h}u = w^{h} - R_{h}w^{h} + u - \theta^{h}. \]
Hence we obtain (3.3) from (3.4). This completes the proof. \( \square \)

### 3.1 A posteriori error estimators

Following the element residual \( \hat{R}_{T}(u_{h}) \) and the jump residual \( J_{E}(u_{h}) \) for (2.10), we now define an element residual \( R_{T}(E_{h}u) \) and a jump residual \( J_{E}(E_{h}u) \) for (2.10) as follows:

\[
R_{T}(E_{h}u) = \lambda^{h}E_{h}u + \nabla \cdot (A\nabla E_{h}u) - cE_{h}u \quad \text{in } T \subset \mathcal{T}_{h},
\]
\[
J_{E}(E_{h}u) = -A\nabla(E_{h}u)^{+} \cdot \nu^{+} - A\nabla(E_{h}u)^{-} \cdot \nu^{-}
\]
\[
= \|[A\nabla E_{h}u]_{E} \cdot \nu_{E}
\]
on \( E \in \mathcal{E}_{h}, \)

where \( E, \nu^{+} \) and \( \nu^{-} \) are defined as those of section 2.1.

For \( T \subset \mathcal{T}_{h}, \) we define the local error indicator \( \eta_{h}(E_{h}u, T) \) by
\[
\eta_{h}^{2}(E_{h}u, T) = h_{T}^{2}\|R_{T}(E_{h}u)\|_{0,T}^{2} + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_{h}, E \subset \partial T} \|J_{E}(E_{h}u)\|_{0,E}^{2}
\]
and the oscillation \( osc_{h}(E_{h}u, T) \) by
\[
osc_{h}^{2}(E_{h}u, T) = h_{T}^{2}\|R_{T}(E_{h}u) - R_{T}(E_{h}u)\|_{0,T}^{2} + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_{h}, E \subset \partial T} h_{E}\|J_{E}(E_{h}u) - J_{E}(E_{h}u)\|_{0,E}^{2}.
\]

We define the error estimator \( \eta_{h}(E_{h}u, \Omega) \) and the oscillation \( osc_{h}(E_{h}u, \Omega) \) by
\[
\eta_{h}^{2}(E_{h}u, \Omega) = \sum_{T \subset \mathcal{T}_{h}, T \subset \Omega} \eta_{h}^{2}(E_{h}u, T) \quad \text{and} \quad osc_{h}^{2}(E_{h}u, \Omega) = \sum_{T \subset \mathcal{T}_{h}, T \subset \Omega} osc_{h}^{2}(E_{h}u, T).
\]

For any \( U_{h} = (u_{h,1}, \ldots, u_{h,\alpha}) \in V_{h}^{q}, \) we let
\[
\eta_{h}^{2}(U_{h}, \Omega) = \sum_{l=1}^{q} \eta_{h}^{2}(u_{h,l}, \Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad osc_{h}^{2}(U_{h}, \Omega) = \sum_{l=1}^{q} osc_{h}^{2}(u_{h,l}, \Omega)
\]
and for any \( E_{h}U = (E_{h}u_{1}, \ldots, E_{h}u_{q}) \in V_{h}^{q}, \) we set
\[
\eta_{h}^{2}(E_{h}U, \Omega) = \sum_{l=1}^{q} \eta_{h}^{2}(E_{h}u_{l}, \Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad osc_{h}^{2}(E_{h}U, \Omega) = \sum_{l=1}^{q} osc_{h}^{2}(E_{h}u_{l}, \Omega).
\]
Given $h_0 \in (0, 1)$, define 
\[ \tilde{r}(h_0) = \sup_{h \in (0, h_0)} r(h). \]

**Theorem 3.2.** There exist constants $C_1, C_2$ and $C_3$, which only depend on the shape regularity constant $\gamma^*$, coercivity constant $c_a$ and continuity constant $C_a$ of the bilinear form, such that
\[ \|u - E_h u\|_{a, \Omega} \leq C_1 \eta_h(E_h u, \Omega) \] (3.5)
and
\[ C_2^2 \eta_h^2(E_h u, \Omega) - C_3^2 \text{osc}_h^2(E_h u, \Omega) \leq \|u - E_h u\|^2_{a, \Omega} \] (3.6)
provided $h_0 \ll 1$. Consequently,
\[ |\lambda - \lambda^h| \lesssim \eta_h^2(E_h u, \Omega) \]
and
\[ \eta_h^2(E_h u, \Omega) - \text{osc}_h^2(E_h u, \Omega) \lesssim |\lambda - \lambda^h|. \]

**Proof.** Recall that $L^h u = \sum_{i=1}^q a_{h,i}^h(u) \lambda^h_i K u_{h,i}$. We obtain from (2.6) and (2.7) that
\[ \|w^h - R_h w^h\|_{a, \Omega} \leq \tilde{C}_1 \eta_h(E_h u, \Omega) \] (3.7)
and
\[ \tilde{C}_2^2 \eta_h^2(E_h u, \Omega) - \tilde{C}_3^2 \text{osc}_h^2(E_h u, \Omega) \leq \|w^h - R_h w^h\|^2_{a, \Omega}. \] (3.8)
Combining (3.2), (3.3), (3.7) with (3.8), we complete the proof. In particular, we may choose the constants $C_1, C_2$ and $C_3$ satisfying
\[ C_1 = \tilde{C}_1 (1 + \tilde{C}\tilde{r}(h_0)), \quad C_2 = \tilde{C}_2 (1 - \tilde{C}\tilde{r}(h_0)), \quad C_3 = \tilde{C}_3 (1 - \tilde{C}\tilde{r}(h_0)). \] (3.9)

### 3.2 Adaptive algorithm

Recall that the adaptive procedure consists of loops of the form

\[
\text{Solve} \rightarrow \text{Estimate} \rightarrow \text{Mark} \rightarrow \text{Refine}
\]

We assume that the solutions of the finite dimensional problems can be solved to any accuracy efficiently\(^1\). The a posteriori error estimators are an essential part of the **Estimate** step. In the following discussion, we use $\eta_h(U_h, \Omega)$ defined above as the a posteriori error estimator.

\(^1\) In fact, we have ignored two important practical issues: the inexact solution of the resulting algebraic system and the numerical integration. We remark the discussion about the inexact solution in Section 7.
Choose a parameter $0 < \theta < 1$.

1. Pick an initial mesh $\mathcal{T}_{h_0}$ with mesh size $h_0$.
2. Solve the system on $\mathcal{T}_{h_0}$ for the discrete solutions $(\lambda_{h_0,l}, u_{h_0,l})(l = 1, \cdots, q)$.
3. Let $k = 0$.
4. Compute the local indicators $\eta_{h_k}(u_{h_k,l}, T)(l = 1, \cdots, q)$.
5. Construct $\mathcal{M}_{h_k} \subset \mathcal{T}_{h_k}$ by Marking Strategy $E$ and parameter $\theta$.
6. Refine $\mathcal{T}_{h_k}$ to get a new conforming mesh $\mathcal{T}_{h_{k+1}}$ by Procedure REFINE.
7. Solve the system on $\mathcal{T}_{h_{k+1}}$ for the discrete solution $(\lambda_{h_{k+1},l}, u_{h_{k+1},l})(l = 1, \cdots, q)$.
8. Let $k = k + 1$ and go to Step 4.

Our Algorithm $C$ is nothing but Algorithm $C_0$ when Marking Strategy $E_0$ is replaced by the following Marking Strategy $E$.

Given a parameter $0 < \theta < 1$.

1. Construct a minimal subset $\mathcal{M}_{h_k}$ of $\mathcal{T}_{h_k}$ by selecting some elements in $\mathcal{T}_{h_k}$ such that
   \[ \sum_{T \in \mathcal{M}_{h_k}} \eta_{h_k}^2(U_{h_k}, T) \geq \theta \eta_{h_k}^2(U_{h_k}, \Omega). \]
2. Mark all the elements in $\mathcal{M}_{h_k}$.

We shall now present the following property of eigenspace approximation that will play a crucial role in our analysis.

**Lemma 3.1.** Given constant $\theta \in (0, 1)$. If
\[ \sum_{T \in \mathcal{M}_H} \eta_H^2(U_H, T) \geq \theta \eta_H^2(U_H, \Omega), \] (3.10)
then for any orthonormal basis \( \{ u_l \}_{l=1}^q \) of \( M(\lambda) \), there holds

\[
\sum_{T \in \mathcal{M}_H} \eta_H^2(E_H U, T) \geq \theta' \eta_H^2(E_H U, \Omega),
\]

(3.11)

where \( E_H U = (E_H u_1, \cdots, E_H u_q) \) and \( \theta' = \frac{q}{4q^2} \in (0, 1) \).

**Proof.** We denote \( E_H u_l \) as \( v_{H,l} \). Since \( M_H(\lambda) = \text{span}\{u_{H,1}, \cdots, u_{H,q}\} \), we have that there exists \( q \) constants \( \beta_{H,j}^l (j = 1, \cdots, q) \) satisfying

\[
\sum_{j=1}^q (\beta_{H,j}^l)^2 = 1
\]

such that

\[
v_{H,l} = \sum_{j=1}^q \beta_{H,j}^l u_{H,j}, \quad l = 1, \cdots, q.
\]

We may analyze as follows

\[
\eta_H^2(E_H U, \Omega) = \sum_{l=1}^q \eta_H^2(\sum_{j=1}^q \beta_{H,j}^l u_{H,j}, \Omega)
\]

\[
\leq 2 \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^q (\beta_{H,j}^l)^2 \eta_H^2(u_{H,j}, \Omega)
\]

\[
= 2 \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{l=1}^q (\beta_{H,j}^l)^2 \eta_H^2(u_{H,j}, \Omega),
\]

which together with the fact that \( |\beta_{H,j}^l| \leq 1 \) yields

\[
\eta_H^2(E_H U, \Omega) \leq 2q \eta_H^2(U_H, \Omega).
\]

(3.12)

We see from the definition of \( E_H \) that \( \{ v_{H,l} \}_{l=1}^q \) is an orthonormal basis of \( M_H(\lambda) \), namely, \( M_H(\lambda) = \text{span}\{u_{H,1}, \cdots, u_{H,q}\} = \text{span}\{v_{H,1}, \cdots, v_{H,q}\} \). So there exist \( q \) constants \( \beta_{H,j}^l (j = 1, \cdots, q) \) satisfying \( \sum_{j=1}^q (\beta_{H,j}^l)^2 = 1 \) such that

\[
u_{H,l} = \sum_{j=1}^q \beta_{H,j}^l v_{H,j}, \quad l = 1, \cdots, q.
\]

Similarly, from the following estimation

\[
\sum_{T \in \mathcal{M}_H} \eta_H^2(U_H, T) = \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{T \in \mathcal{M}_H} \eta_H^2(\sum_{j=1}^q \beta_{H,j}^l v_{H,j}, T)
\]

\[
\leq 2 \sum_{l=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^q (\beta_{H,j}^l)^2 \sum_{T \in \mathcal{M}_H} \eta_H^2(v_{H,j}, T)
\]

\[
= 2 \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{l=1}^q (\beta_{H,j}^l)^2 \sum_{T \in \mathcal{M}_H} \eta_H^2(v_{H,j}, T),
\]

we obtain

\[
\sum_{T \in \mathcal{M}_H} \eta_H^2(U_H, T) \leq 2q \sum_{T \in \mathcal{M}_H} \eta_H^2(E_H U, T).
\]

(3.13)
Lemma 4.1. Let $\theta$ be used in our analysis for both convergence and quasi-optimal complexity. Following Theorem 3.1, we can establish some relationship between the two level approximations, which is nothing but (3.11) with $\theta' = \frac{\theta}{4q^2}$.

4 Convergence

Following Theorem 3.1, we can establish some relationship between the two level approximations, which will be used in our analysis for both convergence and quasi-optimal complexity.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let $h, H \in (0, h_0), \{u_i\}_{i=1}^q$ be any orthonormal basis of $M(\lambda)$, $\chi^{H,i} = a(E Hu_i, E Hu_i)$, $w^{H,i} = \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha H,i(u_i)\lambda H,i Ku_{H,i}$, and $W^H = (w^{H,1}, \ldots, w^{H,q})$. Then

\[
\|U - E_h U\|_{a,\Omega} = \|W^H - R_h W^H\|_{a,\Omega} + O(\bar{r}(h_0)) (\|U - E_h U\|_{a,\Omega} + \|U - E H U\|_{a,\Omega}),
\]

(4.1)

\[
\text{osc}_h(E_h U, \Omega) = \text{osc}_h(R_h W^H, \Omega) + O(\bar{r}(h_0)) (\|U - E_h U\|_{a,\Omega} + \|U - E H U\|_{a,\Omega}),
\]

(4.2)

and

\[
\eta_h(E_h U, \Omega) = \eta_h(R_h W^H, \Omega) + O(\bar{r}(h_0)) (\|U - E_h U\|_{a,\Omega} + \|U - E H U\|_{a,\Omega}).
\]

(4.3)

**Proof.** It is sufficient to prove that for any $u \in M(\lambda)$, $w^h = \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha h,i(u)\lambda h,i Ku_{h,i}$, and $w^H = \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha H,i(u)\lambda H,i Ku_{H,i}$, the following equalities hold,

\[
\|u - E_h u\|_{a,\Omega} = \|w^H - R_h w^H\|_{a,\Omega} + O(\bar{r}(h_0)) (\|u - E_h u\|_{a,\Omega} + \|u - E H u\|_{a,\Omega}),
\]

(4.4)

\[
\text{osc}_h(E_h u, \Omega) = \text{osc}_h(R_h w^H, \Omega) + O(\bar{r}(h_0)) (\|u - E_h u\|_{a,\Omega} + \|u - E H u\|_{a,\Omega}),
\]

(4.5)

and

\[
\eta_h(E_h u, \Omega) = \eta_h(R_h w^H, \Omega) + O(\bar{r}(h_0)) (\|u - E_h u\|_{a,\Omega} + \|u - E H u\|_{a,\Omega}).
\]

(4.6)

First, we prove (4.4). We see that

\[
\|R_h(w^h - w^H) + w^H - u\|_{a,\Omega} \lesssim \|w^h - w^H\|_{a,\Omega} + \|u - w^H\|_{a,\Omega}
\]

\[
\lesssim \|u - w^H\|_{a,\Omega} + \|u - w^h\|_{a,\Omega},
\]

which together with (3.1) leads to

\[
\|R_h(w^h - w^H) + w^H - u\|_{a,\Omega} \lesssim \bar{r}(h_0)(\|u - E H u\|_{a,\Omega} + \|u - E_h u\|_{a,\Omega}).
\]

(4.7)

Note that (3.2) implies

\[
u - E_h u = w^H - R_h w^H + R_h(w^H - w^h) + u - w^H,
\]

(4.8)
we get (4.11) from (4.7). We obtain from Lemma 2.1 that
\[
\tilde{\text{os}}_{h}(R_{h}(w^{b} - w^{H}),\Omega) \lesssim \|R_{h}(w^{H} - w^{b})\|_{a,\Omega},
\]  
(4.9)
which together with 3.3 and (4.7) yields
\[
\tilde{\text{os}}_{h}(R_{h}(w^{H} - w^{h}),\Omega) \lesssim \tilde{r}(h_{0})(\|u - E_{H}u\|_{a,\Omega} + \|u - E_{h}u\|_{a,\Omega}).
\]  
(4.10)
Due to \(E_{h}u = R_{h}w^{H} + R_{h}(w^{h} - w^{H})\), we conclude from the definition of oscillation that
\[
\tilde{\text{os}}_{h}(R_{h}w^{h},\Omega) = \tilde{\text{os}}_{h}(R_{h}w^{H} + R_{h}(w^{h} - w^{H}),\Omega),
\]
then we arrive at (4.5), together with (4.10).

We now prove (4.6). By (2.7), we have
\[
\tilde{\eta}_{h}(R_{h}(w^{h} - w^{H}),\Omega) \lesssim \|(w^{h} - w^{H}) - R_{h}(w^{h} - w^{H})\|_{a,\Omega} + \tilde{\text{os}}_{h}(R_{h}(w^{h} - w^{H}),\Omega)
\]  
(4.11)
\[
\lesssim \|u - w^{h}\|_{a,\Omega} + \|u - w^{H}\|_{a,\Omega} + \|R_{h}(w^{h} - w^{H})\|_{a,\Omega},
\]
where (4.4) is used in the last inequality. Using (4.3) and (4.7), we obtain
\[
\tilde{\eta}_{h}(R_{h}(w^{h} - w^{H}),\Omega) \lesssim \tilde{r}(h_{0})(\|u - E_{H}u\|_{a,\Omega} + \|u - E_{h}u\|_{a,\Omega}).
\]  
(4.11)
From (4.11) and the fact that
\[
\tilde{\eta}_{h}(R_{h}w^{h},\Omega) = \tilde{\eta}_{h}(R_{h}w^{H} + R_{h}(w^{h} - w^{H}),\Omega),
\]
we get
\[
\tilde{\eta}_{h}(R_{h}w^{h},\Omega) = \tilde{\eta}_{h}(R_{h}w^{H},\Omega) + O(\tilde{r}(h_{0})) (\|u - E_{H}u\|_{a,\Omega} + \|u - E_{h}u\|_{a,\Omega}),
\]
which is nothing but (4.6) since \(\tilde{\eta}_{h}(R_{h}w^{H},\Omega) = \eta_{h}(E_{h}u,\Omega)\). \(\square\)

We are now in the position to present and analyze the error reduction result.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let \(\lambda \in \mathbb{R}\) be some eigenpair of (2.2) with multiplicity \(q\), \(\{u_{l}\}_{l=1}^{q}\) be an orthonormal basis of \(M(\lambda)\), and \(\{(\lambda_{h_{k}}, u_{h_{k}})\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{0}}\) be a sequence of finite element solutions produced by Algorithm C of Section 3. Then there exist constants \(\gamma > 0\) and \(\alpha \in (0,1)\), depending only on the shape regularity of meshes, \(C_{a}\) and \(e_{a}\), the parameter used by Algorithm C, such that for any two consecutive iterates \(k\) and \(k + 1\), we have
\[
\|U - E_{h_{k+1}}U\|^{2}_{a,\Omega} + \gamma \eta^{2}_{h_{k+1}}(E_{h_{k+1}}U,\Omega) \leq \alpha^{2} (\|U - E_{h_{k}}U\|^{2}_{a,\Omega} + \gamma \eta^{2}_{h_{k}}(E_{h_{k}}U,\Omega))
\]  
(4.12)
provided \(h_{0} \ll 1\). Therefore, Algorithm C converges with a linear rate \(\alpha\), namely, the \(n\)-th iterate solution \((\lambda^{n}, E_{h_{n}}u_{l})\) of Algorithm C satisfies
\[
\|U - E_{h_{n}}U\|^{2}_{a,\Omega} + \gamma \eta^{2}_{h_{n}}(E_{h_{n}}U,\Omega) \leq C_{0} \alpha^{2n}
\]  
(4.13)
and
\[
\lambda^{n} - \lambda \lesssim \alpha^{2n},
\]  
(4.14)
where \(C_{0} = \|U - E_{h_{0}}U\|^{2}_{a,\Omega} + \gamma \eta^{2}_{h_{0}}(E_{h_{0}}U,\Omega)\).
Proof. For convenience, we use \((\lambda_h, t, u_h, t), (\lambda_{H}, t, u_{H}, t)\) to denote \((\lambda_{h+1}, t, u_{h+1}, t)\) and \((\lambda_h, t, u_h, t)\), respectively. We see that it is sufficient to prove

\[
\| U - E_h U \|_{a, \Omega}^2 + \gamma \eta_h^2(E_h U, \Omega) \leq \alpha^2 (\| U - E_H U \|_{a, \Omega}^2 + \gamma \eta_h^2(E_h U, \Omega)).
\]

We derive from Lemma 3.1 that Marking Strategy E implies that there exists a constant \(\theta' = \frac{\theta}{\theta + \alpha}, \alpha \in (0, 1)\) such that

\[
\sum_{T \in M_H} \eta_T^2(E_H U, T) \geq \theta' \eta^2_H(E_H U, \Omega). \tag{4.15}
\]

Recall that \(w^{h, l} = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_{h,i}(u_l) \lambda_{h,i} K u_{h,i}, w^{H, l} = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_{H,i}(u_l) \lambda_{H,i} K u_{H,i}\), we get from (4.13) that for \(W^H \equiv (w^{H, 1}, \cdots, w^{H, d})\), Marking Strategy E0 is satisfied with \(\theta = \theta'\). So, we conclude from Theorem 2.1 that there exist constants \(\gamma > 0\) and \(\xi \in (0, 1)\) satisfying

\[
\| W^H - R_h W^H \|_{a, \Omega}^2 + \gamma \eta_h^2(R_h W^H, \Omega) \leq \xi \| W^H - E_H U \|_{a, \Omega}^2 + \gamma \eta_h^2(E_h U, \Omega), \tag{4.16}
\]

where (4.2) is used when \(h\) is replaced by \(H\).

By Lemma 3.1 and (3.4), we have that there exist constants \(\bar{C}_1 > 0, \bar{C}_2 > 0\) such that

\[
\| U - E_h U \|_{a, \Omega}^2 + \gamma \eta_h^2(E_h U, \Omega) = \| W^H - R_h W^H \|_{a, \Omega}^2 + \gamma \eta_h^2(R_h W^H, \Omega) + \bar{C}_1 \gamma^2(h_0) || U - E_H U \|_{a, \Omega}^2 (4.17)
\]

and

\[
\| U - E_h U \|_{a, \Omega}^2 + \gamma \eta_h^2(E_h U, \Omega) = \| W^H - R_h W^H \|_{a, \Omega}^2 + \gamma \eta_h^2(R_h W^H, \Omega) + \bar{C}_2 \gamma^2(h_0) (\| U - E_h U \|_{a, \Omega}^2 + \| U - E_H U \|_{a, \Omega}^2). \tag{4.18}
\]

Combining (4.13), (4.17) with (4.18), we get when \(h_0 \ll 1\) that

\[
\| U - E_h U \|_{a, \Omega}^2 + \frac{\gamma}{1 - \bar{C}_2 \gamma^2(h_0)} \eta_h^2(E_h U, \Omega) \leq \frac{\xi^2 (1 + \bar{C}_1 \gamma^2(h_0)) + \tilde{C}_1 \gamma^2(h_0)}{1 - \bar{C}_2 \gamma^2(h_0)} \| U - E_H U \|_{a, \Omega}^2 + \frac{\xi^2}{1 - \bar{C}_2 \gamma^2(h_0)} \gamma \eta_h^2(E_h U, \Omega).
\]

Since \(h_0 \ll 1\) implies \(\tilde{c}(h_0) \ll 1\), there exists \(\delta_1 \in (0, 1)\) such that \(|\bar{C}_1 \gamma^2(h_0)| \leq \delta_1\) if \(h_0 \ll 1\). Hence,

\[
\| U - E_h U \|_{a, \Omega}^2 + \frac{\gamma}{1 - \bar{C}_2 \gamma^2(h_0)} \eta_h^2(E_h U, \Omega) \leq \frac{\xi^2 (1 + \delta_1) + \tilde{C}_1 \gamma^2(h_0)}{1 - \bar{C}_2 \gamma^2(h_0)} \left( \| U - E_H U \|_{a, \Omega}^2 + \frac{\xi^2}{1 - \bar{C}_2 \gamma^2(h_0)} \gamma \eta_h^2(E_h U, \Omega) \right)
\]

when \(h_0 \ll 1\). Note that the constant \(\alpha\) defined by

\[
\alpha = \left( \frac{\xi^2 (1 + \delta_1) + \tilde{C}_2 \gamma^2(h_0)}{1 - \bar{C}_2 \gamma^2(h_0)} \right)^{1/2}
\]

satisfies \(\alpha \in (0, 1)\) if \(h_0 \ll 1\). We finally arrive at (4.12) by using the fact that

\[
\frac{\xi^2 \gamma}{\xi^2 (1 + \delta_1) + \tilde{C}_2 \gamma^2(h_0)} < \gamma,
\]

where

\[
\gamma = \frac{\tilde{c}}{1 - \bar{C}_2 \gamma^2(h_0)}. \tag{4.19}
\]

This completes the proof. \(\blacksquare\)
5 Complexity

We introduce a function approximation class as follows

\[ A^*_γ = \{ v \in H : |v|_{s, γ} < ∞ \}, \]

where \( γ > 0 \) is some constant,

\[ |v|_{s, γ} = \sup_{ε > 0} ε ( \inf_{T \subset T_0} \inf (\|v - v_T\|^2_{Ω} + (γ + 1) \text{osc}_T(v_T, T)))^{1/2} \leq \epsilon \]

and \( T \subset T_0 \) means \( T \) is a refinement of \( T_0 \). It is seen from the definition that, for all \( γ > 0 \), \( A^*_γ = A^*_1 \). For simplicity, here and hereafter, we use \( A^* \) to stand for \( A^*_1 \), and use \( |v|_s \) to denote \( |v|_{s, γ} \). So \( A^* \) is the class of functions that can be approximated within a given tolerance \( ε \) by continuous piecewise polynomial functions over a partition \( T \) with number of degrees of freedom \( #T - #T_0 \leq ε^{-1/γ} |v|_s^{1/ε} \).

To give the proof of optimal complexity of Algorithm \( C \) for the eigenvalue problem (2.10), we need some preparations. We know that in each mesh \( T_{h,k} \), \( u^{h,k,l} = \sum_{i=1}^{q} α_{h,k,i}(u_i)λ_{h,k,i}Kh_{h,k,i} \) satisfies

\[ a(w^{h,k,l}, v) = (\sum_{i=1}^{q} α_{h,k,i}(u_i)λ_{h,k,i}v_{h,k,i}, v) \quad \forall v \in V_{h,k}, \quad l = 1, \cdots, q. \quad (5.1) \]

Thanks to Theorem [5.1] and Lemma [1.1] and their proofs, we are able to analyze the complexity of adaptive finite element method for multiple eigenvalue problems by using the complexity result for boundary value problems, which is similar to what was demonstrated in the convergence analysis.

Using the similar procedure as in the proof of Theorem [4.7] we have

**Lemma 5.1.** Let \( λ \in \mathbb{R} \) be some eigenvalue of (2.2) with multiplicity \( q \), and \( \{u_i\}^{q}_{i=1} \) be an orthonormal basis of \( M(λ) \). Let \( (λ_{h,k,i}, u_{h,k,i}) \in \mathbb{R} \times V_{h,k} \) and \( (λ_{h+1,k,i}, u_{h+1,k,i}) \in \mathbb{R} \times V_{h+1,k} \) be discrete solutions of (2.10) over a conforming mesh \( T_{h,k} \) and its refinement \( T_{h+1,k} \) with marked element \( M_{h,k} \). Suppose they satisfy the following property

\[ \|U - E_{h,k}U\|^2_{a,Ω} + γₗ \text{osc}^2_{h,k,i}(E_{h,k}U, Ω) \leq βₗ^2 (\|U - E_{h,k}U\|^2_{a,Ω} + γₗ \text{osc}^2_{h,k,i}(E_{h,k}U, Ω)), \]

where \( γₗ > 0, βₗ > 0 \) are some constants. Then for the associated boundary value problem (5.1), we have

\[ \|W^{h,k} - R_{h,k}W^{h,k}\|^2_{a,Ω} + γₗ \text{osc}^2_{h,k,i}(R_{h,k}W^{h,k}, Ω) \leq βₗ^2 (\|W^{h,k} - R_{h,k}W^{h,k}\|^2_{a,Ω} + γₗ \text{osc}^2_{h,k,i}(E_{h,k}U, Ω)) \]

with

\[ βₗ = \left( \frac{βₗ^2(1 + \delta_1) + ̂C₅γₗ^2(h_0)}{1 - ̂C₅γₗ^2(h_0)} \right)^{1/2}, \quad γₗ = \frac{γₗ}{1 - ̂C₅γₗ^2(h_0)}, \quad (5.2) \]

where \( ̂C₅ \) is some constant depending on \( A \); \( ̂C \) and \( Cₗ \), \( δ₁ \in (0, 1) \) is some constant as shown in the proof Theorem [4.7].
Proof. By Lemma 4.1 and (3.4), we have that there exists constant $\hat{C}_3 > 0$ such that
\[
\|W^H - R_h W^H\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma_* \text{osc}_{H}^2 (WF^H, \Omega) = \|U - E_h U\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma_* \text{osc}_{H}^2 (EF_h U, \Omega) + \hat{C}_1 \hat{\gamma}(h_0) \|W^H - R_h W^H\|_{a,\Omega}^2,
\]
and
\[
\|W^H - R_h W^H\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma_* \text{osc}_{H}^2 (WF^H, \Omega) = \|U - E_h U\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma_* \text{osc}_{H}^2 (EF_h U, \Omega) + \hat{C}_2 \hat{\gamma}(h_0) (\|W^H - R_h W^H\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \|W^H - R_h W^H\|_{2,\Omega}^2).
\]
Proceed the same procedure as in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we get
\[
\|W^H - R_h W^H\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma_* \text{osc}_{H}^2 (WF^H, \Omega) \leq \hat{\beta}_*^2 (\|W^H - R_h W^H\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma_* \text{osc}_{H}^2 (WF^H, \Omega))
\]
with
\[
\hat{\beta}_* = \left( \frac{\hat{C}_2^2 (1 + \delta_1) + \hat{C}_3 \hat{\gamma}^2(h_0)}{1 - \hat{C}_3 \hat{\gamma}^2(h_0)} \right)^{1/2}, \quad \hat{\gamma}_* = \frac{\gamma_*}{1 - \hat{C}_3 \hat{\gamma}^2(h_0)},
\]
where $C_3$ is some positive constant and $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$ is some constant as shown in the proof Theorem 4.1. This completes the proof. \hfill $\square$

The following statement is a direct consequence of $E_{h_k} u_l = R_{h_k} w^{h_k,l}$, Proposition 2.2 and Lemma 5.1.

Corollary 5.1. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ be some eigenpair of (2.7) with multiplicity $q$, and \{u_l\}_{l=1}^q be an orthonormal basis of $M(\lambda)$. Suppose that they satisfy the decrease property
\[
\|U - E_{h_{k+1}} U\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma_* \text{osc}_{H}^2 (E_{h_{k+1}} U, \Omega) \leq \hat{\beta}_*^2 (\|U - E_{h_k} U\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma_* \text{osc}_{H}^2 (E_{h_k} U, \Omega))
\]
with constants $\gamma_* > 0$ and $\hat{\beta}_* \in (0, \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}})$. Then the set $\mathcal{R} = R_{T_{h_k} \to T_{h_{k+1}}}$ satisfies the following inequality
\[
\sum_{T \in \mathcal{R}} \eta_h^2 (E_{h_k} U, T) \geq \hat{\theta} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{h_k}} \eta_h^2 (E_{h_k} U, T)
\]
with $\hat{\theta} = \frac{\hat{C}_2^2 (1 - \beta_0^2)}{C_0 \hat{C}^2 (1 + 2C_2 C_4 \gamma_*)}$ and $\hat{C}_0 = \max(1, \frac{C_2}{\gamma_*})$, where $\hat{\beta}_*$ and $\hat{\gamma}_*$ are defined in (5.2) with $\delta_2$ being chosen such that $\beta_0^2 \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$.

Lemma 5.2. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ be some eigenvalue of (2.7) with multiplicity $q$, \{u_l\}_{l=1}^q be an orthonormal basis of $M(\lambda)$, $u_l \in A^s(l = 1, \cdots, q)$ and $T_{h_k}$ be a conforming partition obtained from $T_{h_k}$. Let $T_{h_{k+1}}$ be a mesh created from $T_{h_k}$ upon making the set $\mathcal{M}_{h_k}$ according to Marking Strategy $E$ with $\theta \in (0, \frac{C_2 \gamma}{C_0 \hat{C}^2 (1 + 2C_2 C_4 \gamma_*)})$. Let \{$(\lambda_l, u_l, h_l, t_l), l = 1, \cdots, q$\}$_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be discrete solutions of (2.10) over a conforming mesh $T_{h_k}$ and $M_{h_k}(\lambda) = \text{span}\{u_{h,1}, \cdots, u_{h,q}\}$. Then
\[
\#M_{h_k} \leq C \left( \|U - E_{h_k} U\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma_* \text{osc}_{H}^2 (E_{h_k} U, \Omega) \right)^{-1/2} \left( q^{\frac{1}{s}} - 1 \sum_{l=1}^q |u_l|_{s}^{1/s} \right), \quad (5.3)
\]
where the constant $C$ depends on the discrepancy between $\theta$ and $\frac{C_2 \gamma}{C_0 \hat{C}^2 (1 + 2C_2 C_4 \gamma_*)}$.
Proof. Let $\beta, \beta_1 \in (0, 1)$ satisfy $\beta_1 \in (0, \beta)$ and
\[
\theta < \frac{C_2^2 \gamma}{C_3^2 (C_1^2 + (1 + 2C_2^2 C_1^2) \gamma)} (1 - \beta^2).
\]

Choose
\[
\epsilon = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \beta_1 \left( \|U - E_{h_k} U\|^2_{\alpha, \Omega} + \gamma \text{osc}^2_{h_k} (E_{h_k} U, \Omega) \right)^{1/2}
\]
and let $T_h$ be a refinement of $T_h$ with minimal degrees of freedom satisfying
\[
\|u_l - E_{h_k} u_l\|^2_{\alpha, \Omega} + (\gamma + 1) \text{osc}^2_{h_k} (E_{h_k} u_l, \Omega) \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{q}, \quad l = 1, \ldots, q,
\]
which means
\[
\|U - E_{h_k} U\|^2_{\alpha, \Omega} + (\gamma + 1) \text{osc}^2_{h_k} (E_{h_k} U, \Omega) \leq \epsilon^2.
\] (5.4)

We get from the definition of $A^s$ that
\[
\#T_h - \#T_{h_0}
\leq \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \beta_1 \right)^{-1/s} \left( \|U - E_{h_k} U\|^2_{\alpha, \Omega} + \gamma \text{osc}^2_{h_k} (E_{h_k} U, \Omega) \right)^{-1/2s} q^{1/2s} |u_l|^{1/s}, \quad l = 1, \ldots, q,
\]
which implies
\[
\#T_h - \#T_{h_0}
\leq \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \beta_1 \right)^{-1/s} \left( \|U - E_{h_k} U\|^2_{\alpha, \Omega} + \gamma \text{osc}^2_{h_k} (E_{h_k} U, \Omega) \right)^{-1/2s} \left( q^{\frac{1}{2s}} - \sum_{l=1}^q |u_l|^{1/s} \right).
\]

Let $T_{h_{k+}}$ be the smallest common refinement of $T_{h_k}$ and $T_{h_0}$. Note that both $T_{h_k}$ and $T_{h_0}$ are refinements of $T_{h_0}$, we have that the number of elements in $T_{h_{k+}}$ that are not in $T_{h_k}$ is less than the number of elements that must be added to go from $T_{h_k}$ to $T_{h_{k+}}$, namely,
\[
\#T_{h_{k+}} - \#T_{h_k} \leq \#T_{h_{k+}} - \#T_{h_0}.
\]

Let $w^{h_{k+}} = \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_{h_{k+}, i} (u_l) \lambda_{h_{k+}, i} K u_{h_{k+}, i} K \left( \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_{h_{k+}, i} (u_l) \lambda_{h_{k+}, i} u_{h_{k+}, i} \right)$ \((l = 1, \ldots, q)\), namely
\[
L w^{h_{k+}} = \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_{h_{k+}, i} (u_l) \lambda_{h_{k+}, i} u_{h_{k+}, i}.
\]

We obtain from Lemma 2.3 and the Young inequality that
\[
\text{osc}^2_{h_{k+}} (R_{h_{k+}}, W^{h_{k+}}, \Omega) \leq 2 \text{osc}^2_{h_k} (R_{h_k} W^{h_k}, \Omega) + 2C^2 \| R_{h_{k+}} W^{h_{k+}} - R_{h_k} W^{h_k} \|^2_{\alpha, \Omega}.
\]

Note that $T_{h_{k+}}$ is a refinement of $T_{h_k}$, $L^2$-projection error are monotone and the following orthogonality
\[
\| W^{h_k} - R_{h_{k+}} W^{h_k} \|^2_{\alpha, \Omega} = \| W^{h_k} - R_{h_k} W^{h_k} \|^2_{\alpha, \Omega} - \| R_{h_{k+}} W^{h_k} - R_{h_k} W^{h_k} \|^2_{\alpha, \Omega}
\]
is valid, we arrive at
\[
\| W^{h_k} - R_{h_{k+}} W^{h_k} \|^2_{\alpha, \Omega} + \frac{1}{2C^2} \text{osc}^2_{h_{k+}} (R_{h_{k+}} W^{h_k}, \Omega)
\leq \| W^{h_k} - R_{h_k} W^{h_k} \|^2_{\alpha, \Omega} + \frac{1}{C^2} \text{osc}^2_{h_k} (R_{h_k} W^{h_k}, \Omega).
\]
Since (2.8) implies $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{2\tilde{C}^2}$, we obtain that $\sigma \equiv \frac{1}{\tilde{C}^2} - \gamma \in (0, 1)$ and
\[
\|W^{h*} - R_{h,k^+}W^{h*}\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma\text{osc}_{h,k^+}^2 (R_{h,k^+}W^{h*}, \Omega) \\
\leq \|W^{h*} - R_{h,k}W^{h*}\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{\tilde{C}^2}\text{osc}_{h,k}^2 (R_{h,k}W^{h*}, \Omega) \\
\leq \|W^{h*} - R_{h,k}W^{h*}\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + (\gamma + \sigma)\text{osc}_{h,k}^2 (R_{h,k}W^{h*}, \Omega).
\]
Applying the similar argument in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we may conclude that
\[
\|U - E_{h,k^+}U\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma\text{osc}_{h,k^+}^2 (E_{h,k^+}U, \Omega) \\
\leq \beta_0^2 \left(\|U - E_{h,k}U\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + (\gamma + \sigma)\text{osc}_{h,k}^2 (E_{h,k}U, \Omega)\right) \\
\leq \beta_0^2 \left(\|U - E_{h,k}U\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + (\gamma + 1)\text{osc}_{h,k}^2 (E_{h,k}U, \Omega)\right),
\]
where
\[
\beta_0 = \left(1 + \delta_1 + \tilde{C}_2\gamma^2(h_0)\right)^{1/2}.
\]
and $\delta_1$ is the constant appearing in the proof of Theorem 4.1. Combining (5.4) and (5.5), we then arrive at
\[
\|U - E_{h,k^+}U\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma\text{osc}_{h,k^+}^2 (E_{h,k^+}U, \Omega) \leq \tilde{\beta}^2 \left(\|U - E_{h,k}U\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma\text{osc}_{h,k}^2 (E_{h,k}U, \Omega)\right)
\]
with $\tilde{\beta} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\beta_0\beta_1$.

Let $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$ be some constant satisfying
\[
(1 + \delta_1)^2 \beta_1^2 \leq \beta^2,
\]
which implies
\[
(1 + \delta_1)\beta_1^2 < 1.
\]
We see from $h_0 \ll 1$ and (5.7) that $\tilde{\beta}^2 \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. Thus we get from Corollary 5.1 that $T_{h,k^+}$ satisfies
\[
\sum_{T \in \mathcal{M}_{h,k^+}} \gamma_{h,k}^2 (E_{h,k}U, T) \geq \bar{\theta} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} \gamma_{h,k}^2 (E_{h,k}U, T),
\]
where
\[
\bar{\theta} = \frac{\tilde{C}_2^2 (1 - 2\beta^2)}{C_0(C_1^2 + (1 + 2C_2^2C_2^2))}, \quad \tilde{C}_0 = \max(1, \frac{\tilde{C}_2^2}{C_4}) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\beta} = \left(\frac{\beta^2 (1 + \delta_1) + \tilde{C}_2\gamma^2(h_0)}{1 - \tilde{C}_4\gamma^2(h_0)}\right)^{1/2}.
\]
From the definition of $\gamma$ (see (4.19)) and $\tilde{\gamma}$ (see (2.8)), we obtain that $\tilde{\gamma} < 1$. On the other hand, we have $\tilde{C}_4 > 1$ and hence $\tilde{C}_0 = \frac{\tilde{C}_2^2}{C_4^2}$. Consequently, we can write $\bar{\theta}$ as $\bar{\theta} = \frac{\tilde{C}_2^2 (1 - 2\beta^2)}{\tilde{C}_2^2 (C_4^2 + (1 + 2C_2^2C_2^2))}$.

Since $h_0 \ll 1$, we obtain that $\tilde{\gamma} > \gamma$ and $\tilde{\beta} \in (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\beta)$ from (5.6). Using (5.9), we get that
\[
\bar{\theta} = \frac{\tilde{C}_2^2 (1 - 2\beta^2)}{\tilde{C}_2^2 (C_4^2 + (1 + 2C_2^2C_2^2))} \geq \frac{\tilde{C}_2^2 (C_4^2 + (1 + 2C_2^2C_2^2))}{\tilde{C}_2^2 (C_4^2 + (1 + 2C_2^2C_2^2))} (1 - \beta^2)
\]
\[
= \frac{\tilde{C}_2^2 (1 - \tilde{C}_4\gamma(h_0)^2) (C_4^2 + (1 + 2C_2^2C_2^2))}{(1 - \tilde{C}_4\gamma(h_0)^2) (C_4^2 + (1 + 2C_2^2C_2^2))} (1 - \beta^2),
\]

Thus for $0 \leq \gamma > \gamma$ yields
\[
\hat{\theta} \geq \frac{C_3^2}{C_3^2(C_4^2 + (1 + 2C_2^2C_1^2))} (1 - \beta^2) = \frac{C_2^2 \gamma}{C_3^2(C_4^2 + (1 + 2C_2^2C_1^2))} (1 - \beta^2) > \theta.
\]
Therefore, we have
\[
\text{#} \mathcal{M}_{h_k} \leq \text{#} R \leq \text{#} \mathcal{T}_{h_{k-1}} - \text{#} \mathcal{T}_{h_k} \leq \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \gamma \parallel(U - E_{h_k} U)\parallel_{a,\Omega}^{2} + \gamma \text{osc}_{h_k}^2 (E_{h_k} U, \Omega) \right)^{-1/2s} \left( q^{\frac{s}{2} - 1} \sum_{l=1}^{q} |u_l|^{1/s} \right).
\]
This is the desired estimate (5.3) with an explicit dependence on the discrepancy between $\theta$ and $c_2^2 C_1^2 (1 + 2C_2^2C_1^2)/\gamma$ via $\beta_1$. This completes the proof. 

We are now ready to show that Algorithm C possesses quasi-optimal complexity.

**Theorem 5.1.** Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ be some eigenvalue of (2.2) with multiplicity $q$, $\{u_l\}_{l=1}^{q}$ be an orthonormal basis of $M(\lambda)$, and $u_l \in A^*(l = 1, \cdots, q).$ Let $\{(\lambda_{h_k,l}, u_{h_k,l})\}, l = 1, \cdots, q$ be a sequence of finite element solutions produced by Algorithm C of Section 3 and $M_{h_k}(\lambda) = \text{span}\{u_{h_k,1}, \cdots, u_{h_k,q}\}$. Then the n-th iterate solution space $M_{h_n}(\lambda)$ of Algorithm C satisfies the quasi-optimal bound
\[
\parallel U - E_{h_k} U \parallel_{a,\Omega}^{2} + \gamma \text{osc}_{h_k}^2 (E_{h_k} U, \Omega) \leq \left( \text{#} T_{h_n} - \text{#} T_{h_0} \right)^{-2s} \lambda_{h_n,l} - \lambda \leq \left( \text{#} T_{h_n} - \text{#} T_{h_0} \right)^{-2s},
\]
where the hidden constant depends on the exact solution $(\lambda, M(\lambda))$ and the discrepancy between $\theta$ and $c_2^2 C_1^2 (1 + 2C_2^2C_1^2)/\gamma$.

**Proof.** We see from (3.6) that
\[
\parallel U - E_{h_k} U \parallel_{a,\Omega}^{2} + \gamma \text{osc}_{h_k}^2 (E_{h_k} U, \Omega) \leq \bar{C} \parallel U - E_{h_k} U \parallel_{a,\Omega}^{2} + \gamma \text{osc}_{h_k}^2 (E_{h_k} U, \Omega),
\]
where $\bar{C} = \max(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} C_2^2, \frac{C_3^2}{C_2^2}).$ Hence, we get from (5.3) that
\[
\text{#} M_{h_k} \leq \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \bar{C} \left( \parallel U - E_{h_k} U \parallel_{a,\Omega}^{2} + \gamma \text{osc}_{h_k}^2 (E_{h_k} U) \right)^{-1/2s} \left( q^{\frac{s}{2} - 1} \sum_{l=1}^{q} |u_l|^{1/s} \right).
\]
Note that Theorem 4.1 implies
\[
\parallel U - E_{h_{k+1}} U \parallel_{a,\Omega}^{2} + \gamma \text{osc}_{h_{k+1}}^2 (E_{h_{k+1}} U, \Omega) \leq \alpha^2 \left( \parallel U - E_{h_k} U \parallel_{a,\Omega}^{2} + \gamma \text{osc}_{h_k}^2 (E_{h_k} U, \Omega) \right).
\]
Thus for $0 \leq k < n$, we arrive at
\[
\left( \parallel U - E_{h_k} U \parallel_{a,\Omega}^{2} + \gamma \text{osc}_{h_k}^2 (E_{h_k} U, \Omega) \right)^{-1/2s} \leq \alpha^{(n-k)/s} \left( \parallel U - E_{h_n} U \parallel_{a,\Omega}^{2} + \gamma \text{osc}_{h_n}^2 (E_{h_n} U, \Omega) \right)^{-1/2s}.
\]
We next employ Lemma 2.2 to deduce that
\[
\#T_n - \#T_0 \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \#M_{h_k}
\]
\[
\lesssim \left( \sum_{l=1}^{q} |u_l|_{s}^{1/s} \right) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left( \|U - E_{h_k} U\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma \eta_{h_k}^2 (E_{h_k} U, \Omega) \right)^{-1/2s}
\]
\[
\lesssim \left( \|U - E_{h_n} U\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma \eta_{h_n}^2 (E_{h_n} U, \Omega) \right)^{-1/2s} \left( \sum_{l=1}^{q} |u_l|_{s}^{1/s} \right) \sum_{k=0}^{n} \alpha^k,
\]
which together with the fact \(\alpha < 1\) leads to
\[
\#T_n - \#T_0 \lesssim \left( \|U - E_{h_n} U\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma \eta_{h_n}^2 (E_{h_n} U, \Omega) \right)^{-1/2s} \left( \sum_{l=1}^{q} |u_l|_{s}^{1/s} \right).
\]
Since \(\text{osc}(E_{h_n} U, \Omega) \leq \eta_{h_n} (E_{h_n} U, \Omega)\), we conclude
\[
\#T_n - \#T_0 \lesssim \left( \|U - E_{h_n} U\|_{a,\Omega}^2 + \gamma \text{osc}_{h_n}^2 (E_{h_n} U, \Omega) \right)^{-1/2s} \left( \sum_{l=1}^{q} |u_l|_{s}^{1/s} \right).
\]
This completes the proof.

6 Numerical examples

In this section, we show some numerical experiments for both linear finite elements and quadratic
finite elements in three dimensions to illustrate the theoretical results obtained in this paper.

Our numerical experiments were carried out on LSSC-III in the State Key Laboratory of
Scientific and Engineering Computing, Chinese Academy of Sciences, and our codes were based on
the toolbox PHG of the State Key Laboratory of Scientific and Engineering Computing, Chinese
Academy of Sciences.

For the convenience of analysis for our numerical results below, we define the following notations.
Let \(\lambda \in \mathbb{R}\) be some exact eigenvalue with multiplicity \(q\), \(M(\lambda)\) be the corresponding eigenfunction
space as defined before, and \(\{u_l\}_{l=1}^{q}\) be some orthonormal basis of \(M(\lambda)\). Let \((\lambda_{h,l}, u_{h,l}) (l = 1, \cdots, q)\)
be the finite element approximation, \(M_h(\lambda) = \text{span} \{u_{h,1}, \cdots, u_{h,q}\}\). For \(M(\lambda)\) and \(M_h(\lambda)\),
we define the a posteriori error estimators \(\eta_h(M_h(\lambda), \Omega)\) and the error \(D(M(\lambda), M_h(\lambda))\) over mesh
\(T_h\) as follows:

\[
\eta_h(M_h(\lambda), \Omega) = \sum_{l=1}^{q} \eta_h(u_{h,l}, \Omega), \quad (6.1)
\]

\[
D(M(\lambda), M_h(\lambda)) = \sum_{l=1}^{q} \|u_l - E_h u_l\|_{a,\Omega}. \quad (6.2)
\]

We see from the proof of Lemma 3.1 that
\[
\eta_h(M_h(\lambda), \Omega) \approx \sum_{l=1}^{q} \eta_h(E_h u_l, \Omega).
\]
Thus we get from Theorem 3.2 that
\[
\eta_h(M_h(\lambda), \Omega) \approx D(M(\lambda), M_h(\lambda)).
\]
Example 1 Consider the following harmonic oscillator equation, which is a simple model in quantum mechanics [18]:

\[-\frac{1}{2}\Delta u + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2 u = \lambda u \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3, \tag{6.3}\]

where $|x| = \sqrt{|x_1|^2 + |x_2|^2 + |x_3|^2}$. The eigenvalues of (6.3) are $\lambda_n = n + \frac{1}{2}$ with multiplicity $\frac{n(n+1)}{2} (n = 1, 2, \ldots)$, and its associated eigenfunction is $u_n = \gamma e^{-|x|^2/2} H_n(x)$ with any nonzero constant $\gamma$ and $H_n(x) = (-1)^n e^{x^2} \frac{d^n}{dx^n}(e^{-x^2})$.

Since the solution of (6.3) exponentially decays, we may solve it over some bounded domain $\Omega$. In the computation, we solve the following eigenvalue problem: find $(\lambda, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times H^1_0(\Omega)$ such that

\[
\int_\Omega |u|^2 \, dx = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
-\frac{1}{2}\Delta u + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2 u = \lambda u \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\
u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega,
\end{array} \right.
\]

where $\Omega = (-5.5, 5.5)^3$. We calculate the approximation of the first two smallest eigenvalues $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ with multiplicity 1 and 3, respectively, and their corresponding eigenfunction spaces $M(\lambda_1)$ and $M(\lambda_2)$ with dimension 1 and 3, respectively.

Some cross-sections of the adaptively refined mesh constructed by the Marking Strategy E are displayed in Fig. 6.1 from which we observe that the mesh is denser in the center of the domain where the solutions oscillate quickly than in the domain far away from the center where the solution is smoother. This shows that our adaptively refined mesh can catch the oscillation of the solution efficiently and the a posteriori error estimators we designed are efficient. Our numerical results are presented in Fig. 6.2 and Fig. 6.3. Since the multiplicity of the first two smallest eigenvalues are 1 and 3, respectively, for the discrete problem, we calculate the first 4 eigenpairs. We see from the left figure of Figure 6.2 that the convergence curves of error for all eigenvalues by using linear finite elements are parallel to the line with slope $-\frac{1}{4}$. Besides, we also observe that the convergence curves for the second, the third and the forth eigenvalues overlap together, this coincide with the fact that the multiplicity of the second eigenvalue is 3. Meanwhile, from the left figure of Fig. 6.3 we see that by using linear finite elements, the convergence curves of the a posteriori error estimators for eigenfunction space $\eta_h(M_h(\lambda_1))$ and $\eta_h(M_h(\lambda_2))$ are parallel to the line with slope $-\frac{1}{4}$. Since $\eta_h(M_h(\lambda), \Omega) \approx D(M(\lambda), M_h(\lambda))$, we obtain that the convergence curves of error for the eigenfunction space $D(M(\lambda_1), M_h(\lambda_1))$ and $D(M(\lambda_2), M_h(\lambda_2))$ are also parallel to the line with slope $-\frac{1}{4}$. This means that the approximation of eigenvalues as well as the eigenfunction space have reached the optimal convergence rate, which coincides with our theory in Section 5. We have the similar conclusion for the quadratic finite elements from the right figures of Fig. 6.2 and Fig. 6.3.

Example 2 Consider the Schrödinger equation for hydrogen atoms:

\[
\left( -\frac{1}{2}\Delta - \frac{1}{|x|} \right) u = \lambda u \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \tag{6.4}
\]

with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u|^2 \, dx = 1$. The eigenvalues of (6.4) are $\lambda_n = -\frac{1}{2n^2} (n = 1, 2, \ldots)$ and the multiplicity of $\lambda_n$ is $n^2$ (see, e.g., [19]).

Since the eigenfunctions of (6.4) decay exponentially, instead of (6.4), we may solve the following eigenvalue problem: find $(\lambda, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times H^1_0(\Omega)$ such that $\int_\Omega |u|^2 \, dx = 1$ and

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\left( -\frac{1}{2}\Delta - \frac{1}{|x|} \right) u = \lambda u \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\
u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega,
\end{array} \right. \tag{6.5}
\]
where \( \Omega \) is some bounded domain in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \). In our computation, we choose \( \Omega = (-20,0,20) \times (-20,0,20) \times (-20,0,20) \) and find the first 2 smallest eigenvalue approximations and their associated eigenfunction space approximations. Since the multiplicity of the \( n \)-th smallest eigenvalue is \( n^2 \), for the discrete problem of (6.5), we calculate the first 5 smallest eigenvalues and their associated eigenfunctions.

Fig. 6.4 is the cross-sections of the adaptively refined mesh constructed by Marking Strategy E. Similarly, we see that for both the linear finite elements and quadratic finite elements, the mesh is much denser in the center of the domain where the solution oscillates quickly than in the domain far away from the center where the solution is smooth. This means that the a posteriori error estimators we used are efficient.

The numerical results are presented in Fig. 6.5 and Fig. 6.6. Similar to Example 1, Fig. 6.5 shows that the convergence curve for all the eigenvalues obtained by linear finite elements and quadratic finite elements are parallel to the line with slope \(-\frac{2}{3}\) and \(-\frac{4}{3}\), respectively, which means all the eigenvalue approximations reach the optimal convergence rate for both linear finite element and quadratic finite element. Meanwhile, we see from Fig. 6.6 that convergence curve for the a posteriori error estimators for eigenfunction space \( \eta_h(M_h(\lambda_1)) \) and \( \eta_h(M_h(\lambda_2)) \) obtained by linear finite element are parallel to the line with slope \(-\frac{1}{3}\), and those obtained by quadratic finite element are parallel to the line with slope \(-\frac{2}{3}\). We observe that the approximation of eigenfunction space
Figure 6.3: The convergence curves of $\eta_h(M_h(\lambda_1), \Omega)$ and $\eta_h(M_h(\lambda_2), \Omega)$ for Example 1

Figure 6.4: The cross-section of an adaptive mesh of Example 2

Example 3 Consider the following eigenvalue problem which is defined in a non-convex domain:

$$\text{find } (\lambda, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times H^1_0(\Omega) \text{ such that } \int_{\Omega} |u|^2 \, dx = 1 \text{ and }$$

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2} \Delta u &= \lambda u \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega, \end{cases}$$

(6.6)

where $\Omega = (-5.0, 5.0)^3 \setminus (0, 5.0)^3$, see the left figure of Fig. 6.7 below. We observe from the numerical calculation that $\lambda_1 = 0.210651$ with multiplicity 1 and $\lambda_2 = 0.331779$ with multiplicity 2.

The surface of the adaptively refined meshes constructed by Marking Strategy E is shown in Fig. 6.7. Besides, some cross-sections are displayed in Fig. 6.7. We see from these figures that for both linear finite elements and quadratic finite elements, the mesh is much denser along the lines where the solution is singular than in the domain far away from the singular lines. It indicates that our error estimator and marking strategy are efficient.

Our numerical results are listed in Fig. 6.8 and Fig. 6.9. Similar to Example 1 and Example 2, we can also see that the approximations of eigenvalue as well as eigenfunction have reached optimal convergence rate, which coincides with our theory in Section 5.
7 Concluding remarks

We have studied the convergence and complexity for elliptic multiple eigenvalue problems. Now we turn to address how to apply the same arguments to the Steklov problem that consists in finding $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \neq 0$ such that

\[
\begin{cases}
-\nabla \cdot (A \nabla u) + cu = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\
(A \nabla u) \cdot \vec{n} = \lambda uv & \text{on } \partial \Omega,
\end{cases}
\]

where $\vec{n}$ is the outward unit normal vector of $\Omega$ on $\partial \Omega$.

We set $H = H^1(\Omega)$, $V_h = S_h(\Omega)$, $W = L^2(\partial \Omega)$, $b(\cdot, \cdot) = (\cdot, \cdot)_{\partial \Omega}$ and consider the non-homogeneous Neumann problem as a model problem as follows:

\[
\begin{cases}
Lu_i = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N, \\
(A \nabla u_i) \cdot \vec{n} = f_i & \text{on } \partial \Omega.
\end{cases}
\]
Define the element residual \( \tilde{R}_T(u_{i,h}) \) and the jump residual \( \tilde{J}_E(u_{i,h}) \) for (7.1) as follows:

\[
\tilde{R}_T(u_{i,h}) = \nabla \cdot (A \nabla u_{i,h}) - cu_{i,h} \quad \text{in} \ T \in \mathcal{T}_h, \\
\tilde{J}_E(u_{i,h}) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
[\! [A \nabla u_{i,h}] \! ]_E \cdot \nu_E & \text{on} \ E \in \mathcal{E}_h \\
A \nabla u_{i,h} \cdot \nu - f_i & \text{on} \ E \in \mathcal{S}_h,
\end{array} \right.
\]

where \( \mathcal{S}_h \) denote the set of boundary faces. For \( T \in \mathcal{T}_h \), we denote the local error indicator \( \tilde{\eta}_h(u_{i,h}, T) \) by

\[
\tilde{\eta}_h^2(u_{i,h}, T) = h_T^2 \| \tilde{R}_T(u_{i,h}) \|_{0,T}^2 + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h \cup \mathcal{S}_h, E \subset \partial T} h_E \| \tilde{J}_E(u_{i,h}) \|_{0,E}^2,
\]

and the oscillation \( \tilde{\text{osc}}_h(u_{i,h}, T) \) by

\[
\tilde{\text{osc}}_h^2(u_{i,h}, T) = h_T^2 \| \tilde{R}_T(u_{i,h}) - \tilde{R}_T(u_{i,h}) \|_{0,T}^2 + \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h \cup \mathcal{S}_h, E \subset \partial T} h_E \| \tilde{J}_E(u_{i,h}) - \tilde{J}_E(u_{i,h}) \|_{0,E}^2. \quad (7.2)
\]

We see that Lemma 2.5 is also valid for (7.2).
In context of Steklov eigenvalue problems, we define
\[ R_T(E_hu) = \nabla \cdot (A\nabla E_hu) - cE_hu \quad \text{in} \quad T \in T_h, \]
\[ J_E(E_hu) = \begin{cases} 
|A\nabla E_hu| E \cdot \nu_E & \text{on} \quad E \in E_h \\
A\nabla E_hu \cdot \hat{n} - \lambda^h E_hu & \text{on} \quad E \in S_h,
\end{cases} \]
where \( \hat{n} \) denotes the outward unit normal vector on \( E \in S_h \). For \( T \in T_h \), we define the local error indicator \( \eta_h^2(E_hu, T) \) by
\[ \eta_h^2(E_hu, T) = h_T^2 \| R_T(E_hu) \|_{0,T}^2 + \sum_{E \in E_h \cup S_h, E \subset \partial T} \| J_E(E_hu) \|_{0,E}^2, \]
and the oscillation \( \text{osc}_h^2(E_hu, T) \) by
\[ \text{osc}_h^2(E_hu, T) = h_T^2 \| R_T(E_hu) - \overline{R_T(E_hu)} \|_{0,T}^2 + \sum_{E \in E_h \cup S_h, E \subset \partial T} h_E \| J_E(E_hu) - \overline{J_E(E_hu)} \|_{0,E}^2. \]

We obtain by using the same argument that Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 5.1 are valid for the Steklov problem with multiple eigenvalues.

In our numerical analysis above, for convenience, we assume that the algebraic eigenvalue problem is exactly solved and the numerical integration is exact. Indeed, the same conclusion can be expected if all the numerical errors are taken into account, including both the error resulting from the inexact solving of the algebraic eigenvalue problem and the error coming from the inexact numerical integration. Suppose \((\lambda, u)\) is an eigenpair with the multiplicity of \(\lambda\) being \(q\), the exact solution on mesh \(T_k\) are \(\{(\lambda_{h,i}, u_{h,i})\}_{i=1}^q\), and the solution considering the numerical error are \(\{(\hat{\lambda}_{h,i}, \hat{u}_{h,i})\}_{i=1}^q\). If the numerical errors resulting from the solution of algebraic system and the numerical integration are small enough, say, satisfy
\[ \sum_{i=1}^q (\| u_{h,i} - \hat{u}_{h,i} \|_a^2 + |\lambda_{h,i} - \hat{\lambda}_{h,i}|) \lesssim r(h_0) \sum_{i=1}^q \eta_h^2(\hat{u}_{h,i}, \Omega) \]
with \(r(h_0) \ll 1\) for \(h_0 \ll 1\), then we have from the following triangle inequality
\[ \| u_i - \hat{u}_{h,i} \|_a \leq \| u_i - u_{h,i} \|_a + \| u_{h,i} - \hat{u}_{h,i} \|_a, \]
that our main results obtained in this paper hold true for inexact algebraic solution and inexact numerical integration, too.
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