

A POLYNOMIAL DIMENSION-DEPENDENCE ANALYSIS OF BRAMBLE–PASCIAK–XU PRECONDITIONERS *

BOOU JIANG[†], JONGHO PARK[†], AND JINCHAO XU[†]

Abstract. We investigate the dimension dependence of Bramble–Pasciak–Xu (BPX) preconditioners for high-dimensional partial differential equations and establish that the condition numbers of BPX-preconditioned systems grow only polynomially with the spatial dimension. Our analysis requires a careful derivation of the dimension dependence of several fundamental tools in the theory of finite element methods, including the elliptic regularity, Bramble–Hilbert lemma, trace inequalities, and inverse inequalities. We further introduce a new quasi-interpolation operator into finite element spaces, a variant of the classical Scott–Zhang interpolation, whose associated constants scale polynomially with the dimension. Building on these ingredients, we prove a multilevel norm equivalence theorem and derive a BPX preconditioner with explicit polynomial bounds on its dimensional dependence. This result has notable implications for emerging quantum computing methodologies: recent studies indicate that polynomial dependence of BPX preconditioners on dimension can yield exponential speedups for quantum-algorithmic approaches over their classical counterparts.

Key words. Bramble–Pasciak–Xu preconditioners, Dimension dependence, Multilevel methods, Scott–Zhang interpolation

AMS subject classifications. 65N55, 65N30, 65F08

1. Introduction. The main purpose of this paper is to show that the Bramble–Pasciak–Xu (BPX) preconditioners [7, 35] admit condition numbers whose dependence on the spatial dimension is only polynomial, under a suitable geometric assumption on the underlying triangulations. While BPX preconditioners and their variants have been widely applied to two- and three-dimensional problems arising in computational mechanics and other applications (see, e.g., [5, 10, 26, 38]), to the best of our knowledge there has been no investigation of their behavior in high-dimensional regimes, in particular how their conditioning depends on the dimension. Such an analysis has recently become especially relevant due to advances in quantum algorithms for the numerical solution of partial differential equations (PDEs) [15, 23].

BPX preconditioners were first proposed in [7, 35] as a result of efforts to parallelize multilevel iterative methods for the numerical solution of PDEs, and they are now regarded as one of the major multigrid approaches for solving large-scale algebraic systems arising from numerical PDEs. Within the framework of subspace correction methods [37, 39], BPX preconditioners can be viewed as parallel subspace correction methods based on a multilevel space decomposition. BPX preconditioners have also motivated important theoretical developments in multilevel iterative methods, including the multilevel norm equivalence theorem [4, 14, 29], which implies that the condition number of the BPX preconditioner is independent of the mesh size and the number of levels, and has since become a foundation for the design and analysis of many modern multilevel algorithms.

The importance of BPX preconditioners has been newly recognized recently in connection with the development of quantum algorithms for solving large-scale linear systems (see, e.g., [1, 11, 21]), which have the potential to provide exponential speedup

*Submitted to arXiv.

Funding: This work was supported by the KAUST Baseline Research Fund.

[†]Applied Mathematics and Computational Sciences Program, Computer, Electrical and Mathematical Science and Engineering Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), Thuwal 23955, Saudi Arabia (boou.jiang@kaust.edu.sa, jongho.park@kaust.edu.sa, jinchao.xu@kaust.edu.sa).

over classical algorithms. In particular, quantum algorithms have been applied to finite element methods for solving various numerical PDEs; see, e.g., [24, 25, 28].

Since the performance of these quantum algorithms depends strongly on the condition number of the target linear system, BPX preconditioners were incorporated into quantum finite element solvers in [15, 23] to address this issue. Notably, in [15, Remark 6.6] and [23, Remark 5.11], it was observed that if the condition number of the BPX-preconditioned system depends only polynomially on the spatial dimension, then the corresponding quantum schemes would achieve exponential speedup with respect to the dimension compared to classical methods. These observations highlight the importance of analyzing the dimension dependence of BPX preconditioners, which is the main goal of this paper.

In this paper, we study the dimension dependence of BPX preconditioners [7, 35], providing answers to questions raised in [15, 23] in the context of quantum algorithms. Namely, we prove that the condition number of BPX-preconditioned systems arising from continuous, piecewise linear finite element methods in high dimensions depends on the spatial dimension only polynomially. To achieve this, we first carefully derive the dimension dependence of several fundamental tools in finite element analysis, including the Bramble–Hilbert lemma [6], trace inequalities, and inverse inequalities [9, 12], whereas most of the existing literature does not explicitly track this dependence.

We then propose a new quasi-interpolation operator into finite element spaces, so called *averaged* Scott–Zhang interpolation, whose L^2 - and H^1 -error estimates depend on the dimension only polynomially. We observe that with conventional quasi-interpolation operators, such as the Scott–Zhang interpolation [33], it is difficult to obtain polynomial dependence directly; therefore, we introduce a modified variant.

Using these ingredients, we derive a multilevel norm equivalence theorem [4, 14, 29] and construct a BPX preconditioner whose dependence on the spatial dimension is explicitly polynomial. Incorporating the theory of parallel subspace correction methods [31, 39] provides an even sharper upper bound for the condition number of the BPX preconditioner.

This paper is organized as follows. In [section 2](#), we introduce the notation used throughout the paper. In [section 3](#), we summarize important notions of triangulations in finite element methods, with emphasis on their dependence on the spatial dimension. In [section 4](#), we analyze the dimension dependence of several fundamental tools in finite element analysis and multilevel iterative methods. In [section 5](#), we introduce the averaged Scott–Zhang quasi-interpolation and establish its error estimates. In [section 6](#), we derive the multilevel norm equivalence theorem and the BPX preconditioner, and we analyze their dependence on the dimension. Finally, in [section 7](#), we conclude the paper with remarks.

2. Notation. This section is devoted to the notation used throughout the paper.

Following standard conventions in the multilevel method literature (see, e.g., [37]), we write $x \lesssim y$ (equivalently $y \gtrsim x$) if there exists a constant $C > 0$, independent of all important parameters (in this paper, these include the mesh size, number of levels, dimension, shape regularity, quasi-uniformity), such that $x \leq Cy$. We write $x \approx y$ when both $x \lesssim y$ and $y \lesssim x$ hold.

Regarding matrices and vectors, we use the following notation:

- I_d : the $d \times d$ identity matrix;
- $\mathbf{0}_d$: the d -dimensional vector whose entries are all equal to 0.
- $\mathbf{1}_d$: the d -dimensional vector whose entries are all equal to 1.

For finite element functions, we identify functions with their corresponding vectors of degrees of freedom whenever convenient.

2.1. Simplicies and triangulations. Next we introduce notation related to simplices. Throughout the paper, all simplices are regarded as open sets. For a d -simplex $\tau \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we write:

- h_τ : the diameter of τ ;
- r_τ : the inradius of τ ;
- $\mathcal{V}(\tau)$: the set of vertices of τ ;
- $\mathcal{F}(\tau)$: the set of $(d-1)$ -dimensional faces of τ .

Note that

$$|\mathcal{V}(\tau)| = |\mathcal{F}(\tau)| = d + 1.$$

Given a bounded polyhedral domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let \mathcal{T}_h be a conforming triangulation of Ω with characteristic mesh size h . That is, \mathcal{T}_h is a collection of disjoint d -simplices (elements) such that

$$\bar{\Omega} = \bigcup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \bar{\tau}, \quad h = \max_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_\tau.$$

For the triangulation \mathcal{T}_h , we use the following notation:

- $\mathcal{T}_h(\partial\Omega)$: the set of all elements that have at least one $(d-1)$ -face on $\partial\Omega$;
- \mathcal{V}_h : the set of all vertices of \mathcal{T}_h ;
- $\mathcal{V}_h(\partial\Omega)$: the set of all vertices of \mathcal{T}_h lying on $\partial\Omega$;
- \mathcal{F}_h : the set of all $(d-1)$ -faces of \mathcal{T}_h ;
- $\mathcal{F}_h(\partial\Omega)$: the set of all $(d-1)$ -faces of \mathcal{T}_h lying on $\partial\Omega$.

For a vertex $a \in \mathcal{V}_h$, let ω_a denote the vertex patch around a , i.e.,

$$(2.1) \quad \bar{\omega}_a = \bigcup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h, a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} \bar{\tau}.$$

Similarly, for an element $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$, the element patch around τ is denoted by ω_τ :

$$(2.2) \quad \bar{\omega}_\tau = \bigcup_{\tau' \in \mathcal{T}_h, \bar{\tau} \cap \bar{\tau}' \neq \emptyset} \bar{\tau}'.$$

2.2. Finite element spaces. Given a triangulation \mathcal{T}_h of a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote by V_h the lowest-order Lagrangian finite element space, namely the space of continuous, piecewise linear functions on \mathcal{T}_h :

$$V_h = \{v \in C(\Omega) : v|_\tau \in \mathbb{P}_1(\tau) \text{ for all } \tau \in \mathcal{T}_h\}.$$

To incorporate the Dirichlet boundary condition, we also define

$$V_{h,0} = \{v \in V_h : v = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}.$$

For each $a \in \mathcal{V}_h$, there exists a nodal basis function $\phi_a \in V_h$ satisfying

$$(2.3) \quad \phi_a(b) = \delta_{ab}, \quad b \in \mathcal{V}_h,$$

where δ_{ab} denotes the Kronecker delta.

3. Triangulations in high dimensions. In this section, we review important notions of triangulations in finite element methods, such as shape-regularity and quasi-uniformity, and discuss their dependence on the spatial dimension. In addition, we present the Freudenthal triangulation as a concrete example of a triangulation in high dimensions and examine its properties.

Throughout this section, we assume that \mathcal{T}_h is a triangulation of a bounded polyhedral domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

3.1. Shape-regularity and quasi-uniformity. Shape-regularity and quasi-uniformity of triangulations are standard notions that appear throughout the finite element literature; see [9, 12] for standard references. Here, we review these concepts and highlight how the high-dimensional setting affects them.

We begin with the definition of shape-regularity.

DEFINITION 3.1 (shape-regularity). *A triangulation \mathcal{T}_h is said to be ρ -shape-regular if there exists a constant $\rho > 0$ such that*

$$h_\tau \leq \rho r_\tau, \quad \tau \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

A useful property of shape-regular triangulations is that the height of each element is uniformly comparable to its diameter, as summarized in [Theorem 3.2](#).

LEMMA 3.2. *Let \mathcal{T}_h be a ρ -shape-regular triangulation of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and let $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$. For a given $(d-1)$ -face $F \in \mathcal{F}(\tau)$, let h_F denote the distance from the vertex of τ opposite to F to the hyperplane containing F . Then we have*

$$\rho^{-1} h_\tau \lesssim h_F \leq h_\tau.$$

Proof. The inequality $h_F \leq h_\tau$ is immediate, so it remains to prove $h_F \gtrsim \rho^{-1} h_\tau$. Computing the volume of τ in two different ways gives

$$(3.1) \quad h_F |F| = r_\tau \sum_{F' \in \mathcal{F}(\tau)} |F'|.$$

Hence, we get

$$h_F = r_\tau \cdot \frac{1}{|F|} \sum_{F' \in \mathcal{F}(\tau)} |F'| \geq 2r_\tau \geq 2\rho^{-1} h_\tau,$$

where the first inequality follows from the simplex inequality [22], and the second follows from [Theorem 3.1](#). \square

One important observation is that the shape-regularity parameter ρ implicitly depends on the dimension d . Therefore, in what follows, unlike much of the finite element literature where the dependence on the shape-regularity parameter is omitted for simplicity, we will explicitly keep track of the dependence on ρ as well. Indeed, we have the following lower bound for τ in terms of the dimension d .

PROPOSITION 3.3. *For a d -simplex $\tau \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$\frac{h_\tau}{r_\tau} \gtrsim d.$$

Proof. For each $(d-1)$ -face $F \in \mathcal{F}(\tau)$, we define h_F as in [Theorem 3.2](#). Then

$$r_\tau^{-1} \stackrel{(3.1)}{=} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\tau)} h_F^{-1} \geq (d+1) h_\tau^{-1},$$

where the last inequality follows from [Theorem 3.2](#). This completes the proof. \square

Remark 3.4. The estimate in [Theorem 3.3](#) is sharp. Indeed, the ratio between the diameter and the inradius of a regular d -simplex is given by $\sqrt{2d(d+1)} \approx d$.

While shape-regularity measures how similar the shapes of elements in a given triangulation are, we also need a notion that measures how similar their sizes are. This notion, called quasi-uniformity, is given in [Theorem 3.5](#).

DEFINITION 3.5 (quasi-uniformity). *A triangulation \mathcal{T}_h is said to be (ρ, σ) -quasi-uniform if it is ρ -shape regular and there exists a constant $\sigma > 0$ such that*

$$\sigma h \leq h_\tau \leq h, \quad \tau \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

Fortunately, the quasi-uniformity parameter σ does not depend on the dimension d ; uniform triangulations in which every element is congruent are still possible even in high dimensions. Nevertheless, for completeness, we will also keep track of the dependence on the quasi-uniformity parameter σ in the analysis presented in this paper.

3.2. Freudenthal triangulations. Constructing simplicial meshes in high dimensions is highly nontrivial. Here we present the Freudenthal triangulation [3] as an example of a structured simplicial mesh in arbitrary spatial dimensions. This triangulation has been used in the literature on structure-preserving finite element methods in high dimensions; see, e.g., [18, 40].

For simplicity, we describe the Freudenthal triangulation of the unit cube $(0, 1)^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For each permutation $s: \{1, \dots, d\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, d\}$, we define

$$\tau_s = \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in (0, 1)^d : 0 < x_{s(1)} < x_{s(2)} < \dots < x_{s(d)} < 1\}.$$

The vertices $\{v_i^s\}_{i=0}^d$ of τ_s are given by

$$v_0^s = \mathbf{0}_d, \quad v_1^s = e_{s(d)}, \quad v_2^s = e_{s(d)} + e_{s(d-1)}, \quad \dots, \quad v_d^s = e_{s(d)} + \dots + e_{s(1)} = \mathbf{1}_d,$$

where e_i denotes the i th canonical basis vector of \mathbb{R}^d . The Freudenthal triangulation of the unit cube is the collection of all such simplices τ_s , one for each permutation s .

One can readily observe that all d -simplices in the Freudenthal triangulation are congruent and satisfy

$$|\tau_s| = \frac{1}{d!}, \quad h_{\tau_s} = \sqrt{d}, \quad r_{\tau_s} = \frac{1}{2 + (d-1)\sqrt{2}}.$$

Hence, the ratio between the diameter and the inradius is

$$\frac{h_{\tau_s}}{r_{\tau_s}} = 2\sqrt{d} + (d-1)\sqrt{2d} \approx d^{3/2},$$

which shows that the shape-regularity parameter ρ of the Freudenthal triangulation satisfies $\rho \approx d^{3/2}$, and therefore is not optimal in the sense of Theorem 3.3. This observation suggests that maintaining high-quality simplicial meshes becomes increasingly challenging in high dimensions.

Now we consider the Freudenthal triangulation of a general bounded polyhedral domain Ω . A desirable property of the Freudenthal triangulation is that every vertex patch defined in (2.1) for an interior vertex is convex, since it can be characterized as the intersection of half-spaces. This property motivates a crucial assumption that will be used throughout the paper; see Theorem 5.1. On the other hand, one can observe that an element patch defined in (2.2) is nonconvex in general when $d \geq 3$.

4. Fundamental tools. In this section, we revisit several important inequalities in the finite element theory while specifying their dependence on the dimension d .

4.1. Nodal basis functions. The following estimate for the nodal basis function ϕ_a defined in (2.3) is elementary yet useful.

LEMMA 4.1. *Let \mathcal{T}_h be a (ρ, σ) -quasi-uniform triangulation of Ω . For any $a \in \mathcal{V}_h$, the nodal basis function ϕ_a defined in (2.3) satisfies*

$$\|\nabla \phi_a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \rho \sigma^{-1} h^{-1}.$$

Proof. It follows that

$$\|\nabla \phi_a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = \max_{\tau \subset \omega_a} h_{a,\tau}^{-1} \lesssim \max_{\tau \subset \omega_a} \rho h_\tau^{-1} \leq \rho \sigma^{-1} h^{-1},$$

where $h_{a,\tau}$ denotes the distance from a to the its opposite $(d-1)$ -face of the element τ . The inequalities follow from the definition of ϕ_a , Theorem 3.2, and the definition of quasi-uniformity, respectively. \square

4.2. Regularity on convex domains. Elliptic regularity plays a central role in the error analysis of finite element methods for elliptic problems [9, 12]. For convex domains, it is known, often referred to as the Miranda–Talenti estimate [27, Lemma 1.2.2] (see also [20, Theorem 3.1.2.1]), that the elliptic regularity constant for bounding the $|\cdot|_{H^2(\Omega)}$ -seminorm is 1, and thus is independent of the dimension, the shape of the domain, and related factors. For completeness, we state this fact in Theorem 4.2.

LEMMA 4.2 (elliptic regularity on convex domains). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex, bounded, and piecewise smooth domain. Given $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, let $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ be the solution of the variational problem*

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx = \int_{\Omega} f v \, dx, \quad v \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Then we have $u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap H^2(\Omega)$ and

$$|u|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

4.3. Bramble–Hilbert lemma. The Bramble–Hilbert lemma [6] is a fundamental tool in polynomial approximation theory in Sobolev spaces [9, Chapter 4]. In this section, we derive a sharp estimate for the Bramble–Hilbert lemma on convex domains, where the constant involved is independent of the dimension, the shape of the domain, and other related geometric factors.

We begin by recalling the sharp Poincaré inequality for convex domains, as presented in [2, 32]. This result is particularly noteworthy, since for nonconvex domains—even those with favorable geometric structure such as vertex patches [34]—the situation becomes substantially more complicated, and the dependence on the dimension can grow as large as $\mathcal{O}(d^d)$, which is prohibitively severe.

LEMMA 4.3 (Poincaré inequality on convex domains). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded convex domain. Then we have*

$$\left\| v - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} v \, dx \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\text{diam}(\Omega)}{\pi} |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \quad v \in H^1(\Omega).$$

Using Theorem 4.3, we derive in Theorem 4.4 a sharp estimate for the Bramble–Hilbert lemma on convex domains. We note that the Bramble–Hilbert lemma for

convex domains in more general settings, involving broader classes of Sobolev spaces, was studied in [16].

LEMMA 4.4 (Bramble–Hilbert lemma on convex domains). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded convex domain. Then we have*

$$\inf_{v \in \mathbb{P}_1(\Omega)} |v - p|_{H^j(\Omega)} \lesssim \text{diam}(\Omega)^{2-j} |v|_{H^2(\Omega)}, \quad v \in H^2(\Omega), \quad j = 0, 1.$$

Proof. Take any $v \in H^2(\Omega)$, and define $p \in \mathbb{P}_1(\Omega)$ by

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} v(y) dy + \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \nabla v(y) dy \cdot \left(x - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} y dy \right), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

By direct calculation, we get

$$(4.1) \quad \int_{\Omega} (v - p) dx = 0, \quad \int_{\Omega} \nabla(v - p) dx = \mathbf{0}_d.$$

Hence, by the Poincaré inequality (Theorem 4.3), we have

$$(4.2) \quad \|v - p\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \text{diam}(\Omega)^2 |v - p|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2.$$

For each $i = 1, \dots, d$, (4.1) implies

$$\int_{\Omega} \partial_i(v - p) dx = 0,$$

so another application of the Poincaré inequality gives

$$\|\partial_i(v - p)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \text{diam}(\Omega)^2 \|\nabla \partial_i(v - p)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Summing over i yields

$$(4.3) \quad |v - p|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d \|\partial_i(v - p)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ \lesssim \text{diam}(\Omega)^2 \sum_{i=1}^d \|\nabla \partial_i(v - p)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \text{diam}(\Omega)^2 |v - p|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2 = \text{diam}(\Omega)^2 |v|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Combining (4.2) and (4.3), we obtain

$$\|v - p\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \text{diam}(\Omega)^2 |v - p|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \text{diam}(\Omega)^4 |v|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

which completes the proof. \square

4.4. Trace inequalities. Trace inequalities are important results that relate functions in Sobolev spaces to their traces on the boundary. To derive sharp estimates with respect to the dimension and other relevant parameters, we consider several special cases of trace inequalities separately. We begin with the trace inequality that relates a shape-regular d -simplex and one of its $(d - 1)$ -faces, stated in Theorem 4.5.

LEMMA 4.5 (trace inequality on simplices). *Let \mathcal{T}_h be a ρ -shape-regular triangulation of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then for any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}(\tau)$, we have*

$$\|v\|_{L^2(F)} \lesssim \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} h_{\tau}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{L^2(\tau)} + h_{\tau}^{\frac{1}{2}} |v|_{H^1(\tau)}, \quad v \in H^1(\tau).$$

Proof. Let x_F be the vertex of τ opposite to F . For $x \in F$, define

$$v_x(t) = v(x_F + t(x - x_F)), \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

Then,

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2 = \int_F \int_0^1 |v_x(t)|^2 |x - x_F| dt dx \geq h_F \int_F \int_0^1 |v_x(t)|^2 dt dx,$$

where h_F denotes the distance from x_F to the hyperplane containing F . Thanks to [Theorem 3.2](#), we obtain

$$(4.4) \quad \int_F \int_0^1 |v_x(t)|^2 dt dx \leq h_F^{-1} \|v\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2 \lesssim \rho h_\tau^{-1} \|v\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2.$$

On the other hand, for $t \in [0, 1]$, the fundamental theorem of calculus gives

$$v(x) = v_x(t) + \int_t^1 v'_x(s) ds = v_x(t) + \int_t^1 \nabla v(x_F + s(x - x_F)) \cdot (x - x_F) ds.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |v(x)|^2 &\lesssim |v_x(t)|^2 + \left(\int_t^1 \nabla v(x_F + s(x - x_F)) \cdot (x - x_F) ds \right)^2 \\ &\leq |v_x(t)|^2 + \int_t^1 |\nabla v(x_F + s(x - x_F))|^2 |x - x_F|^2 ds \\ &\leq |v_x(t)|^2 + h_\tau \int_0^1 |\nabla v(x_F + s(x - x_F))|^2 |x - x_F| ds. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating both sides with respect to $x \in F$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{L^2(F)}^2 &= \int_F |v(x)|^2 dx \\ &\leq \int_F \int_0^1 |v_x(t)|^2 dt dx + h_\tau \int_F \int_0^1 |\nabla v(x_F + s(x - x_F))|^2 |x - x_F| ds dx \\ &\stackrel{(4.4)}{\lesssim} \rho h_\tau^{-1} \|v\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2 + h_\tau \|v\|_{H^1(\tau)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

In [Theorem 4.5](#), since $|\mathcal{F}(\tau)| = d + 1$, summing the estimate in [Theorem 4.5](#) over all faces yields the following corollary.

COROLLARY 4.6 (trace inequality on simplices). *Let \mathcal{T}_h be a ρ -shape-regular triangulation of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then for any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we have*

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\partial\tau)} \lesssim \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} d^{\frac{1}{2}} h_\tau^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{L^2(\tau)} + d^{\frac{1}{2}} h_\tau^{\frac{1}{2}} |v|_{H^1(\tau)}, \quad v \in H^1(\tau).$$

Next, we consider the discrete trace inequality. Namely, for $v \in V_h$, we want to estimate $\|v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}$ in terms of $\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, where Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^d . This

can be done directly using the ingredients developed so far:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2 &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h(\partial\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^2(\partial\tau)}^2 \\
 &\lesssim \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h(\partial\Omega)} \left(\rho d h_\tau^{-1} \|v\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2 + d h_\tau |v|_{H^1(\tau)}^2 \right) \\
 &\lesssim \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h(\partial\Omega)} \rho^2 d^4 h_\tau^{-1} \|v\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2 \\
 &\lesssim \rho^2 \sigma^{-1} d^4 h^{-1} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

where the inequalities follow from [Theorem 4.6](#), [Theorem 4.9](#), and quasi-uniformity, respectively.

While the above argument is sufficient for low dimensions, as in most standard applications, it becomes inadequate in high dimensions due to the high-order dependence on d introduced by the trace and inverse inequalities. Therefore, in what follows, we provide a sharper estimate based on a more direct argument.

LEMMA 4.7 (discrete trace inequality). *Let \mathcal{T}_h be a (ρ, σ) -quasi-uniform triangulation of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then we have*

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \lesssim \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} d h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad v \in V_h.$$

Proof. Take any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Note that $v|_\tau \in \mathbb{P}_1(\tau)$ for $v \in V_h$. The $L^2(\tau)$ -mass matrix M_τ for the nodal basis $\{\phi_{\tau,a}\}_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)}$ of the space $\mathbb{P}_1(\tau)$ is given by

$$(4.5) \quad M_\tau = \frac{|\tau|}{(d+1)(d+2)} (I_{d+1} + \mathbf{1}_{d+1} \mathbf{1}_{d+1}^t).$$

On the other hand, since

$$\int_{F_a} \phi_{\tau,b} \phi_{\tau,c} dx = \begin{cases} \frac{|F_a|}{d(d+1)} (1 + \delta_{bc}), & \text{if } b, c \neq a, \\ 0, & \text{if } b = a \text{ or } c = a, \end{cases} \quad a, b, c \in \mathcal{V}(\tau),$$

where F_a denotes the $(d-1)$ -face of τ opposite to a , the $L^2(\partial\tau)$ -mass matrix $M_{\partial\tau}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.6) \quad (M_{\partial\tau})_{bc} &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau) \setminus \{b,c\}} \int_{F_a} \phi_{\tau,b} \phi_{\tau,c} dx \\
 &\approx d^{-2} (1 + \delta_{bc}) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau) \setminus \{b,c\}} |F_a| \lesssim \rho h_\tau^{-1} |\tau| (1 + \delta_{bc}), \quad b, c \in \mathcal{V}(\tau),
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is because of $|\mathcal{V}(\tau)| = d+1$ and of the following which is a direct consequence of [Theorem 3.2](#):

$$|F_a| = d h_{F_a}^{-1} |\tau| \lesssim \rho d h_\tau^{-1} |\tau|.$$

Consequently, by (4.5) and (4.6), we obtain

$$(4.7) \quad \sup_{v \in \mathbb{P}_1(\tau)} \frac{\|v\|_{L^2(\partial\tau)}^2}{\|v\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2} = \sup_{v \in \mathbb{P}_1(\tau)} \frac{v^t M_{\partial\tau} v}{v^t M_\tau v} \lesssim \rho d^2 h_\tau^{-1}.$$

Now, we take any $v \in V_h$. It follows that

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)}^2 = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h(\partial\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^2(\partial\tau)}^2 \stackrel{(4.7)}{\lesssim} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h(\partial\Omega)} \rho d^2 h_\tau^{-1} \|v\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2 \leq \rho \sigma^{-1} d^2 h^{-1} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

where the last inequality is due to the quasi-uniformity of \mathcal{T}_h . \square

4.5. Inverse inequalities. Finally, we present inverse inequalities for finite element functions, together with their dependence on the spatial dimension d . We begin with a sharp inverse inequality on the reference element in \mathbb{R}^d .

LEMMA 4.8 (reference inverse inequality). *Let $\hat{\tau}_d$ be the d -dimensional reference element defined by*

$$\hat{\tau}_d = \left\{ x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_i > 0, \sum_{i=1}^d x_i < 1 \right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then we have

$$\sup_{v \in \mathbb{P}_1(\hat{\tau}_d) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|v|_{H^1(\hat{\tau}_d)}}{\|v\|_{L^2(\hat{\tau}_d)}} = (d+1)(d+2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \approx d^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Proof. Take any $v \in \mathbb{P}_1(\hat{\tau}_d)$ and write

$$v = \sum_{i=0}^d v_i \hat{\phi}_i,$$

where $\{\hat{\phi}_i\}_{i=0}^d$ denotes the set of nodal basis functions on the reference element $\hat{\tau}_d$. As in (4.5), by direct computation, we obtain

$$(4.8a) \quad \|v\|_{L^2(\hat{\tau}_d)}^2 = \frac{|\hat{\tau}_d|}{(d+1)(d+2)} v^t M_d v, \quad |v|_{H^1(\hat{\tau}_d)}^2 = |\hat{\tau}_d| v^t K_d v,$$

where

$$(4.8b) \quad M_d = I_{d+1} + \mathbf{1}_{d+1} \mathbf{1}_{d+1}^t, \quad K_d = \begin{bmatrix} d & -\mathbf{1}_d^t \\ -\mathbf{1}_d & I_d \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since one can verify by straightforward calculation that $\lambda_{\max}(M_d^{-1}K_d) = d+1$, it follows from (4.8) that the desired result holds. \square

Using the reference inverse inequality presented in Theorem 4.8, we can derive a general inverse inequality for elements in a shape-regular triangulation, as stated in Theorem 4.9.

LEMMA 4.9 (local inverse inequality). *Let \mathcal{T}_h be a ρ -shape-regular triangulation of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then for any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we have*

$$|v|_{H^1(\tau)} \lesssim \rho d^{\frac{3}{2}} h_\tau^{-1} \|v\|_{L^2(\tau)}, \quad v \in \mathbb{P}_1(\tau).$$

Proof. Let $F_\tau: \hat{\tau}_d \rightarrow \tau$ be the affine mapping given by $F_\tau(\hat{x}) = B_\tau \hat{x} + b_\tau$, where B_τ is a $d \times d$ matrix and b_τ is a vector. The inball of τ with radius r_τ pulls back under

B_τ^{-1} to an ellipsoid contained in $\hat{\tau}_d$. The largest axis of this ellipsoid is $2r_\tau\|B_\tau^{-1}\|$, which cannot exceed the diameter $h_{\hat{\tau}_d} = \sqrt{2}$ of $\hat{\tau}_d$. Hence, we obtain

$$(4.9) \quad \|B_\tau^{-1}\| \lesssim r_\tau^{-1} \leq \rho h_\tau^{-1},$$

where the last inequality follows from the shape-regularity.

Let $\hat{v} \in \mathcal{P}_m(\hat{\tau})$ be the pullback of v , i.e., $\hat{v}(\hat{x}) = v(F_\tau(\hat{x}))$ for $\hat{x} \in \hat{\tau}_d$. By change of variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |v|_{H^1(\tau)}^2 &= |\det B_\tau| \int_{\hat{\tau}_d} |B_\tau^{-1} \nabla \hat{v}|^2 d\hat{x} \\ &\stackrel{(4.9)}{\lesssim} \rho^2 h_\tau^{-2} |\det B_\tau| |\hat{v}|_{H^1(\hat{\tau})}^2 \lesssim \rho^2 d^3 h_\tau^{-2} |\det B_\tau| \|\hat{v}\|_{L^2(\hat{\tau})}^2 = \rho^2 d^3 h_\tau^{-2} \|v\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from [Theorem 4.8](#). This completes the proof. \square

The following global result is an immediate consequence of the local estimate.

COROLLARY 4.10 (global inverse inequality). *Let \mathcal{T}_h be a (ρ, σ) -quasi-uniform triangulation of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then we have*

$$|v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \rho \sigma^{-1} d^{\frac{3}{2}} h^{-1} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad v \in V_h.$$

5. Averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation. In this section, we introduce a variant of the Scott–Zhang interpolation [\[33\]](#), called the *averaged* Scott–Zhang interpolation, whose dependence on the spatial dimension d is only polynomial, whereas the original version may depend exponentially on d . Using this averaged interpolation, we also derive estimates for the L^2 - and H^1 -orthogonal projections onto the finite element space V_h with polynomial dependence on d .

To begin, we state our assumption on the domain Ω and its triangulation \mathcal{T}_h in [Theorem 5.1](#). Under this assumption, our setting satisfies all requirements needed to obtain favorable dependence on the dimension d : for example, the dimension-independent elliptic regularity in [Theorem 4.2](#) and the Bramble–Hilbert estimate in [Theorem 4.4](#).

Assumption 5.1. The domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is bounded, convex, and polyhedral. The triangulation \mathcal{T}_h is (ρ, σ) -quasi-uniform, and every vertex patch ω_a , $a \in \mathcal{V}_h$, is convex.

Note that the convexity assumption on each vertex patch ω_a in [Theorem 5.1](#) is nontrivial. One example that satisfies this assumption is the Freudenthal triangulation discussed in [section 3](#).

5.1. Definitions. The Scott–Zhang interpolation was first introduced in [\[33\]](#) as a modified Lagrange-type interpolation for approximating nonsmooth functions in Sobolev spaces by continuous piecewise polynomials, while also preserving homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. For completeness, we present a version of the Scott–Zhang interpolation in [Theorem 5.2](#). More general discussions can be found in [\[9, 33\]](#).

DEFINITION 5.2 (Scott–Zhang interpolation). *For each $a \in \mathcal{V}_h$, we define K_a as follows:*

- If a is an interior node, K_a is an element in \mathcal{T}_h such that $K_a \subset \omega_a$.
- If $a \in \partial\Omega$, K_a is a $(d-1)$ -face such that $a \in \partial K_a \subset \partial\Omega$.

The Scott–Zhang interpolation $I_h: H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow V_h$ is defined by

$$(I_h v)(a) = \int_{K_a} \psi_a v \, dx, \quad v \in H^1(\Omega), \quad a \in \mathcal{V}_h,$$

where $\psi_a \in \mathbb{P}_1(K_a)$ is the function dual to the K_a -restricted nodal basis $\{\phi_b|_{K_a}\}_{b \in \mathcal{V}(K_a)}$, i.e.,

$$\int_{K_a} \psi_a \phi_b \, dx = \delta_{ab}, \quad b \in \mathcal{V}(K_a).$$

While the Scott–Zhang interpolation has been successfully applied in the analysis of finite element methods and multilevel iterative methods (see [9, 19]), its standard estimates involve the number of elements sharing a given node. Since this number can grow rapidly with the dimension d , the corresponding bounds may inherit an undesirable dependence on d in high-dimensional settings.

For example, suppose we wish to derive a stability estimate for the Scott–Zhang interpolation by bounding

$$\|I_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|I_h v\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

for $v \in H^1(\Omega)$. Because the Scott–Zhang interpolant at a node $a \in \mathcal{V}_h$ is defined using an integral over the region K_a , the corresponding K_a -term contributes to the bound for every element $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$ satisfying $a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)$.

To address this issue, we introduce the *averaged* Scott–Zhang interpolation, whose definition is given in [Theorem 5.3](#).

DEFINITION 5.3 (averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation). *The averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation $I_h: H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow V_h$ is defined by*

$$(I_h v)(a) = \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} |K| \right)^{-1} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} |K| \int_K \psi_{a,K} v \, dx, \quad v \in H^1(\Omega), \quad a \in \mathcal{V}_h,$$

where $\psi_{a,K} \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ is the function dual to the K -restricted nodal basis $\{\phi_b|_K\}_{b \in \mathcal{V}(K)}$. The collection \mathcal{K}_a is defined as follows:

- If $a \in \mathcal{V}_h \setminus \partial\Omega$, then

$$\mathcal{K}_a = \{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h : \tau \subset \omega_a\}.$$

- If $a \in \mathcal{V}_h \cap \partial\Omega$, then \mathcal{K}_a is chosen as follows. For each element $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$ such that $\tau \subset \omega_a$ and $\mathcal{F}(\tau) \cap \mathcal{F}_h(\partial\Omega) \neq \emptyset$, we select one boundary $(d-1)$ -face of τ lying on $\partial\Omega$ and include it in \mathcal{K}_a . Thus, \mathcal{K}_a contains exactly one such boundary face from every element that contains a and has at least one boundary face.

In what follows, we use only the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation introduced in [Theorem 5.3](#), and not the original version in [Theorem 5.2](#). Thus, every occurrence of I_h in the sequel refers to the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation.

We next discuss connections to existing finite element quasi-interpolation operators [13, 17, 33]. As with the original Scott–Zhang operator, the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation preserves the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition.

The proposed averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation resembles the Clément interpolation [13] in the sense that the value at a node is defined using an integral over the entire vertex patch. The key difference is that the present construction uses a weighted average, which plays an important role in obtaining polynomial dependence on the dimension d . Furthermore, our definition employs a dual basis, as in the Scott–Zhang interpolation, which avoids an additional application of inverse inequalities—an important point when controlling the dependence on d .

We also note that the idea of averaging was used in [17] in the construction of quasi-interpolants. Whereas the purpose in [17] was to stitch a discontinuous function into a continuous one, our use of averaging is motivated by reducing the dependence on the spatial dimension, as will become clear in the subsequent analysis.

5.2. Error estimates. We now derive the L^2 - and H^1 -error estimates for the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation. As a first step, we present some useful estimates for the dual functions $\psi_{a,K}$ appearing in Theorem 5.3.

LEMMA 5.4. *For each $a \in \mathcal{V}_h$, let \mathcal{K}_a be defined as in Theorem 5.3. For each $K \in \mathcal{K}_a$, the dual function $\psi_{a,K} \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ introduced in Theorem 5.3 satisfies*

$$\|\psi_{a,K}\|_{L^1(K)} \lesssim d, \quad \|\psi_{a,K}\|_{L^2(K)} \lesssim d|K|^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. Note that K is a d -simplex when $a \in \mathcal{V}_h \setminus \partial\Omega$, and a $(d-1)$ -simplex when $a \in \mathcal{V}_h \cap \partial\Omega$. If K is a d -simplex, then, as in (4.5), the $L^2(K)$ -mass matrix M_K associated with the basis $\{\phi_b|_K\}_{b \in \mathcal{V}_h(K)}$ is given by

$$M_K = \frac{|K|}{(d+1)(d+2)}(I_{d+1} + \mathbf{1}_{d+1}\mathbf{1}_{d+1}^t).$$

Hence, we have

$$M_K^{-1} = \frac{(d+1)(d+2)}{|K|} \left(I_{d+1} - \frac{1}{d+2} \mathbf{1}_{d+1} \mathbf{1}_{d+1}^t \right).$$

Since $\psi_{a,K}$ is the $L^2(K)$ -dual of $\phi_a|_K$, we obtain

$$\psi_{a,K} = \sum_{b \in \mathcal{V}_h(K)} (M_K^{-1})_{ba} \phi_b|_K = \frac{d+1}{|K|} ((d+2)\phi_a|_K - 1).$$

Direct calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_{a,K}\|_{L^1(K)} &= \frac{d+1}{|K|} \int_K |(d+2)\phi_a|_K - 1| \, dx = \frac{2(d+1)^{d+1}}{(d+2)^d} - 1, \\ \|\psi_{a,K}\|_{L^2(K)}^2 &= (M_K^{-1})_{aa} = \frac{(d+1)^2}{|K|}, \end{aligned}$$

which is our desired result.

If K is a $(d-1)$ -simplex, an analogous argument using the $(d-1)$ -dimensional mass matrix yields the desired result. \square

Using the identities

$$(5.1) \quad \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} \phi_a(x) = 1, \quad \int_K \psi_{a,K}(y) \, dy = 1,$$

we readily obtain [Theorem 5.5](#), which will be useful in deriving error estimates for the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation.

LEMMA 5.5. *For each $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $x \in \tau$, the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation $I_h : H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow V_h$ defined in [Theorem 5.3](#) satisfies*

$$(v - I_h v)(x) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} (\Psi_a v)(x) \phi_a(x), \quad v \in H^1(\Omega),$$

where $(\Psi_a v)(x)$ is given by

$$(\Psi_a v)(x) = \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} |K| \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} |K| \int_K \psi_{a,K}(y) (v(x) - v(y)) dy \right).$$

Thanks to [Theorem 5.5](#), it suffices to estimate $\Psi_a v$ for each $a \in \mathcal{V}_h$ in order to obtain an estimate for the error $v - I_h v$ of the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation; a similar technique was used, for example, in [30, Lemma 5.1]. In [Theorem 5.6](#), we present an L^2 -estimate for $\Psi_a v$.

LEMMA 5.6. *Suppose that [Theorem 5.1](#) holds. Then, for each $a \in \mathcal{V}_h$, the operator Ψ_a defined in [Theorem 5.5](#) satisfies*

$$\|\Psi_a v\|_{L^2(\omega_a)} \lesssim \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} dh^j |v|_{H^j(\omega_a)}, \quad v \in H^j(\Omega), \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Proof. We define (see [Theorem 5.3](#) for the definition of \mathcal{K}_a)

$$(5.2) \quad \alpha_K = \left(\sum_{K' \in \mathcal{K}_a} |K'| \right)^{-1} |K|, \quad K \in \mathcal{K}_a,$$

so that we have

$$0 \leq \alpha_K \leq 1, \quad \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} \alpha_K = 1.$$

From the definition of $\Psi_a v$, the Jensen inequality

$$(5.3) \quad \varphi \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} \alpha_K v_K \right) \leq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} \alpha_K \varphi(v_K)$$

with

$$\varphi = \|\cdot\|_{L^2(\omega_a)}^2, \quad v_K = \int_K \psi_{a,K}(y) (v(\cdot) - v(y)) dy$$

gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi_a v\|_{L^2(\omega_a)}^2 &= \left\| \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} \alpha_K \int_K \psi_{a,K}(y) (v(\cdot) - v(y)) dy \right\|_{L^2(\omega_a)}^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} \alpha_K \left\| \int_K \psi_{a,K}(y) (v(\cdot) - v(y)) dy \right\|_{L^2(\omega_a)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\Psi_a v\|_{L^2(\omega_a)}^2 &\leq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} \alpha_K \int_{\omega_a} \left(\int_K \psi_{a,K}(y)^2 dy \right) \left(\int_K (v(x) - v(y))^2 dy \right) dx \\
 (5.4) \quad &\approx d^2 \left(\sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} |K| \right)^{-1} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} \int_{\omega_a} \int_K (v(x) - v(y))^2 dy dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

where we used the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and [Theorem 5.4](#).

Now, we consider two cases $a \in \mathcal{V}_h \setminus \partial\Omega$ and $a \in \mathcal{V}_h \cap \partial\Omega$ separately. First, we consider the case $a \in \mathcal{V}_h \setminus \partial\Omega$. In this case, \mathcal{K}_a consists of the elements contained in ω_a . Hence, (5.4) implies

$$(5.5) \quad \|\Psi_a v\|_{L^2(\omega_a)}^2 \lesssim d^2 |\omega_a|^{-1} \int_{\omega_a} \int_{\omega_a} (v(x) - v(y))^2 dy dx \lesssim d^2 \|v\|_{L^2(\omega_a)}^2,$$

where the last inequality uses

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.6) \quad &\int_{\omega_a} \int_{\omega_a} (v(x) - v(y))^2 dy dx \\
 &\leq 2 \int_{\omega_a} \int_{\omega_a} v(x)^2 dy dx + 2 \int_{\omega_a} \int_{\omega_a} v(y)^2 dy dx = 4 |\omega_a| \int_{\omega_a} v(x)^2 dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that Ψ_a is invariant under addition of a first-degree polynomial. Namely,

$$(5.7) \quad \Psi_a v = \Psi_a(v + p), \quad p \in \mathbb{P}_1(\Omega).$$

Therefore, from (5.5) and (5.7), we deduce

$$\|\Psi_a v\|_{L^2(\omega_a)}^2 \lesssim d^2 \inf_{p \in \mathbb{P}_1(\omega_a)} \|v + p\|_{L^2(\omega_a)}^2 \lesssim d^2 h^{2j} |v|_{H^j(\omega_a)}^2,$$

where the last inequality is due to [Theorems 4.3](#) and [4.4](#) with the convexity assumption on ω_a (see [Theorem 5.1](#)).

Next, we consider the case $a \in \mathcal{V}_h \cap \partial\Omega$. In this case, for each $K \in \mathcal{K}_a$, there exists an element $\tau_K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ such that $\tau_K \subset \omega_a$, $\mathcal{F}(\tau_K) \cap \mathcal{F}_h(\partial\Omega) \neq \emptyset$, and τ_K 's are mutually disjoint. By [Theorem 4.5](#) and the quasi-uniformity, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.8) \quad &\int_K (v(x) - v(y))^2 dy \lesssim \rho h_{\tau_K}^{-1} \int_{\tau_K} (v(x) - v(y))^2 dy + h_{\tau_K} |v|_{H^1(\tau_K)}^2 \\
 &\lesssim \rho \sigma^{-1} h^{-1} \int_{\tau_K} (v(x) - v(y))^2 dy + h |v|_{H^1(\tau_K)}^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

We also observe that, since

$$\omega_a \subset \left\{ x \in \Omega : \text{dist} \left(x, \bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} \overline{K} \right) \leq h \right\},$$

we have

$$(5.9) \quad |\omega_a| \leq h \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} |K|.$$

Combining (5.4), (5.8), and (5.9), we obtain

(5.10)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi_a v\|_{L^2(\omega_a)}^2 &\lesssim d^2 h |\omega_a|^{-1} \int_{\omega_a} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} \left(\rho \sigma^{-1} h^{-1} \int_{\tau_K} (v(x) - v(y))^2 dy + h |v|_{H^1(\tau_K)}^2 \right) dx \\ &\leq \rho \sigma^{-1} d^2 |\omega_a|^{-1} \int_{\omega_a} \int_{\omega_a} (v(x) - v(y))^2 dy dx + d^2 h^2 |v|_{H^1(\omega_a)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \rho \sigma^{-1} d^2 \|v\|_{L^2(\omega_a)}^2 + d^2 h^2 |v|_{H^1(\omega_a)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality the fact that τ_K 's are disjoint is used and in the last inequality we use (5.6). Again, using (5.7) with Theorems 4.3 and 4.4 in (5.10) yields

$$\|\Psi_a v\|_{L^2(\omega_a)}^2 \lesssim \rho \sigma^{-1} d^2 h^{2j} |v|_{H^j(\omega_a)}^2,$$

which is the desired result. \square

Using Theorem 5.6, we now present an L^2 -error estimate for the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation in Theorem 5.7.

THEOREM 5.7 (L^2 -error estimate). *Suppose that Theorem 5.1 holds. Then, the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation $I_h: H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow V_h$ defined in Theorem 5.3 satisfies*

$$\|v - I_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} d^{\frac{3}{2}} h^j |v|_{H^j(\Omega)}, \quad v \in H^j(\Omega), \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Proof. Take any element $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $x \in \tau$. By Theorem 5.5 and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (5.11) \quad (v - I_h v)(x)^2 &= \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} (\Psi_a v)(x) \phi_a(x) \right)^2 \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} (\Psi_a v)(x)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} \phi_a(x)^2 \right) \stackrel{(5.1)}{\leq} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} (\Psi_a v)(x)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating over $x \in \tau$ followed by summing over $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|v - I_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|v - I_h v\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2 \leq \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} \|\Psi_a v\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2 \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}_h} \|\Psi_a v\|_{L^2(\omega_a)}^2 \lesssim \rho \sigma^{-1} d^2 h^{2j} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}_h} |v|_{H^j(\omega_a)}^2 \lesssim \rho \sigma^{-1} d^3 h^{2j} |v|_{H^j(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate inequality is due to Theorem 5.6, and the last inequality is due to that each element has $d + 1$ vertices. \square

Next, we consider the H^1 -error estimate. In the same spirit as Theorem 5.6, we present an H^1 -estimate for $\Psi_a v$ in Lemma 5.8.

LEMMA 5.8. *Suppose that Theorem 5.1 holds. Then, for each $a \in \mathcal{V}_h$, the operator Ψ_a defined in Theorem 5.5 satisfies*

$$|\Psi_a v|_{H^1(\omega_a)} \lesssim d h |v|_{H^2(\omega_a)}, \quad v \in H^2(\Omega).$$

Proof. For each $K \in \mathcal{K}_a$ (see [Theorem 5.3](#) for the definition of \mathcal{K}_a , we define α_K as in (5.2). From the definition of $\Psi_a v$, the Jensen inequality (5.3) with

$$\varphi = \|\cdot\|_{H^1(\omega_a)}^2, \quad v_K = \int_K \psi_{a,K}(y)(v(\cdot) - v(y)) dy$$

gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_a v|_{H^1(\omega_a)}^2 &= \left| \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} \alpha_K \int_K \psi_{a,K}(y)(v(\cdot) - v(y)) dy \right|_{H^1(\omega_a)}^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} \alpha_K \left| \int_K \psi_{a,K}(y)(v(\cdot) - v(y)) dy \right|_{H^1(\omega_a)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_a v|_{H^1(\omega_a)}^2 &\leq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} \alpha_K \int_{\omega_a} \left(\int_K \psi_{a,K}(y) \nabla v(x) dy \right)^2 dx \\ (5.12) \quad &\leq \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}_a} \alpha_K \int_{\omega_a} |\nabla v(x)|^2 dx \left(\int_K |\psi_{a,K}(y)| dy \right)^2 \\ &\approx d^2 |v|_{H^1(\omega_a)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and the final \approx is due to [Theorem 5.4](#). Since Ψ_a is invariant under addition of a first-degree polynomial (see (5.7)), replacing v with $v + p$ for $p \in \mathbb{P}_1(\omega_a)$ in (5.12) and then applying [Theorem 4.4](#) yields the desired result. \square

Finally, using [Lemma 5.8](#), we obtain the H^1 -error estimate for the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation, as stated in [Theorem 5.9](#).

THEOREM 5.9. *Suppose that [Theorem 5.1](#) holds. Then, the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation $I_h: H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow V_h$ defined in [Theorem 5.3](#) satisfies*

$$|v - I_h v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \rho^{\frac{3}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}} d^2 h |v|_{H^2(\Omega)}, \quad v \in H^2(\Omega).$$

Proof. Take any element $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $x \in \tau$. By [Theorem 5.5](#) and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla(v - I_h v)(x)|^2 &\leq \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} |\nabla((\Psi_a v)\phi_a)(x)| \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} |\nabla(\Psi_a v)(x)| \phi_a(x) \right)^2 + \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} |(\Psi_a v)(x)| |\nabla \phi_a(x)| \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} |\nabla(\Psi_a v)(x)|^2 + \rho^2 \sigma^{-2} h^{-2} \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} |(\Psi_a v)(x)| \right)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} (|\nabla(\Psi_a v)(x)|^2 + \rho^2 \sigma^{-2} d h^{-2} (\Psi_a v)(x)^2), \end{aligned}$$

where in the penultimate inequality the first term is estimated as in (5.11), and the second term follows from Theorem 4.1. The final inequality uses the fact that $|\mathcal{V}(\tau)| = d + 1$. Integrating over $x \in \tau$ and then summing over $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} |v - I_h v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 &\lesssim \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}(\tau)} \left(|\Psi_a v|_{H^1(\tau)}^2 + \rho^2 \sigma^{-2} d h^{-2} \|\Psi_a v\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}_h} \left(|\Psi_a v|_{H^1(\omega_a)}^2 + \rho^2 \sigma^{-2} d h^{-2} \|\Psi_a v\|_{L^2(\omega_a)}^2 \right) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{a \in \mathcal{V}_h} \rho^3 \sigma^{-3} d^3 h^2 |v|_{H^2(\omega_a)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \rho^3 \sigma^{-3} d^4 h^2 |v|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate inequality follows from Theorem 5.6 and Lemma 5.8, and the final inequality uses the fact that each element has $d + 1$ vertices. \square

Remark 5.10. In Theorem 5.3, the nodal value of the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation at an interior node $a \in \mathcal{V}_h \setminus \partial\Omega$ is defined using the elements $\tau \subset \omega_a$. Alternatively, it is also possible to define it in terms of certain $(d - 1)$ -faces, in a manner similar to the original Scott–Zhang construction [33]. In this case, a similar analysis yields results analogous to those presented above; the only difference is that the trace inequality (Theorem 4.5) must be applied additional times.

5.3. Estimates for orthogonal projections. We are now ready to study the L^2 - and H^1 -orthogonal projections, which play important roles in the analysis of multilevel methods, using the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation.

We first consider the L^2 -orthogonal projection, which was studied in, e.g., [8, 36]. Let $Q_h: H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow V_h$ be the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto V_h :

$$(5.13) \quad \int_{\Omega} (Q_h v) v_h \, dx = \int_{\Omega} v v_h \, dx, \quad v \in H^1(\Omega), \, v_h \in V_h.$$

The following estimate can be obtained straightforward from the L^2 -approximation estimate of the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation.

THEOREM 5.11. *Suppose that Theorem 5.1 holds. Then the L^2 -orthogonal projection $Q_h: H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow V_h$ defined in (5.13) satisfies*

$$\|v - Q_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} d^{\frac{3}{2}} h |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \quad v \in H^1(\Omega).$$

Proof. Given $v \in H^1(\Omega)$, by Theorem 5.7, we have

$$\|v - Q_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|v - v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|v - I_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} d^{\frac{3}{2}} h |v|_{H^1(\Omega)},$$

where I_h is the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation defined in Theorem 5.3. \square

Similarly, let $P_h: H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow V_{h,0}$ be the H^1 -orthogonal projection onto $V_{h,0}$:

$$(5.14) \quad \int_{\Omega} \nabla(P_h v) \cdot \nabla v_h \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \nabla v \cdot \nabla v_h \, dx, \quad v \in H_0^1(\Omega), \, v_h \in V_{h,0}.$$

Note that P_h is well-defined thanks to the essential boundary conditions imposed on $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $V_{h,0}$. Using a standard duality argument (see, e.g., [9]) and the H^1 -approximation estimate of the averaged Scott–Zhang interpolation, we obtain the following result.

THEOREM 5.12. *Suppose that Theorem 5.1 holds. Then the H^1 -orthogonal projection $P_h: H_0^1(\Omega) \rightarrow V_{h,0}$ be defined in (5.14) satisfies*

$$\|v - P_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \rho^{\frac{3}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}} d^2 h |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \quad v \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

Proof. Take any $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Consider the auxiliary problem: find $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$(5.15) \quad \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla \phi \, dx = \int_{\Omega} (v - P_h v) \phi \, dx, \quad \phi \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

By Theorem 4.2, we have

$$(5.16) \quad |w|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq \|v - P_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Therefore, for any $v_h \in V_{h,0}$, we get

$$\|v - P_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \stackrel{(5.15)}{=} \int_{\Omega} \nabla w \cdot \nabla (v - P_h v) \, dx \stackrel{(5.14)}{=} \int_{\Omega} \nabla (w - v_h) \cdot \nabla (v - P_h v) \, dx.$$

Choosing $v_h = I_h w$ gives

$$\|v - P_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = \int_{\Omega} \nabla (w - I_h w) \cdot \nabla (v - P_h v) \, dx \leq |w - I_h w|_{H^1(\Omega)} |v - P_h v|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

Invoking Theorem 5.9, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|v - P_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\lesssim \rho^{\frac{3}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}} d^2 h |w|_{H^2(\Omega)} |v - P_h v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\stackrel{(5.14)}{\leq} \rho^{\frac{3}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}} d^2 h |w|_{H^2(\Omega)} |v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\stackrel{(5.16)}{\leq} \rho^{\frac{3}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}} d^2 h \|v - P_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by $\|v - P_h v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ yields the desired result. \square

6. Bramble–Pasciak–Xu preconditioners. In this section, we present our main result: we show that the condition numbers of BPX preconditioners [7, 35] depend on the spatial dimension d only polynomially. We begin by analyzing the dimension dependence of the strengthened Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities [37] and the norm equivalence theorem [4, 14, 29, 37], two important technical tools in the analysis of multilevel methods. Using the norm equivalence theorem, we then derive the BPX preconditioner. Finally, by invoking the theory of parallel subspace correction methods [31, 37, 39], we obtain an improved estimate for the condition number of the BPX preconditioner.

6.1. Multilevel finite element spaces. A standard assumption on multilevel finite element spaces, commonly used in multilevel methods (see, e.g., [37]), is stated in Theorem 6.1.

Assumption 6.1. For $J \geq 1$, the triangulation \mathcal{T}_h admits a sequence of triangulations $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_J = \mathcal{T}_h$ satisfying the following conditions:

- \mathcal{T}_l is a refinement of \mathcal{T}_{l-1} for $1 \leq l \leq J-1$.
- For each $1 \leq l \leq J$, the characteristic mesh size h_l of \mathcal{T}_l satisfies

$$h_l \approx \gamma^{2l}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq J,$$

for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$.

Note that the number of levels J satisfies $J = \mathcal{O}(|\log h|)$. For each triangulation \mathcal{T}_l , we define the corresponding finite element space

$$V_l := \{v \in H_0^1(\Omega) : v|_\tau \in \mathbb{P}_1(\tau) \text{ for all } \tau \in \mathcal{T}_l\}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq J.$$

These spaces form a nested sequence of subspaces of $V_{h,0}$:

$$(6.1) \quad V_1 \subset V_2 \subset \cdots \subset V_J = V_{h,0},$$

which yields the following multilevel space decomposition:

$$(6.2) \quad V_{h,0} = \sum_{l=1}^J V_l.$$

The overlap among the subspaces in the multilevel decomposition (6.2) is essential: although it introduces redundancy in representation, this redundancy enables multilevel methods to efficiently reduce errors across different frequency ranges. For algebraic perspectives explaining how such redundancy improves the convergence rate of iterative methods, see [31].

Let $Q_l: V_{h,0} \rightarrow V_l$ be the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto V_l , with the convention $Q_0 = 0$. An important property is that, on the range $\mathcal{R}(Q_l - Q_{l-1})$ of the difference operator $Q_l - Q_{l-1}$, the L^2 -norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ and the scaled H^1 -seminorm $h_l |\cdot|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ are equivalent, as summarized in Theorem 6.2.

LEMMA 6.2. *Suppose that Theorems 5.1 and 6.1 hold. For any $1 \leq l \leq J$, we have*

$$\rho^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} d^{-\frac{3}{2}} \gamma^2 h_l^{-1} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim |v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \rho \sigma^{-1} d^{\frac{3}{2}} h_l^{-1} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad v \in \mathcal{R}(Q_l - Q_{l-1}),$$

where $Q_l: V_{h,0} \rightarrow V_l$ denotes the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto V_l , and $Q_0 = 0$.

Proof. Since the right inequality is clear from the global inverse inequality (Corollary 4.10), we only prove the left inequality. Take any $v \in \mathcal{R}(Q_l - Q_{l-1})$. There exists $w \in V_{h,0}$ such that

$$(6.3) \quad v = (Q_l - Q_{l-1})w = (I - Q_{l-1})(Q_l - Q_{l-1})w.$$

Then by the approximation property of the L^2 -orthogonal projection (Theorem 5.11) and Theorem 6.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\stackrel{(6.3)}{=} \|(I - Q_{l-1})(Q_l - Q_{l-1})w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} d^{\frac{3}{2}} \gamma^{-2} h_l |(Q_l - Q_{l-1})w|_{H^1(\Omega)} \stackrel{(6.3)}{=} \rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} d^{\frac{3}{2}} \gamma^{-2} h_l |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

6.2. Strengthened Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities. The strengthened Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities are important technical tools for analyzing the multilevel space decomposition (6.2). Here, we closely follow the arguments in [37, Section 6.1], with careful attention to the dependence on the spatial dimension d and relevant parameters.

In Lemma 6.3, we reproduce the Cauchy–Schwarz-type inequality from [37, Lemma 6.1], now with explicit dependence on the dimension and parameters.

LEMMA 6.3. *Suppose that Theorems 5.1 and 6.1 hold. For any $1 \leq l \leq k \leq J$, we have*

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla v \cdot \nabla w \, dx \lesssim \rho \sigma^{-1} d^{\frac{3}{2}} \gamma^{k-l} h_k^{-1} |v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad v \in V_l, \, w \in V_k.$$

Proof. Take any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_l$. Since ∇v is constant on τ , by the shape-regularity and the quasi-uniformity (see Theorem 5.1), we have

$$(6.4) \quad \frac{\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\partial\tau)}^2}{\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2} = \frac{|\partial\tau|}{|\tau|} = d\tau^{-1} \leq \rho d h_{\tau}^{-1} \leq \rho \sigma^{-1} d h_l^{-1}.$$

It follows from the Green's identity that

$$(6.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\tau} \nabla v \cdot \nabla w \, dx &\leq \int_{\partial\tau} w \frac{\partial v}{\partial n} \, ds \\ &\leq \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\partial\tau)} \|w\|_{L^2(\partial\tau)} \\ &\lesssim \rho \sigma^{-1} d^{\frac{3}{2}} h_l^{-1/2} h_k^{-1/2} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\tau)} \|w\|_{L^2(\tau)} \\ &\approx \rho \sigma^{-1} d^{\frac{3}{2}} \gamma^{k-l} h_k^{-1} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\tau)} \|w\|_{L^2(\tau)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate step follows from the discrete trace inequality (Theorem 4.7) together with (6.4), and the final \approx uses Theorem 6.1. Summing (6.5) over all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_l$ followed by applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \nabla v \cdot \nabla w \, dx &\lesssim \rho \sigma^{-1} d^{\frac{3}{2}} \gamma^{k-l} h_k^{-1} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_l} |v|_{H^1(\tau)} \|w\|_{L^2(\tau)} \\ &\leq \rho \sigma^{-1} d^{\frac{3}{2}} \gamma^{k-l} h_k^{-1} \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_l} |v|_{H^1(\tau)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_l} \|w\|_{L^2(\tau)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \rho \sigma^{-1} d^{\frac{3}{2}} \gamma^{k-l} h_k^{-1} |v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

We now state the strengthened Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities among the spaces $\{\mathcal{R}(Q_l - Q_{l-1})\}_{l=1}^J$ in Theorem 6.4 (cf. [37, Lemma 6.2]). This result follows directly from Theorem 6.2 and Lemma 6.3.

LEMMA 6.4 (Strengthened Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities). *Suppose that Theorems 5.1 and 6.1 hold. For any $1 \leq l \leq k \leq J$, we have*

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla v \cdot \nabla w \, dx \lesssim \rho^{\frac{3}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}} d^3 \gamma^{k-l-2} |v|_{H^1(\Omega)} |w|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \quad v \in \mathcal{R}(Q_l - Q_{l-1}), \, w \in \mathcal{R}(Q_k - Q_{k-1}),$$

where $Q_l: V_{h,0} \rightarrow V_l$ denotes the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto V_l , and $Q_0 = 0$.

6.3. Norm equivalence theorem. We now present the norm equivalence theorem [4, 14, 29, 37], one of the most important theoretical results in the analysis of multilevel iterative methods, in Theorem 6.5. We note that although we assume full elliptic regularity for convenience (see Theorem 5.1), the norm equivalence theorem itself does not require full elliptic regularity and remains valid for a broader class of domains.

THEOREM 6.5. Suppose that [Theorems 5.1](#) and [6.1](#) hold. Then we have

$$\underline{C}_{\rho,\sigma,d,\gamma} \sum_{l=1}^J |(Q_l - Q_{l-1})v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \overline{C}_{\rho,\sigma,d,\gamma} \sum_{l=1}^J |(Q_l - Q_{l-1})v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2, \quad v \in V_{h,0},$$

where $Q_l: V_{h,0} \rightarrow V_l$ denotes the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto V_l , $Q_0 = 0$, and

$$\underline{C}_{\rho,\sigma,d,\gamma} = \rho^{-5} \sigma^5 d^{-7} \gamma^4 (1 - \gamma^2)(1 - \gamma^4), \quad \overline{C}_{\rho,\sigma,d,\gamma} = \frac{\rho^{\frac{3}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}} d^3}{\gamma^2 (1 - \gamma)}.$$

Proof. For each $1 \leq l \leq J$, we define

$$(6.6) \quad v_l = (P_l - P_{l-1})v = (I - P_{l-1})(P_l - P_{l-1})v \in V_l,$$

so that we have

$$(6.7) \quad v = \sum_{l=1}^J v_l, \quad |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 = \sum_{l=1}^J |v_l|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2.$$

We readily observe that

$$(6.8) \quad (Q_k - Q_{k-1})v_l = 0, \quad v_l \in V_l, \quad k > l.$$

Moreover, for $k \leq l$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(Q_k - Q_{k-1})v_l\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &= \|(I - Q_{k-1})Q_k v_l\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|v_l\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ (6.9) \quad &\stackrel{(6.6)}{=} \|(I - P_{l-1})(P_l - P_{l-1})v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim \rho^{\frac{3}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}} d^2 h_{l-1} |(P_l - P_{l-1})v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\stackrel{(6.6)}{=} \rho^{\frac{3}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}} d^2 h_{l-1} |v_l|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to [Theorem 5.12](#). From (6.7) and (6.8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} (6.10) \quad \sum_{l=1}^J |(Q_l - Q_{l-1})v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 &= \sum_{i,j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{\min(i,j)} \int_{\Omega} \nabla((Q_l - Q_{l-1})v_i) \cdot \nabla((Q_l - Q_{l-1})v_j) dx \\ &\leq \sum_{i,j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{\min(i,j)} |(Q_l - Q_{l-1})v_i|_{H^1(\Omega)} |(Q_l - Q_{l-1})v_j|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

By [Theorem 6.2](#) and (6.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (6.11) \quad &\sum_{i,j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{\min(i,j)} |(Q_l - Q_{l-1})v_i|_{H^1(\Omega)} |(Q_l - Q_{l-1})v_j|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim \rho^2 \sigma^{-2} d^3 \sum_{i,j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{\min(i,j)} h_l^{-2} \|\tilde{Q}_l v_i\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\tilde{Q}_l v_j\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim \rho^5 \sigma^{-5} d^7 \sum_{i,j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{\min(i,j)} h_l^{-2} h_{i-1} h_{j-1} |v_i|_{H^1(\Omega)} |v_j|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using [Theorem 6.1](#) and the inequality

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\min(i,j)} h_l^{-2} \approx \sum_{l=1}^{\min(i,j)} \gamma^{-4l} = \frac{\gamma^{-4\min(i,j)} - 1}{1 - \gamma^4} \lesssim \frac{h_{\min(i,j)}^{-2}}{1 - \gamma^4},$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{\min(i,j)} h_l^{-2} h_{i-1} h_{j-1} |v_i|_{H^1(\Omega)} |v_j|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ (6.12) \quad & \lesssim \frac{1}{\gamma^4(1 - \gamma^4)} \sum_{i,j=1}^J h_{\min(i,j)}^{-2} h_i h_j |v_i|_{H^1(\Omega)} |v_j|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ & \approx \frac{1}{\gamma^4(1 - \gamma^4)} \sum_{i,j=1}^J \gamma^{2|i-j|} |v_i|_{H^1(\Omega)} |v_j|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

With elementary manipulations, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j=1}^J \gamma^{2|i-j|} |v_i|_{H^1(\Omega)} |v_j|_{H^1(\Omega)} \lesssim \sum_{i,j=1}^J \gamma^{2|i-j|} (|v_i|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + |v_j|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2) \\ (6.13) \quad & \approx \sum_{i=1}^J \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \gamma^{2|i-j|} \right) |v_i|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{1 - \gamma^2} \sum_{i=1}^J |v_i|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \stackrel{(6.7)}{=} \frac{1}{1 - \gamma^2} |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (6.10)–(6.13) yields the desired estimate for $\underline{C}_{\rho,\sigma,d,\gamma}$.

On the other hand, we use [Theorem 6.4](#) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 &= \sum_{i,j=1}^J \int_{\Omega} \nabla((Q_i - Q_{i-1})v) \cdot \nabla((Q_j - Q_{j-1})v) \, dx \\ &\lesssim \rho^{\frac{3}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}} d^3 \sum_{i,j=1}^J \gamma^{|i-j|-2} |(Q_i - Q_{i-1})v|_{H^1(\Omega)} |(Q_j - Q_{j-1})v|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \frac{\rho^{\frac{3}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}} d^3}{\gamma^2(1 - \gamma)} \sum_{l=1}^J |\tilde{Q}_l v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the estimate for $\overline{C}_{\rho,\sigma,d,\gamma}$. \square

Combining [Theorem 6.2](#) and [Theorem 6.5](#), we obtain [Theorem 6.6](#), which plays an important role in the derivation of BPX preconditioners.

COROLLARY 6.6. *Suppose that [Theorems 5.1](#) and [6.1](#) hold. Then we have*

$$\underline{C}_{\rho,\sigma,d,\gamma}(\hat{A}v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \overline{C}_{\rho,\sigma,d,\gamma}(\hat{A}v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad v \in V_{h,0},$$

where the linear operator $\hat{A}: V_{h,0} \rightarrow V_{h,0}$ is defined by

$$\hat{A} = \sum_{l=1}^J h_l^{-2} (Q_l - Q_{l-1}),$$

and $Q_l: V_{h,0} \rightarrow V_l$ denotes the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto V_l , $Q_0 = 0$, and

$$\underline{C}_{\rho,\sigma,d,\gamma} = \rho^{-6} \sigma^6 d^{-10} \gamma^8 (1 - \gamma^2)(1 - \gamma^4), \quad \overline{C}_{\rho,\sigma,d,\gamma} = \frac{\rho^{\frac{7}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{7}{2}} d^6}{\gamma^2 (1 - \gamma)}.$$

6.4. Construction of BPX preconditioners. While the BPX preconditioner was originally developed as part of an effort to parallelize classical multigrid methods [7, 35], here we derive it in an alternative way, namely through the norm equivalence theorem established above.

Our starting point is the linear operator \hat{A} defined in Theorem 6.6. By Theorem 6.1, we have

$$\hat{A}^{-1} = \sum_{l=1}^J h_l^2 (Q_l - Q_{l-1}) \approx \sum_{l=1}^J \gamma^{2l} (Q_l - Q_{l-1}).$$

Hence, for any $v \in V_{h,0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{A}^{-1}v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} &\approx \sum_{l=1}^J \gamma^{2l} ((Q_l - Q_{l-1})v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ (6.14) \quad &= \gamma^{2J} (v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} + \sum_{l=1}^J \gamma^{2l} (1 - \gamma^2) (Q_l v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\approx h_J^2 (v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} + (1 - \gamma^2) \sum_{l=1}^J h_l^2 (Q_l v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

We now consider the following instance of BPX preconditioners (see [7]):

$$(6.15) \quad B = \sum_{l=1}^J h_l^2 Q_l.$$

Then (6.14) implies

$$(1 - \gamma^2) (Bv, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim (\hat{A}^{-1}v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim (Bv, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad v \in V_{h,0}.$$

Equivalently,

$$(6.16) \quad (1 - \gamma^2) (\hat{A}v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim (B^{-1}v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim (\hat{A}v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad v \in V_{h,0}.$$

Combining (6.16) with Theorem 6.6, we obtain

$$(6.17) \quad (1 - \gamma^2) \overline{C}_{\rho,\sigma,d,\gamma}^{-1} |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim (B^{-1}v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \underline{C}_{\rho,\sigma,d,\gamma}^{-1} |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2, \quad v \in V_{h,0},$$

where $\underline{C}_{\rho,\sigma,d,\gamma}$ and $\overline{C}_{\rho,\sigma,d,\gamma}$ are the constants in Theorem 6.6. The inequality (6.17) shows that the condition number $\kappa(BA)$ of the operator BA , where $A: V_{h,0} \rightarrow V_{h,0}$ is defined by

$$(6.18) \quad (Av, w)_{L^2(\Omega)} = \int_{\Omega} \nabla v \cdot \nabla w \, dx, \quad v, w \in V_{h,0},$$

is bounded independently of the mesh size h and the number of levels J , while depending on the dimension d and the shape-regularity parameter ρ only polynomially. This is precisely the main goal of this paper.

On the other hand, by using the theory of parallel subspace correction methods [37, 39], we can obtain an even sharper bound on $\kappa(BA)$, as we discuss next.

6.5. BPX preconditioners as parallel subspace correction methods. As discussed in [37], the BPX preconditioner (6.15), or more general form with general smoothers (see [7]) are interpreted as parallel subspace correction methods based on the multilevel space decomposition (6.2).

From the well-established convergence theory of parallel subspace correction methods (see, e.g., [31, Theorem 6.2] and [39, Lemma 2.4]), we have the following result.

LEMMA 6.7. *The Bramble–Pasciak–Xu preconditioner B defined in (6.15) satisfies*

$$(B^{-1}v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = \inf_{v_l \in V_l, \sum_{l=1}^J v_l = v} \sum_{l=1}^J h_l^{-2} \|v_l\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad v \in V_{h,0}.$$

Using Theorem 6.7, we obtain the following estimate, which is sharper than the constant $C_{\rho, \sigma, d, \gamma}^{-1}$ appearing in (6.17).

LEMMA 6.8. *Suppose that Theorems 5.1 and 6.1 hold. Then the Bramble–Pasciak–Xu preconditioner B defined in (6.15) satisfies*

$$(B^{-1}v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \rho^3 \sigma^{-3} d^4 \gamma^{-4} |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2, \quad v \in V_{h,0}.$$

Proof. For any $1 \leq l \leq J$, we define $v_l \in V_l$ as in (6.6). By Theorem 6.7, (6.9), Theorem 6.1, and (6.7), we get

$$\begin{aligned} (B^{-1}v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \sum_{l=1}^J h_l^{-2} \|v_l\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\lesssim \rho^3 \sigma^{-3} d^4 \sum_{l=1}^J h_l^{-2} h_{l-1}^2 |v_l|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\approx \rho^3 \sigma^{-3} d^4 \gamma^{-4} \sum_{l=1}^J |v_l|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\ &= \rho^3 \sigma^{-3} d^4 \gamma^{-4} |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Combining (6.17) with Theorem 6.8, we finally obtain the following estimate.

THEOREM 6.9. *Suppose that Theorems 5.1 and 6.1 hold. Then the Bramble–Pasciak–Xu preconditioner B defined in (6.15) satisfies*

$$\rho^{-\frac{7}{2}} \sigma^{\frac{7}{2}} d^{-6} \gamma^2 (1-\gamma)(1-\gamma^2) |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim (B^{-1}v, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \rho^3 \sigma^{-3} d^4 \gamma^{-4} |v|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2, \quad v \in V_{h,0}.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\kappa(BA) \lesssim \frac{\rho^{\frac{13}{2}} \sigma^{-\frac{13}{2}} d^{10}}{\gamma^6 (1-\gamma)(1-\gamma^2)},$$

where the operator A was defined in (6.18).

7. Conclusion. In this paper, we have provided a comprehensive analysis of the dimension dependence of BPX preconditioners. We proved that, under a certain geometric assumption, the BPX preconditioner exhibits only polynomial dependence on the spatial dimension. We emphasize that our result has direct and important implications for quantum algorithms, a recently emerging topic in computational mathematics. As discussed in [15, 23], establishing polynomial dimension dependence of BPX preconditioners helps explain the exponential speedup observed in certain quantum algorithms for the numerical solution of PDEs.

We note that one important assumption in this paper is the convexity of the domain, which guarantees the dimension-independent elliptic regularity estimate stated in Theorem 4.2. Such an estimate is not available for nonconvex domains. Since many practical applications involve nonconvex geometries, understanding the behavior of BPX preconditioners for high-dimensional problems without full elliptic regularity remains an important direction for future research.

Acknowledgement. The authors wish to thank Professor Daniel Peterseim for highlighting the importance of BPX preconditioners in the context of quantum computing, which inspired this research, in his talk at the 21st European Finite Element Fair. The authors are also grateful to Professor Shi Jin for his seminar during his visit to KAUST, and for posing the question that motivated this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. AMBAINIS, *Variable time amplitude amplification and quantum algorithms for linear algebra problems*, in 29th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, vol. 14 of LIPIcs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform., Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2012, pp. 636–647.
- [2] M. BEBENDORF, *A note on the Poincaré inequality for convex domains*, Z. Anal. Anwendungen, 22 (2003), pp. 751–756.
- [3] J. BEY, *Simplicial grid refinement: On Freudenthal’s algorithm and the optimal number of congruence classes*, Numer. Math., 85 (2000), pp. 1–29.
- [4] F. BORNEMANN AND H. YSERENTANT, *A basic norm equivalence for the theory of multilevel methods*, Numer. Math., 64 (1993), pp. 455–476.
- [5] J. P. BORTHAGARAY, R. H. NOCHETTO, S. WU, AND J. XU, *Robust BPX preconditioner for fractional Laplacians on bounded Lipschitz domains*, Math. Comp., 92 (2023), pp. 2439–2473.
- [6] J. H. BRAMBLE AND S. R. HILBERT, *Estimation of linear functionals on Sobolev spaces with application to Fourier transforms and spline interpolation*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 7 (1970), pp. 112–124.
- [7] J. H. BRAMBLE, J. E. PASCIAK, AND J. XU, *Parallel multilevel preconditioners*, Math. Comp., 55 (1990), pp. 1–22.
- [8] J. H. BRAMBLE AND J. XU, *Some estimates for a weighted L^2 projection*, Math. Comp., 56 (1991), pp. 463–476.
- [9] S. C. BRENNER AND L. R. SCOTT, *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, Springer, New York, third ed., 2008.
- [10] A. BUFFA, H. HARBRECHT, A. KUNOTH, S. WU, AND G. SANGALLI, *BPX-preconditioning for isogeometric analysis*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg., 265 (2013), pp. 63–70.
- [11] A. M. CHILDS, R. KOTHARI, AND R. D. SOMMA, *Quantum algorithm for systems of linear equations with exponentially improved dependence on precision*, SIAM J. Comput., 46 (2017), pp. 1920–1950.
- [12] P. G. CIARLET, *The Finite Element Method for Elliptic Problems*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2002.
- [13] P. CLÉMENT, *Approximation by finite element functions using local regularization*, Rev. Française Automat. Informat. Recherche Opérationnelle Sér. Rouge Anal. Numér., 9 (1975), pp. 77–84.
- [14] W. DAHMEN AND A. KUNOTH, *Multilevel preconditioning*, Numer. Math., 63 (1992), pp. 315–344.

- [15] M. DEIML AND D. PETERSEIM, *Quantum realization of the finite element method*, Math. Comp., (2025), <https://doi.org/10.1090/mcom/4137>.
- [16] S. DEKEL AND D. LEVIATAN, *The Bramble–Hilbert lemma for convex domains*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 35 (2004), pp. 1203–1212.
- [17] A. ERN AND J.-L. GUERMOND, *Finite element quasi-interpolation and best approximation*, ESAIM Math. Model. Numer., 51 (2017), pp. 1367–1385.
- [18] P. E. FARRELL, L. MITCHELL, AND L. R. SCOTT, *Two conjectures on the Stokes complex in three dimensions on Freudenthal meshes*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 46 (2024), pp. A629–A644.
- [19] M. FAUSTMANN, J. M. MELENK, AND M. PARVIZI, *On the stability of Scott–Zhang type operators and application to multilevel preconditioning in fractional diffusion*, ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal., 55 (2021), pp. 595–625.
- [20] P. GRISVARD, *Elliptic Problems in Nonsmooth Domains*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2011.
- [21] A. W. HARROW, A. HASSIDIM, AND S. LLOYD, *Quantum algorithm for linear systems of equations*, Phys. Rev. Lett., 15(103) (2008), p. Paper No. 150502.
- [22] S. IZUMI, *Sufficiency of simplex inequalities*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 144 (2016), pp. 1299–1307.
- [23] S. JIN, N. LIU, C. MA, AND Y. YU, *Quantum preconditioning method for linear systems problems via Schrödingerization*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.06866, (2025).
- [24] S. JIN, N. LIU, AND Y. YU, *Schrödingerization based quantum algorithms for the fractional Poisson equation*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.01602, (2025).
- [25] S. JIN, N. LIU, AND Y. YU, *Schrödingerization based quantum algorithms for the time-fractional heat equation*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.17713, (2025).
- [26] B. LI AND X. XIE, *BPX preconditioner for nonstandard finite element methods for diffusion problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 54 (2016), pp. 1147–1168.
- [27] A. MAUGERI, D. K. PALAGACHEV, AND L. G. SOFTOVA, *Elliptic and Parabolic Equations with Discontinuous Coefficients*, Wiley-VCH Verlag Berlin GmbH, Berlin, 2000.
- [28] A. MONTANARO AND S. PALLISTER, *Quantum algorithms and the finite element method*, Phys. Rev. A, 93 (2016), p. 032324.
- [29] P. OSWALD, *On function spaces related to finite element approximation theory*, Z. Anal. Anwendungen, 9 (1990), pp. 43–64.
- [30] J. PARK, *Two-level overlapping Schwarz preconditioners with universal coarse spaces for 2mth-order elliptic problems*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 46 (2024), pp. A3681–A3702.
- [31] J. PARK AND J. XU, *Auxiliary space theory for the analysis of iterative methods for semidefinite linear systems*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.07179, (2025).
- [32] L. E. PAYNE AND H. F. WEINBERGER, *An optimal Poincaré inequality for convex domains*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 5 (1960), pp. 286–292.
- [33] L. R. SCOTT AND S. ZHANG, *Finite element interpolation of nonsmooth functions satisfying boundary conditions*, Math. Comp., 54 (1990), pp. 483–493.
- [34] A. VEESER AND R. VERFÜRTH, *Poincaré constants for finite element stars*, IMA J. Numer. Anal., 32 (2012), pp. 30–47.
- [35] J. XU, *Theory of multilevel methods*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1989. Thesis (Ph.D.)–Cornell University.
- [36] J. XU, *Counterexamples concerning a weighted L^2 projection*, Math. Comp., 57 (1991), pp. 563–568.
- [37] J. XU, *Iterative methods by space decomposition and subspace correction*, SIAM Rev., 34 (1992), pp. 581–613.
- [38] J. XU, *The auxiliary space method and optimal multigrid preconditioning techniques for unstructured grids*, Computing, 56 (1996), pp. 215–235.
- [39] J. XU AND L. ZIKATANOV, *The method of alternating projections and the method of subspace corrections in Hilbert space*, J. Amer. Math. Soc., 15 (2002), pp. 573–597.
- [40] S. ZHANG, *Divergence-free finite elements on tetrahedral grids for $k \geq 6$* , Math. Comp., 80 (2011), pp. 669–695.