

On singular Galerkin discretizations for three models in high-frequency scattering

T. Chaumont-Frelet* S. Sauter†

February 4, 2026

Abstract

We consider three common mathematical models for time-harmonic high frequency scattering: the Helmholtz equation in two and three spatial dimensions, a transverse magnetic problem in two-dimensions, and Maxwell's equation in three dimensions with dissipative boundary conditions such that the continuous problem is well posed. In this paper, we construct meshes for popular (low order) Galerkin finite element discretizations such that the discrete system matrix becomes singular and the discrete problem is not well posed. This implies that a condition “the finite element space has to be sufficiently rich” in the form of a *resolution condition* – typically imposed for discrete well-posedness – is not an artifact from the proof by a compact perturbation argument but necessary for discrete stability of the Galerkin discretization.

AMS Subject Classification: 65N12, 65N30, 35J25, 65F99

Key Words: Helmholtz equation; Maxwell equation; high wavenumber; pre-asymptotic stability; hp-finite elements

1 Introduction

The finite element discretization of partial differential equations (PDEs) modeling time-harmonic wave propagation is a challenging problem in numerical analysis. It is especially difficult to develop optimal stability and convergence results because the natural variational formulations of such PDE models are not coercive. In particular, this lack of coercivity leads to linear systems with indefinite matrices, which must be numerically solved. It is well-known that if the discretization space is sufficiently “rich”, the discretized problem has a unique solution if the original PDE model is well-posed. However, what happens for finite element spaces that are not large enough is less clear. In this

*(theophile.chaumont@inria.fr), Inria, Univ. Lille, CNRS, UMR 8524 - Laboratoire Paul Painlevé, 59000 Lille, France

†(stas@math.uzh.ch), Institut für Mathematik, Universität Zürich, Winterthurerstr 190, CH-8057 Zürich, Switzerland

work, we construct meshes such the system matrices resulting from finite element discretizations are singular for certain wavenumbers, even if the original PDE model is well-posed.

Given a polytopic domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d = 2$ or 3) with diameter ℓ , a right-hand side in the dual energy space $f \in \mathcal{H}(\Omega)^*$, and a wavenumber $k > 0$, we consider time-harmonic wave propagation problems of the form: Find $u \in \mathcal{H}(\Omega)$ such that

$$-k^2(u, v)_\Omega - ik(\gamma_{\mathcal{D}}u, \gamma_{\mathcal{D}}v)_{\partial\Omega} + (\mathcal{D}u, \mathcal{D}v)_\Omega = \langle f, v \rangle \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{H}(\Omega). \quad (1)$$

In (1), \mathcal{D} is a differential operator from the de Rham complex (i.e., the gradient, the curl or the divergence), $\gamma_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the naturally associated trace operator, and $\mathcal{H}(\Omega)$ is the corresponding Sobolev space. These notation are rigorously introduced in Section 2 below.

The dissipation introduced on the boundary ensures that (1) is well-posed for all $k > 0$. It is furthermore possible to control the norm of the solution u by the norm of the right-hand side f explicitly in k , see e.g. [11, 16, 18, 23, 32]. We focus on so-called ‘‘Robin’’ boundary conditions for simplicity in this introduction, but the results of this work are valid for generic boundary conditions, including Dirichlet-to-Neumann operators arising from the Sommerfeld radiation condition [8, 30].

We are interested in the conforming finite element method (FEM) applied to (1) based on a finite-dimensional subspace $\mathcal{H}_h \subset \mathcal{H}(\Omega)$. In this setting, the goal is to find a discrete approximation $u_h \in \mathcal{H}_h$ such that

$$-k^2(u_h, v_h)_\Omega - ik(\gamma_{\mathcal{D}}u_h, \gamma_{\mathcal{D}}v_h)_{\partial\Omega} + (\mathcal{D}u_h, \mathcal{D}v_h)_\Omega = \langle f, v_h \rangle \quad \forall v_h \in \mathcal{H}_h. \quad (2)$$

This is a finite-dimensional linear system and, given a basis of \mathcal{H}_h , the left-hand side of (2) can be represented by the system matrix A .

Finite element spaces are based on a simplicial mesh \mathcal{T}_h of Ω and \mathcal{H}_h collects all the elements of $\mathcal{H}(\Omega)$ whose restriction to each simplex belongs to a suitable polynomial subspace \widehat{P} . This is detailed in Section 3. The key parameters controlling the design of the finite element space are the diameter h of the largest simplex in \mathcal{T}_h and the maximal polynomial degree p of the elements of \widehat{P} . The quantity kh/p is then inversely proportional to the number of degrees of freedom per wavelength.

Following [2, 9, 10, 15, 21, 23, 26, 22, 29], there exist constants $\beta, c > 0$ independent of h and k such that if

$$\frac{kh}{p} \leq c(k\ell)^\beta \quad (3)$$

then the matrix A is known to be regular, and the approximation u_h to u is uniformly accurate for all k . The particular value of β depends on p and the geometry of Ω , as we recap in Section 3. As a general rule of thumb, the values of β decreases with p , which makes high-order methods more suitable. It is numerically observed that the resolution condition in (3) is necessary to obtain

accurate approximations. In fact, under appropriate assumptions, the optimal value of β is $1/(2p)$.

In this work, we are interested in the properties of the matrix A when no resolution conditions as in (3) are imposed. Although such discretization does not lead to accurate approximations, it is still of interest in the context of preconditioning [1] and adaptivity [5]. Indeed, high accuracy is not expected for the coarsest level of a multigrid solver nor for the initial mesh of an adaptive algorithm performing iterative refinements. Rather, one desires that the matrix A possesses basic algebraic and analytical properties and, in particular, that it is non-singular.

In [4, Theorem 3.1] a positive result in one space dimension has been proved: Any hp finite element Galerkin discretization of the one-dimensional Helmholtz equation with Robin boundary condition has a unique solution for all wavenumbers $k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and all one-dimensional meshes.

In this paper we investigate the well-posedness of the Galerkin discretization for time-harmonic high-frequency scattering problems in two and three dimensions. The results we provide are of a negative nature. Specifically, we construct a mesh $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ for which the system matrix A is singular for particular values of k . Our work is inspired by [4] where one mesh was presented such that the lowest-order Lagrange finite element in two space dimensions becomes singular. Here, we expand on [4] and construct further meshes such that the Galerkin discretization becomes singular, more precisely we show that for the Galerkin method on these meshes for (a) two- and three-dimensional settings, (b) Lagrange, Raviart–Thomas and Nédélec finite elements, and (c) larger polynomial degrees the arising linear system can become singular.

Our examples do not only concern the particular mesh $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$, but in fact, any mesh \mathcal{T}_h containing (a possibly scaled version of) $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ as a submesh is affected. To be more specific, we in fact construct finite element functions $u_h \in \mathcal{H}_h \setminus \{0\}$ with local support such that $(\mathcal{D}u_h, \mathcal{D}v_h)_\Omega = k^2(u_h, v_h)_\Omega$ for all $v_h \in \mathcal{H}_h$. This is a manifestation of the fact that the so-called “unique continuation principle” does not hold at the discrete level [14]. This is in contrast to the continuous level, where such a principle is in fact used to establish the well-posedness of (1), see e.g. [7, 33].

The numerical discretization of unique continuation problems is also of independent interest (see e.g. [6]), and we expect that the present results might be of interest in this context.

The remainder of this work is organized as follows. In Section 2, three model problems for high-frequency scattering are introduced on the continuous level and well-posedness results from the literature are recalled. The Galerkin discretizations for these models by popular finite element spaces are presented in Section 3 and their well-posedness is formulated provided the finite element space satisfies a resolution condition which is stated in an explicit way.

In Section 4 we introduce the two basic meshes, one for two and one for three dimensions, which are used to construct the singular discretizations. They are inspired by the work [4] and we denote them by *Bernkopf meshes*. We assemble

the system matrices by an implementation¹ of our finite element methods in the symbolic mathematics software MATHEMATICA™ (see [34]). The matrix entries then are quadratic functions of the wavenumber k . To analyze the critical wavenumbers leading to a singular system matrix we have computed its determinant (a polynomial in k) and analyzed its roots. Here, we present the results by explicitly characterizing all the critical frequencies k for these meshes and different examples.

In the concluding Section 5 we summarize our findings and also explain that general meshes which contain a (scaled and dilated) Bernkopf mesh as a submesh lead to singular system matrices for scaled versions of the critical wavenumbers k in the basic Bernkopf meshes.

For the Maxwell equation, discretized by Nédélec elements, the analysis of the determinant of the system matrix involves a discussion of a cubic polynomial with parameter-dependent coefficients. We have shifted this tedious analysis to Appendix A.

2 Setting

In this section we introduce our model scattering problems and their discretization. The physical domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \{2, 3\}$ is assumed to be bounded and Lipschitz. Its boundary is denoted by $\Gamma := \partial\Omega$. and the outer normal vector field by \mathbf{n} .

Let $L^p(\Omega)$, $p \in [1, \infty]$, and $H^1(\Omega)$ be the standard Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces on Ω and we denote by $\mathbf{L}^p(\Omega) := (L^p(\Omega))^d$, $\mathbf{H}^1(\Omega) := (H^1(\Omega))^d$ their vector valued analogues. We will also need the spaces

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega) &:= \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega) \mid \text{div } \mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega)\}, \\ \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; \Omega) &:= \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega) \mid \text{curl } \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)\}\end{aligned}$$

and the space of tangential fields in $\mathbf{L}^2(\Gamma)$:

$$\mathbf{L}_T^2(\Gamma) := \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\Gamma) \mid \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma\}.$$

For the spaces $H^1(\Omega)$, $\mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega)$, $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; \Omega)$ we introduce norms where the L^2 term is weighted by the wavenumber $k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\|_{\nabla, k} &:= \left(\|\nabla u\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + k^2 \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right)^{1/2} && \text{for } H^1(\Omega), \\ \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\text{div}, k} &:= \left(\|\text{div } \mathbf{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + k^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right)^{1/2} && \text{for } \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega), \\ \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\text{curl}, k} &:= \left(\|\text{curl } \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 + k^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)}^2 \right)^{1/2} && \text{for } \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; \Omega).\end{aligned}$$

¹The source code of the MATHEMATICA notebook and data files are online available, Link: <https://drive.math.uzh.ch/index.php/s/daFi9g27CZ3eXmC>

Problem 1 (Helmholtz problem) *The weak formulation of the Helmholtz problem with Robin boundary condition is given by*

$$\text{find } u \in H^1(\Omega) \text{ s.t. } a_k^H(u, v) = F(v) \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega), \quad (4)$$

for some given continuous anti-linear form $F \in (H^1(\Omega))'$ and sesquilinear form $a_k^H : H^1(\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$a_k^H(u, v) := (\nabla u, \nabla v)_{L^2(\Omega)} - k^2(u, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} - i k(u, v)_{L^2(\Gamma)}.$$

Next, we consider the transverse magnetic problem in 2D with impedance boundary condition. The *energy space* for this problem is chosen to be

$$\mathbf{V}_{\text{imp}} := \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega) \mid \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} \in L^2(\Gamma)\} \quad (5)$$

and furnished with the norm

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\text{div}, k, +} := \left(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\text{div}, k}^2 + |k| \|\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Problem 2 (Transverse magnetic problem in 2D) *The weak form of the transverse magnetic problem in two dimensions is given by*

$$\text{find } \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{V}_{\text{imp}} \text{ s.t. } a_k^{\text{M2D}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = F(\mathbf{v}) \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}_{\text{imp}}, \quad (6)$$

for some given continuous anti-linear form $F \in \mathbf{V}'_{\text{imp}}$ and sesquilinear form $a_k^{\text{M2D}} : \mathbf{V}_{\text{imp}} \times \mathbf{V}_{\text{imp}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ given by

$$a_k^{\text{M2D}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) := (\text{div } \mathbf{u}, \text{div } \mathbf{v})_{L^2(\Omega)} - k^2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_{L^2(\Omega)} - i k(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n})_{L^2(\Gamma)}.$$

Finally, we consider the three-dimensional Maxwell equations with impedance boundary condition. The energy space is chosen to be

$$\mathbf{X}_{\text{imp}} := \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; \Omega) \mid \mathbf{u}_T \in \mathbf{L}_T^2(\Gamma)\}, \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{u}_T := \mathbf{n} \times (\mathbf{u}|_{\Gamma} \times \mathbf{n})$; its norm is given by

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\text{curl}, k, +} := \left(\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\text{curl}, k}^2 + |k| \|\mathbf{u}_T\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Problem 3 (Maxwell's equation in 3D) *For some given continuous anti-linear form $F \in \mathbf{X}'_{\text{imp}}$, the weak form of the Maxwell equation in 3D with impedance boundary condition is given by*

$$\text{find } \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{X}_{\text{imp}} \text{ s.t. } a_k^{\text{M3D}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = F(\mathbf{v}) \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{X}_{\text{imp}} \quad (8)$$

with sesquilinear form $a_k^{\text{M3D}} : \mathbf{X}_{\text{imp}} \times \mathbf{X}_{\text{imp}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$a_k^{\text{M3D}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = (\text{curl } \mathbf{u}, \text{curl } \mathbf{v})_{L^2(\Omega)} - k^2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_{L^2(\Omega)} - i k(\mathbf{u}_T, \mathbf{v}_T)_{L^2(\Gamma)}.$$

These problems have in common that they are well posed for all wavenumbers $k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and we cite here the relevant theorems.

Remark 4 *For the well-posedness of the Galerkin discretization of these problems an approximation property (see (14), (15), (16)) will be key which involves the continuous solution operator applied to functions in a space which is compactly embedded in the dual energy space. This is why we define in the following the solution operator for these subspaces.*

Proposition 5 ([23, Prop. 8.1.3]) *Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain. Then, (4) is uniquely solvable for all $F \in (H^1(\Omega))'$ and the solution depends continuously on the data.*

Proposition 5 implies that the solution operator $T_k^H : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega)$ is well defined for $f \in L^2$ by

$$a_k^H(T_k^H f, v) = (f, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega). \quad (9)$$

Proposition 6 ([9, Thm. 3.1]) *Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain. Then, (6) is uniquely solvable for all $F \in \mathbf{V}'_{\text{imp}}$ and the solution depends continuously on the data².*

If the assumptions in Proposition 6 are satisfied, the solution operator $T_k^{\text{M2D}} : \mathbf{L}^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega)$ is well defined by

$$a_k^{\text{M2D}}(T_k^{\text{M2D}} \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v})_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^1(\text{div}; \Omega)$$

for all $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{L}^2$.

Well-posedness of the Maxwell problem with impedance condition is proved in [27, Thm. 4.17].

Proposition 7 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain with simply connected and sufficiently smooth boundary. Then, (8) is uniquely solvable for all $F \in \mathbf{X}'_{\text{imp}}$ and the solution depends continuously on the data.*

We introduce the space

$$\mathbf{V}_{k,0} := \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{X}_{\text{imp}} \mid k^2 (\mathbf{v}, \nabla \varphi)_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} + i k (\mathbf{v}_T, (\nabla \varphi)_T)_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Gamma)} = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \in H_{\text{imp}}^1(\Omega) \right\},$$

where

$$H_{\text{imp}}^1(\Omega) := \left\{ \varphi \in H^1(\Omega) \mid \varphi|_{\Gamma} \in H^1(\Gamma) \right\}.$$

The assumptions of Proposition 7 imply that the solution operator $T_k^{\text{M3D}} : \mathbf{V}_{k,0} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}_{\text{imp}}$ is well defined by

$$a_k^{\text{M3D}}(T_k^{\text{M3D}} \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v}) = (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{v})_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{X}_{\text{imp}}$$

for all $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{V}_{k,0}$.

²Note that the general assumption that Ω is a convex polygonal domain in [9] is not needed in the proof of Theorem 3.1 therein.

3 The finite element spaces

A Galerkin method is employed to discretize these equations which will be based on common finite element spaces on conforming (no hanging nodes) simplicial meshes \mathcal{T} for Ω that satisfy

1. The (closed) elements $K \in \mathcal{T}$ cover Ω , i.e., $\overline{\Omega} = \cup_{K \in \mathcal{T}} K$.
2. Associated with each element K is the *element map*, a C^1 -diffeomorphism $\phi_K : \hat{K} \rightarrow K$. The set \hat{K} is the *reference simplex*

$$\hat{K} := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d \mid \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \leq 1 \right\}.$$

3. Denoting $h_K = \text{diam } K$, there holds, with some *shape-regularity constant* $\gamma_{\mathcal{T}}$,

$$h_K^{-1} \|\phi'_K\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty(\hat{K})} + h_K \|(\phi'_K)^{-1}\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty(\hat{K})} \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{T}}. \quad (10)$$

4. The intersection of two elements is either empty, a vertex, an edge, a face (for $d = 3$), or they coincide (here, vertices, edges, and faces are the images of the corresponding entities on the reference tetrahedron \hat{K}).
5. The parametrization of common inner edges (2D) and faces (3D) is compatible: their pullbacks by ϕ_K^{-1} and $\phi_{K'}^{-1}$ for two adjacent elements K, K' are affine equivalent.

Remark 8 *The construction of simplicial finite element meshes that satisfy the above assumption can be based on patchwise structured meshes as described, for example, in [25, Ex. 5.1] or [24, Sec. 3.3.2].*

Next, we recall the definition of conforming finite element spaces for the discretization of Problems 1 - 3. For a simplex $K \in \mathcal{T}$, let $\mathbb{P}_p(K)$ denote the space of d -variate polynomials of total degree $\leq p$.

Definition 9 (Conforming hp finite element space) *Let \mathcal{T} be a conforming finite element mesh for the domain Ω . Then the conforming hp finite element space $S_p(\mathcal{T}) \subset H^1(\Omega)$ is given by*

$$S_p(\mathcal{T}) := \{u \in H^1(\Omega) \mid \forall K \in \mathcal{T} \quad u|_K \circ \phi_K \in \mathbb{P}_p(K)\}.$$

We employ this space for the discretization of Problem 1:

$$\text{find } u_S \in S_p(\mathcal{T}) \text{ s.t. } a_k^H(u_S, v) = F(v) \quad \forall v \in S_p(\mathcal{T}). \quad (11)$$

Definition 10 (Raviart-Thomas elements) *On the reference element the Raviart-Thomas element of order p is given by*

$$\mathbf{RT}_p(\hat{K}) := \left\{ \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{x}q(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{p} \in \left(\mathbb{P}_p(\hat{K})\right)^3, q \in \mathbb{P}_p(\hat{K}) \right\}.$$

For a conforming simplicial finite element mesh \mathcal{T} of Ω , the Raviart-Thomas finite element of order p is the space:

$$\mathbf{RT}_p(\mathcal{T}) := \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{div}; \Omega) \mid (\det \phi'_K) (\phi'_K)^{-1} \mathbf{u}|_K \circ \phi_K \in \mathbf{RT}_p(\hat{K}) \right\}.$$

The Raviart-Thomas finite element is employed for the discretization of Problem 2:

$$\text{find } \mathbf{u}_{\text{RT}} \in \mathbf{RT}_p(\mathcal{T}) \text{ s.t. } a_k^{\text{M2D}}(\mathbf{u}_{\text{RT}}, \mathbf{v}) = F(\mathbf{v}) \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{RT}_p(\mathcal{T}). \quad (12)$$

Definition 11 (Nédélec elements) On the reference element \hat{K} the Nédélec (type I) element of order p is given by

$$\mathbf{N}_p^{\text{I}}(\hat{K}) := \left\{ \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}) + s\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \left(\mathbb{P}_p(\hat{K})\right)^3 \right\}.$$

For a conforming simplicial finite element mesh \mathcal{T} of Ω , the Nédélec (type I) finite element of order p is the space:

$$\mathbf{N}_p^{\text{I}}(\mathcal{T}) := \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{H}(\text{curl}; \Omega) \mid (\phi'_K)^T \mathbf{u}|_K \circ \phi_K \in \mathbf{N}_p^{\text{I}}(\hat{K}) \right\}.$$

We consider discretizations of Problem 3 by a Galerkin method based on the Nédélec space $\mathbf{N}_p^{\text{I}}(\mathcal{T})$:

$$\text{find } \mathbf{u}_N \in \mathbf{N}_p^{\text{I}}(\mathcal{T}) \text{ s.t. } a_k^{\text{M3D}}(\mathbf{u}_N, \mathbf{v}) = F(\mathbf{v}) \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{N}_p^{\text{I}}(\mathcal{T}). \quad (13)$$

Since the original variational problems (Prob. 1 – 3) are not coercive the well-posedness of the Galerkin discretization is not simply inherited. The common theory of well-posedness for the discretizations is based on a compact perturbation argument which is known as the “Schatz argument” (see [29]); for Maxwell’s equation the argument is more subtle since $\mathbf{H}(\text{curl}, \Omega)$ is not compactly embedded in $\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)$. In any case the well-posedness theorem for conforming Galerkin discretizations of the original variational problem is typically of the form: if the finite element space is “rich enough”, then the discrete equations are well-posed. We cite here the relevant theorems but first introduce some notation.

Proposition 12 ([26, Thm. 3.2]) Let the simplicial finite element mesh \mathcal{T} and the polynomial degree be chosen such that the adjoint approximation property (cf. (9))

$$\eta(S_p(\mathcal{T})) := \sup_{f \in L^2(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \inf_{v \in S_p(\mathcal{T})} \frac{\|T_{-k}^H f - v\|_{\mathcal{H}}}{\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}} \quad (14)$$

satisfies

$$C_c \eta(S_p(\mathcal{T})) < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Then the Galerkin discretization (11) of Problem 1 is well-posed.

For the transverse magnetic problem in 2D with impedance boundary condition we quote a result in [9, Thm. 4.1] for lowest order Raviart-Thomas elements which also shows for this equation that if the maximal mesh width h of the shape regular triangulation \mathcal{T} for $\mathbf{RT}_1(\mathcal{T})$ is small enough, the Galerkin discretization is well posed.

Proposition 13 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a convex bounded polygonal domain. If*

$$k^2 h \text{ is sufficiently small} \quad (15)$$

then the Galerkin discretization (12) of Problem 2 is well posed.

For the Maxwell problem the well-posedness for the Galerkin discretization by Nédélec elements (13) is investigated in [22, §9]. Here, we formulate that result in a slightly different way. We introduce the adjoint approximation property $\delta_k : \mathbf{X}_{\text{imp}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\delta_k(\mathbf{0}) := 0$ and for $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{X}_{\text{imp}} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ by

$$\delta_k(\mathbf{w}) := 2 \sup_{\mathbf{v}_N \in \mathbf{N}_p^1(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{\left| k^2 (\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_N)_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)} + i k (\mathbf{w}_T, (\mathbf{v}_N)_T)_{\mathbf{L}^2(\Gamma)} \right|}{\|\mathbf{w}\|_{\text{curl},k,+} \|\mathbf{v}_N\|_{\text{curl},k,+}}. \quad (16)$$

Proposition 14 *Let the assumptions in Prop. 7 be satisfied and let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{X}_{\text{imp}}$ be the exact solution. Assume that for any given $\alpha \in]0, 1[$, the conforming simplicial finite element mesh \mathcal{T} and the polynomial degree p is chosen such that for any function $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{X}_{\text{imp}}$ with*

$$a_k^{\text{M3D}}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) = 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{N}_p^1(\mathcal{T})$$

it holds $\delta_k(\mathbf{w}) \leq \alpha$. Then, the discrete problem (13) has a unique solution $\mathbf{u}_N \in \mathbf{N}_p^1(\mathcal{T})$ which satisfies the quasi-optimal error estimate

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_N\|_{\text{curl},k,+} \leq \frac{1 + \delta_k(\mathbf{e}_N)}{1 - \delta_k(\mathbf{e}_N)} \inf_{\mathbf{v}_N \in \mathbf{N}_p^1(\mathcal{T})} \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}_N\|_{\text{curl},k,+} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{e}_N := \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_N.$$

The proof is a simple reformulation of [22, Thm. 9.7, Prop. 9.1] which is based on [20].

Remark 15 *In [22, Lem. 9.6] it is explained how the polynomial degree p and the mesh have to be chosen such that $\delta_k(\mathbf{w}) \leq \alpha$ holds. An essential ingredient of this theory is to prove that the adjoint approximation property*

$$\eta(\mathbf{N}_p^1(\mathcal{T})) := \sup_{\mathbf{v}_0 \in \mathbf{V}_{-k,0} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \inf_{\mathbf{w}_N \in \mathbf{N}_p^1(\mathcal{T})} \frac{\|T_{-k}^{\text{M3D}} \mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{w}_N\|_{\text{curl},k,+}}{\|\mathbf{v}_0\|_{\text{curl},k,+}}$$

can be made small for sufficiently fine meshes \mathcal{T} and polynomial degree p depending logarithmically on k . In this way, the notion “ $\mathbf{N}_p^1(\mathcal{T})$ is sufficiently rich” becomes a qualitative condition.

In summary, we have illustrated that for some high frequency scattering problems which are well-posed on the continuous level, the conforming Galerkin discretization is well-posed if the finite element space is “rich enough” such that an adjoint approximation property is sufficiently small.

Hence, it is a natural question whether the conforming Galerkin discretization can be singular if the resolution condition is not satisfied or whether this is an artefact of the theory based on the Schatz perturbation argument. Interestingly, for the Helmholtz equation with Robin boundary condition on a one-dimensional interval $\Omega = (a, b)$ it has been proven in [4] that the conforming Galerkin discretization always admits a unique solution without any restriction to the mesh and/or the polynomial degree.

The resolution condition is sufficient for discrete well-posedness but leaves the question open whether there exist meshes such that the Galerkin discretization becomes singular. This is a motivation for the development of various modifications of the conforming Galerkin discretization which are always well-posed; among them is the first order system least squares (FOSLS) finite element method (see [13], [19], [3]), stabilized methods [17], [35], [12], and Discontinuous Petrov Galerkin methods [28]. These methods have in common that the resulting discretization always have a unique solution. However, the number of degrees of freedom can be substantially larger than for the conforming Galerkin FEM and their implementation is more subtle. This was one motivation to investigate the question:

Can the conforming Galerkin FEM lead to singular system matrices for problems (11), (12), (13)?

4 Bernkopf-type meshes

In [4] an example (Bernkopf mesh) is presented for the Helmholtz problem 1 in 2D for lowest order elements such that the conforming Galerkin discretization has a non-trivial homogeneous solution. In this section, we investigate whether also for higher polynomial degrees, 3D problems, and Maxwell’s equation such examples exist.

Remark 16 *We have realized the computations for all examples in the symbolic mathematics program MATHEMATICA™ (cf. [34]) and hence no rounding errors occur in our computation.*

First, we introduce the domain and the meshes and start with the two-dimensional Bernkopf mesh.

Definition 17 (2D Bernkopf mesh) (see [4, §3.2]) *Let $\Omega = (-1, 1)^2$. The vertices in the triangulation are $\mathbf{P}_1^\Gamma = (-1, -1)^T$, $\mathbf{P}_2^\Gamma = (1, -1)^T$, $\mathbf{P}_3^\Gamma = (1, 1)^T$, $\mathbf{P}_4^\Gamma = (-1, 1)^T$, $\mathbf{P}_1^\Omega = (-\alpha, 0)^T$, $\mathbf{P}_2^\Omega = (0, -\alpha)^T$, $\mathbf{P}_3^\Omega = (\alpha, 0)^T$, $\mathbf{P}_4^\Omega = (0, \alpha)^T$, $\mathbf{P}_5^\Omega = (0, 0)^T$ for a parameter $\alpha \in]0, 1[$. The triangulation \mathcal{T}_2 consists of 12 triangles T_j , $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 12\}$ as depicted in Figure 1.*




Figure 1: Bernkopf mesh in 2D for $\alpha = 1/2$.

Definition 18 (3D Bernkopf mesh) Let $\mathbf{V}_i^\Gamma = (\mathbf{P}_i^\Gamma, 0)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Set $\mathbf{V}_5^\Gamma := (0, 0, 1)^T$, and $\mathbf{V}_6^\Gamma := (0, 0, -1)^T$. The domain Ω is the convex hull of \mathbf{V}_i^Γ , $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 6\}$ and the inner vertices are given by $\mathbf{V}_i^\Omega = (\mathbf{P}_i^\Omega, 0)^T$, $i \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$. The mesh \mathcal{T}_3 (see 2) consists of 24 tetrahedra of the form $K_j = \text{conv}(T_j, \mathbf{V}_5^\Gamma)$, $1 \leq j \leq 12$ and $K_{12+j} = \text{conv}(T_j, \mathbf{V}_6^\Gamma)$, $1 \leq j \leq 12$.

4.1 Helmholtz Problem 1, $d = 2$, $p = 1, 2$

We explain our conceptual approach for finding critical wavenumbers $k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that the system matrix for the Helmholtz problem is singular, while the procedure for Problems 2 and 3 is completely analogue. The system matrix is singular iff there is a non-trivial $u \in S \setminus \{0\}$ to the equation

$$a^H(u, v) = 0 \quad \forall v \in S. \quad (17)$$

By choosing $v = u$ and considering the imaginary part of the sesquilinear form for $k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ leads to $\|u\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} = 0$ and, in turn to $u|_\Gamma = 0$. For such a function u the boundary part of the sesquilinear form is zero and we have

$$a^H(u, v) = (\nabla u, \nabla v)_{L^2(\Omega)} - k^2 (u, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Let $(b_y)_{y \in \Sigma}$ denote the standard local nodal basis for the space S with the set Σ of degrees of freedom. The degrees of freedom for the inner nodes define the subset $\overset{\circ}{\Sigma}$. We compute the matrix

$$A_\alpha(k) = (a_{y,z}(k))_{\substack{y \in \Sigma \\ z \in \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}}} \quad \text{with} \quad a_{y,z} := (\nabla b_y, \nabla b_z)_{L^2(\Omega)} - k^2 (b_y, b_z)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad (18)$$




Figure 2: Bernkopf mesh in 3D for the choice $\alpha = 1/2$.

which is a rectangular matrix with more rows than columns. From basic linear algebra we know that problem (17) has a non-trivial solution $u \in S \setminus \{0\}$ iff $\ker A_\alpha(k)$ is non-trivial. This is equivalent to

$$\det B_\alpha(k) = 0 \quad \text{for } B_\alpha(k) := (A_\alpha(k))^T A_\alpha(k).$$

From the definition in (18) it is clear that $\det B_\alpha(k)$ is a polynomial in $\kappa = k^2$ so that $Q_\alpha(\kappa) := \det B_\alpha(\sqrt{\kappa})$ is a polynomial in κ . To find critical frequencies $k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, we are interested in positive roots of $Q_\alpha(\kappa)$. Our MATHEMATICA implementation computes first the system matrix $A_\alpha(k)$, then the matrix $B_\alpha(k)$, and finally its determinant $\det B_\alpha(k)$ as well as the polynomial Q_α . We discuss Q_α and finally compute positive roots which are the (squares of the) critical wave numbers k . Since Q_α is a polynomial the number of roots is always finite. We derive by symbolic calculus that, for any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$, there exists at least one positive root κ of Q_α and hence, at least two spurious frequencies. Since the α -dependent coefficients in Q_α are rather complicated we do not attempt to determine *all* roots of Q_α but some of them.

For any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ and $p = 1$ our MATHEMATICA implementation shows that $Q_\alpha(\kappa)$ can be factorized into three polynomials $\eta_1 \in \mathbb{P}_1$, $\eta_2 \in \mathbb{P}_2$, $\eta_3 \in \mathbb{P}_4$: $Q_\alpha(\kappa) = \frac{\eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 \eta_3}{f_\alpha}$, where f_α is a positive polynomial for $\alpha \in]0, 1[$. The root of η_1 is given by $\frac{6(2-\alpha)}{\alpha(1-\alpha)}$ (positive for $\alpha \in]0, 1[$) while the two roots of η_2 have non-zero imaginary part and hence are not relevant for critical wavenumbers $k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. We do not analyze the polynomial η_3 furthermore but simply conclude from the analysis of η_1 that for any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ two critical wavenumbers exist³

$$k(\alpha)^2 = \frac{6(2-\alpha)}{\alpha(1-\alpha)}$$

and the conforming Galerkin discretization with finite element space $S_1(\mathcal{T}_2)$, has a *spurious mode*, i.e., there exists an element $u_p \in S_p(\mathcal{T}_2) \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$a_{k(\alpha)}^H(u_p, v) = 0 \quad \forall v \in S_p(\mathcal{T}_2).$$

For any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ and $p = 2$, the MATHEMATICA implementation shows that $Q_\alpha(\kappa)$ can be factorized into five polynomials $\eta_1 \in \mathbb{P}_1$, $\eta_2 \in \mathbb{P}_4$, $\eta_3 \in \mathbb{P}_6$, $\eta_4, \eta_5 \in \mathbb{P}_{10}$: $Q_\alpha(\kappa) = f_\alpha \eta_1^2 \eta_2 \eta_3 \eta_4 \eta_5^2$, where f_α is a positive, rational function for $\alpha \in]0, 1[$. The root of η_1 is given by

$$k(\alpha)^2 = \frac{15(\alpha^2 + (2-\alpha)^2)}{\alpha(1-\alpha)(2-\alpha)}$$

(positive for $\alpha \in]0, 1[$) while the roots of the other polynomials are not discussed here. In this way, we have shown that for any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ two critical wavenumbers exist. The spurious modes for $p = 1, 2$ are depicted in Figure 3.

³Note that this example for $p = 1$ is the one treated in [4, Lem. 3.2] and an elementary proof is given without symbolic computation.




Figure 3: Spurious solutions for the \mathbb{P}_1 and \mathbb{P}_2 Galerkin discretization of the two-dimensional Helmholtz equation for $\alpha = 1/2$. Left: $p = 1$ and $k(\alpha) = \pm 6$, right: $p = 2$ and $k(\alpha) = \pm 10$.

4.2 Helmholtz Problem 1, $d = 3$

For any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ and $p = 1$, symbolic manipulation by the MATHEMATICA implementation shows that $Q_\alpha(\kappa)$ can be factorized into three polynomials $\eta_1 \in \mathbb{P}_1$, $\eta_2 \in \mathbb{P}_2$, $\eta_3 \in \mathbb{P}_4$: $Q_\alpha(\kappa) = \frac{\eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 \eta_3}{f_\alpha}$ with a positive polynomial f_α for all $\alpha \in]0, 1[$. The root of η_1 is given by $\kappa = \frac{20}{\alpha(1-\alpha)}$ (positive for $\alpha \in]0, 1[$) while the roots of the other polynomials are not discussed here. In this way, we have shown that for any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ two critical wavenumbers exist

$$k(\alpha)^2 = \frac{20}{\alpha(1-\alpha)}.$$

For any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ and $p = 2$ symbolic manipulation shows that $Q_\alpha(\kappa)$ can be factorized into eight polynomials $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathbb{P}_1$, $\eta_3 \in \mathbb{P}_2$, $\eta_4, \eta_5 \in \mathbb{P}_4$, $\eta_6 \in \mathbb{P}_8$, $\eta_7 \in \mathbb{P}_{12}$, $\eta_8 = \mathbb{P}_{14}$: $Q_\alpha(\kappa) = f_\alpha \eta_1^2 \eta_2^2 \eta_3^2 \eta_4 \eta_5 \eta_6 \eta_7^2 \eta_8$ with a positive rational function f_α for all $\alpha \in]0, 1[$. The root of η_1 is given by $\kappa = \frac{42}{\alpha(1-\alpha)}$ (positive for $\alpha \in]0, 1[$), the root of η_2 by $\frac{21(\alpha+1)\alpha^2+2(2-\alpha)}{(2-\alpha)(1-\alpha)\alpha}$ (positive for $\alpha \in]0, 1[$), the roots of η_3 have non-zero imaginary part for any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ and not relevant for critical frequencies $k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. The functions η_4, \dots, η_8 are not discussed. In this way, we have shown that for any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ four critical wavenumbers exist

$$k(\alpha)^2 \in \left\{ \frac{42}{\alpha(1-\alpha)}, \frac{21(\alpha+1)\alpha^2+2(2-\alpha)}{(2-\alpha)(1-\alpha)\alpha} \right\}.$$

The spurious solution for $p = 1$ is shown in Figure 4 while each of the two cases for $p = 2$ are depicted in Figure 5.




Figure 4: Spurious solution for the \mathbb{P}_1 Galerkin discretization of the 3D Helmholtz problem for the Bernkopf mesh with $\alpha = 1/2$ and critical wavenumber $k_1(1/2) = \pm\sqrt{80}$.




Figure 5: Spurious solutions for the \mathbb{P}_2 Galerkin discretization for the Helmholtz problem in 3D for $\alpha = 1/2$. Left: $k_2(1/2)^2 = 168$, right: $k_2(1/2)^2 = 189$.

4.3 Maxwell 2D, RT1:

For any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ and $p = 1$, symbolic manipulation by the MATHEMATICA implementation shows that $Q_\alpha(\kappa)$ for this problem can be factorized into five polynomials $\eta_1(\kappa) = \kappa^{10}$, $\eta_2, \eta_3 \in \mathbb{P}_2$, $\eta_4 \in \mathbb{P}_4$, $\eta_5 \in \mathbb{P}_6 : Q_\alpha(\kappa) = f_\alpha \eta_1 \eta_2^2 \eta_3 \eta_4 \eta_5^2$ with a positive rational function f_α for all $\alpha \in]0, 1[$. Clearly, the only root of η_1 is $\kappa = 0$ which is not relevant for critical wavenumbers $k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$; η_2 has two positive roots⁴

$$\kappa_\pm(\alpha) = \frac{12}{\alpha^2} \frac{2 + 7\alpha + 3\alpha^2 - 3\alpha^3 \pm \sqrt{3\alpha^6 + 3(5 - 4\alpha)\alpha^4 + (37 - 30\alpha)\alpha^2 + 28\alpha + 4}}{2 + 6\alpha - \alpha^2 - \alpha^3},$$

while the imaginary parts of the roots of η_3 are always non-zero for $\alpha \in]0, 1[$. We do not investigate the roots of η_4 and η_5 . It follows that the conforming Galerkin discretization of the transverse magnetic problem in 2D by Raviart-Thomas finite elements $\mathbf{RT}_1(\mathcal{T}_2)$ has a *spurious mode* for any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ and $k^2 = \kappa_\pm(\alpha)$.

4.4 Maxwell 3D, \mathbf{N}_p^I for $p=1$:

For any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ and $p = 1$ symbolic manipulation by the MATHEMATICA implementation shows that $Q_\alpha(\kappa)$ for this problem can be factorized into nine polynomials $\eta_1(\kappa) = \kappa^{10}$, $\eta_2 \in \mathbb{P}_1$, $\eta_3, \eta_4 \in \mathbb{P}_2$, $\eta_5 \in \mathbb{P}_3$, $\eta_6, \eta_7, \eta_8 \in \mathbb{P}_4$, $\eta_9 \in \mathbb{P}_8 : Q_\alpha(\kappa) = \frac{\eta_1 \eta_2^2 \eta_3 \eta_4^2 \eta_5^2 \eta_6 \eta_7 \eta_8 \eta_9^2}{f_\alpha}$ with a positive polynomial f_α for all $\alpha \in]0, 1[$. Clearly, the only root of η_1 is $\kappa = 0$ which is not relevant for critical wavenumbers $k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$; η_2 has a positive root

$$\kappa(\alpha) = 20 \frac{2 - \alpha}{1 + \alpha(1 - \alpha)},$$

while the imaginary parts of the roots of η_3, η_4 are always non-zero for $\alpha \in]0, 1[$. We do not investigate the roots of η_6, \dots, η_9 .

The polynomial η_5 requires a more subtle analysis. Define coefficients

$$c_0(\alpha) := 1024000 (2\alpha^2 + \alpha + 2), \quad (19)$$

$$c_1(\alpha) := -1600 (\alpha^3 (60 - 19\alpha) + 47\alpha^2 + 136\alpha + 36),$$

$$c_2(\alpha) := 20 (\alpha^3 (222 - 35\alpha^3) + (16 - 15\alpha^5) + 12\alpha^4 + 188\alpha^2 + 112\alpha)$$

$$c_3(\alpha) := -(\alpha^4 (26 - 21\alpha) + \alpha^2 (41 - 31\alpha) + 52\alpha + 8) \alpha^2 \quad (20)$$

and the polynomial

$$p_\alpha(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^3 c_\ell(\alpha) x^\ell. \quad (21)$$

⁴It is easy to see that, by expanding the fraction for the case $((\cdot) - \sqrt{\cdot})$ by $((\cdot) + \sqrt{\cdot})$, the numerator becomes $6\alpha^2 (4 + \alpha (10 - 8\alpha - \alpha^2 + \alpha^3))$, i.e., positive for any $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ while the positivity of the denominator is obvious. For the case $((\cdot) + \sqrt{\cdot})$ the positivity is obvious.




Figure 6: Discriminant Δ of the cubic polynomial η_5 as a function of $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

All three roots of the polynomial p_α are real, positive, and distinct. Since the proof is somehow tedious but elementary we have postponed it to Appendix A. Here we depict the graph of the discriminant:

$$\Delta := -18c_0c_1c_2c_3 + 4c_2^3c_0 - c_1^2c_2^2 + 4c_3c_1^3 + 27c_3^2c_0^2$$

motivated by the following reasoning: It holds (see, e.g., [31, Chap. IX, p.122])

$$\Delta(\alpha) < 0 \iff \text{all three roots of } p_\alpha \text{ are distinct and real.}$$

Note that the coefficients $c_\ell(\alpha)$ in $p_\alpha(x)$ satisfy sign properties which directly follow from their representations (19)-(20): for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ it holds:

$$c_0(\alpha) > 0, \quad c_1(\alpha) < 0, \quad c_2(\alpha) > 0, \quad c_3(\alpha) < 0$$

and $p_\alpha(x) > 0$ for all $x \leq 0$ follows. Consequently: if $\Delta < 0$ in $]0, 1[$ then all three roots of p_α are distinct, real, and positive. The graph of Δ is shown in Figure 6.

In summary, the conforming Galerkin discretization by the Nédélec space $\mathbf{N}_1^I(\mathcal{T}_3)$ has eight spurious wavenumbers

$$k(\alpha) \in \left\{ \pm \sqrt{20 \frac{2-\alpha}{1+\alpha(1-\alpha)}}, \pm \sqrt{x_1(\alpha)}, \pm \sqrt{x_2(\alpha)}, \pm \sqrt{x_3(\alpha)} \right\},$$

where $x_m(\alpha)$, $1 \leq m \leq 3$, are the three distinct and positive roots of the equation

$$p_\alpha(x) = 0. \tag{22}$$

5 Conclusion

In this paper we considered three common models in two and three spatial dimensions for high-frequency scattering problems, all of which are well posed

on the continuous level. We constructed simplicial meshes for popular, low-order, conforming Galerkin finite element discretizations for these variational problems such that the discrete system is singular for certain discrete values of k . These meshes are highly symmetric and for all constructed examples, the number of degrees of freedom is relatively low on the domain boundary.

Even for these specially constructed meshes the system matrix is singular only for finitely many spurious frequencies $k > 0$ indicating that these cases are very rare events.

Next, we comment on the resolution condition applied to periodic copies of the Bernkopf meshes. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h = 1/(N+1)$. Let \mathcal{T}_3^+ denote some conforming tetrahedral mesh of $(-1, 1)^3$ which a) contains \mathcal{T}_3 as a submesh and b) the four congruent triangles, which arise by inserting the two diagonals into each facet of the cube $(-1, 1)^3$, are facets of some tetrahedra in \mathcal{T}_3^+ . For a uniform notation we set $\mathcal{T}_2^+ := \mathcal{T}_2$.

A scaling of the mesh \mathcal{T}_d^+ , $d = 2, 3$, by a factor $h/2$ leads to a mesh $\mathcal{T}_{d,h}^+$ of $\Omega_h := (-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2})^d$ which contains the scaled version $\mathcal{T}_{d,h}$ of \mathcal{T}_d as a submesh. The translation $\Phi_{\mu} : \Omega_h \rightarrow \Omega_h(\mu)$ is given for

$$\mu \in \mathcal{J}_N := \left\{ \nu = (\nu_j)_{j=1}^d \in \mathbb{N}_0^d \mid \|\mu\|_{\max} \leq N \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{1} = (1)_{i=1}^d$$

by

$$\Phi_{\mu}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} + h \left(\mu + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1} \right).$$

The simplices in $\Omega_h(\mu)$, $\mu \in \mathcal{J}_N$, define a conforming simplicial mesh for $(0, 1)^d$ where each cell $\Omega_h(\mu)$ contains a copy of the scaled structured mesh $\mathcal{T}_{d,h}$. By a scaling argument (which is detailed in [4, Lem. 3.3]) one obtains that there are non-trivial homogeneous solutions of the discrete problem which are localized in one of the cells if

$$kh = k(\alpha)$$

for the spurious wavenumbers $k(\alpha)$ defined for the Galerkin discretization of our model problems on the constructed meshes. On the other hand, this observation can also be formulated in a reversed way: since $k(\alpha)$ is independent of h a condition

$$kh < k(\alpha)$$

ensures that no non-trivial discrete homogenous solutions exist which are localizing in one cell. Such a condition is substantially weaker than a typical condition “for some fixed $\nu > 1$, the product $k^{\nu}h$ must be sufficiently small” as it appears, e.g., with $\nu = 2$ in (15).

A Analysis of the roots of p_{α} in (21)

In this appendix we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 19 *The cubic polynomial p_α in (21) has three distinct positive roots for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.*

Proof. The coefficients $c_m(\alpha)$ in $p_\alpha(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^3 c_\ell(\alpha) x^\alpha$ satisfy the following sign properties which directly follow from their representations (19)-(20): for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ it holds:

$$c_0(\alpha) > 0, \quad c_1(\alpha) < 0, \quad c_2(\alpha) > 0, \quad c_3(\alpha) < 0.$$

This implies

$$\text{sign } p_\alpha(0) = \text{sign } c_0(\alpha) = 1, \quad (23)$$

$$\text{sign } p_\alpha(+\infty) = \text{sign } c_3(\alpha) = -1. \quad (24)$$

Next we prove that

$$\text{sign } p_\alpha(50) = -1. \quad (25)$$

Case 1. $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ and we set $b = 1 - \alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. For $x = 50$ it holds $p_\alpha(50) = -\frac{1000}{\alpha^7}w(b)$ for

$$w(b) = 13375b^5(1-b) + 2625b^7 + b^2\tilde{w}_3(b) + 500b + 55 \quad (26)$$

with

$$\tilde{w}_3(b) := 14875b^3 - 29495b^2 + 10905b + 567.$$

Next we show $\tilde{w}_3(b) \geq 0$ in the range $b \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, i.e., $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. A straightforward discussion of \tilde{w}_3 shows that it has a local minimum at $\frac{347}{525} + \frac{2}{8925}\sqrt{3833194} > 1$, i.e., outside the interval $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Hence, \tilde{w}_3 has no local minimum in this interval and

$$\min_{0 \leq b \leq \frac{1}{2}} \tilde{w}_3(b) = \min \left\{ \tilde{w}_3(0), \tilde{w}_3\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \right\} = \frac{4041}{8} > 0.$$

This directly implies $w(b) \geq 55$ and, in turn, $p_\alpha(50) < 0$ for $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$.

Case 2. $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. We write $p_\alpha(50) = -\frac{1000}{\alpha^7}v(\alpha)$ for

$$v(\alpha) := 2625\alpha^6(1-\alpha) + \alpha^4v_2(\alpha) + \alpha v_3(\alpha) + 32 \quad (27)$$

with

$$v_2(\alpha) := 2375\alpha^2 - 3125\alpha + 3005 \quad \text{and} \quad v_3(\alpha) := 200\alpha^2 - 6688\alpha + 4256.$$

Again, a straightforward discussion yields, that v_2 has a local minimum at $\frac{25}{38}$ with value $\frac{150255}{76} > 0$ and hence is positive for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. The function v_3 has a local minimum at $\frac{418}{25} > 1$. Hence there is no local minimum in $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and

$$\min_{\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]} v_3(\alpha) = \min \left\{ v_3(0), v_3\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \right\} = 962.$$

We use these positivity estimates in (27) to get

$$\min_{\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]} v(\alpha) \geq 32.$$

In turn we have proved that

$$\forall \alpha \in [0, 1] \quad p_\alpha(50) < 0.$$

Finally we prove

$$\forall \alpha \in [0, 1] \quad \exists y_\alpha > 50 \quad \text{sign } p_\alpha(y_\alpha) = 1 \quad (28)$$

and distinguish between two cases:

Case 1. For $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ we prove that $p_\alpha(150) > 0$. It holds $p_\alpha(150) = \frac{1000}{\alpha^7} z(\alpha)$ with

$$z(\alpha) := \alpha^5 z_2(\alpha) + \alpha z_3(\alpha) + 608 \quad (29)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} z_2(\alpha) &:= 70875\alpha^2 - 103500\alpha + 97875, \\ z_3(\alpha) &:= -128415\alpha^3 - 90000\alpha^2 + 48368\alpha + 18784. \end{aligned}$$

A straightforward analysis yields that z_2 has a local minimum at $\alpha = \frac{46}{63}$ with positive value $\frac{420625}{7}$ and hence $z_2(\alpha) > 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. A straightforward discussion of the function z_3 shows that it has a local minimum at $\alpha = -\frac{2000}{8561} - \frac{4}{128415}\sqrt{185649515} < 0$. Consequently if has no local minimum in $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and

$$\min_{\alpha \in [0, 1/2]} z_3(\alpha) = \min \left\{ z_3(0), z_3\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \right\} = \frac{35329}{8} > 0.$$

From (29) it follows $z(\alpha) \geq 608$ for all $\alpha \in [0, 1/2]$ and in turn $p_\alpha(150) > 0$ in this range.

Case 2. For $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ we prove that $p_\alpha(y_\alpha) > 0$ for $y_\alpha = 105 - 50\alpha$. Note that $y_\alpha > 50$ in this range. We obtain $p_\alpha(105 - 50\alpha) = \frac{125}{\alpha^7} \zeta(b)$ for $b = 1 - \alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and

$$\zeta(b) = 100b^9 \zeta_1(b) + b^5 \zeta_3(b) + b \xi_3(b) + 95 \quad (30)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_1(b) &:= 517 - 210b, \\ \zeta_3(b) &:= 12494 + 165531b - 113321b^2 - 6930b^3, \\ \xi_3(b) &:= 4588 + 42097b + 14067b^2 - 153097b^3. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, the first factor ζ_1 is positive for $b \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. The function $\zeta_3(b)$ has a local minimum at $\alpha = -\frac{1}{20790}\sqrt{16283038531} - \frac{113321}{20790} < 0$. Hence, there is no local minimum in $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and

$$\min_{b \in [0, 1/2]} \zeta_3(b) = \min \left\{ \zeta_3(0), \zeta_3\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \right\} = 12494.$$

The function ξ_3 has a local minimum at $\frac{4689}{153097} - \frac{2}{459291}\sqrt{4883\,163\,429} < 0$. Again there is no local minimum in $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and

$$\min_{b \in [0, 1/2]} \xi_3(b) = \min \left\{ \xi_3(0), \xi_3\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \right\} = 4588.$$

From (30) it follows that $\min_{0 \leq b \leq 1/2} \zeta(b) \geq 95$ and in turn $p_\alpha(105 - 50\alpha) > 0$ for any $\alpha \in [0, 1/2]$.

By using the meanvalue theorem the sign properties (23), (24), (25), (28) of p_α imply that all three roots of p_α are real, positive and distinct. ■

References

- [1] Y. E. A, C. Oosterlee, and C. Vuik. A novel multigrid based preconditioner for heterogeneous Helmholtz problems. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 27(4):1471–1492, 2006.
- [2] M. Bernkopf, T. Chaumont-Frelet, and J. Melenk. Wavenumber-explicit stability and convergence analysis of hp -finite element discretizations of Helmholtz problems in piecewise smooth media. *Math. Comp.*, 94(351):73–122, 2025.
- [3] M. Bernkopf and J. M. Melenk. Analysis of the hp -version of a first order system least squares method for the Helmholtz equation. In *Advanced finite element methods with applications*, volume 128 of *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng.*, pages 57–84. Springer, Cham, 2019.
- [4] M. Bernkopf, S. Sauter, C. Torres, and A. Veit. Solvability of discrete Helmholtz equations. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 43(3):1802–1830, 2023.
- [5] A. Bespalov, A. Haberl, and D. Praetorius. Adaptive FEM with coarse initial mesh guarantees optimal convergence rates for compactly perturbed elliptic problems. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 317:318–340, 2017.
- [6] E. Burman, G. Delay, and A. Ern. A hybridized high-order method for unique continuation subject to the Helmholtz equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 59(5):2368–2392, 2021.
- [7] N. Burq. Décroissance de l'énergie locale de l'équation des ondes pour le problème extérieur et absence de résonance au voisinage du réel. *Acta Math.*, 180:1–29, 1998.
- [8] S. Chandler-Wilde and P. Monk. Wave-number-explicit bounds in time-harmonic scattering. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 39(5):1428–1455, 2008.
- [9] T. Chaumont-Frelet. Mixed finite element discretizations of acoustic Helmholtz problems with high wavenumbers. *Calcolo*, 56:49, 2019.

- [10] T. Chaumont-Frelet, J. Galkowski, and E. Spence. Sharp error bounds for edge-element discretisations of the high-frequency Maxwell equations. arXiv:2408.04507, accepted in *Math. Comp.*, 2024.
- [11] T. Chaumont-Frelet, A. Moiola, and E. Spence. Explicit bounds for the high-frequency time-harmonic Maxwell equations in heterogeneous media. *J. Math. Pures et Appl.*, 179:183–218, 2023.
- [12] H. Chen, P. Lu, and X. Xu. A hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin method for the Helmholtz equation with high wave number. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 51(4):2166–2188, 2013.
- [13] H. Chen and W. Qiu. A first order system least squares method for the Helmholtz equation. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 309:145–162, 2017.
- [14] G. Cox, S. MacLachlan, and L. Steeves. Unique continuation principles for finite-element discretizations of the Laplacian. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 2025.
- [15] Y. Du and H. Wu. Preasymptotic error analysis of higher order FEM and CIP-FEM for Helmholtz equation with high wave number. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 53(2):782–804, 2015.
- [16] S. Esterhazy and J. Melenk. On stability of discretizations of the Helmholtz equation. In *Numerical analysis of multiscale problems*, pages 285–324. Springer, 2011.
- [17] X. Feng and H. Wu. Discontinuous Galerkin methods for the Helmholtz equation with large wave number. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 47(4):2872–2896, 2009.
- [18] R. Hiptmair, A. Moiola, and I. Perugia. Stability results for the time-harmonic Maxwell equations with impedance boundary conditions. *Math. Meth. Appl. Sci.*, 21(11):2263–2287, 2010.
- [19] B. Lee, T. A. Manteuffel, S. F. McCormick, and J. Ruge. First-order system least-squares for the Helmholtz equation. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 21(5):1927–1949, 2000.
- [20] M. Löhndorf and J. M. Melenk. Wavenumber-explicit hp -BEM for high frequency scattering. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 49(6):2340–2363, 2011.
- [21] S. Lu and H. Wu. Preasymptotic error estimates of higher-order EEM for the time-harmonic Maxwell equations with large wave number. arXiv:2504.19481, 2025.
- [22] J. Melenk and S. Sauter. Wavenumber-explicit hp -FEM analysis for Maxwell's equations with impedance boundary conditions. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 24(6):1871–1939, 2024.

- [23] J. M. Melenk. *On Generalized Finite Element Methods*. PhD thesis, University of Maryland at College Park, 1995.
- [24] J. M. Melenk. *hp-Finite Element Methods for Singular Perturbations*. Springer, Berlin, 2002.
- [25] J. M. Melenk and S. A. Sauter. Convergence Analysis for Finite Element Discretizations of the Helmholtz equation with Dirichlet-to-Neumann boundary condition. *Math. Comp.*, 79:1871–1914, 2010.
- [26] J. M. Melenk and S. A. Sauter. Wave-Number Explicit Convergence Analysis for Galerkin Discretizations of the Helmholtz Equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 49(3):1210–1243, 2011.
- [27] P. Monk. *Finite element methods for Maxwell's equations*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2003.
- [28] S. Petrides and L. F. Demkowicz. An adaptive DPG method for high frequency time-harmonic wave propagation problems. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 74(8):1999–2017, 2017.
- [29] A. Schatz. An obeservation concerning Ritz-Galerkin methods with indefinite bilinear forms. *Math. Comp.*, 28:959–962, 1974.
- [30] E. Spence. Wavenumber-explicit bounds in time-harmonic acoustic scattering. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 46(4):2987–3024, 2014.
- [31] H. W. Turnbull. *Theory of Equations*. Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh, 1939.
- [32] B. Verfürth. Heterogeneous multiscale method for the Maxwell equations with high contrast. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 53:35–61, 2019.
- [33] T. Wolff. A property of measures in \mathbb{R}^n and an application to unique continuation. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 2(2):225–284, 1992.
- [34] Wolfram Research, Inc. Mathematica, Version 14.3. Champaign, IL, 2025.
- [35] L. Zhu and H. Wu. Preasymptotic error analysis of CIP-FEM and FEM for Helmholtz equation with high wave number. Part II: *hp* version. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 51(3):1828–1852, 2013.