

ASC Report No. 30/2013

**Quasi-optimal convergence rates for adaptive
boundary element methods with data
approximation,
Part II: Hyper-singular integral equation**

M. Feischl, T. Führer, M. Karkulik, J.M. Melenk, and
D. Praetorius

Most recent ASC Reports

- 29/2013 *W. Auzinger, A.S. Bagherzadeh, O. Koch*
Error estimation based on locally weighted defect for boundary value problems in second order ordinary differential equations
- 28/2013 *I.G. Graham, M. Löhndorf, J.M. Melenk, E.A. Spence*
When is the error in the h -BEM for solving the Helmholtz equation bounded independently of k ?
- 27/2013 *R. Hammer, W. Pötz, and A. Arnold*
Single-cone real-space finite difference scheme for the time-dependent Dirac equation
- 26/2013 *M. Aurada, M. Ebner, M. Feischl, S. Ferraz-Leite, T. Führer, P. Goldenits, M. Karkulik, M. Mayr, and D. Praetorius*
Hilbert (Release 3): A MATLAB implementation of adaptive BEM
- 25/2013 *M. Feischl, T. Führer, M. Karkulik, D. Praetorius, and E.P. Stephan*
Efficient additive Schwarz preconditioning for hypersingular integral equations on locally refined triangulations
- 24/2013 *M. Feischl, T. Führer, M. Karkulik, J.M. Melenk, and D. Praetorius*
Quasi-optimal convergence rates for adaptive boundary element methods with data approximation,
Part I: Weakly-singular integral equation
- 23/2013 *W. Auzinger, W. Herfort*
Local error structures and order conditions in terms of Lie elements for exponential splitting schemes
- 22/2013 *Markus Aurada, Michael Feischl, Thomas Führer, Michael Karkulik, and Dirk Praetorius*
Energy norm based error estimators for adaptive BEM for hypersingular integral equations
- 21/2013 *Michael Karkulik, Carl-Martin Pfeiler, and Dirk Praetorius*
 L^2 -orthogonal projections onto lowest-order finite elements in \mathbb{R}^d are H^1 -stable
- 20/2013 *Markus Faustmann, Jens Markus Melenk, Dirk Praetorius*
 \mathcal{H} -matrix approximability of the inverses of FEM matrices

Institute for Analysis and Scientific Computing
Vienna University of Technology
Wiedner Hauptstraße 8–10
1040 Wien, Austria

E-Mail: admin@asc.tuwien.ac.at

WWW: <http://www.asc.tuwien.ac.at>

FAX: +43-1-58801-10196

ISBN 978-3-902627-05-6

© Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Nachdruck nur mit Genehmigung des Autors.



QUASI-OPTIMAL CONVERGENCE RATES FOR ADAPTIVE BOUNDARY ELEMENT METHODS WITH DATA APPROXIMATION. PART II: HYPER-SINGULAR INTEGRAL EQUATION

M. FEISCHL, T. FÜHRER, M. KARKULIK, J. M. MELENK, AND D. PRAETORIUS

ABSTRACT. We analyze an adaptive boundary element method with fixed-order piecewise polynomials for the hyper-singular integral equation of the Laplace-Neumann problem in 2D and 3D which incorporates the approximation of the given Neumann data into the overall adaptive scheme. The adaptivity is driven by some residual-error estimator plus data oscillation terms. We prove convergence even with quasi-optimal rates. Numerical experiments underline the theoretical results.

1. INTRODUCTION & OUTLINE

Data approximation is an important subject in numerical algorithms, and reliable numerical schemes have to properly account for it. The present work proves quasi-optimal convergence rates for an adaptive boundary element method (ABEM) that includes data errors. While an earlier work [FFK⁺13] was concerned with weakly-singular integral equations, the present work considers the hyper-singular integral equation

$$Wg = (1/2 - K')\phi \quad \text{on } \Gamma := \partial\Omega \quad (1)$$

for given boundary data ϕ and a bounded Lipschitz domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 2, 3$, with polygonal resp. polyhedral boundary $\partial\Omega$ (see Section 2 for the precise statement of the integral operators W and K' involved). In the spirit of, e.g., [Ste07, CKNS08], we prove convergence and quasi-optimality of some standard adaptive algorithm of the type

$$\boxed{\text{solve}} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \boxed{\text{estimate}} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \boxed{\text{mark}} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \boxed{\text{refine}} \quad (2)$$

which is steered by the weighted residual estimator from [CMPS04] plus data oscillation terms. The proposed algorithm employs the L^2 -orthogonal projection to replace the given data ϕ in the Galerkin scheme by some discrete data $\Pi_\ell\phi$. The benefit of such an approach is that the implementation of (2) has to deal with discrete integral operators only. Since reliable quadrature for these (with polynomial ansatz and test functions) is well-understood, see e.g. [SS11], such an approach is superior to the data dependent integration of $K'\phi$, where possible singularities of ϕ as well as the singular kernel of the boundary integral operator K' have to be treated simultaneously.

First convergence and quasi-optimality results for *lowest-order ABEM* have independently been achieved by [FKMP13, Gan13]. While [FKMP13] is concerned with the weakly-singular integral equation for the Laplacian on polygonal / polyhedral boundaries, the work [Gan13] treats general weakly-singular and hyper-singular integral equations on smooth boundaries. In either work, the heart of the matter are novel inverse estimates for the integral operators involved. These have recently been generalized to arbitrary polynomials on polygonal / polyhedral boundaries in [AFF⁺12]. Besides this,

Date: October 2, 2013.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 65N30, 65N15, 65N38.

Key words and phrases. boundary element method, hyper-singular integral equation, a posteriori error estimate, adaptive algorithm, convergence, optimality.

certain properties of the error estimator are required which have to be analyzed beyond the particular lowest-order case. For the weakly-singular integral equation, this has been done in [FFK⁺13], while the analysis for the hyper-singular integral equation is the topic of the present work.

The contribution of this work may thus be summarized as follows: Unlike [Gan13], we address the important question of data approximation in the adaptive algorithm considered and prove convergence and quasi-optimality in this case. Owing to the method of proof, the analysis of the error estimator in [Gan13] is restricted to lowest-order ABEM, i.e., globally continuous and piecewise affine ansatz and test functions. Instead, the analysis given here covers continuous piecewise polynomials of arbitrary, but fixed order. Finally, the overall presentation aims to give a deeper insight into which *basic properties* of the error estimator are really mandatory to prove optimal convergence for ABEM. A further qualitative improvement over, e.g., [Ste07, CKNS08, FKMP13, Gan13] is that our analysis avoids the use of a lower bound (so-called efficiency) and hence relaxes the dependencies of optimal marking parameters.

Outline. The work and its main results are organized as follows: Section 2 fixes the functional analytic framework of the (stabilized) hyper-singular integral equation (1) and its Galerkin discretization by piecewise polynomials. In Section 3 we introduce and analyze the weighted residual error estimator. Moreover, we analyze the overall a posteriori error control in case of data approximation of ϕ by discontinuous piecewise polynomials in terms of data oscillation terms (Theorem 7). Section 4 gives a precise statement of the adaptive loop (2) and proves linear convergence of the overall error estimator with respect to the iteration step ℓ (Corollary 10). In Section 5, we prove that the adaptive algorithm leads asymptotically to optimal convergence rates (Theorem 11). Conclusions are drawn in Section 6, and possible extensions of the analysis to indirect integral formulations and screen problems are discussed. Numerical experiments in 2D and 3D conclude the work in Section 7.

Throughout the work, the symbol \lesssim abbreviates \leq up to a multiplicative constant, and \simeq means that both estimates \lesssim and \gtrsim hold.

2. PRELIMINARIES

This section gives a brief overview of the functional analytic setting of the hyper-singular integral equation. For more details, we refer to the monographs [HW08, McL00]; a comprehensive discussion of the boundary element spaces employed in the present work can be found in the monograph [SS11].

Throughout, we assume that Ω is a bounded Lipschitz domain in \mathbb{R}^d , $d = 2, 3$, with connected and polygonal / polyhedral boundary $\Gamma = \partial\Omega$. With the fundamental solution of the Laplacian

$$G(x, y) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \log|x - y| \text{ for } d = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad G(x, y) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{1}{|x - y|} \text{ for } d = 3, \quad (3)$$

the hypersingular integral equation (1) involves the hyper-singular integral operator W as well as the adjoint of the double-layer integral operator K . These operators are formally defined by

$$W\phi(x) := -\partial_{n_y} \int_{\Gamma} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \phi(y) d\Gamma(y), \quad (4)$$

$$K\phi(x) := \int_{\Gamma} \partial_{n_y} G(x, y) \phi(y) d\Gamma(y), \quad (5)$$

where n_z denote the outer unit normal vector at $z \in \Gamma$ and ∂_{n_z} is the normal derivative.

2.1. Sobolev spaces. Let $L^2(\Gamma)$ and $H^1(\Gamma)$ denote the usual Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces on $\Gamma = \partial\Omega$. The norm on $H^1(\Gamma)$ reads

$$\|u\|_{H^1(\Gamma)}^2 = \|u\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2, \quad (6)$$

where $\nabla(\cdot)$ denotes the arclength derivative or the surface gradient for $d = 2, 3$. Sobolev spaces of fractional-order $0 < s < 1$ are defined by interpolation

$$H^s(\Gamma) = [L^2(\Gamma); H^1(\Gamma)]_s, \quad (7)$$

where $[\cdot; \cdot]_s$ denotes interpolation by the K -method. To abbreviate notation, let $H^0(\Gamma) := L^2(\Gamma)$. The Sobolev spaces $H^{-s}(\Gamma)$ for $0 < s \leq 1$ are defined by duality

$$H^{-s}(\Gamma) = H^s(\Gamma)^*, \quad (8)$$

where duality is understood with respect to the extended $L^2(\Gamma)$ -scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. We note that $H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ is equivalently characterized as the trace space of $H^1(\Omega)$.

2.2. Hyper-singular integral operator. The hyper-singular integral operator W from (4) is a well-defined linear and continuous operator

$$W : H^s(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\Gamma) \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq s \leq 1. \quad (9)$$

Moreover, W is symmetric and positive semi-definite on $H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$, i.e.,

$$\langle Wv, w \rangle = \langle Ww, v \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle Wv, v \rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } v, w \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma). \quad (10)$$

Since Γ is connected, the kernel of W is one-dimensional and spanned by the constant functions. The bilinear form

$$\langle\langle v, w \rangle\rangle_W := \langle Wv, w \rangle \quad (11)$$

is a scalar product on $H_\star^{1/2}(\Gamma) := \{v \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma) : \langle 1, v \rangle = 0\}$. Therefore,

$$\langle\langle v, w \rangle\rangle_{W+S} := \langle Wv, w \rangle + \langle 1, v \rangle \langle 1, w \rangle \quad \text{for } v, w \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma) \quad (12)$$

defines a scalar product on $H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$. According to the Rellich compactness theorem, the induced norm $\|v\|_{W+S}^2 = \langle\langle v, v \rangle\rangle_{W+S}$ is an equivalent norm on $H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$.

2.3. Neumann problem. The double-layer integral operator K from (5) is a well-defined linear and continuous operator

$$K : H^s(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^s(\Gamma) \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq s \leq 1. \quad (13)$$

Moreover, its adjoint is a well-defined linear and continuous operator

$$K' : H^{-s}(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{-s}(\Gamma) \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq s \leq 1. \quad (14)$$

For the particular right-hand side $f = (1/2 - K')\phi$ in (1), the hyper-singular integral equation is an equivalent formulation of the Neumann problem

$$-\Delta P = 0 \text{ in } \Omega \quad \text{with Neumann boundary conditions } \partial_n P = \phi \text{ on } \Gamma \quad (15)$$

in the following sense: The hyper-singular integral equation (1) admits a unique solution $u \in H_\star^{1/2}(\Gamma)$. If uniqueness of the potential P from (15) is enforced by $\int_\Gamma P \, d\Gamma = 0$, then $u = P|_\Gamma$, i.e., u is the trace of P on Γ .

We note that existence and uniqueness of the solution $u \in H_\star^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ of (1) follow from the Lax-Milgram lemma: As $\langle Wv, 1 \rangle = 0$ and $\langle (1/2 - K')\psi, 1 \rangle = 0$ for all $v \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$

and $\psi \in H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$, the hyper-singular integral equation is equivalently recast in the variational formulation

$$\langle\langle u, v \rangle\rangle_{W+S} = \langle(1/2 - K')\phi, v\rangle \quad \text{for all } v \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma). \quad (16)$$

According to the Lax-Milgram lemma, the latter equation admits a unique solution, and $|\Gamma| \langle u, 1 \rangle = \langle\langle Wu, 1 \rangle\rangle_{W+S} = \langle(1/2 - K')\phi, 1\rangle = 0$ proves $u \in H_\star^{1/2}(\Gamma)$.

2.4. Admissible triangulations. For $d = 2$, we suppose that \mathcal{T}_\star is a partition of Γ into finitely many compact affine line segments. For $d = 3$, we suppose that \mathcal{T}_\star is a triangulation of Γ into finitely many compact and flat surface triangles which is regular in the sense of Ciarlet, i.e., the intersection of two elements $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_\star$ with $T \neq T'$ is either empty, or a common node, or a common edge. In these cases, we say that \mathcal{T}_\star is an *admissible triangulation* of Γ . Throughout, we assume that all triangulations are admissible.

Let $|\cdot|$ denote the surface measure, i.e., $|T| = \text{diam}(T)$ for an affine line segment and $d = 2$. With an admissible triangulation \mathcal{T}_\star , we associate its local mesh-width

$$h_\star \in L^\infty(\Gamma), \quad h_\star|_T := h_\star(T) := |T|^{1/(d-1)} \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_\star. \quad (17)$$

Throughout, quantities associated with a given triangulation \mathcal{T}_\star have the same index, e.g., h_\star for the associated mesh-width function or G_\star for the corresponding Galerkin solution (see below).

For $d = 2$, we say that \mathcal{T}_\star is γ -shape regular if

$$\frac{\text{diam}(T)}{\text{diam}(T')} \leq \gamma \quad \text{for all neighboring elements } T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_\star. \quad (18a)$$

For $d = 3$, \mathcal{T}_\star is called γ -shape regular if

$$\frac{\text{diam}(T)}{|T|^{1/2}} \leq \gamma \quad \text{for all elements } T \in \mathcal{T}_\star. \quad (18b)$$

2.5. Discrete spaces. Let $T_{\text{ref}} = [0, 1]$ for $d = 2$ and $T_{\text{ref}} = \text{conv}\{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ for $d = 3$ denote the reference simplices in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} . By assumption, each element $T \in \mathcal{T}_\star$ is the image of T_{ref} under an affine bijection $\gamma_T : T_{\text{ref}} \rightarrow T$. Let $\mathcal{P}^p(T_{\text{ref}})$ denote the space of all polynomials of degree $\leq p$ on the reference element. We then define spaces of \mathcal{T}_\star -piecewise polynomials by

$$\mathcal{P}^p(\mathcal{T}_\star) := \left\{ V_\star : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_\star \quad V_\star \circ \gamma_T \in \mathcal{P}^p(T_{\text{ref}}) \right\} \quad (19)$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star) := \mathcal{P}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star) \cap C(\Gamma). \quad (20)$$

We note that $\mathcal{P}^p(\mathcal{T}_\star) \subset L^2(\Gamma) \subset H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star) \subset H^1(\Gamma) \subset H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

3. A POSTERIORI ERROR ESTIMATION

In this section, we recall the weighted residual error estimator from [CMPS04]. We give a new proof for its reliability and derive the properties needed for the later convergence and quasi-optimality analysis. Unlike [Gan13], where similar results have been derived for the first time, our analysis covers arbitrary polynomials of fixed degree $p \geq 0$ and is essentially independent of the mesh-refinement strategy used. In addition, we incorporate the approximation of the given right-hand side data by piecewise polynomials into the overall a posteriori error estimation. The benefit is that the later implementation has to

deal with discrete integral operators only so that the question of *reliable quadrature* is much simplified.

3.1. Mesh-refinement. For admissible triangulations $\mathcal{T}_\ell, \mathcal{T}_\star$ of Γ , we write $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \text{refine}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$ and say that \mathcal{T}_\star is an arbitrary refinement of \mathcal{T}_ℓ , if

$$T = \bigcup \{T' \in \mathcal{T}_\star : T' \subseteq T\} \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_\ell \quad (21a)$$

and

$$|T'| \leq |T|/2 \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star \quad \text{and } T' \in \mathcal{T}_\star \text{ with } T' \subseteq T, \quad (21b)$$

i.e., each element $T \in \mathcal{T}_\ell$ is the union of its successors, and refinement ensures that the surface area is at least halved. Note that $\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star$ denotes the set of refined elements, while $\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell$ then consists of their successors. The assumptions posed imply that $\bigcup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star) = \bigcup(\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell)$ with the pointwise estimates $h_\star \leq 2^{-1/(d-1)} h_\ell$ on $\bigcup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)$ and $h_\star = h_\ell$ on $\bigcup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \cap \mathcal{T}_\star)$.

3.2. Auxiliary results. This subsection recalls and states some facts which are used for the a posteriori error analysis. First, we shall need certain inverse estimates.

Lemma 1. *Let \mathcal{T}_\star be an admissible triangulation of Γ . For all $\psi \in L^2(\Gamma)$ and $v \in H^1(\Gamma)$, it holds*

$$C_{\text{inv}}^{-1} \|h_\star^{1/2} (1/2 - K') \psi\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \leq \|\psi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} + \|h_\star^{1/2} \psi\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \quad (22)$$

as well as

$$C_{\text{inv}}^{-1} \|h_\star^{1/2} Wv\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \leq \|v\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} + \|h_\star^{1/2} \nabla v\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}. \quad (23)$$

In particular, for all $\Psi_\star \in \mathcal{P}^p(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ and $V_\star \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$, it holds that

$$\|h_\star^{1/2} \Psi_\star\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \|h_\star^{1/2} (1/2 - K') \Psi_\star\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \leq C_{\text{inv}} \|\Psi_\star\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \quad (24)$$

as well as

$$\|h_\star^{1/2} \nabla V_\star\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \|h_\star^{1/2} WV_\star\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \leq C_{\text{inv}} \|V_\star\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}. \quad (25)$$

The constant $C_{\text{inv}} > 0$ depends only on γ -shape regularity of \mathcal{T}_\star , the boundary Γ , and the polynomial degree $p \geq 0$.

Proof. The estimates (22)–(23) are proven in [AFF⁺12, Theorem 1]. The estimates (24)–(25) follow directly by employing the inverse estimates from [GHS05, Theorem 3.6] for $\|\cdot\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \gtrsim \|h_\star^{1/2}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}$ and for $\|\cdot\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \gtrsim \|h_\star^{1/2} \nabla(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}$ from [CP07, Corollary 3.2] for $d = 2$ and from [AFF⁺13b, Proposition 5] for $d = 3$. \square

Second, we shall rely on the Scott-Zhang projection [SZ90] for quasi-interpolation in $H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$. While the original work from [SZ90] is concerned with the integer-order Sobolev space $H^1(\Omega)$ on Lipschitz domains, the approach is generalized to fractional-order Sobolev spaces $H^s(\Gamma)$ and $\widetilde{H}^s(\Gamma)$ for $0 \leq s \leq 1$ on boundaries in [AFF⁺13b]. Since the precise construction will matter below, we briefly sketch it: Fix a set \mathcal{N}_\star of Lagrange nodes for the space $\mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$. For each $z \in \mathcal{N}_\star$, choose an *arbitrary* element $T_z \in \mathcal{T}_\star$ with $z \in T_z$. Let $\phi_z \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ denote the Lagrange basis function associated with z and $\phi_z^\star \in \mathcal{P}^{p+1}(T_z)$ be the L^2 -dual basis function, i.e., $\int_{T_z} \phi_z^\star \phi_{z'} dx = \delta_{zz'}$ for all $z' \in \mathcal{N}_\star$ with Kronecker's delta $\delta_{zz'}$. Then, the Scott-Zhang projection J_\star defined by

$$J_\star v := \sum_{z \in \mathcal{N}_\star} \left(\int_{T_z} \phi_z^\star v dx \right) \phi_z \quad (26)$$

has the following properties.

Lemma 2. $J_\star : L^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ is a well-defined linear projection, i.e., it holds

$$J_\star V_\star = V_\star \quad \text{for all } V_\star \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star). \quad (27)$$

In particular, it even holds

$$(J_\star v)(z) = v(z) \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathcal{N}_\star \text{ and } v \in L^2(\Gamma) \text{ with } v|_{T_z} \in \mathcal{P}^{p+1}(T_z), \quad (28)$$

where T_z is the element chosen for z in (26). Moreover, J_\star is stable in $H^s(\Gamma)$ for all $0 \leq s \leq 1$, i.e.,

$$\|J_\star v\|_{H^s(\Gamma)} \leq C_{sz} \|v\|_{H^s(\Gamma)} \quad \text{for all } v \in H^s(\Gamma) \quad (29)$$

and has a local first-order approximation property

$$\|h_\star^{-s}(1 - J_\star)v\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \leq C_{sz} \|v\|_{H^s(\Gamma)} \quad \text{for all } v \in H^s(\Gamma). \quad (30)$$

The constant $C_{sz} > 0$ depends only on Γ , $0 \leq s \leq 1$, the polynomial degree $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and γ -shape regularity of \mathcal{T}_\star .

Proof. Well-posedness and projection property (27)–(28) as well as L^2 -stability (i.e. (29) for $s = 0$) follow by construction, see also [AFF⁺13b, Lemma 3]. For $T \in \mathcal{T}_\star$, let

$$\omega_\star(T) := \bigcup \{T' \in \mathcal{T}_\star : T \cap T' \neq \emptyset\}$$

denote the patch of T . Following the original arguments from [SZ90], it is noted in [AFF⁺13b] that

$$\text{diam}(T)^{-1} \|(1 - J_\star)v\|_{L^2(T)} + \|\nabla J_\star v\|_{L^2(T)} \lesssim \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\omega_\star(T))} \quad \text{for all } v \in H^1(\Gamma) \text{ and } T \in \mathcal{T}_\star.$$

By γ -shape regularity, this implies the global estimate

$$\|h_\star^{-1}(1 - J_\star)v\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \|\nabla J_\star v\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \lesssim \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \leq \|v\|_{H^1(\Gamma)} \quad \text{for all } v \in H^1(\Gamma).$$

Together with L^2 -stability (29) for $s = 0$, one thus obtains H^1 -stability (29) for $s = 1$ as well as the approximation estimate (30) for $s = 0$ and $s = 1$. The general case $0 < s < 1$ in (29)–(30) therefore follows by interpolation. \square

Bootstrapping [CP06, Theorem 4.1] by use of idempotency of projections, we obtain the following result, which will allow us to control the error incurred by approximation the Neumann data.

Lemma 3. Suppose that $\pi_\star : L^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow X_\star$ is the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto a subspace $X_\star \subseteq L^2(\Gamma)$ with $\mathcal{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_\star) \subseteq X_\star$. Then, it holds

$$\|(1 - \pi_\star)\psi\|_{H^{-s}(\Gamma)} \leq C_{\text{apx}} \|h^s(1 - \pi_\star)\psi\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \quad \text{for all } \psi \in L^2(\Gamma). \quad (31)$$

The constant $C_{\text{apx}} > 0$ depends only on Γ and $0 \leq s \leq 1$. \square

3.3. Weighted residual error estimator. For given $f \in L^2(\Gamma)$, let $u \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ and $U_\star \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ be the unique solutions of

$$\langle\langle u, v \rangle\rangle_{W+S} = \langle f, v \rangle \quad \text{for all } v \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma) \quad (32)$$

and

$$\langle\langle U_\star, V_\star \rangle\rangle_{W+S} = \langle f, V_\star \rangle \quad \text{for all } V_\star \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star). \quad (33)$$

We employ the weighted residual error estimator [CMPS04] with local contributions

$$\eta_\star(T) := \|h_\star^{1/2}(f - WU_\star)\|_{L^2(T)} \quad (34a)$$

and let

$$\eta_\star := \eta_\star(\mathcal{T}_\star) \quad \text{with} \quad \eta_\star(\mathcal{E}_\star)^2 := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{E}_\star} \eta_\star(T)^2 \quad \text{for all } \mathcal{E}_\star \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\star. \quad (34b)$$

Note that $\eta_\star(\mathcal{E}_\star) = \|h_\star^{1/2}(f - WU_\star)\|_{L^2(\cup \mathcal{E}_\star)}$. The following proposition collects the *basic properties* of η_\star . The discrete reliability (37) has first been proved in [Gan13]. For technical reasons, the proof in [Gan13] relied on the use of newest vertex bisection and is restricted to the lowest-order case $p = 0$, since it uses the norm localization techniques from [Fae00, Fae02]. Our proof refines the arguments from [CMPS04], where reliability (39) is proved, but our use of the Scott-Zhang projection from Lemma 2 leads to formally weaker dependencies of the constants involved. As a further qualitative improvement over [Gan13], we note that our discrete reliability estimate (37) involves only the refined elements $\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star$, while the original result of [Gan13] is based on the refined elements plus one additional layer of non-refined elements.

Proposition 4. *Let $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \text{refine}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$ and let U_ℓ and U_\star be the corresponding Galerkin solutions from (33). Then, the weighted residual error estimator η_ℓ from (34) satisfies the following properties (i)–(iii).*

(i) *Stability on non-refined elements: There exists a constant $C_{\text{stab}} > 0$ such that*

$$|\eta_\star(\mathcal{T}_\star \cap \mathcal{T}_\ell) - \eta_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \cap \mathcal{T}_\star)| \leq C_{\text{stab}} \|U_\star - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}. \quad (35)$$

(ii) *Reduction on refined elements: There exist constants $0 < q_{\text{red}} < 1$ and $C_{\text{red}} > 0$ such that*

$$\eta_\star^2(\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell) \leq q_{\text{red}} \eta_\ell^2(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star) + C_{\text{red}} \|U_\star - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}^2. \quad (36)$$

(iii) *Discrete reliability: There exists a constant $C_{\text{dlr}} > 0$ such that*

$$\|U_\star - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq C_{\text{dlr}} \eta_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star). \quad (37)$$

The constants $C_{\text{stab}}, C_{\text{red}}, C_{\text{dlr}} > 0$ and $0 < q_{\text{red}} < 1$ depend only on Γ , γ -shape regularity of \mathcal{T}_ℓ and \mathcal{T}_\star , and the polynomial degree $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Proof of stability (35). The reverse triangle inequality and $h_\star = h_\ell$ on the non-refined region $\cup(\mathcal{T}_\star \cap \mathcal{T}_\ell)$ prove

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta_\star(\mathcal{T}_\star \cap \mathcal{T}_\ell) - \eta_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\star \cap \mathcal{T}_\ell)| &\leq \|h_\star^{1/2}(f - WU_\star) - h_\ell^{1/2}(f - WU_\ell)\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_\star \cap \mathcal{T}_\ell))} \\ &\leq \|h_\star^{1/2}W(U_\star - U_\ell)\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}. \end{aligned}$$

By use of the inverse estimate (25), we conclude the proof with $C_{\text{stab}} = C_{\text{inv}}$. \square

Proof of reduction (36). Recall $h_\star \leq qh_\ell$ with $q = 2^{-1/(d-1)} < 1$ in the refined region $\cup(\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell) = \cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)$. Together with the triangle inequality and the inverse estimate (25), this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_\star(\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell) &= \|h_\star^{1/2}(f - WU_\star)\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell))} \\ &\leq \|h_\star^{1/2}(f - WU_\ell)\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell))} + \|h_\star^{1/2}W(U_\star - U_\ell)\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell))} \\ &\leq q^{1/2} \|h_\ell^{1/2}(f - WU_\ell)\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell))} + C_{\text{inv}} \|U_\star - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \\ &= q^{1/2} \eta_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star) + C_{\text{inv}} \|U_\star - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}. \end{aligned}$$

The Young inequality $(a + b)^2 \leq (1 + \delta)a^2 + (1 + \delta^{-1})b^2$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta > 0$ concludes the proof of (36) with $q_{\text{red}} = (1 + \delta)q$ and $C_{\text{red}} = (1 + \delta^{-1})C_{\text{inv}}^2$ if $\delta > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small. \square

Proof of discrete reliability (37). We employ norm equivalence and the Galerkin orthogonality to see

$$\|U_\star - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}^2 \simeq \|U_\star - U_\ell\|_{W+S}^2 = \langle\langle U_\star - U_\ell, (1 - J_\ell)(U_\star - U_\ell) \rangle\rangle_{W+S}$$

with J_ℓ being the Scott-Zhang projection onto $\mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$ from Lemma 2. The Galerkin orthogonality together with $W1 = 0$ implies $|\Gamma| \langle U_\star - U_\ell, 1 \rangle = \langle\langle U_\star - U_\ell, 1 \rangle\rangle_{W+S} = 0$. This yields

$$\|U_\star - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}^2 \simeq \langle\langle U_\star - U_\ell, (1 - J_\ell)(U_\star - U_\ell) \rangle\rangle_{W+S} = \langle f - WU_\ell, (1 - J_\ell)(U_\star - U_\ell) \rangle.$$

Since the results of Lemma 2 do not depend on the precise choice of the elements $T_z \in \mathcal{T}_\ell$ associated with the Lagrangian nodes $z \in \mathcal{N}_\ell$ of $\mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$, we may suppose that $T_z \in \mathcal{T}_\ell \cap \mathcal{T}_\star$ if $z \in \mathcal{N}_\ell \cap \cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \cap \mathcal{T}_\star)$. According to the projection property (28), this implies

$$(1 - J_\ell)(U_\star - U_\ell) = 0 \quad \text{in the non-refined region } \cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \cap \mathcal{T}_\star).$$

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the approximation property (30) thus yield

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f - WU_\ell, (1 - J_\ell)(U_\star - U_\ell) \rangle &\leq \|h_\ell^{1/2}(f - WU_\ell)\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star))} \|h_\ell^{-1/2}(1 - J_\ell)(U_\star - U_\ell)\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ &\lesssim \|h_\ell^{1/2}(f - WU_\ell)\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star))} \|U_\star - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \\ &= \eta_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star) \|U_\star - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the last three estimates, we conclude the proof. \square

The properties (i)–(iii) of Proposition 4 are called *basic properties* as they provide the essential mathematical ingredients to prove linear convergence (Section 4) and quasi-optimal convergence rates (Section 5) for adaptive algorithms. In fact, the following properties (iv)–(vi) are derived from algebraic postprocessing of (i)–(iii).

Corollary 5. *Let $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \mathbf{refine}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$ with corresponding Galerkin solutions U_ℓ and U_\star from (33). Then, the weighted residual error estimator η_ℓ from (34) satisfies the following properties (iv)–(vi):*

(iv) *Quasi-monotonicity: There exists a constant $C_{\text{mon}} > 0$ such that*

$$\eta_\star \leq C_{\text{mon}} \eta_\ell. \quad (38)$$

(v) *Reliability: With the constant C_{dir} from discrete reliability (37), we have*

$$\|u - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq C_{\text{dir}} \eta_\ell. \quad (39)$$

(vi) *Estimator reduction: the following implication is valid:*

$$\theta \eta_\ell^2 \leq \eta_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)^2 \implies \eta_\star^2 \leq q_{\text{est}} \eta_\ell^2 + C_{\text{est}} \|U_\star - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}^2. \quad (40)$$

The constants $C_{\text{est}} > 0$ and $0 < q_{\text{est}} < 1$ depend only on $0 < \theta \leq 1$ and $C_{\text{stab}}, C_{\text{red}}, q_{\text{red}}$, while C_{mon} depends only on $C_{\text{dir}}, C_{\text{stab}}, C_{\text{red}}$.

Proof of quasi-monotonicity (38). Stability (35) together with the reduction (36) shows

$$\eta_\star^2 \lesssim \eta_\ell^2 + \|U_\star - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}^2.$$

With discrete reliability (37), this implies

$$\eta_\star^2 \lesssim (1 + C_{\text{dir}}) \eta_\ell^2$$

and concludes the proof of (iv). \square

Proof of reliability (39). Since the stabilized hyper-singular integral operator is $H^{1/2}$ -elliptic, each Galerkin solution $U_\star \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ satisfies the Céa-type quasi-optimality

$$\|u - U_\star\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \lesssim \min_{V_\star \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star)} \|u - V_\star\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}.$$

For given $\varepsilon > 0$, standard density results imply

$$\|u - U_\star\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq \varepsilon$$

provided that the *global* mesh-width $\|h_\star\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma)} \ll 1$ is sufficiently small. Consequently, for given $\varepsilon > 0$ and \mathcal{T}_ℓ , there exists a refinement \mathcal{T}_\star of \mathcal{T}_ℓ with $\|u - U_\star\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq \varepsilon$. The triangle inequality and discrete reliability (37) thus yield

$$\|u - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq \varepsilon + \|U_\star - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq \varepsilon + C_{\text{dir}} \eta_\ell.$$

The left-hand side as well as the right-hand side of the latter estimate are independent of \mathcal{T}_\star . Hence, passing to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ concludes the proof of (v). \square

Proof of estimator reduction (40). Recall Young's inequality $(a + b)^2 \leq (1 + \delta)a^2 + (1 + \delta^{-1})b^2$ for all $\delta > 0$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. We exploit stability (35) and reduction (36) to see

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_\star^2 &= \eta_\star^2(\mathcal{T}_\ell \cap \mathcal{T}_\star) + \eta_\star^2(\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell) \\ &\leq (1 + \delta)\eta_\ell^2(\mathcal{T}_\ell \cap \mathcal{T}_\star) + q_{\text{red}}\eta_\ell^2(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star) + \left((1 + \delta^{-1})C_{\text{stab}}^2 + C_{\text{red}}\right) \|U_\star - U_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The assumption $\theta\eta_\ell^2 \leq \eta_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)^2$ for $\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star$ then implies

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \delta)\eta_\ell^2(\mathcal{T}_\ell \cap \mathcal{T}_\star) + q_{\text{red}}\eta_\ell^2(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star) &\leq (1 + \delta)\eta_\ell^2 - (1 + \delta - q_{\text{red}})\eta_\ell^2(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star) \\ &\leq \left(1 + \delta - \theta(1 + \delta - q_{\text{red}})\right)\eta_\ell^2. \end{aligned}$$

For sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, the combination of the last two estimates proves (40) with $q_{\text{est}} = 1 + \delta - \theta(1 + \delta - q_{\text{red}}) < 1$ and $C_{\text{est}} = (1 + \delta^{-1})C_{\text{stab}}^2 + C_{\text{red}}$. \square

3.4. Control of data approximation error. For an admissible triangulation \mathcal{T}_\star , we consider the L^2 -orthogonal projection Π_\star onto $\mathcal{P}^p(\mathcal{T}_\star)$, which is given for $f \in L^2(\Gamma)$ elementwise as the unique solution of

$$\int_T (1 - \Pi_\star)f \Psi_\star dx = 0 \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_\star \text{ and all } \Psi_\star \in \mathcal{P}^p(\mathcal{T}_\star).$$

Let

$$\text{osc}_\star(T) := \|h_\star^{1/2}(1 - \Pi_\star)f\|_{L^2(T)} \quad (41a)$$

and let

$$\text{osc}_\star := \text{osc}_\star(\mathcal{T}_\star) \quad \text{with} \quad \text{osc}_\star(\mathcal{E}_\star)^2 := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{E}_\star} \text{osc}_\star(T)^2 \quad \text{for all } \mathcal{E}_\star \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\star. \quad (41b)$$

In analogy to Proposition 4, the following proposition collects the basic properties of osc_\star .

Proposition 6. *Let $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \text{refine}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$. Then, the data oscillation osc_ℓ from (41) satisfies the following properties (i)–(iii).*

(i) *Stability on non-refined elements: It holds*

$$\text{osc}_\star(\mathcal{T}_\star \cap \mathcal{T}_\ell) = \text{osc}_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\star \cap \mathcal{T}_\ell). \quad (42)$$

(ii) *Reduction on refined elements: There exist a constant $0 < q_{\text{osc}} < 1$ such that*

$$\text{osc}_\star^2(\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell) \leq q_{\text{osc}} \text{osc}_\ell^2(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star). \quad (43)$$

(iii) *Discrete reliability: There exists a constant $C_{\text{osc}} > 0$ such that*

$$\|(\Pi_\star - \Pi_\ell)f\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq C_{\text{osc}} \text{osc}_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star). \quad (44)$$

The constant $C_{\text{osc}} > 0$ depends only on Γ , while $0 < q_{\text{osc}} = 2^{-1/(d-1)} < 1$ is generic.

Proof. Note that Π_ℓ is the \mathcal{T}_ℓ -elementwise best approximation. First, this reveals the identity $\Pi_\ell f = \Pi_\star f$ in the non-refined region $\cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \cap \mathcal{T}_\star)$ and hence proves (42). Recall $h_\star \leq q h_\ell$ with $q = 2^{-1/(d-1)}$ in the refined region $\cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star) = \cup(\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell)$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{osc}_\star(\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell) &= \|h_\star^{1/2}(1 - \Pi_\star)f\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell))} \leq q^{1/2} \|h_\ell^{1/2}(1 - \Pi_\ell)f\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_\star \setminus \mathcal{T}_\ell))} \\ &= q^{1/2} \text{osc}_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star). \end{aligned}$$

and proves (43). To see (44), note that orthogonal projections satisfy elementwise

$$\Pi_\star(1 - \Pi_\ell) = \Pi_\star - \Pi_\ell = (1 - \Pi_\ell)\Pi_\star.$$

With Lemma 3 and $\Pi_\ell f = \Pi_\star f$ in $\cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \cap \mathcal{T}_\star)$, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\Pi_\star - \Pi_\ell)f\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} &= \|(1 - \Pi_\ell)\Pi_\star f\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \lesssim \|h_\ell^{1/2}(1 - \Pi_\ell)\Pi_\star f\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ &= \|h_\ell^{1/2}(\Pi_\star - \Pi_\ell)f\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star))} = \|h_\ell^{1/2}\Pi_\star(1 - \Pi_\ell)f\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star))} \\ &\leq \|h_\ell^{1/2}(1 - \Pi_\ell)f\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star))} = \text{osc}_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star). \end{aligned}$$

For the final estimate, we have used that $h_\ell \in \mathcal{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_\ell) \subseteq \mathcal{P}^0(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ and that Π_\star is the \mathcal{T}_\star -piecewise L^2 -orthogonal projection. This proves (44) with $C_{\text{osc}} = C_{\text{apx}}$. \square

3.5. Overall a posteriori error estimator. For given Neumann data $\phi \in L^2(\Gamma)$, let $g \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ and $G_\star \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ be the unique solutions of

$$\langle\langle g, v \rangle\rangle_{W+S} = \langle\langle (1/2 - K')\phi, v \rangle\rangle \quad \text{for all } v \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma), \quad (45)$$

$$\langle\langle G_\star, V_\star \rangle\rangle_{W+S} = \langle\langle (1/2 - K')\Pi_\star \phi, V_\star \rangle\rangle \quad \text{for all } V_\star \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star). \quad (46)$$

For the a posteriori error control, we define the local contributions

$$\rho_\star(T) := \|h_\star^{1/2}((1/2 - K')\Pi_\star \phi - W G_\star)\|_{L^2(T)} + \|h_\star^{1/2}(1 - \Pi_\star)\phi\|_{L^2(T)} \quad (47a)$$

and let

$$\rho_\star := \rho_\star(\mathcal{T}_\star), \quad \text{where, for any } \mathcal{E}_\star \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\star, \text{ we set } \rho_\star(\mathcal{E}_\star)^2 := \sum_{T \in \mathcal{E}_\star} \rho_\star(T)^2; \quad (47b)$$

that is, we consider the sum of weighted residual error estimator plus data oscillation terms. Compared to η_\star from Section 3.3, the difference is that now the right-hand side f changes in each step of the adaptive loop, i.e., $f = (1/2 - K')\Pi_\ell \phi$. The following proposition collects the properties of ρ_\star . As for the weighted residual error estimator η_\star , an algebraic postprocessing of the *basic properties* (i)–(iii) reveals further properties (iv)–(vi) of ρ_\star required for the convergence and quasi-optimality analysis below.

Theorem 7. *Let $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \text{refine}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$ with corresponding Galerkin solutions G_ℓ and G_\star from (46). Then, the overall error estimator ρ_ℓ from (47) satisfies the following properties (i)–(iii):*

(i) *Stability on non-refined elements: There exists a constant $C_{\text{stab}} > 0$ such that*

$$C_{\text{stab}}^{-1} |\rho_\star(\mathcal{T}_\star \cap \mathcal{T}_\ell) - \rho_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \cap \mathcal{T}_\star)| \leq \|G_\star - G_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} + \|(\Pi_\star - \Pi_\ell)\phi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)}. \quad (48)$$

(ii) *Reduction on refined elements:* There exist constants $0 < q_{\text{red}} < 1$ and $C_{\text{red}} > 0$ such that

$$\rho_{\star}^2(\mathcal{T}_{\star} \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\ell}) \leq q_{\text{red}} \rho_{\ell}^2(\mathcal{T}_{\ell} \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\star}) + C_{\text{red}} \left(\|G_{\star} - G_{\ell}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}^2 + \|(\Pi_{\star} - \Pi_{\ell})\phi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)}^2 \right). \quad (49)$$

(iii) *Discrete reliability:* There exists a constant $C_{\text{dlr}} > 0$ such that

$$\|G_{\star} - G_{\ell}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} + \|(\Pi_{\star} - \Pi_{\ell})\phi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq C_{\text{dlr}} \rho_{\ell}(\mathcal{T}_{\ell} \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\star}). \quad (50)$$

The constants $C_{\text{dlr}}, C_{\text{stab}}, C_{\text{red}} > 0$ and $0 < q_{\text{red}} < 1$ depend only on Γ , γ -shape regularity of \mathcal{T}_{ℓ} and \mathcal{T}_{\star} , and the polynomial degree $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Moreover, these basic properties imply the following properties (iv)–(vi).

(iv) *Quasi-monotonicity:* There exists a constant $C_{\text{mon}} > 0$ such that

$$\rho_{\star} \leq C_{\text{mon}} \rho_{\ell} \quad (51)$$

(v) *Reliability:* With the constant C_{dlr} from discrete reliability (50), it holds

$$\|g - G_{\ell}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq C_{\text{dlr}} \rho_{\ell} \quad (52)$$

(vi) *Estimator reduction:* It holds the implication

$$\theta \rho_{\ell}^2 \leq \rho_{\ell}(\mathcal{T}_{\ell} \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\star})^2 \implies \rho_{\star}^2 \leq q_{\text{est}} \rho_{\ell}^2 + C_{\text{est}} \left(\|G_{\star} - G_{\ell}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}^2 + \|(\Pi_{\star} - \Pi_{\ell})\phi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)}^2 \right). \quad (53)$$

The constants $C_{\text{est}} > 0$ and $0 < q_{\text{est}} \leq 1$ depend only on $0 < \theta \leq 1$ and $C_{\text{stab}}, C_{\text{red}}, q_{\text{red}}$, while C_{mon} depends only on $C_{\text{dlr}}, C_{\text{stab}}, C_{\text{red}}$.

Proof. We first prove stability (48). Recall that $h_{\star} = h_{\ell}$ on $\cup(\mathcal{T}_{\ell} \cap \mathcal{T}_{\star})$. The reverse triangle inequality and stability (42) of the data oscillation prove

$$\begin{aligned} & |\rho_{\star}(\mathcal{T}_{\star} \cap \mathcal{T}_{\ell}) - \rho_{\ell}(\mathcal{T}_{\star} \cap \mathcal{T}_{\ell})| \\ & \leq \|h_{\star}^{1/2}((1/2 - K')\Pi_{\star}\phi - WG_{\star}) - h_{\ell}^{1/2}((1/2 - K')\Pi_{\ell}\phi - WG_{\ell})\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_{\star} \cap \mathcal{T}_{\ell}))} \\ & \leq \|h_{\star}^{1/2}(1/2 - K')(\Pi_{\star} - \Pi_{\ell})\phi\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \|h_{\star}^{1/2}W(G_{\star} - G_{\ell})\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ & \lesssim \|(\Pi_{\star} - \Pi_{\ell})\phi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} + \|G_{\star} - G_{\ell}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the inverse estimates (24)–(25).

Second, we prove the discrete reliability (50). To that end, let $G_{\ell, \star} \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_{\star})$ denote the unique Galerkin solution of

$$\langle G_{\ell, \star}, V_{\star} \rangle_{W+S} = \langle (1/2 - K')\Pi_{\ell}\phi, V_{\star} \rangle \quad \text{for all } V_{\star} \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_{\star}).$$

Note that $G_{\ell, \star} \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_{\star})$ and $G_{\ell} \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_{\ell})$ are Galerkin solutions for the same right-hand side $f = (1/2 - K')\Pi_{\ell}\phi$. Therefore, the discrete reliability (37) of the weighted residual error estimator yields

$$\|G_{\ell, \star} - G_{\ell}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \lesssim \|h_{\ell}^{1/2}((1/2 - K')\Pi_{\ell}\phi - WG_{\ell})\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_{\ell} \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\star}))} \leq \rho_{\ell}(\mathcal{T}_{\ell} \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\star}). \quad (54)$$

Moreover, the stability of the Galerkin formulations and the adjoint double-layer potential yield

$$\|G_{\star} - G_{\ell, \star}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \lesssim \|(1/2 - K')\Pi_{\star}\phi - (1/2 - K')\Pi_{\ell}\phi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \lesssim \|(\Pi_{\star} - \Pi_{\ell})\phi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)}. \quad (55)$$

Therefore, the discrete reliability (44) of the data oscillations gives

$$\|G_{\star} - G_{\ell, \star}\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} + \|(\Pi_{\star} - \Pi_{\ell})\phi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \lesssim \text{osc}_{\ell}(\mathcal{T}_{\ell} \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\star}) \leq \rho_{\ell}(\mathcal{T}_{\ell} \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\star}).$$

The combination of (54)–(55) proves (50).

The reduction property (49) is proved analogously. Arguing along the lines of Corollary 5, one sees that the basic properties (i)–(iii) already imply the further properties (iv)–(vi). Details are left to the reader. \square

4. LINEAR CONVERGENCE OF ADAPTIVE BEM

We consider the following adaptive mesh-refining algorithm.

Algorithm 8. Input: initial mesh \mathcal{T}_0 , adaptivity parameter $0 < \theta \leq 1$, and $\ell = 0$.

- (i) Compute approximate data $\Pi_\ell \phi$ using the L^2 -orthogonal projection $\Pi_\ell : L^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^p(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$.
- (ii) Compute the Galerkin solution $G_\ell \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$ of (46).
- (iii) Compute refinement indicators $\rho_\ell(T)$ from (47) for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_\ell$.
- (iv) Determine a set of marked elements $\mathcal{M}_\ell \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\ell$ which satisfies the Dörfler marking criterion

$$\theta \rho_\ell^2 \leq \rho_\ell(\mathcal{M}_\ell)^2. \quad (56)$$

- (v) Refine at least the marked elements to obtain $\mathcal{T}_{\ell+1} \in \mathbf{refine}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$, i.e., $\mathcal{M}_\ell \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\ell+1}$.
- (vi) Increment $\ell \leftarrow \ell + 1$ and goto (i).

Output: sequence of error estimators $(\rho_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ and sequence of Galerkin solutions $(G_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$.

For the mesh-refinement in step (v), we suppose that the assumptions of Section 3.1 hold true, i.e., marked elements are at least refined into two sons of (at most) half area. Note that we do not impose any minimality condition on the set of marked elements \mathcal{M}_ℓ in step (iv) so that, formally, $\mathcal{M}_\ell = \mathcal{T}_\ell$ would also be a valid choice.

Theorem 9. Let $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \mathbf{refine}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$ with corresponding Galerkin solutions $G_\ell \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$ and $G_\star \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ of (46). Let $g_\ell, g_\star \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ denote the unique solutions of

$$\langle\langle g_\ell, v \rangle\rangle_{W+S} = \langle\langle (1/2 - K')\Pi_\ell \phi, v \rangle\rangle \quad \text{for all } v \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma), \quad (57)$$

$$\langle\langle g_\star, v \rangle\rangle_{W+S} = \langle\langle (1/2 - K')\Pi_\star \phi, v \rangle\rangle \quad \text{for all } v \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma). \quad (58)$$

Suppose that the set of refined elements satisfies the Dörfler marking

$$\theta \rho_\ell^2 \leq \rho_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)^2 \quad (59)$$

for some $0 < \theta \leq 1$. Then, there exist constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$, and $0 < \kappa < 1$ such that the quasi-errors

$$\Delta_\ell := \|\|g_\ell - G_\ell\|\|_{W+S}^2 + \alpha \rho_\ell^2 + \beta \text{osc}_\ell^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_\star := \|\|g_\star - G_\star\|\|_{W+S}^2 + \alpha \rho_\star^2 + \beta \text{osc}_\star^2 \quad (60)$$

satisfy the contraction property

$$\Delta_\star \leq \kappa \Delta_\ell. \quad (61)$$

Moreover, it holds

$$\alpha \rho_\ell^2 \leq \Delta_\ell \leq (C_{\text{dir}}^2 + \alpha + \beta) \rho_\ell. \quad (62)$$

The constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$, and $0 < \kappa < 1$ depend only on $C_{\text{dir}}, C_{\text{est}}, q_{\text{est}}$ as well as on Γ . Indirectly, they hence also depend on $0 < \theta \leq 1$, γ -shape regularity of \mathcal{T}_ℓ and \mathcal{T}_\star , and the polynomial degree $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Corollary 10. *Suppose that all meshes \mathcal{T}_ℓ generated by Algorithm 8 are uniformly γ -shape regular. Then, Algorithm 8 guarantees R -linear convergence of the error estimator sequence*

$$\rho_{\ell+k}^2 \leq C_1 \kappa^k \rho_\ell^2 \quad \text{for all } k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (63)$$

with $C_1 = \alpha^{-1}(C_{\text{dr}}^2 + \alpha + \beta)$ and the constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$, and $0 < \kappa < 1$ from Theorem 9.

Proof. Theorem 9 applies with $\mathcal{T}_\star = \mathcal{T}_{\ell+1}$, since $\mathcal{M}_\ell \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\ell+1}$ satisfies the Dörfler marking (56). By induction, the contraction estimate (61) proves $\Delta_{\ell+k} \leq \kappa^k \Delta_\ell$ for all $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Together with the equivalence (62), this concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 9. First, we recall the norm equivalence $\|\cdot\|_{W+S} \simeq \|\cdot\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}$, namely

$$C_2^{-1} \|v\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq \|v\|_{W+S} \leq C_2 \|v\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \quad \text{for all } v \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma), \quad (64)$$

where $C_2 > 0$ depends only on Γ .

- Second, recall stability of the continuous formulation in the sense that

$$\|g_\star - g_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \lesssim \|(1/2 - K')(\Pi_\star - \Pi_\ell)\phi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \lesssim \|(\Pi_\star - \Pi_\ell)\phi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)}.$$

Together with the norm equivalence (64) and discrete reliability (44) of the data oscillation, this leads to

$$C_3^{-1} \|g_\star - g_\ell\|_{W+S}^2 \leq \|(\Pi_\star - \Pi_\ell)\phi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)}^2 \leq C_{\text{osc}}^2 \text{osc}_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)^2, \quad (65)$$

where $C_3 > 0$ depends only on Γ .

- Third, the Galerkin orthogonality implies

$$\langle g_\star - G_\star, V_\star \rangle_{W+S} = 0 \quad \text{for all } V_\star \in \mathcal{S}^p(\mathcal{T}_\star).$$

This yields Pythagoras' equality

$$\|g_\star - G_\ell\|_{W+S}^2 = \|g_\star - G_\star\|_{W+S}^2 + \|G_\star - G_\ell\|_{W+S}^2.$$

The Young inequality $(a+b)^2 \leq (1+\varepsilon)a^2 + (1+\varepsilon^{-1})b^2$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ gives

$$\|g_\star - G_\ell\|_{W+S}^2 \leq (1+\varepsilon) \|g_\ell - G_\ell\|_{W+S}^2 + (1+\varepsilon^{-1}) \|g_\star - g_\ell\|_{W+S}^2.$$

Combining the last two observations with the stability estimate (65), we see

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_\star - G_\star\|_{W+S}^2 &\leq (1+\varepsilon) \|g_\ell - G_\ell\|_{W+S}^2 - \|G_\star - G_\ell\|_{W+S}^2 \\ &\quad + (1+\varepsilon^{-1}) C_3 C_{\text{osc}}^2 \text{osc}_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

- Fourth, we define $C_4 = (1+\varepsilon^{-1})C_3 C_{\text{osc}}^2 + \alpha C_{\text{est}} C_{\text{osc}}^2$ and combine estimator reduction (53) with (66) to see

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\star &\leq (1+\varepsilon) \|g_\ell - G_\ell\|_{W+S}^2 - \|G_\star - G_\ell\|_{W+S}^2 + (1+\varepsilon^{-1}) C_3 C_{\text{osc}}^2 \text{osc}_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)^2 \\ &\quad + \alpha q_{\text{est}} \rho_\ell^2 + \alpha C_{\text{est}} \left(\|G_\star - G_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}^2 + \|(\Pi_\star - \Pi_\ell)\phi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)}^2 \right) + \beta \text{osc}_\star^2 \\ &\leq (1+\varepsilon) \|g_\ell - G_\ell\|_{W+S}^2 + \alpha q_{\text{est}} \rho_\ell^2 + C_4 \text{osc}_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)^2 + \beta \text{osc}_\star^2 \\ &\quad + (\alpha C_{\text{est}} C_2^2 - 1) \|G_\star - G_\ell\|_{W+S}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

With the choice $\alpha := C_{\text{est}}^{-1} C_2^{-2}$, the last term vanishes.

- Fifth, note that $h_\star \leq q h_\ell$ with $q = 2^{-1/(d-1)}$ on $\cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)$, while $h_\star = h_\ell$ on $\cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \cap \mathcal{T}_\star)$. With the characteristic function $\chi_{\cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)}$, this implies the pointwise estimate $(1 -$

$q)h_\ell\chi_{\cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)} \leq h_\ell - h_\star$ and hence the best approximation property of Π_\star yields

$$\begin{aligned} (1-q)\operatorname{osc}_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)^2 &= (1-q)\|h_\ell^{1/2}(1-\Pi_\ell)\|_{L^2(\cup(\mathcal{T}_\ell\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star))}^2 \\ &\leq \|h_\ell^{1/2}(1-\Pi_\ell)\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 - \|h_\star^{1/2}(1-\Pi_\ell)\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 \\ &\leq \operatorname{osc}_\ell^2 - \operatorname{osc}_\star^2. \end{aligned}$$

With the above choice of α and $\beta := C_4(1-q)^{-1}$, the estimate (67) becomes

$$\Delta_\star \leq (1+\varepsilon)\|g_\ell - G_\ell\|_{W+S}^2 + \alpha q_{\text{est}}\rho_\ell^2 + \beta \operatorname{osc}_\ell^2. \quad (68)$$

• Sixth, since g_ℓ and G_ℓ are determined by the same right-hand side $f = (1/2 - K')\Pi_\ell\phi$, the reliability estimate (39) of the weighted residual error estimator yields

$$C_{\text{dir}}^{-1}\|g_\ell - G_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} \leq \|h_\ell^{1/2}(1/2 - K')\Pi_\ell\phi - WG_\ell\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \leq \rho_\ell.$$

Together with the norm equivalence $\|\cdot\|_{W+S} \simeq \|\cdot\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)}$, this leads to

$$C_5\|g_\ell - G_\ell\|_{W+S}^2 \leq \rho_\ell^2, \quad (69)$$

where $C_5 > 0$ depends only on C_{dir} and Γ . Moreover, it holds $\operatorname{osc}_\ell^2 \leq \rho_\ell^2$. For arbitrary $\delta > 0$, we obtain from (68)

$$\Delta_\star \leq (1+\varepsilon - \alpha\delta C_5)\|g_\ell - G_\ell\|_{W+S}^2 + \alpha(q_{\text{est}} + 2\delta)\rho_\ell^2 + (\beta - \alpha\delta)\operatorname{osc}_\ell^2 \leq \kappa\Delta_\ell$$

where

$$\kappa := \max\left\{1+\varepsilon - \alpha\delta C_5, q_{\text{est}} + 2\delta, (\beta - \alpha\delta)/\beta\right\}.$$

The choice $\delta < (1 - q_{\text{est}})/2$ and $\varepsilon < \alpha\delta C_5$ yields $0 < \kappa < 1$ and concludes the proof. \square

5. QUASI-OPTIMAL CONVERGENCE RATES

In this section, we prove that the usual implementation of Algorithm 8 leads to quasi-optimal convergence behavior in the following sense: Suppose that adaptive mesh-refinement can provide a decay $\mathcal{O}(N^{-s})$ of the error estimator ρ_\star with respect to the number N of elements and some algebraic convergence rate $s > 0$, if the *optimal meshes* are chosen (which do not have to be nested). Theorem 11 below then proves that the sequence of estimators ρ_ℓ generated by Algorithm 8 will also decay asymptotically with rate s .

5.1. Additional assumptions. While all the previous results hold without any further assumptions on the mesh-refinement, the following assumptions are necessary for the optimality result of Theorem 11, where we further specify step (iv)–(v) of Algorithm 8.

(A1) We suppose that the set of marked elements \mathcal{M}_ℓ which satisfies (56), has minimal cardinality.

We note that the set \mathcal{M}_ℓ might be non-unique in general and that its computation usually relies on sorting the refinement indicators $\rho_\ell(T)$. For the mesh-refinement in step (v), we suppose the following.

(A2) For $d = 2$, the bisection algorithm from [AFF⁺13a] is used. For $d = 3$, we use 2D newest vertex bisection, see, e.g., [KPP13] and the references therein.

(A3) In either case, we suppose that $\mathcal{T}_{\ell+1} = \text{refine}(\mathcal{T}_\ell; \mathcal{M}_\ell)$ is the coarsest admissible refinement of \mathcal{T}_ℓ such that all marked elements $T \in \mathcal{M}_\ell$ have been bisected.

First, the choice of these mesh-refinement strategies guarantees that the meshes \mathcal{T}_ℓ generated by Algorithm 8 are uniformly γ -shape regular, where $\gamma > 0$ depends only on the initial mesh \mathcal{T}_0 .

Second, it has first been observed in [BDD04] for 2D newest vertex bisection that the number $\#\mathcal{T}_\ell$ of elements in \mathcal{T}_ℓ can be controlled by the number of marked elements, i.e.,

$$\#\mathcal{T}_\ell - \#\mathcal{T}_0 \leq C_{\text{mesh}} \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \#\mathcal{M}_j, \quad (70)$$

where $C_{\text{mesh}} > 0$ depends only on \mathcal{T}_0 . While [BDD04] required an additional assumption on \mathcal{T}_0 , this assumption has recently been removed in [KPP13], so that the initial triangulation \mathcal{T}_0 is in fact an arbitrary admissible triangulation. For $d = 2$, the estimate (70) is proved in [AFF⁺13a] for a bisection based refinement, where additional bisection of non-marked elements are required to ensure uniform γ -shape regularity. In either case, the proof of (70) naturally relies on assumption (A3)

Finally, for two admissible triangulations \mathcal{T}_ℓ and \mathcal{T}_\star , let $\mathcal{T}_\ell \oplus \mathcal{T}_\star \in \text{refine}(\mathcal{T}_\ell) \cap \text{refine}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ be the coarsest admissible refinement of both \mathcal{T}_ℓ and \mathcal{T}_\star . Then, $\mathcal{T}_\ell \oplus \mathcal{T}_\star$ is in fact the overlay, and it holds

$$\#(\mathcal{T}_\ell \oplus \mathcal{T}_\star) \leq \#\mathcal{T}_\ell + \#\mathcal{T}_\star - \#\mathcal{T}_0, \quad (71)$$

see [Ste07] for $d = 3$ and 2D newest vertex bisection and [AFF⁺13a] for $d = 2$.

Overall, we note that the estimates (70)–(71) are required for the arguments of the proof and strongly tailored to the mesh-refinement strategy chosen in (A2).

5.2. Optimality result. To quantify the convergence rate of Algorithm 8, we introduce for all $s > 0$ the quasi-norm

$$\|(g, \phi)\|_{\mathbb{A}_s} := \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \inf_{\substack{\mathcal{T}_\star \in \text{refine}(\mathcal{T}_0) \\ \#\mathcal{T}_\star - \#\mathcal{T}_0 \leq N}} (N + 1)^s \rho_\star.$$

Note that $\|(g, \phi)\|_{\mathbb{A}_s} < \infty$ for some $s > 0$ implies that a convergence rate

$$\rho_\star \lesssim (\#\mathcal{T}_\star - \#\mathcal{T}_0)^{-s}$$

could be achieved if the optimal meshes \mathcal{T}_\star are chosen. The following theorem states that each possible rate $s > 0$ will be recovered by Algorithm 8, i.e., the meshes generated are asymptotically optimal.

Theorem 11. *Let $0 < \theta < \theta_{\text{opt}} := (1 + C_{\text{stab}}^2 C_{\text{dlr}}^2)^{-1}$. Then, the adaptively generated meshes of Algorithm 8 satisfy*

$$c_{\text{opt}} \|(g, \phi)\|_{\mathbb{A}_s} \leq \sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0} (\#\mathcal{T}_\ell - \#\mathcal{T}_0 + 1)^s \rho_\ell \leq C_{\text{opt}} \|(g, \phi)\|_{\mathbb{A}_s}. \quad (72)$$

The constant $c_{\text{opt}} > 0$ depends only on $d = 2, 3$, whereas the constant $C_{\text{opt}} > 0$ depends on $\theta, C_{\text{mesh}}, C_{\text{dlr}}, C_{\text{red}}, C_{\text{stab}}, q_{\text{red}}$, as well as the polynomial degree p, s , and the γ -shape regularity of \mathcal{T}_0 .

We note that unlike the FEM literature, e.g., [CKNS08, Ste07] and the first results on ABEM [FKMP13, Gan13], the upper bound θ_{opt} on optimal marking parameters is independent of any lower bound for the error (so-called *efficiency* of the estimator). The proof needs some preparations. The following result shows that Dörfler marking (56) is not only sufficient (63), but even necessary to obtain linear convergence of the error estimator.

Lemma 12. For any $0 < \theta < \theta_{\text{opt}}$, there exists $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$ such that all $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \text{refine}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$ satisfy the implication

$$\rho_\star^2 \leq \kappa_0 \rho_\ell^2 \quad \implies \quad \theta \rho_\ell^2 \leq \rho_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)^2. \quad (73)$$

The constant κ_0 depends only on θ , C_{stab} , and C_{dlr} .

Proof. Recall Young's inequality $(a + b)^2 \leq (1 + \delta)a^2 + (1 + \delta^{-1})b^2$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta > 0$. The stability (48) shows

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\ell^2 &= \rho_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \cap \mathcal{T}_\star)^2 + \rho_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)^2 \\ &\leq (1 + \delta)\rho_\star(\mathcal{T}_\star \cap \mathcal{T}_\ell)^2 + \rho_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)^2 \\ &\quad + (1 + \delta^{-1})C_{\text{stab}}^2 \left(\|G_\star - G_\ell\|_{H^{1/2}(\Gamma)} + \|(\Pi_\star - \Pi_\ell)\phi\|_{H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

The assumption $\rho_\star^2 \leq \kappa_0 \rho_\ell^2$ together with discrete reliability (50) imply

$$\rho_\ell^2 \leq (1 + \delta)\kappa_0 \rho_\ell^2 + (1 + (1 + \delta^{-1})C_{\text{stab}}^2 C_{\text{dlr}}^2)\rho_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)^2$$

and hence

$$\theta \rho_\ell^2 \leq \rho_\ell(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)^2 \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq \theta < \theta(\kappa_0) := \sup_{\delta > 0} \frac{1 - (1 + \delta)\kappa_0}{1 + (1 + \delta^{-1})C_{\text{stab}}^2 C_{\text{dlr}}^2}.$$

For each $\theta < \theta_{\text{opt}}$, there exist $\delta, \kappa_0 > 0$ such that

$$\theta < \frac{1 - (1 + \delta)\kappa_0}{1 + (1 + \delta^{-1})C_{\text{stab}}^2 C_{\text{dlr}}^2} < \theta_{\text{opt}}$$

and hence $\theta < \theta(\kappa_0)$. This concludes the proof. \square

The definition of the quasi-norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{A}_s}$ allows to find *optimal* meshes, which compare with the adaptively generated meshes. This is stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 13. Let $0 < \kappa < 1$ and let $s > 0$ such that $\|(g, \phi)\|_{\mathbb{A}_s} < \infty$. For all admissible meshes \mathcal{T}_ℓ , there exists a refinement $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \text{refine}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$ with

$$\rho_\star^2 \leq \kappa \rho_\ell^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \#\mathcal{T}_\star - \#\mathcal{T}_\ell + 1 \leq C_6 \|(g, \phi)\|_{\mathbb{A}_s}^{1/s} \rho_\ell^{-1/s}. \quad (74)$$

The constant $C_6 > 0$ depends only on C_{mon} , κ , and $s > 0$.

Proof. Arguing as in [Ste07, CKNS08], the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{A}_s}$ provides for each sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ a mesh $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon \in \text{refine}(\mathcal{T}_0)$ which satisfies

$$\#\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon - \#\mathcal{T}_0 + 1 \lesssim \|(g, \phi)\|_{\mathbb{A}_s}^{1/s} \varepsilon^{-1/s} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon.$$

For $\varepsilon := C_{\text{mon}}^{-1} \kappa^{1/2} \rho_\ell$, define $\mathcal{T}_\star := \mathcal{T}_\ell \oplus \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon$ and verify with (71)

$$\#\mathcal{T}_\star - \#\mathcal{T}_\ell + 1 \leq \#\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon - \#\mathcal{T}_0 + 1 \lesssim \|(g, \phi)\|_{\mathbb{A}_s}^{1/s} \rho_\ell^{-1/s}.$$

Since $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \text{refine}(\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon)$ and by choice of ε , the quasi-monotonicity (51) shows

$$\rho_\star^2 \leq C_{\text{mon}}^2 \rho_\varepsilon^2 \leq \kappa \rho_\ell^2.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 11. Choose $\kappa > 0$ sufficiently small such that the implication (73) holds true. Given \mathcal{T}_ℓ , Lemma 13 provides a mesh $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \text{refine}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$ with (74). Therefore, Lemma 12 implies that $\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star$ satisfies the Dörfler marking (56). Since (A1) states that \mathcal{M}_ℓ is a set of minimal cardinality which satisfies Dörfler marking, there holds

$$\#\mathcal{M}_\ell + 1 \leq \#(\mathcal{T}_\ell \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star) + 1 \leq \#\mathcal{T}_\star - \#\mathcal{T}_\ell + 1 \lesssim \|(g, \phi)\|_{\mathbb{A}_s}^{1/s} \rho_\ell^{-1/s}.$$

This and the mesh-closure estimate (70) imply

$$\#\mathcal{T}_\ell - \#\mathcal{T}_0 + 1 \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (\#\mathcal{M}_j + 1) \lesssim \|(g, \phi)\|_{\mathbb{A}_s}^{1/s} \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \rho_j^{-1/s}.$$

The R -linear convergence of Corollary 10 together with the convergence of the geometric series show

$$\#\mathcal{T}_\ell - \#\mathcal{T}_0 + 1 \lesssim \|(g, \phi)\|_{\mathbb{A}_s}^{1/s} \rho_\ell^{-1/s} C_1^{-1/s} \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \kappa^{(\ell-j)/s} \lesssim \|(g, \phi)\|_{\mathbb{A}_s}^{1/s} \rho_\ell^{-1/s}.$$

This implies the upper bound in (72). The lower bound in (72) follows from elementary arguments and the fact that each refined element is split into at most two sons for $d = 2$ and into at most four sons for $d = 3$. This concludes the proof. \square

6. CONCLUSIONS AND REMARKS

6.1. Conclusions on convergence results. In contrast to the FEM, the right-hand sides in BEM typically involve boundary integral operators, which cannot be evaluated exactly in practice. Thus, the analysis of data error is mandatory. To compute the right-hand side term $(1/2 - K')\phi$ numerically in our model problem (1), we follow the earlier work [AFLG⁺12] and replace the exact data ϕ by its L^2 -projection Φ_ℓ onto discontinuous piecewise polynomials. This approach thus decouples the problem of integrating the singular kernel of the integral operator K' from integrating the possibly singular data ϕ to compute $K'\phi$. On their own, both problems are well understood. Moreover, in 2D (see [Mai01]) one can even find analytic formulas to compute the term $K'\Phi_\ell$ exactly, while there exist black-box quadrature algorithms to compute $K'\Phi_\ell$ in 3D (see, e.g., [SS11]).

Based on the weighted residual error estimator from [CMS01], we introduced an overall error estimator which controls both, the discretization error as well as the data approximation error (Theorem 7). For the resulting adaptive algorithm, linear convergence (Corollary 10) even with quasi-optimal rates (Theorem 11) is shown. Throughout, the analysis applies to Galerkin BEM based on piecewise polynomials of arbitrary but fixed maximal order $p \geq 1$.

We note that linear convergence (Corollary 10) as well as the optimality result of Theorem 11 also hold if data approximation is avoided, i.e., Π_\star is taken as the identity in (46) and hence $\text{osc}_\star = 0$ throughout. Therefore, this work generalizes [Gan13] from the lowest order case $p = 0$ to general $p \geq 0$.

6.2. Extension to indirect BEM. Linear convergence (Corollary 10) as well as the optimality result of Theorem 11 also hold for indirect BEM (32) with Galerkin discretization (33), where the analysis is even simpler. The necessary properties of the error estimator are provided by Proposition 4 and Corollary 5.

Moreover, the analysis can easily be adapted to indirect BEM with data approximation, where (33) becomes

$$\langle\langle U_\star, V_\star \rangle\rangle_{W+S} = \langle \Pi_\star f, V_\star \rangle \quad \text{for all } V_\star \in \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\star).$$

Details follow by simplifying the proof of Theorem 7, while the proofs of linear convergence and optimal convergence rates hold accordingly.

6.3. Extension to screen problems. For a connected and relatively open screen $\Gamma \subsetneq \partial\Omega$, let $\widetilde{H}^1(\Gamma)$ denote the space of all $H^1(\partial\Omega)$ -functions which are supported on $\overline{\Gamma}$.




FIGURE 1. Z-shaped domain Ω with boundary $\Gamma = \partial\Omega$ and initial triangulation of Γ into 9 boundary elements for the numerical experiment from Section 7.1.

One defines

$$\widetilde{H}^s(\Gamma) = [L^2(\Gamma); \widetilde{H}^1(\Gamma)]_s \quad \text{and} \quad H^s(\Gamma) = [L^2(\Gamma); H^1(\Gamma)]_s$$

by interpolation for $0 < s < 1$ and the corresponding dual spaces

$$\widetilde{H}^{-s}(\Gamma) = H^s(\Gamma)' \quad \text{and} \quad H^{-s}(\Gamma) = \widetilde{H}^s(\Gamma)'$$

with respect to the extended $L^2(\Gamma)$ -scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Then, $W : \widetilde{H}^s(\Gamma) \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\Gamma)$ is a well-defined linear and continuous operator. Moreover, W is symmetric and elliptic on $\widetilde{H}^{1/2}(\Gamma)$. For given right-hand side $f \in H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$, the hyper-singular integral equation $Wu = f$ thus fits into the setting of the Lax-Milgram lemma, and (unlike the case $\Gamma = \partial\Omega$) the stabilization can be omitted.

The analysis of the weighted residual error estimator in Proposition 4 holds verbatim. On a technical side, one requires that the inverse estimates of Lemma 1 remain valid which is, in fact, the case. We refer to the references [AFF⁺13b, AFF⁺12, GHS05] also given above. Moreover, our analysis requires an appropriate Scott-Zhang projection in $\widetilde{H}^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ which is defined and analyzed in [AFF⁺13b], and Lemma 2 transfers to this case as well. Overall, also linear convergence (Corollary 10) and optimality (Theorem 11) remain valid.

7. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

This section reports on some numerical experiments in 2D with first-order $\mathcal{S}^1(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ and second-order $\mathcal{S}^2(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ boundary elements. All experiments are conducted in MATLAB by means of the library HILBERT [AEF⁺13].

7.1. Direct BEM for 2D Neumann problem. We consider the hyper-singular integral equation (45) on the boundary of the Z-shaped domain sketched in Figure 1. The Neumann data $\phi \in H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$ is given by the normal derivative of the potential

$$P(x, y) = r^{4/7} \cos(4/7\varphi),$$

where (r, φ) denote the polar coordinates of $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, i.e. $(x, y) = r(\cos(\varphi), \sin(\varphi))$. Up to an additive constant, the exact solution $g \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ is the trace $P|_\Gamma$ of the potential P .




FIGURE 2. Hyper-singular integral equation from Section 7.1 on the Z-shaped domain, sketched in Figure 1. Uniform mesh-refinement leads to a suboptimal convergence $\mathcal{O}(N^{-4/7})$ for both $p = 0$ and $p = 1$, whereas the adaptive strategy recovers the optimal convergence $\mathcal{O}(N^{-(3/2+p)})$.

We solve the perturbed discrete system (46) in each step of the adaptive algorithm from Section 4. Moreover, Algorithm 8 is steered by the local error indicators $\rho_\ell(T)$ from (47). We note that the energy norm $\|g\|_{W+S}$ of the exact solution is unknown. Therefore, we employ [AFF⁺13b, Lemma 6] for $s = 1/2$ and estimate the energy error by

$$\|g - G_\ell\|_{W+S} \lesssim \|h_\ell^{1/2} \nabla(g - G_\ell)\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} =: \text{err}_\ell.$$

In Figure 2, we compare adaptive ($\theta = 0.25$) vs. uniform ($\theta = 1$) mesh-refinement for $p = 0, 1$. Since the exact solution satisfies $g \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma) \cap H^{1/2+4/7-\varepsilon}(\Gamma)$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, theory predicts the convergence order $\|g - G_\ell\|_{W+S} = \mathcal{O}(N_\ell^{-s})$ with $s = 4/7$ for uniform mesh-refinement. This is confirmed by our numerical results from Figure 2 for both $p = 0$ and $p = 1$, whereas the adaptive strategies for $p = 0, 1$ recover the respective optimal orders $s = 3/2 + p$.

7.2. 2D slit problem. Let $\Gamma := (-1, 1) \times \{0\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$. We consider the hyper-singular integral equation

$$\langle\langle g, v \rangle\rangle_W = \langle \phi, v \rangle \quad \text{for all } v \in \widetilde{H}^{1/2}(\Gamma)$$

with right-hand side $\phi = 1$ and exact solution $g(x, 0) = 2\sqrt{1-x^2}$. Since $\Pi_\ell \phi = \phi$, the discrete formulation reads

$$\langle\langle G_\ell, V_\ell \rangle\rangle_W = \langle \Pi_\ell \phi, V_\ell \rangle = \langle \phi, V_\ell \rangle \quad \text{for all } V_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_0^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\ell),$$

where $\mathcal{S}_0^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\ell) = \mathcal{S}^{p+1}(\mathcal{T}_\ell) \cap \widetilde{H}^{1/2}(\Gamma)$. Moreover, the oscillation term vanishes in (47). Thus, the local error indicators, which are used to steer Algorithm 8, read

$$\rho_\ell(T) = \|h_\ell^{1/2}(WG_\ell - \phi)\|_{L^2(T)} \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_\ell.$$




FIGURE 3. Hyper-singular integral equation from Section 7.2 on the slit $\Gamma := (-1, 1) \times \{0\}$. Uniform mesh-refinement leads to a suboptimal convergence $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1/2})$ for both $p = 0$ and $p = 1$, whereas the adaptive strategy recovers the optimal convergence $\mathcal{O}(N^{-(3/2+p)})$.

The Galerkin orthogonality allows to compute the error in energy norm by

$$\|g - G_\ell\|_W^2 = \|g\|_W^2 - \|G_\ell\|_W^2 = \pi - \|G_\ell\|_W^2 =: \text{err}_\ell^2.$$

We stress that $g \in \widetilde{H}^{1/2}(\Gamma) \cap H^{1-\varepsilon}(\Gamma)$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, but $g \notin H^1(\Gamma)$. Theory predicts a convergence rate $\text{err}_\ell = \mathcal{O}(N_\ell^{-s})$ with $s = 1/2$ for uniform mesh-refinement. This is confirmed by the numerical experiments for both $p = 0, 1$, see Figure 3. In contrast to that, the adaptive strategy from Algorithm 8 with $\theta = 0.25$ regains the optimal order of convergence $s = 3/2 + p$ in either case $p = 0, 1$.

Acknowledgements: The authors MF, TF, and DP acknowledge support through the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) under grant P21732 *Adaptive Boundary Element Method*. MK acknowledges support by CONICYT project Anillo ACT1118 (ANANUM). MF, JMM, and DP acknowledge the support of the FWF doctoral school *Dissipation and Dispersion in Nonlinear PDEs*, funded under grant W1245.

REFERENCES

- [AEF⁺13] Markus Aurada, Michael Ebner, Michael Feischl, Samuel Ferraz-Leite, Thomas Führer, Petra Goldenits, Michael Karkulik, and Dirk Praetorius. HILBERT – a MATLAB implementation of adaptive 2D-BEM. *Numer. Algorithms*, in print, 2013.
- [AFF⁺12] Markus Aurada, Michael Feischl, Thomas Führer, J. Markus Melenk, and Dirk Praetorius. Inverse estimates for elliptic boundary integral operators and their application to the adaptive coupling of FEM and BEM. *ASC Report*, 07/2012, *Institute for Analysis and Scientific Computing, Vienna University of Technology*, 2012.
- [AFF⁺13a] Markus Aurada, Michael Feischl, Thomas Führer, Michael Karkulik, and Dirk Praetorius. Efficiency and optimality of some weighted-residual error estimator for adaptive 2D boundary element methods. *Comput. Methods Appl. Math.*, 13:305–332, 2013.

- [AFF⁺13b] Markus Aurada, Michael Feischl, Thomas Führer, Michael Karkulik, and Dirk Praetorius. Energy norm based error estimators for adaptive BEM for hypersingular integral equations. *ASC Report*, 22/2013, *Institute for Analysis and Scientific Computing, Vienna University of Technology*, 2013.
- [AFLG⁺12] M. Aurada, S. Ferraz-Leite, P. Goldenits, M. Karkulik, M. Mayr, and D. Praetorius. Convergence of adaptive BEM for some mixed boundary value problem. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 62(4):226–245, 2012.
- [BDD04] Peter Binev, Wolfgang Dahmen, and Ronald DeVore. Adaptive finite element methods with convergence rates. *Numer. Math.*, 97(2):219–268, 2004.
- [CKNS08] J. Manuel Cascon, Christian Kreuzer, Ricardo H. Nochetto, and Kunibert G. Siebert. Quasi-optimal convergence rate for an adaptive finite element method. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 46(5):2524–2550, 2008.
- [CMPS04] Carsten Carstensen, Matthias Maischak, Dirk Praetorius, and Ernst P. Stephan. Residual-based a posteriori error estimate for hypersingular equation on surfaces. *Numer. Math.*, 97(3):397–425, 2004.
- [CMS01] Carsten Carstensen, Matthias Maischak, and Ernst P. Stephan. A posteriori error estimate and h -adaptive algorithm on surfaces for Symm’s integral equation. *Numer. Math.*, 90(2):197–213, 2001.
- [CP06] Carsten Carstensen and Dirk Praetorius. Averaging techniques for the effective numerical solution of Symm’s integral equation of the first kind. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 27(4):1226–1260, 2006.
- [CP07] Carsten Carstensen and Dirk Praetorius. Averaging techniques for the a posteriori BEM error control for a hypersingular integral equation in two dimensions. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 29(2):782–810, 2007.
- [Fae00] Birgit Faermann. Localization of the Aronszajn-Slobodeckij norm and application to adaptive boundary element methods. I. The two-dimensional case. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 20(2):203–234, 2000.
- [Fae02] Birgit Faermann. Localization of the Aronszajn-Slobodeckij norm and application to adaptive boundary element methods. II. The three-dimensional case. *Numer. Math.*, 92(3):467–499, 2002.
- [FFK⁺13] Michael Feischl, Thomas Führer, Michael Karkulik, Jens Markus Melenk, and Dirk Praetorius. Quasi-optimal convergence rates for adaptive boundary element methods with data approximation, part I: Weakly-singular integral equation. *Calcolo*, accepted for publication, 2013.
- [FKMP13] Michael Feischl, Michael Karkulik, J. Markus Melenk, and Dirk Praetorius. Quasi-optimal convergence rate for an adaptive boundary element method. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 51:1327–1348, 2013.
- [Gan13] Tsogtgerel Gantumur. Adaptive boundary element methods with convergence rates. *Numerische Mathematik*, 124(3):471–516, 2013.
- [GHS05] Ivan G. Graham, Wolfgang Hackbusch, and Stefan A. Sauter. Finite elements on degenerate meshes: inverse-type inequalities and applications. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 25(2):379–407, 2005.
- [HW08] George C. Hsiao and Wolfgang L. Wendland. *Boundary integral equations*, volume 164 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008.
- [KPP13] Michael Karkulik, David Pavlicek, and Dirk Praetorius. On 2D newest vertex bisection: Optimality of mesh-closure and H^1 -stability of L_2 -projection. *Constr. Approx.*, 38:213–234, 2013.
- [Mai01] Matthias Maischak. The analytical computation of the Galerkin elements for the Laplace, Lamé and Helmholtz equation in 2D-BEM. *Preprint, Institute for Applied Mathematics, University of Hanover*, 2001.
- [McL00] William McLean. *Strongly elliptic systems and boundary integral equations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [SS11] Stefan A. Sauter and Christoph Schwab. *Boundary element methods*, volume 39 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2011. Translated and expanded from the 2004 German original.
- [Ste07] Rob Stevenson. Optimality of a standard adaptive finite element method. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 7(2):245–269, 2007.

[SZ90] L. Ridgway Scott and Shangyou Zhang. Finite element interpolation of nonsmooth functions satisfying boundary conditions. *Math. Comp.*, 54(190):483–493, 1990.

INSTITUTE FOR ANALYSIS AND SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING, VIENNA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY,
WIEDNER HAUPTSTRASSE 8-10, A-1040 WIEN, AUSTRIA

E-mail address: {Michael.Feischl,Thomas.Fuehrer,Melenk}@tuwien.ac.at

E-mail address: Dirk.Praetorius@tuwien.ac.at (corresponding author)

FACULTAD DE MATEMÁTICAS, PONTIFICIA UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DE CHILE, AVENIDA VICUÑA
MACKENNA 4860, SANTIAGO, CHILE

E-mail address: mkarkulik@mat.puc.cl