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Abstract
We propose a new algorithm for Adaptive Finite Element Methods based on Smoothing iterations (S-AFEM). The algorithm is inspired by the ascending phase of the V-cycle multigrid method: we replace accurate algebraic solutions in intermediate cycles of the classical AFEM with the application of a prolongation step, followed by a fixed number of smoothing steps. Even though these intermediate solutions are far from the exact algebraic solutions, their a-posteriori error estimation produces a refinement pattern that is substantially equivalent to the one that would be generated by classical AFEM, at a considerable fraction of the computational cost. We quantify rigorously how the error propagates throughout the algorithm, and we provide a connection with classical a posteriori error analysis. A series of numerical experiments highlights the efficiency and the computational speedup of S-AFEM.
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1. Introduction

The efficient numerical simulation of complex physical processes requires the use of economical discrete models [10]. The adaptive finite element method (AFEM) is a very successful scheme for the numerical resolution of partial differential equations (PDEs) in computational sciences and engineering, especially for the case of elliptic problems. In Finite Element simulations (FEM), the domain of a PDE is discretised into a large set of small and simple domains (the cells or elements) depending on a size parameter $h > 0$. Typical shapes that are used for the discretisation are triangles, quadrilaterals, tetrahedrons, or hexahedrons. The solution space is constructed by gluing together simpler finite dimensional spaces, defined on a piecewise manner on each cell, and the original problem is solved on this simpler, finite dimensional space, transforming the original PDE into an algebraic system of equations, see, e.g., some of the numerous books dedicated to FEM [7, 26, 56, 25, 18, 30, 35, 19]. Rigorous analysis of the numerical method allows one to estimate the discretisation error both a priori (giving global bounds on the total error that depend on a global size parameter $h$), and a posteriori (providing a local distribution of the error on the discretised mesh in terms of known quantities). The Adaptive Finite Element Method (AFEM) consists of successive loops of the steps

$$\text{Solve} \rightarrow \text{Estimate} \rightarrow \text{Mark} \rightarrow \text{Refine}$$

(1)

to decrease the total discretisation error, by repeating the FEM solution process ($\text{Solve}$) on a mesh that has been refined ($\text{Refine}$) on the areas where the a-posteriori analysis has shown that the error is larger ($\text{Estimate}$ and $\text{Mark}$).

One of the first AFEM analysis was provided by Babuška and Vogelius [20] for linear symmetric elliptic problems in one dimension. The first multidimensional convergence result was given by Dörfler in [28], and the first complexity
result was given by Binev, Dehmen, and DeVore in [14]. In recent years, convergence, convergence rate, and complexity results have been incrementally improved for AFEM applied to second-order elliptic problems for conforming finite element methods, see, e.g., the publications [28, 40, 32, 34, 49, 15, 11, 24, 42]; for a detailed description on AFEM we refer to the books [29, 41, 31, 43, 10].

A common practical assumption of AFEM is that in the step Solve, one obtains the exact solution of the algebraic system. Numerical roundoff, however, conflicts with this assumption (cf., e.g., [50]), and a complete analysis should incorporate the algebraic error in the a posteriori error analysis (see the survey [5] and the references therein for highlights on the interplay between discretization and algebraic error in AFEM).

Finite elements for physically relevant problems produce large linear systems of equations, and the only competitive option for their solution is given by preconditioned iterative methods (see, e.g., [55] or [47]). For symmetric positive definite systems, the preconditioned Conjugate Gradient Method (PCG) with (either algebraic or geometric) multigrid preconditioner (see, e.g., [36, 39]) guarantees a fixed number of iterations to reach convergence independently on the mesh parameter $h$. The number of iterations performed plays a crucial role in determining the computational work on one hand, and the accuracy of the solution on the other hand. An efficient solver should use this principal advantage by introducing stopping criteria that do not significantly affect the quality of the solution at each adaptive step and the convergence of the adaptive algorithm itself [8, 51, 37].

The question of stopping criteria for iterative PDE solvers that account for inexactness of the algebraic approximations is nowadays becoming a widely addressed topic, see, e.g., [12, 4, 5, 37, 46] and the references therein. However, most of the above mentioned literature focuses on ways to estimate the algebraic error, without really exploiting the other side of the coin: rough approximate solutions, with large algebraic error, may still offer large computational savings when used in the correct way.

In this work we present and analyse a simple yet effective algorithm to reduce the overall computational cost of the AFEM algorithm, by providing a fast procedure for the construction of a quasi-optimal mesh sequence that does not require the exact solution of the algebraic problem in the intermediate steps of the AFEM algorithm.

Our setting is as follows. We consider linear second-order elliptic boundary value problems (BVPs) whose variational formulation reads: seek $u \in V$ s.t. $Au = f$ in $V$ under suitable boundary conditions, where $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ is a normed Hilbert space defined over a Lipschitz bounded domain $\Omega$, the linear operator $\mathcal{A} : V \to V^*$ is a second order elliptic operator, and $f \in V^*$ is a given datum. The Finite Element Method (FEM) provides numerical solutions to the above problem in a finite dimensional solution space $V_h \subset V$, typically made up by continuous and piecewise polynomial functions, and transforms the continuous problem above in a discrete model of type $\mathcal{A}_h u_h = f_h$ in $V_h$ under suitable boundary conditions, where $\mathcal{A}_h = \mathcal{A} |_{V_h}$. The overall procedure leads to the resolution of a (potentially very large) linear algebraic system of equations of
type $Au = f$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, where $N = \dim(V_h)$.

The standard AFEM algorithm (following [22]) can be summarised in the following steps:

**Algorithm 1.1 (AFEM algorithm). [22]**

**Input:** initial mesh $\mathcal{T}_1$

**Loop:** for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, \bar{k}$ do steps 1. - 4.

1. **Solve:** $A_k u_k = f_k$ in $\mathbb{R}^{N_k}$, where $\dim(V_k) = N_k$, based on $\mathcal{T}_k$.

2. **Estimate:** Compute $\eta_T(u_k)^2$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_k$.

3. **Mark:** Choose set of cells to refine $\mathcal{M}_k \subset \mathcal{T}_k$ based on $\eta_T(u_k)^2$.

4. **Refine:** Generate new mesh $\mathcal{T}_{k+1}$ by refinement of the cells in $\mathcal{M}_k$.

**Output:** nested sequence of meshes $\mathcal{T}_k$, approximations $u_k$, and local estimators $\eta_T(u_k)$, for $k = 1, \ldots, \bar{k} - 1$, and final problem-adapted approximation $u_{\bar{k}}$.

This procedure solves for any level $k = 1, 2, \ldots, \bar{k}$ the following discrete problems: seek $u_k \in V_k$ s.t. $A_k u_k = f_k$ in $V_k$ under suitable boundary conditions, where $A_k : V_k \to V_k^*$, $A_k := A|_{V_k}$. The finite element spaces are nested $V_1 \subset V_2 \subset \cdots \subset V_{\bar{k}}$ and $N_1 < N_2 < \cdots < N_{\bar{k}}$.

The algorithm we propose takes its inspiration from the ascending phase of the V-cycle multigrid method, where a sequence of prolongation and smoothing steps is applied to what is considered an algebraically exact solution at the coarsest level. In the multigrid literature, this procedure is used to transfer the low frequency information contained in the coarse solution to a finer –nested– grid, where some steps of a smoothing iteration are applied in order to improve the accuracy of the solution in the high frequency range. We refer to the classical books [33, 55, 17, 16] for a more in-depth analysis on multigrid methods.

The iteration of this procedure turns out to be very effective in providing accurate algebraic solutions in $O(N)$ time, and it is based on the principle that even a small number of smoothing iterations is sufficient to eliminate the high frequency error, while the prolongation from coarser grids guarantees the convergence in the low frequency regime, resulting in an overall accurate solution.

The main difference between the ascending phase of the V-cycle multigrid method and AFEM is that in AFEM the next grid in the sequence is unknown, and requires an exact algebraic solution on the current grid to trigger the **Estimate-Mark-Refine** steps.

The intermediate algebraic solutions required by the AFEM algorithm are instrumental to the construction of the final grid, and find no other use in the final computations. From these considerations, we analysed in detail the algebraic error propagation in a general multilevel context, providing a rigorous estimate of the algebraic error propagation between different nested levels when applying successive prolongation (Prolongate) and smoothing (Smooth) steps, and we show how this algebraic error relates to the **Estimate** phase of AFEM. In particular, we observe that the combined application of the **Estimate-Mark** steps of AFEM is largely insensitive to substantial algebraic errors in low frequencies, justifying the formalisation of a new Smoothed Adaptive Finite Element.
algorithm (S-AFEM), where the exact algebraic solution in intermediate steps is replaced by the application of a prolongation step (Prolongate), followed by a fixed number of smoothing steps (Smooth):

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

\[
\text{Smooth} \quad \text{Prolongate}
\]

The first and last steps of the S-AFEM algorithm coincide with the classical AFEM. In intermediate steps, however, the solution is far from the exact algebraic solution. We show that the a-posteriori error estimator applied to this approximation triggers a Mark step that provides a refinement pattern that is substantially equivalent to the one that would be generated by a classical Solve step, at a considerable fraction of the computational cost. For three dimensional problems, the speedup in the intermediate steps is in the hundreds, and even if the final grid is not exactly identical to the one that would be obtained with the classical AFEM, the accuracy of the final solutions are comparable.

We start by introducing a general multilevel framework applied to a simple model problem in Section 2. Its algebraic properties are analysed in detail in Section 3, while Section 4 is dedicated to the connection between the algebraic error and the a posteriori error estimates. Section 5 provides a detailed description of the S-AFEM algorithm, while Sections 6 and 7 present some numerical examples that show the efficiency and the computational speedup of S-AFEM, and provide some conclusions.

2. Multilevel framework

In this section we describe the model problem and discuss its algebraic resolution in a multilevel framework. We introduce the smoothed-multilevel methods and we motivate the reason behind the use of smoothing iterations applied to the prolongation of the approximation previous levels.

2.1. Model Problem

As a model problem, we consider the Poisson’s equation with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) \( (d = 1, 2, 3) \) be a bounded, polygonal domain (an open and connected set with polygonal boundary) with Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces \( L^2(\Omega) \) and \( H^1_0(\Omega) \). We look for the solution \( u \in H^1_0(\Omega) \) s.t.

\[-\Delta u = f \text{ in } \Omega \text{ and } u = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma := \partial \Omega, \quad (2)\]

where \( f \in L^2(\Omega) \) is a given source term. We use the standard notation for norms and scalar products in Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces (cf. [11]): for \( u \in H^1_0(\Omega) \) and
\[ \omega \subset \Omega, \text{ we write } |u|_{1,\omega} := (\int_\omega |\nabla u|^2)^{1/2} \text{ and denote by } (\cdot, \cdot)_\omega \text{ the } L^2(\omega)-\text{ scalar product with corresponding norm } \| \cdot \|_\omega. \text{ For } \omega = \Omega, \text{ we omit the corresponding subscripts. The weak form of } (2) \text{ is to find } u \in H^1_0(\Omega) \text{ s.t.} \]

\[ (\nabla u, \nabla v) = (f, v) \forall v \in H^1_0(\Omega). \]  

(3)

We consider a shape regular family of triangulations \( \mathcal{T}_h \) of \( \Omega \) in the sense of Ciarlet [26], depending on a parameter \( h > 0 \) with shape regularity parameter \( C_{T_h} \). We will consider triangulations consisting of triangles or convex quadrilaterals in two dimensions, and tetrahedrons or convex hexahedrons in three dimensions; we denote them by \( T \) and we generically call them cells.

We denote by \( z \) the nodes of \( \mathcal{T}_h \) (i.e. the vertices of the cells) and by \( N_h \) the set of all nodes, while \( N_{h,\text{int}} := N_h \setminus \Gamma \) denotes the set of the free nodes. The set of all edges/faces \( E \) of the cells is denoted by \( E_h \) and similarly, \( E_{h,\text{int}} := E_h \setminus \Gamma \) is the set of internal edges/faces. Let \( \varphi_z \) be the nodal basis function associated to a node \( z \in N_h \) with support \( \omega_z \), which is equal to the patch \( \omega_z = \bigcup\{T \in \mathcal{T} | z \in T\} \).

We use the Courant finite element space \( V_h := \text{span}\{\varphi_z | z \in N_{h,\text{int}}\} \subset H^1_0(\Omega) \).

The discrete approximation \( u_h \in V_h \) is called a Galerkin solution and it is defined by the discrete system

\[ (\nabla u_h, \nabla v_h) = (f, v_h) \forall v_h \in V_h. \]  

(4)

In exact arithmetic, the discretization error \( e_h := u - u_h \) satisfies the standard orthogonality condition

\[ (\nabla (u - u_h), \nabla v_h) = 0 \forall v_h \in V_h. \]  

(5)

Equation (5) is the basic relation under which classical a posteriori error bounds for the discretization error are derived (cf. Section 4).

We consider a nested sequence of shape regular triangulations \( \mathcal{T}_k \) for \( k = 1, \ldots, \bar{k} \), which induces a nested sequence of finite element spaces

\[ V_1 \subset V_2 \subset \cdots \subset V_k \subset H^1_0(\Omega). \]  

(6)

Typical examples are the ones generated during global and local mesh-refinement techniques, starting from a given (coarse) uniform triangulation \( \mathcal{T}_1 \).

Remark 2.0.1. Relation (6) does not hold true for all adaptive refinements. In particular, refinement procedures involving red-green refinements do not satisfy this. In this work we use a code based on the open source library deal.II, that handles local refinement through hanging nodes (see [9]), and this condition is always satisfied if no de-refinement is applied. This will be the case for the numerical tests described in Section 4.

We let \( N_k := z V_k \), for \( k = 1, \ldots, \bar{k} \). By construction, the inequalities \( N_1 < N_2 < \cdots < N_k \) hold true. The associated discrete systems read for each level \( k = 1, 2, \ldots, \bar{k} \)

\[ (\nabla u_k, \nabla v_k) = (f, v_k) \forall v_k \in V_k. \]  

(7)

In the next subsection, we analyse the algebraic resolution of (7).
2.2. Algebraic resolution and smoothing iterations

Let $N = \sharp V_k$, then the discrete system (8) leads to a linear algebraic system of type

$$Au = f \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

(8)

where $A$ denotes the symmetric positive definite (SPD) stiffness matrix with entries $a_{ij} := (\nabla \phi_j, \nabla \phi_i) \forall i, j = 1, \ldots, N$. $u = [u_1, \ldots, u_N]^T$ denotes the coefficients vector in $\mathbb{R}^N$ of the discrete approximation $u_h = \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_j \phi_j \in V_h$ and $f = [f_1, \ldots, f_N]^T$ is the vector with entries $f_j = (f, \phi_j) \forall j = 1, \ldots, N$.

Likewise, the discrete approximation of system (7) generates linear systems of type $A_k u_k = f_k$ of respective dimensions $N_k = \sharp V_k$.

Let $\{w_j\}_{j=1}^N$ denote the eigenvectors of $A$, which by the Spectral Theorem form an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^N$ [38], and let $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_N$ denote the corresponding eigenvalues, ordered non-decreasingly. Eigenvectors corresponding to higher eigenvalues are increasingly oscillatory, i.e., their $A-$ norm is larger. This follows trivially from the fact that $\lambda_i = \|w_i\|^2_A/\|w_i\|_2^2 = \|w_i\|^2_A$.

Definition 2.1. (Smoother vector) Consider two generic vectors $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^N$, which can be uniquely decomposed as $a = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i w_i$ and $b = \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i w_i$. We say that $b$ is smoother than $a$ if $\|b\| \leq \|a\|$ for a suitable norm $\|\cdot\|$, and its components along the most oscillatory eigenvectors are smaller. By convention we define as “oscillatory” the components from $N/2$ onwards. Then $b$ is smoother than $a$ if $b_i \leq a_i$ for $i \in (N/2, N]$.

Definition 2.2. (Smoothing Iteration) Given an initial guess $u^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, consider the classical linear iteration for the resolution of (8) of the form

$$u^{(i+1)} = u^{(i)} + R(f - Au^{(i)}) \text{ for } i = 0, 1, \ldots,$$

(9)

with some nonsingular matrix $R$. Let $u$ denote the exact solution of (8), we denote by $e^{(i)} := u - u^{(i)}$ the error after $i$ iterations. We say that $e^{(i)}$ is a smoothing iteration if $(I - RA)e^{(i)}$ is smoother than $e^{(i)}$ for any $i$.

The matrix $I - RA$ is called the iteration matrix and it is generally denoted by $M := I - RA$. From (9) it is immediate that

$$e^{(i+1)} = e^{(i)} - R(f - Au^{(i)}) = e^{(i)} - RAe^{(i)} = Me^{(i)} = \ldots = M^{i+1}e^{(0)}.$$

(10)

Definition 2.2 and equation (10) imply that for smoothing iterations, the iteration matrix $M$ has a “smoothing” effect on the error, by dumping the highly oscillatory components of the error. For simplicity of exposition, in this work we only use Richardson iteration as a smoothing iteration, but other choices are possible, see, for example, the review in [35, 32, 10].

Definition 2.3. (Richardson Iteration) Given a fixed parameter $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and an initial guess $u^{(0)}$, Richardson iteration for the resolution of (8) takes the form:

$$u^{(i+1)} = u^{(i)} + \omega(f - Au^{(i)}) \text{ for } i = 0, 1, \ldots$$

(11)
Richardson iteration can also be written as

\[ u^{(i+1)} = (I - \omega A)u^{(i)} + \omega f \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1, \ldots \]  

(12)

**Remark 2.3.1.** Richardson iteration (11) is of type (9) where the matrix \( R \) is given by \( \omega I \). The optimal choice for the parameter \( \omega \) is \( \omega = 1/\gamma \), where \( \gamma \) is a damping parameter of the same order as the spectral radius of \( A \)

\[ \rho(A) := \max\{\lambda_i | 1 \leq i \leq N\}. \]  

(13)

In practical situations, \( \gamma = \rho(A) \) or \( \gamma \geq \rho(A) \) [33, 47].

**Remark 2.3.2.** Richardson iteration (11) is a smoothing iteration. Consider the errors after respectively \( i \) and \( i + 1 \) Richardson iterations

\[ e^{(i)} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j^{(i)} w_j \quad \text{and} \quad e^{(i+1)} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j^{(i+1)} w_j \]  

(14)

for some coefficients \( \{c_j^{(i)}\}_{j=1}^{N} \) and \( \{c_j^{(i+1)}\}_{j=1}^{N} \). Observe that by construction, \( M \) and \( A \) share the same eigenvectors \( \{w_j\}_{i=1}^{N} \), and we can easily derive from the error propagation formula (10) that

\[ c_j^{(i+1)} = \theta_j c_j^{(i)} \quad \forall j = 1, \ldots, N, \]  

(15)

where \( \theta_j := 1 - \lambda_j/\gamma \) is the \( j \)-th eigenvalue of the iteration matrix \( M \), and it represents the reduction factor associated to the error component in the direction of \( w_j \). Notice that the definition of \( \theta_j \) is independent on the iteration step \( i \). For the practical choice \( \gamma = 1/\rho(A) \),

\[ \theta_1 = 1 - \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_N} \approx 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_N = 1 - \frac{\lambda_N}{\lambda_N} = 0. \]  

(16)

This implies that after a single Richardson iteration

\[ c_1^{(i+1)} = \theta_1 c_1^{(i+1)} \approx c_1^{(i+1)} \quad \text{and} \quad c_N^{(i+1)} = \theta_N c_N^{(i)} = 0, \]  

(17)

i.e. the slowest converging component corresponds to the smallest eigenvalue \( \lambda_1 \), while the fastest converging component corresponds to the largest eigenvalue \( \lambda_N \).

In general, the reduction factor for Richardson iteration is “close to zero” the biggest the eigenvalue is and “close to one” the smallest the eigenvalue is. After a single Richardson iteration, the high oscillatory components will have been strongly reduced.

Figure 1 shows in a practical example the number of required iterations to bring the error in each component below \( 10^{-8} \) for a one-dimensional model problem with 161 uniformly distributed degrees of freedom, showing how higher frequencies require a smaller number of iterations.
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This characteristic of Richardson iteration makes it a good smoother candidate for many multilevel algorithms, where one solves exactly on a coarse grid (reaching convergence in all components), and then performs a sequence of prolongations followed by a fixed number of smoothing steps, to improve convergence in the finer grids, under the assumptions that lower frequencies have already been taken care of in the previous levels.

This is achieved by considering the canonical embedding $i^{k+1}_k : V_k \hookrightarrow V_{k+1}$ that embeds functions $u_k \in V_k$ in the space $V_{k+1}$. We denote by $I^{k+1}_k : \mathbb{R}^{N_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_{k+1}}$ the corresponding discrete linear operator. Notice that its matrix representation won’t be the identity matrix, since we’re using different basis functions in $V_k$ and in $V_{k+1}$. As an example, consider linear finite element functions. These are uniquely determined by their values in the nodes. For nodes that exist both in $\mathcal{T}_k$ and $\mathcal{T}_{k+1}$, the value at those nodes can be determined in $\mathcal{T}_k$ and it remains the same. For the nodes in $\mathcal{T}_{k+1}$ that are not in $\mathcal{T}_k$, their values are determined by linear interpolation. We will refer to multilevel algorithms that adopt the above procedure of resolution as smoothed-multilevel methods.

2.3. Smoothed-multilevel methods

In order to understand the principle behind many multi-level algorithms, and behind our S-AFEM algorithm, it is useful to consider a simple one-dimensional problem. Consider the model problem (2) with constant function $f = 1$ on the right-hand side. We solve (without preconditioner) using either the CG method or Richardson iterations, on a sequence of uniformly refined grids.
We set a stopping tolerance of $10^{-6}$, and fix a maximum number of iterations to 1,000,000. Moving from one level to the next, the mesh is globally refined, doubling the number of cells of the grids.

Tables 1 and 2 show a comparison between the number of iterations required to reach convergence when we apply the two iterative methods with the initial guess set to zero, or to the prolongation of the solution from the previous cycle.

Surprisingly, the CG method does not seem to gain any advantage from the prolongation step. On the other hand, Richardson iteration shows a dramatic decrease in the number of required iterations when we use the prolongation of the previous solution as initial guess for the iterative procedure.

After the first few levels, Richardson iteration becomes even faster than CG, thanks to its spectral behaviour. The convergence on the coarsest levels captures the less oscillatory part of the solution. Their prolongation allows the iterative solver to start from an already good approximation of the solution in its low frequency part. Intuitively, the prolongation operation substantially leaves unaltered the low frequencies of the previous mesh. By applying smoothing iterations, we’re converging towards the solution in the highest frequencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>DoF</th>
<th>Iterations CG</th>
<th>Iterations CGProl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2561</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>1280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Comparison of the number of iterations between CG without prolongation and CG with prolongation with stopping tolerance of $10^{-6}$ and maximum number of iterations 1,000,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>DoF</th>
<th>Iterations Richardson</th>
<th>Iterations RichardsonProl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5523</td>
<td>1333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20321</td>
<td>1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>74115</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>267713</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>955805</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2561</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Comparison of the number of iterations between Richardson and Richardson with prolongation with stopping tolerance of $10^{-6}$ and maximum number of iterations 1,000,000.

The CG method, on the other hand, is a projection method of Krylov subspace type. The main idea of the projection process in general is to find an approximate solution of system (8), where the dimension $N$ is possibly very
large, by solving at each step a system of much smaller dimensionality, which is obtained by projecting the original system \( \mathbf{F} \) onto a suitable subspace of \( \mathbb{R}^N \) [39]. Specifically, the approximate solution at iterative step \( m \) is searched in \( x_0 + \mathcal{K}_m(r_0, A) \), where \( x_0 \) is a given initial guess and \( \mathcal{K}_m(r_0, A) \subset \mathbb{R}^N \) is the search space given by the Krylov subspace of dimension \( m \ll N \) generated by \( A \) and \( r_0 \) and defined as

\[
\mathcal{K}_m(r_0, A) := \text{span}\{r_0, Ar_0, A^2r_0, \ldots, A^{m-1}r_0\},
\]

(18)

where \( r_0 := \mathbf{f} - Ax_0 \) is the initial residual. Krylov subspaces form a nested sequence of subspaces.

Definition (18) implies that the error at step \( n \) can be written as

\[
e_n = p_n(A)e_0,
\]

(19)

where \( p_n \in \mathbb{P}_n^{(0,1)} := \{p \in \mathbb{P}_n, \text{ s.t. } p(0) = 1\} \).

In particular, the optimality property of CG (cf. eg. [39]) implies that

\[
\|e_n\|_A^2 = \min_{p \in \mathbb{P}_n^{(0,1)}} \|p(A)e_0\|_A^2.
\]

(20)

In each iteration, the conjugate gradient method improves the convergence in all error components relying on the optimality property (20), instead of capturing only the high oscillatory ones. A particular characteristic is that they save all information along the way, i.e., they use at any given iteration the information computed in all previous iterations.

On the other hand, by their nature, smoothing iterations combine aspects of the underlying PDE and the corresponding finite element discretisation. Despite being far less competitive as solvers for large systems in general, smoothing iterations turn out to be very useful in our context, similarly to what happens in multigrid methods: they use the spectral decomposition of \( M \) and exploit the strong relation between eigenfunctions of the iteration matrix \( M \) and the underlying mesh in order to take advantage of coarser meshes.

3. Algebraic Error Analysis

In this section we analyse the algebraic error propagation in smoothed-multilevel methods. We first provide a one step error propagation recursive formula, and afterwards we provide a compact error propagation formula after introducing the Frequency-Coupling and Smoothing (FCS) Matrices. Finally, we provide the algebraic error analysis under the assumption that the prolongation operator preserves low frequencies from the previous level.

3.1. Error propagation

**Theorem 3.1 (Error propagation).** Let \( e_k^{(l)} \) and \( e_{k+1}^{(l)} \) denote the algebraic errors after \( l \) smoothing iterations respectively at step \( k \) and \( k + 1 \), for \( k = 1, \ldots, k - 1 \). Let

\[
a_{k+1} := u_{k+1} - I_{k+1}^{k+1}u_k \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{k+1}}
\]

(21)
denote the difference between the exact algebraic solution $u_{k+1}$ at level $k+1$ and the prolongation of the exact algebraic solution $u_k$ from the previous level $k$ to the current level $k+1$, for $k = 1, \ldots, \bar{k}-1$. Notice that the vector $a_1$ is not defined, so that definition (21) starts from the vector $a_2$. Then, the following error propagation recursive formula holds true

$$e^{(l)}_{k+1} = M_{k+1}^l (a_{k+1} + I_{k}^{k+1} e^{(l)}_{k}), \quad \text{for } k = 1, \ldots, \bar{k} - 1. \tag{22}$$

Proof. Let $e_1 = u_1 - u_1^c$ be the error after the first cycle $k = 1$, where $u_1^c$ is the numerical computed approximation. After prolongating $u_1^c$ to the next level $k = 2$, there is an initial error

$$e^{(0)}_2 = u_2 - I_1^2 u_1^c = u_2 - I_1^2 u_1 + I_1^2 e_1 = a_2 + I_1^2 e_1. \tag{23}$$

After $l$ smoothing iterations there is a smoothed approximation $u_2^{(l)}$ produced and the final error is given by

$$e^{(l)}_2 = M_2^l e_2^{(0)} = M_2^l a_2 + M_2^l I_1^2 e_1. \tag{24}$$

Let now $k = 2, 3, \ldots, \bar{k} - 1$ be generic. We prolongate the smoothed approximation $u_k^{(l)} = u_k - e_k^{(l)}$ from step $k$ to obtain the initial guess for step $k + 1$

$$u_{k+1}^{(0)} = I_{k}^{k+1} u_k^{(l)} = I_{k}^{k+1} u_k - I_{k}^{k+1} e_k^{(l)}, \tag{25}$$

which produces the initial error

$$e_{k+1}^{(0)} = u_{k+1} - u_{k+1}^{(0)} = u_{k+1} - I_{k}^{k+1} u_k + I_{k}^{k+1} e_k^{(l)} = a_{k+1} + I_{k}^{k+1} e_k^{(l)}. \tag{26}$$

After $l$ smoothing iterations the final error at step $k + 1$ is

$$e_{k+1}^{(l)} = M_{k+1}^l e_{k+1}^{(0)} = M_{k+1}^l (a_{k+1} + I_{k}^{k+1} e_k^{(l)}), \tag{27}$$

which proves the recursive formula.\[\square\]
Observation 3.2. If we repetitively apply the one-step error propagation equation \([27]\), we get a recursion of the type

\[
e_{k+1}^{(l)} = M_{k+1}^{l} (a_{k+1} + I_{k+1}^{l} e_k^{(l)})
= M_{k+1}^{l} (a_{k+1} + I_{k+1}^{l} (M_{k}^{l} (a_{k} + I_{k-1}^{l} e_{k-1}^{(l)})))
\]

\[
= M_{k+1}^{l} (a_{k+1} + I_{k+1}^{l} M_{k}^{l} (a_{k} + I_{k-1}^{l} M_{k-1}^{l} (a_{k-1} + \ldots))).
\]  

(28)

By applying all the multiplications extensively we get the following extended error propagation formula for Smoothed-Multilevel Methods

\[
e_{k+1}^{(l)} = M_{k+1}^{l} a_{k+1} + M_{k+1}^{l} I_{k+1}^{l} M_{k}^{l} a_{k} + M_{k+1}^{l} I_{k+1}^{l} M_{k}^{l} I_{k-1}^{l} M_{k-1}^{l} a_{k-1} + \ldots
\]

\[
+ M_{k+1}^{l} I_{k+1}^{l} M_{k}^{l} I_{k-1}^{l} M_{k-1}^{l} \ldots M_{3}^{l} I_{2}^{l} M_{2}^{l} a_{2}
+ M_{k+1}^{l} I_{k+1}^{l} M_{k}^{l} I_{k-1}^{l} M_{k-1}^{l} \ldots M_{3}^{l} I_{2}^{l} M_{2}^{l} I_{1}^{l} e_{1}.
\]  

(29)

Observation 3.3. If we let

\[
a := a_{k+1} + I_{k+1}^{l} M_{k}^{l} a_{k} + I_{k+1}^{l} M_{k}^{l} \ldots I_{k-1}^{l} M_{k-1}^{l} a_{k-1}
\]

\[
\ldots + I_{k+1}^{l} M_{k}^{l} I_{k-1}^{l} M_{k-1}^{l} \ldots M_{3}^{l} I_{2}^{l} M_{2}^{l} I_{1}^{l} e_{1},
\]  

(30)

then equation \([29]\) becomes

\[
e_{k+1}^{(l)} = M_{k+1}^{l} a,
\]  

(31)

which means that the algebraic error at any step \(k + 1\) is the result of \(l\) smoothing iterations applied to the vector \(a\) that defines the error accumulated from prolongating the contribution of the algebraic errors coming from all previous steps.

Definition 3.4 (Frequency-Coupling and Smoothing (FCS) Matrices). Define the frequency-coupling and smoothing (FCS) matrix

\[
B_{j+1,j} := I_{j+1}^{l} M_{j}^{l} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{j+1} \times N_{j}} \text{ for } j = 2, \ldots, k
\]  

(32)

and the frequency-coupling and smoothing product (FCSP)

\[
B_{k+1,i} := B_{k+1,k} \ldots B_{i+1,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{k+1} \times N_{i}} \text{ for } i = 2, \ldots, k.
\]  

(33)

Theorem 3.5 (Error propagation formula for Smoothed-Multilevel Methods). The algebraic error in Smoothed-Multilevel Methods satisfies the following error propagation formula for any step \(k\), for \(k = 2, \ldots, k - 1\)

\[
e_{k+1}^{(l)} = M_{k+1}^{l} \left( a_{k+1} + \sum_{j=2}^{k} B_{k+1,j} a_{j} + B_{k+1,2} I_{1}^{l} e_{1} \right),
\]  

(34)

where the vectors \(a_{j}\) are defined by \([21]\).
Proof. The proof is a trivial consequence of substituting Definition 3.4 in the extended error propagation formula (29), which gives
\[ e^{(l)}_{k+1} = M_{k+1}^l (a_{k+1} + B_{k+1,k} a_k + \ldots + B_{k+1,k} B_{k,k-1} \ldots B_{3,2} a_2 + B_{k+1,k} B_{k,k-1} \ldots B_{3,2} I_2^2 e_1) \]

(35)

Next, we define the frequency cutoff projection operators, which are a useful tool to analyze the structure of the FCS matrix \(B_{j+1,j}\). In Theorem 3.7 we provide a decomposition of the FCS matrix in the product of the prolongation matrix \(I_{j+1,j}\) with the low frequency cutoff projection operator and another matrix, which has a contraction effect on the norms of the vectors.

**Definition 3.6 (Frequency cutoff operators).** We define the projection operator \(L_j : \mathbb{R}^{N_j} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_j}\), such that \(v \mapsto L_j v := \sum_{i=1}^{N_j/2} v_i w_i(j)\) and the projection operator \(H_j : \mathbb{R}^{N_j} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_j}\), such that \(v \mapsto H_j v := \sum_{i=N_j/2+1}^{N_j} v_i w_i(j)\).

In particular,
\[ L_j \oplus H_j = I_{j+1,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \|v\|^2 = \|L_j v\|^2 + \|H_j v\|^2 \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^{N_j} \]

(36)

**Theorem 3.7 (Structure of the FCS matrix).** Let \(j = 2, \ldots, k\) be fixed.

The FCS matrix can be decomposed as
\[ B_{j+1,j} = I_{j+1,j} L_j + C_j, \]

(37)

where the matrix \(C_j \in \mathbb{R}^{N_j+1 \times N_j}\) is defined as
\[ C_j := I_{j+1,j} ((M_j^l - I_{N_j}) L_j + M_j^l H_j) \]

and it is such that
\[ \|C_j v\| \leq c \|v\|, \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^{N_j}, \quad \text{where} \quad c < 1. \]

(39)

Proof. We apply definition (32) of the FCS matrix and relation (36) and we get
\[ B_{j+1,j} = I_{j+1,j} M_j^l \]
\[ = I_{j+1,j} M_j^l L_j + I_{j+1,j} M_j^l H_j \]
\[ = I_{j+1,j} L_j + (I_{j+1,j} M_j^l L_j - I_{j+1,j} L_j + I_{j+1,j} M_j^l H_j) \]
\[ = I_{j+1,j} L_j + C_j, \]

(40)

where \(C_j := I_{j+1,j} ((M_j^l - I_{N_j}) L_j + M_j^l H_j)\).
Next, in order to prove (39), consider \( \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_j} \) and estimate
\[
\| C_j \mathbf{v} \|^2 = \| I_j^{l+1} ((M_j^l - I_d N_j) L_j + M_j^l H_j) \mathbf{v} \|^2 \\
= \| ((M_j^l - I_d N_j) L_j + M_j^l H_j) \mathbf{v} \|^2 \\
\leq (\| (M_j^l - I_d N_j) L_j \mathbf{v} \| + \| M_j^l H_j \mathbf{v} \|)^2 \\
\leq 2(\| (M_j^l - I_d N_j) L_j \mathbf{v} \|^2 + \| M_j^l H_j \mathbf{v} \|^2),
\]
where we’ve applied the triangle inequality and the discrete Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

Consider the first term in the rhs
\[
\| (M_j^l - I_d N_j) L_j \mathbf{v} \|^2 = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{N_j/2} \left( (\theta_i^{(j)})^l - 1 \right) v_i^j \right\|^2 \\
= \sum_{i=1}^{N_j/2} \left( (\theta_i^{(j)})^l - 1 \right)^2 v_i^2 \\
\leq \left( (\theta_i^{(N_j/2)})^l - 1 \right)^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N_j/2} v_i^2 \\
= \left( (\theta_i^{(N_j/2)})^l - 1 \right)^2 \| L_j \mathbf{v} \|^2.
\]
Likewise,
\[
\| M_j^l H_j \mathbf{v} \|^2 = \left\| \sum_{i=N_j/2+1}^{N_j} (\theta_i^{(j)})^l v_i^j \right\|^2 \\
= \sum_{i=N_j/2+1}^{N_j} (\theta_i^{(j)})^{2l} v_i^2 \\
\leq (\theta_i^{(N_j/2+1)})^{2l} \sum_{i=N_j/2+1}^{N_j} v_i^2 \\
= (\theta_i^{(N_j/2+1)})^{2l} \| H_j \mathbf{v} \|^2.
\]
We let \( c := 2 \max \left\{ \left( (\theta_i^{(j)})^l - 1 \right)^2, (\theta_i^{(N_j/2)})^{2l} \right\} < 1 \), we substitute it into (41), and we get estimate (39).

3.2. Non-interacting Frequency Coupling Hypothesis
In order to give a qualitative interpretation to the error propagation formulat, we consider the following (reasonable) assumption: [3.8]
Assumption 3.8 (Non-interacting Frequency Coupling Hypothesis for Smoothed-Multilevel Methods). We assume that
\[ L_j I_{j-1}^j L_{j-1} = I_{j-1}^j L_{j-1}, \forall j = 1, \ldots, k, \]  
(44)
i.e. the prolongation operator preserves low frequencies from the previous level.

Finally, we propose the main result of the section, which is given in Theorem 3.9 where we derive the propagation formula for the algebraic error under hypothesis (44). For the proof, we take advantage of decomposition (37) of the FCS matrix to obtain a decomposition for the FCS (33) and we substitute the results to Theorem 3.5.

Theorem 3.9 (Error propagation formula for smoothed-multilevel methods under the Non-interacting Frequency Coupling Assumption). The algebraic error in smoothed-multilevel methods satisfies the following error propagation formula for any step \( k \), for \( k = 2, \ldots, \bar{k} - 1 \)
\[
e^{(l)}_{k+1} = M_{k+1} l \left( a_{k+1} + \sum_{j=2}^{k} I_{j}^{k+1} L_j a_j + I_2^{k+1} L_2 I_1^2 e_1 + \right.
\left. \sum_{j=2}^{k} D_{k+1,j} a_j + D_{k+1,2} I_1^2 e_1 \right),
\]  
(45)
where the matrix \( D_{k,m} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_k \times N_m} \) is such that \( \|D_{k,m}v\| \leq c\|v\|, \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^{N_m} \), where \( c < 1 \), the matrix \( I_m := I_{k-1}^k \ldots I_{m+1}^k \), \( \forall k > m + 1 \) and the vectors \( a_j \) are defined by (21), i.e., \( a_j := u_j - I_{j-1}^j u_{j-1} \).

Proof. Observing that
\[
B_{k,m} = B_{k,k-1}B_{k-1,m}, \quad \forall k > m + 1,
\]  
(46)
we can recursively apply the decomposition of \( B_{k,k-1} \), and, using assumption (44) we conclude that
\[
B_{k,m} = I_m I_m + D_{k,m},
\]  
(47)
where the matrix \( D_{k,m} \) is in \( \mathbb{R}^{N_k \times N_m} \), and contains all the mixed products. In particular, in every one of these products, there will always be at least one of the matrices \( C_j \) for some \( j \), that is,
\[
\|D_{k,m}v\| \leq c\|v\|, \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^{N_m},
\]  
(48)
where \( c < 1 \). We conclude by substituting decomposition (47) to the error propagation formula (34) in Theorem 3.5.

Remark 3.9.1. Theorem 3.9 quantifies the algebraic error that is accumulated after \( k+1 \) cycles in smoothed-multilevel methods, under the assumption that low frequencies are preserved by the prolongation operator. The smoothing matrix
at cycle $k + 1$ is responsible for dumping the most oscillatory part of this error. There is a contribution given by the accumulation of all low frequency-parts of the errors of all previous cycles (c.f. second and third term in the summation in the rhs of (45)), which is expected to be “small”, since low frequencies of the exact algebraic solution at a mesh are close to the low frequencies of the exact algebraic solution at the successive mesh. Finally there is a last type of contribution, which is given by mixed products (cf. fourth and fifth term in the summation in the rhs of (45)), which is also “small” due to $c < 1$.

Notice that Assumption 3.8 is only useful to distinguish between high and low frequency parts in the error propagation formula, but it is not essential for its proof, given in Theorem 3.5. The assumption is useful to identify qualitatively how the error propagates between successive refinement levels, and can be interpreted as a condition on the distribution of the degrees of freedoms between grids on different levels. In particular, it implies that all low eigenfunctions of the space $V_{j-1}$, in particular those corresponding to the first $N_{j-1}/2$ eigenvalues, can be represented exactly by low frequencies of $V_j$, i.e., they should be representable as linear combinations of the first $N_j/2$ eigenfunctions of $V_j$.

In general, it is not trivial to verify this assumption for practical applications. In fact, for finite element methods of elliptic equations with variable coefficients based on general triangulations, the eigenvalue and eigenvectors of the stiffness matrix is not easy to find out. Indeed it is even harder than solving the linear algebraic equation (cf. eg., the many references [55], [17], [34], [16]). However, it is safe to state that local refinement in finite element simulations introduces more frequencies in the higher part of the spectrum, perturbing only slightly the lowest part of the spectrum.

Assumption 3.8 may also be satisfied only approximately. In this case, Theorem 3.5 should be modified to take this into account. The main statement would still remain valid, but we would also have higher order error terms appearing in the error propagation formula (45), due to the inexactness of the low frequency prolongations. Figure 3.2 provides an example of grid refinement that may be troublesome for the above hypothesis: when passing from the left grid to the right one, we are introducing some low-frequency terms (in the middle left side of the mesh), that may invalidate the assumption. Notice that, from the practical point of view, the assumption is verified for most refinements that do not add too many degrees of freedom between refinement levels.

When this occurs, it may be necessary to use higher frequencies to describe the low modes of the previous grid, but these high frequencies would be damped very quickly by the smoothing steps nonetheless, thanks to the presence of the matrix $M_{k+1}$ in front of the propagation formula (45).

4. A posteriori Error Analysis

In this section we first provide an insight into classical a posteriori error estimation theory. Our focus is on residual-based a posteriori error estimators,
which were historically defined and derived in terms of the discrete approximation $u_h$. We introduce them in Subsection 4.1. The need for accounting for inexact algebraic approximations is discussed in Subsection 4.2, where we describe the main issues that a posteriori error analysis accounting for the algebraic error has to deal with. Our contribution in this analysis is in proving an bound on the estimator for a generic function in terms of the estimator for $u_h$ and the corresponding algebraic error in Subsection 4.3.

### 4.1. Classical a Posteriori Error Estimates and Analysis

Classical a posteriori error estimation theory has been focused on measuring a suitable norm of the discretization error $e_h$ by providing upper and lower bounds in terms of a posteriori error estimators.

By definition, “regarded as an approximation to an (unknown) suitable norm of the discretization error $\|e_h\|$, a (computable) quantity $\eta(u_h)$ is called a posteriori error estimator if it is a function of the known domain $\Omega$, its boundary $\Gamma$, the right-hand side $f$ as well as of the discrete solution $u_h$, or the underlying triangulation” [19].

There are two main requirements that an a posteriori error estimator $\eta(u_h)$ should satisfy, a part from being easy and cheap to compute: it has to be reliable in the sense of an upper bound

$$\|e_h\| \leq C_{rel}\eta(u_h) + h.o.t._{rel} \quad (49)$$

and efficient in the sense of a lower bound

$$\eta(u_h) \leq C_{eff}\|e_h\| + h.o.t._{eff}. \quad (50)$$

The multiplicative constants $C_{rel}$ and $C_{eff}$ are independent on the mesh size and h.o.t. denote oscillations of the right-hand side $f$, which in generic cases are of magnitudes smaller than $\|e_h\|$.
In adaptive mesh-refining procedures, a posteriori error estimators are used in the module $\texttt{Estimate}$ of Algorithm 1.1. In particular, reliability (49) assures enough refinement, while efficiency (50) prevents too much refinement.

Standard residual-based a posteriori error estimators are the most widely used for adaptive techniques. They were first introduced in the context of FEM by Babuška and Rheinboldt in [6] and they have been thereafter widely studied in the literature; we refer, e.g., to the books by Verfürth [54] and by Ainsworth and Oden [2].

Their derivations is based on the residual functional associated to the Galerkin solution, which is defined as $R\{u_h\} : H^1_0(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $R\{u_h\} := (f, \cdot) - a(u_h, \cdot)$ with corresponding dual norm $\|R\{u_h\}\|_* := \sup_{v \in H^1_0(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{R\{u_h\}(v)}{|v|_1}$.

The identity $|e_h|_1 = \|R\{u_h\}\|_*$ leads to reliable and efficient residual-based a posteriori bounds for the discretization error via estimation of the residual function. The main tool exploited in the derivation is the Galerkin orthogonality (5), which fails to be satisfied when algebraic errors are present.

4.2. A posteriori analysis with algebraic Error

When solving real-world practical applications, the main difficulty one has to face is that exact (or even near-to-exact) solutions of the algebraic problem associated to finite element problems cannot be computed. The approximation $u^c_h$ that one obtains in a computer, does not satisfy the Galerkin property (5).

The total error can be written as the sum of two contributions

$$u - u^c_h = (u - u_h) + (u_h - u^c_h).$$

The algebraic error may have a significant effect on the computed approximation, and the solution of the algebraic problem has to be considered an indivisible part of the overall solution process [46].

This issue is reflected in adaptive mesh-refining procedures. The common practice in computational sciences and engineering community has been to replace $u_h$ by $u^c_h$ in the expression of the error estimator $\eta$ during the module $\texttt{Estimate}$. This procedure leads to the urgent challenges that the derivation and application of the a posteriori error estimates should resolve

1. The derivation and the construction of the a posteriori estimator should be done on the available inexact approximation $u^c_h$.
2. The estimation of the total error $u - u^c_h$ should incorporate the algebraic error $u_h - u^c_h$.

The classical realiability and efficiency bounds (49) and (50) have to be consequently revised and extended to take into account the above points.
A vast literature proposes the use of standard residual-based a posteriori error estimator on the discretisation error as a basic building block and extends it, using various heuristics arguments, to incorporate the algebraic error. We refer to the seminal and investigative paper by Papež and Strakoš [45] and the references therein for various approaches.

Residual-based a posteriori error estimates for the total error for the model problem have been published in [13], [4] and [45].

In [45], the authors give the detailed proof of the residual-based upper bound on the energy norm of the total error

\[ |u - v_h|^2 \leq 2C^2(J^2(v_h) + osc^2) + 2C_{int}^2|u_h - v_h|^2, \]  

for \( v_h \in V_h \), with the positive multiplicative factors \( C \) and \( C_{int} \) that are independent of \( u, u_h \) and \( h \), but depend on the shape regularity of the triangulation. The term accounting for the algebraic error is scaled by a multiplicative factor \( C_{int} \) that was introduced in [23]. It represents however a worst case scenario that can lead to an overestimation and it is in general not easy to estimate.

As one of the main still unresolved challenges, the authors point out that a tight upper bound of \( |u_h - u_c|^1 \) is not available yet. The use of finite precision arithmetic and the neglect of roundoff errors may therefore lead to inaccurate and unrealistic estimates.

Last but not least, the authors emphasize that since a lot of methodological difficulties are there already for a simple model problem such as the Poisson problem, it is not clear whether the extension of the estimator to incorporate the algebraic error for more complicated model problems could lead to further complications.

The above discussed issues make the application of the residual-based error estimator for the mesh refinement adaptivity in presence of algebraic errors an open problem, as claimed in [45]. Moreover, when considering h-adaptive algorithms, another difficulty is added: in the bound the algebraic error is estimated globally and its local contributions cannot guarantee an indication of the spatial distribution of the discretization error over the domain (cf. [39] and [44]). In this regard, there have been recently developed flux reconstruction methodologies that introduce robust stopping critera and balance the algebraic and discretization error; we adress to the work [46] and to the references therein for a more elaborated insight on the topic.

4.3. An upper bound on the Error Estimator applied to generic functions

We recall standard upper bounds on the discretization error and lower bounds on the total error (see [21] and [13]), and we prove an upper bound on the estimator defined for a generic finite element function \( v_h \in V_h \), in terms of the estimator defined for the Galerkin solution and the algebraic error. We briefly introduce the notation that we will adopt for the estimates. Let \( h_T = \text{diam}(T) \) for \( T \in T_h \), \( h_z = \text{diam}(\omega_z) \) for \( z \in N_{h, \text{int}} \), and \( h_E = \text{diam}(E) \) for \( E \in E_h \). Consider the mean value operator \( \pi_{\omega_z} : L^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \pi_{\omega_z}(f) := \int_{\omega_z} f/|\omega_z| \).
For a given \( z \in \mathbb{N}_h \), define an oscillation term

\[
osc_z := |\omega_z|^{1/2} \| f - \pi_{\omega_z} f \|_{\omega_z} \quad osc := \left( \sum_{z \in \mathbb{N}_h} osc_z^2 \right)^{1/2}.
\]

(54)

For a given function \( v_h \in V_h \), define for \( E \in \mathcal{E}_h \) and \( T \in \mathcal{T}_h \)

\[
J_E(v_h) := h_E^{1/2} \left\| \frac{\partial v_h}{\partial n_E} \right\|_E, \quad J_T(v_h) := \sum_{E \in \partial T} J_E(v_h),
\]

\[
J(v_h) := \left( \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_h} J_E(v_h)^2 \right)^{1/2} = \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} J_T(v_h)^2 \right)^{1/2},
\]

(55)

where [\cdot] is the standard notation for denoting the jump of a piecewise continuous function across the edge/face \( E \) in normal direction \( n_E \) and where we’ve taken into consideration that when summing overall the elements each edge/face is counted twice.

Lemma 4.1 recalls the classical upper bound on the discretization error, which is stated and proved in [21].

**Lemma 4.1** (Upper bound on the discretization error). There exists a constant \( C^* > 0 \) which depends on the shape of the triangulation, on \( \Omega \), on \( \Gamma \), and which is independent of \( f \) and of the mesh-sizes \( h_T \) such that

\[
|u - u_h|_1 \leq C^*(osc^2 + J^2(u_h))^{1/2}.
\]

(56)

The a posteriori residual-based estimator in the rhs of (56) is made up by an oscillating-contribution (volume-contribution) that measures the variations of the rhs function \( f \) from its mean value \( \pi_{\omega_z}(f) \) on each patch \( \omega_z \), and by an edge/face-contribution that measures the jump of the gradient of the Galerkin solution across the inner edges/faces. Notice that the global upper estimate (56) is made up by local cell-wise estimations.

**Remark 4.1.1.** The proof of (56) is based on a quasi-interpolation operator that was first introduced in [21]. It represents a modification of the classical quasi-interpolation operator due to Clément [27] in the setting of a partition of the unity, which has the effect that the volume contribution term (54) in the a posteriori residual based estimate (56) is smaller compared to the one in the standard estimate [57], [2]. The edge/face-contribution (55) dominates the residual based standard a posteriori estimates for affine finite element approximations [21], [23], and if the right-hand-side \( f \) is smooth, a Poincaré inequality shows that the oscillating term (54) is of higher order [21].

In [13], the authors use standard bubble-function techniques of [53] to prove a global lower bound on the \( | \cdot |_1 \)-norm distance between the true solution \( u \in H^1_0(\Omega) \) and a generic function \( v_h \in V_h \).
Lemma 4.2 (Lower bound on the total error). There exists a constant $C_\ast > 0$ which only depends on the minimum angle of the triangulation, on $\Omega$, on $\Gamma$, and which is independent of $f,u,u_h$ and of the mesh-sizes $h_T$ such that

$$J^2(v_h) \leq C_\ast (|u - u_h|^2 + osc^2) \forall v_h \in V_h. \quad (57)$$

Now we can use Lemma 4.1 and 4.1 to prove our main result for this section.

Theorem 4.3. There exist positive constants $C_1, C_2, C_3$ that only depend on the minimum angle of the triangulation, on $\Omega$, on $\Gamma$, and which are independent of $f,u,u_h$ and of the mesh-sizes $h_T$ such that

$$J^2(v_h) \leq C_1 J^2(u_h) + C_2 |u - u_h|^2 - C_3 osc^2 \forall v_h \in V_h. \quad (58)$$

Proof. For a given function $v_h \in V_h$, we decompose $u - v_h = (u - u_h) + (u_h - v_h)$ and we apply the equality $|u - v_h|^2 = |u - u_h|^2 + |u_h - v_h|^2$ (see, e.g., [39]) to the lower bound (57)

$$J^2(v_h) \leq C_\ast (|u - u_h|^2 + osc^2)$$

$$= C_\ast (|u - u_h|^2 + |u_h - v_h|^2 + osc^2)$$

$$\leq C_\ast (C^2 osc^2 + J^2(u_h)) + |u_h - v_h|^2 + osc^2$$

$$= C_\ast C^2 J^2(u_h) + C_\ast |u_h - v_h|^2 + C_\ast (C^2 + 1) osc^2$$

$$= C_1 J^2(u_h) + C_2 |u_h - v_h|^2 + C_3 osc^2,$$

where we have used the upper bound (56) in (59).

Theorem 4.3 gives an upper bound on $J^2(v_h)$ where $v_h$ is a generic function (for instance, accounting for inexact approximations) in terms of $J^2(u_h)$, the square energy norm of the algebraic error, which is equal to $|u_h - v_h|^2$ and oscillation terms which only depend on the triangulation and the data, but are independent of $u_h$ and $v_h$.

A related result is found in the paper [4], where the authors set the stopping criterion for the CG method by using a residual-based error estimator in the context of elliptic self-adjoint problems. They provide an upper bound on $\eta(v_h)$ in terms of $\eta(w_h)$ and $|v_h - w_h|_1$, where $v_h$ and $w_h$ are generic functions in $V_h$. However, their proof proceeds differently, and it is based on the use of the full a-posterior error estimator, while here we prove that a similar result holds also for the case where only $J(v_h)$ is used, i.e., when only face terms are considered in the estimator.

This result, together with Theorem 3.9, gives us a sound theoretical basis for a smoothed AFEM algorithm, where the algebraic error $|u_h - v_h|^2$ in the intermediate steps is given explicitly by the error propagation formula [45].

5. S-AFEM

In this section, we introduce the smoothed AFEM algorithm (S-AFEM). To fix the ideas, we provide a small discussion with some empirical numerical
evidence that justifies the use of S-AFEM in Subsection 5.1 which is explained in detail in Section 5.2.

For completeness, we report here the error propagation formula (45):

\[
e_{k+1}^{(l)} = M_{k+1}^l \left( a_{k+1} + \sum_{j=2}^{k} I_j^{k+1} L_j a_j + I_2^{k+1} L_2 I_1^2 e_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{k} D_{k+1,j} a_j + D_{k+1,2} I_1^2 e_1 \right) + \sum_{j=2}^{k} I_j^{k+1} L_j a_j.
\]

We observe that the presence of \(M_{k+1}^l\) in front of the error expression guarantees that high frequencies would be dumped very quickly by the use of Richardson smoothing. On the other hand, the largest part of the low frequency error is given by the term

\[ I_2^{k+1} L_2 I_1^2 e_1, \]

and by the accumulation of the error in low frequency that is due to the difference between the exact algebraic solutions in the different levels

\[ \sum_{j=2}^{k} I_j^{k+1} L_j a_j. \]

Of all terms, the ones that contain \(e_1\) could be controlled easily (and in a computationally inexpensive way), by ensuring that first iteration of AFEM is solved accurately, i.e., considering \(e_1 = 0\).

The remaining low frequency terms will have in general a smaller influence on the algebraic error and on the estimator. In particular, it is still acceptable to have a large difference between \(u_k\) and \(u_k'\) (implying a large a posteriori error estimate on the algebraic approximation \(J(v_h)\)), provided that this difference is roughly equally distributed over the grid, since a (almost) constant difference between \(\eta_T(u_k)\) and \(\eta_T(v_h)\) for all \(T\) would result in (almost) the same cells marked for refinement.

### 5.1. Some Numerical Evidences

To fix the ideas, we consider the Peak Problem in two dimensions as described in Subsection 6.1 and we apply ten cycles of the classical AFEM Algorithm 1.1 using non-preconditioned Richardson iterations for the algebraic resolution of the system with initial guess given by the prolongation of the previous approximation for each cycle. We use standard residual-based a posteriori error estimators (55) which are locally defined through the jump of the gradient of the discrete approximation across the edges/faces \(E\) of the cells (cf. Section 4). In Figure 5.1 we plot the \(\ell^2\)-norm of the residual \(r_k^{(l)} := A_k e_k^{(l)}\) and the value of the estimator \(\eta(u_k)\) for all cycles as the Richardson iteration count \(l\) increases from 1 to 30. The same behaviour is present in every refinement cycle.
Figure 3: Residual norm (top) and Estimator (bottom) for intermediate cycles of the classical AFEM algorithm when using Richardson iteration without preconditioner as a solver, with prolongation from the previous solution as starting guess. Darker lines correspond to earlier cycles. Only the first 30 iterations are shown.
The residual norm shows two distinguishable speeds of convergence. The first few iterations induce a rapid drop in the residual norm (due to convergence of the highly oscillatory terms in the solution), while the second part of the iterations converge very slowly, corresponding to the convergence speed of the low frequency in the solution. The estimator, on the other hand, stagnates after very few Richardson iterations (around two or three). In other words, $J(u_l^h)$ is almost the same as $J(u_h)$ for $l \geq 3$, empirically suggesting that the error estimator (55) is mainly affected by the highly oscillatory components of the discrete algebraic solution $u_l^h$, and that the estimate provided by Theorem 4.3 may be improved by exploiting the structure of the algebraic iterative solution in Richardson iteration provided by Theorem 3.9.

Although the value we plot in Figure 5.1 for the estimator is a global one, and gives no information on the distribution of the local estimator on the grid, it is a good hint that the overall behaviour of such distribution will not be changing too much after the first few Richardson iterations. We show some numerical evidence that this is actually the case in the numerical validation Section 6.

Motivated by these numerical evidences and by the earlier observations, we argue that in the intermediate AFEM cycles it is not necessary to solve exactly the discrete system. What matters instead is to capture accurately the highly oscillatory components of the discrete approximation. Low frequency components may have an influence on the error estimator, however, this is mostly a global influence, that has a small effect on the cells that will actually be marked for refinement in the Mark step.

5.2. S-AFEM

We present the Smoothed Adaptive Finite Element algorithm (S-AFEM), where the exact algebraic solution in intermediate steps is replaced by the application of a prolongation step (Prolongate), followed by a smoothing step (Smooth):

$$\text{Solve} \rightarrow \text{Estimate} \rightarrow \text{Mark} \rightarrow \text{Refine} \rightarrow \text{Solve}$$

$$\text{Smooth} \rightarrow \text{Prolongate}$$

The first and last steps of the S-AFEM algorithm coincide with a classical AFEM. In the intermediate steps, however, the solution of the algebraic problem is replaced by a prolongation step (Prolongate) followed by a fixed number of smoothing iterations (Smooth).

The strategy of our method consists precisely in

1. solving exactly the linear algebraic system derived from the discrete problem on the coarsest level $k = 1$ and on the finest level $k = k$;
2. applying a few smoothing iterations on the linear algebraic system in the intermediate levels \( k = 2, \ldots, \bar{k} - 1 \) by using the prolongation of the approximation from the previous level as an initial guess;

3. executing the \( \mathcal{E} \)stimate and \( \mathcal{R} \)efine steps on the approximate solutions for \( k = 2, \ldots, \bar{k} - 1 \).

In particular, the algorithm reads

**Algorithm 5.1 (Smoothed-adaptive mesh-refining algorithm).** Input: initial mesh \( \mathcal{T}_1 \)

Step \( k = 1 \): Solve \( \mathcal{A}_1 u_1 = f_1 \) based on \( \mathcal{T}_1 \).

Loop: for \( k = 2, \ldots, \bar{k} - 1 \) do steps 1–4

1. **Smooth**: Compute \( l \) smoothing iterations on the discrete system \( \mathcal{A}_k u_k = f_k \), with initial guess \( u_k^{(0)} := I_{k-1} u_{k-1}^{(l)} \), which produce \( u_k^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_k} \) with corresponding \( u_k^l \in V_k \).

2. **Estimate**: Compute \( \nu_T^2(u_k^l) \) for all \( T \in \mathcal{T}_k \).

3. **Mark**: Choose set of cells to refine \( \mathcal{M}_k \subset \mathcal{T}_k \) based on \( \nu_T^2(u_k^l) \).

4. **Refine**: Generate new mesh \( \mathcal{T}_{k+1} \) by refinement of the cells in \( \mathcal{M}_k \).

Step \( k = \bar{k} \): Solve the discrete system \( \mathcal{A}_{\bar{k}} u_{\bar{k}} = f_{\bar{k}} \).

Output: sequence of meshes \( \mathcal{T}_k \), smoothed approximations \( u_k^l \), and estimators \( \eta(u_k^l) \), final adapted-approximation \( u_{\bar{k}}^l \).

In step \( k = 1 \), we capture the smoothest (i.e. less oscillatory) part of the discrete approximation by solving the discrete system exactly on the coarsest level. As the mesh is locally refined from one level to the other, we increase the higher portion of the spectrum of the matrix \( A_k \). Thanks to the structure of the refinement in typical finite element methods, mostly high frequencies are added to the system, while low frequencies are substantially left unaltered. This is formalized by the Non-interacting Frequency Coupling Hypothesis for smoothed-multilevel methods (44).

The advantage of S-AFEM is that, on one hand, we save a substantial amount of computational time that would be needed for the algebraic solution in the intermediate steps, and on the other hand we obtain roughly the same mesh-sequence, hence the same refinement at each step, with an accuracy on the final approximation step that is comparable to the classical AFEM algorithm, at a fraction of the computational cost.

6. Numerical validation

The numerical results presented in this paper were realized using a custom C++ code based on the deal.II library [9, 34], and on the deal2lkit library [48]. We consider two classical experiments used to benchmark adaptive finite element methods. A classical marking strategy is used in our implementation (see, e.g., [28]): for any level \( k \) we \( \mathcal{M}_k \) for refinement the subset of elements \( \mathcal{M}_k := \{ T \in \mathcal{T}_k : \eta_T \geq L \} \),

(60)
where $L$ is a *threshold error*, defined as the largest value such that

$$
\Theta^2 \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_k} \eta_T^2 \leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{M}_k} \eta_T^2.
$$

(61)

The parameter $\Theta$ is such that $0 \leq \Theta \leq 1$, where $\Theta = 1$ corresponds to an almost uniform refinement, while $\Theta = 0$ corresponds to no refinement. In our numerical tests, unless otherwise stated, we set $\Theta = 0.3$. The refinement strategy that we adopt in this work is based on the use of “hanging nodes” (see [9] for a detailed discussion on the implementation details).

6.1. Two-dimensional examples

*Smooth domain, peak right hand side, two dimensions.* The first example we consider consists in solving the model problem on a square domain, with a custom forcing term that contains a peak in a specified point in the domain, forcing the exact solution to be

$$
u(x, y) = xe^{-(x-0.5)^2+(y-0.117)^2},
$$

in two dimensions (see Figure 4).

*Fichera corner domain, smooth right hand side, two dimensions.* In the second two-dimensional test case, we consider a Fichera corner domain, i.e., a square where the upper right corner is removed, and the reentrant corner coincides with the origin. No forcing term is added to the problem, but the boundary conditions
Figure 5: Solution to the Fichera corner problem (63) in two dimensions.

are set so that the following exact solution is obtained (when expressed in polar coordinates)

\[ u(r, \theta) = r^{2/3} \sin \left( \frac{2\theta + 5\pi}{3} \right) \],

as shown in Figure 5.

In all cases, we apply ten cycles of classical AFEM and of S-AFEM. For the AFEM algorithm, we use the CG method as iterative solver, with an algebraic multigrid preconditioner (AMG), and we iterate until the \( \ell^2 \) norm of the residual is below a tolerance of \( 10^{-12} \) for each cycle. For S-AFEM, we modify the intermediate cycles and we only apply three Richardson iterations. For reference, we report a comparison between the cells marked for refinement by AFEM and S-AFEM after four cycles for the two-dimensional Fichera corner problem in Figure 6, and after nine cycles for the two-dimensional peak problem in Figure 9. In both cases, the set of marked cells, although different in some areas, produces a refined grid that is very similar between the classical AFEM and the S-AFEM, and where the accuracy of the final solution is comparable.

In Figures 10 and 7, we compare the values of the global estimators \( J(u_h) \) and \( J(v_h) \) and of the \( H_1 \) semi-norm of the total errors for each cycle for the two-dimensional peak problem, and for the two-dimensional Fichera corner problem when using S-AFEM. For reference, Figures 8 and 11 show the error and the estimator in the classical AFEM algorithm for the two examples. Notice that the first step of AFEM and of S-AFEM are the same. The last step in the S-AFEM case shows comparable results as in the AFEM algorithm for both examples.

Notice that in S-AFEM the value of the global estimator is almost the same.
of the one that would be obtained by solving using CG and AMG ($J(u_h)$ in Figures 10 and 7), showing that in the two dimensional setting the error estimator (55) is mainly affected by the high frequencies of the discrete solution, which are well captured with just a few Richardson iterations. On the other hand, the total error increases in the intermediate cycles, due to the algebraic error that has been accumulated by applying smoothing iterations instead of solving the algebraic problem until convergence, as quantified by Theorem 3.9. This error measures the distance between the exact algebraic solution and the smooth non-oscillatory components of the approximate solution that are not captured by Richardson iteration, and have little or no influence on the error estimator, and therefore on the generated grid. After ten cycles, we solve the algebraic problem until converge using CG and AMG, as in the first cycle, and we obtain a solution whose error is controlled by the estimator, as expected.

6.2. Three-dimensional examples

Smooth domain, peak right hand side, three dimensions. The first three-dimensional test case that we propose is a model problem on a cube domain, where the forcing term contains a peak in a specified point that forces the exact solution to be given by (see Figure 12):

$$u(x, y, z) = x(x - 1)y(y - 1)z(z - 1)e^{-100((x-0.5)^2+(y-0.117)^2+(z-0.331)^2)}.$$  (64)
Figure 7: True error, algebraic error, and estimator for the Peak problem in two dimensions.

Figure 8: Error and estimator for the Peak problem in two dimensions, using classical AFEM.
Figure 9: Comparison between the cells marked for refinement in AFEM and Smoothed-AFEM after 9 cycles.

Figure 10: True error, algebraic error, and estimator for the Fichera corner in two dimensions.
Figure 11: Error and estimator for the Fichera corner problem in two dimensions, using classical AFEM.

Figure 12: Solution to peak problem (64) in 3D.
Figure 13: True error, algebraic errors, and estimator for the Peak problem in three dimensions, with three smoothing steps.

Figure 14: Error and estimator for the Peak problem in three dimensions, with classical AFEM.
Fichera Corner, smooth right hand side, three dimensions. In the second three-dimensional example, we consider again the classic Fichera corner domain, i.e., a cube where the upper right corner is removed, and the reentrant corner coincides with the origin. We set the exact solution to be

\[ u(r, \theta, \phi) = r^{1/2}, \]  

and we add a forcing term that induces the above exact solution (see Figure 15).

In both examples, the estimator applied to the algebraic solution after three smoothing steps (see Figures 13 and 16) seems to be more sensitive to the low frequency content of \( u_h \). In other words, in the three-dimensional case the combination of Theorems 3.9 and 4.3 provides a sharper estimate. This may also be related to the fact that the increase on the number of degrees of freedom between successive cycles in the three-dimensional setting is much more severe w.r.t. the two-dimensional case, maybe hindering the non-interacting frequency coupling hypothesis. Nonetheless, the difference in accuracy at the final step between AFEM and S-AFEM is negligible also in the three-dimensional case, showing that the (small) differences in the refinement patterns between AFEM and S-AFEM do not influence the final accuracy.
Figure 16: True error, algebraic errors, and estimator for the Fichera corner problem in three dimensions, using three smoothing steps.

Figure 17: Error and estimator for the Fichera corner problem in three dimensions, using classical AFEM.
Table 3: Comparison of the computational cost of the solution stage for ten cycles of adaptive refinement using classical AFEM and S-AFEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peak 2d</th>
<th>Corner 2d</th>
<th>Peak 3d</th>
<th>Corner 3d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First and last solve</td>
<td>0.0187s</td>
<td>0.0601s</td>
<td>32s</td>
<td>101s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate solves (CG)</td>
<td>0.0663s</td>
<td>0.219s</td>
<td>76.4s</td>
<td>185s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate solves (Richardson)</td>
<td>0.005s</td>
<td>0.00892s</td>
<td>0.252s</td>
<td>0.426s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-AFEM intermediate speedup</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>303.7</td>
<td>434.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-AFEM total speedup</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4.045</td>
<td>3.361</td>
<td>2.819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. Computational costs

In the following table we show a comparison of the computational cost associated to the classical AFEM and to the smoothed AFEM, for the four examples we presented in the previous section.

The results were obtained on a 2.8 GHz Intel Core i7 with 4 cores and 16GB of RAM, using MPI parallelization on all 4 cores.

Table 3 only shows the comparison between AFEM and S-AFEM in the solve phase, where S-AFEM is always faster than AFEM, offering an average speedup of a factor three. In the table we compare the computational cost of all intermediate cycles in S-AFEM (Intermediate solves (Richardson) in the table), with the corresponding computational cost for standard AFEM (Intermediate solves (CG) in the table). The first and last solve are the same in the two algorithms, and are reported to provide a scaling with respect to the total computational cost of the solution phase in the program. Other phases (like graphical output, mesh setup, assembling setup, and error estimation) are not shown since they are identical in the two algorithms.

7. Conclusions

In this work we propose a new smoothed algorithm for adaptive finite element methods (S-AFEM), inspired by multilevel techniques. In S-AFEM, the classical algorithm of AFEM (Solve-Estimate-Mark-Refine) is modified to replace the Solve step in intermediate cycles by successive applications of Prolongate and Smooth steps, where the solution from the previous cycle is transferred to the current grid, and a fixed number of smoothing iterations are applied to obtained a rough (but cheap to compute) approximation of the algebraic solution.

We analysed the error propagation properties of the S-AFEM algorithm, and provided a bound on the a-posteriori error estimator applied to the approximated algebraic solution. Although the results are not sharp, they provide a good insight on why the S-AFEM algorithm is capable of producing a mesh sequence that is very close to the one obtained by classical AFEM, at a fraction of the computational cost.

An interesting question for future investigations is whether this technique may be applied to more complex second-order elliptic problems, and whether one can obtain better results with more articulated smoothing algorithms.
References


