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Abstract

We present an error bound for a least squares version of the kernel based meshless finite difference method for elliptic differential equations on smooth compact manifolds of arbitrary dimension without boundary. In particular, we obtain sufficient conditions for the convergence of this method.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a smooth compact manifold of dimension $d$ without boundary, and let $L$ be an elliptic differential operator of order $2\kappa$, $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$, on $\mathcal{M}$ with infinitely differentiable coefficients in local coordinates, and a trivial null space. Then the equation

$$Lu = f$$

has a unique solution $u$ in the Sobolev space $H^t(\mathcal{M})$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, whenever $f \in H^{t-2\kappa}(\mathcal{M})$, and there are constants $A, B > 0$, depending only on $\mathcal{M}, L, t$ and the choice of the Sobolev norms, such that

$$A\|f\|_{H^{t-2\kappa}(\mathcal{M})} \leq \|u\|_{H^t(\mathcal{M})} \leq B\|f\|_{H^{t-2\kappa}(\mathcal{M})},$$

see e.g. [3, Section 6].

Meshless numerical methods are particularly attractive for solving operator equations on manifolds, in particular on the sphere [22, 23], because of the difficulties of creating and maintaining suitable meshes or grids in this setting. Error bounds for meshless methods for the approximation of functions and specifically solutions of operator equations on manifolds have been studied for example in [21, 27, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 41, 43]. However, these results do not apply to localized finite difference type methods considered below.
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Meshless finite difference methods discretize a differential equation (1) (or similarly a boundary value problem) on a set of irregular nodes $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ with the help of numerical differentiation formulas

$$Lu(x_i) \approx \sum_{j \in J_i} w_{ij} u(x_j), \quad J_i \subset J := \{1, \ldots, n\}, \quad i \in I,$$

(3)

where the coefficients $w_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ are obtained by requiring that the formula is exact for certain finite dimensional spaces of functions, for example polynomials or kernel sums or a combination thereof, and the size of the sets of influence $X_i = \{x_j : j \in J_i\}$ is bounded by a fixed number $\nu \ll n$. In particular, the kernel-based formulas are exact for all linear combinations $\sum_{j \in J_i} c_j K(\cdot, x_j)$, $c_j \in \mathbb{R}$, where $K : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a positive definite kernel. The discrete approximate solution $\hat{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of (1), such that $\hat{u}_i \approx u(x_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, is obtained by solving the sparse linear system

$$\sum_{j \in J_i} w_{ij} \hat{u}_j = f(x_i), \quad i \in I.$$

(4)

Numerical performance of methods of this type has been studied e.g. in the book [22] and papers [6, 21, 30, 42, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55], in particular for differential equations on the sphere and other manifolds. In contrast to those meshless methods that discretize the weak form of the equations (see the surveys [7, 39]), no integration of the trial functions over subdomains is needed, which is challenging in the meshless setting as the subdomains are not generated from a few reference shapes controlled by the mesh. In contrast to the global collocation methods (see e.g. [29, 44]), the linear systems are sparse. Moreover, by optimizing the selection of the sets of influence $J_i$, they may be made as sparse as they are in the mesh based methods, such as the finite element method, with comparable accuracy [12, 13, 14, 40].

In the classical setting we choose $I = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, and hence (4) is a square linear system. By using more than $n$ numerical differentiation formulas (3) we arrive at an overdetermined system, and $\hat{u}$ may be obtained by the least squares minimization. In [30] this situation arises from evaluating $Lu$ in the left hand side of (3) on a different set of nodes, larger than $X$. This is similar to the “overtesting” mode that admits, for the collocation and other methods employing trial functions, an error analysis under very general conditions [46, 47], which however does not cover finite difference type methods [48]. An extension of the classical error analysis that requires that the system matrix of (4) is an $M$-matrix has been proposed in [18], and conditions for the $M$-matrix property were investigated in [18, 49]. However, this approach only applies to special geometric configurations of the sets of influence with low convergence order.

In this paper we derive error bounds for an overdetermined version of the meshless finite difference method for elliptic differential equations on smooth closed manifolds, solved by least squares, where the numerical differentiation formulas (3) are generated in blocks corresponding to a family of overlapping subsets $J_\ell \subset J$,

$$[Lu(x_j)]_{j \in J_\ell} \approx W_\ell[u(x_j)]_{j \in J_\ell}, \quad \ell = 1, \ldots, m.$$

(5)
The local differentiation matrices $W_\ell$ are invertible since they correspond to a reproducing kernel $K$ for a Sobolev space $H^s(\mathcal{M})$ such that $L$ is positive and self-adjoint with respect to the inner product defined by $K$. This condition in particular implies that the system matrix has full rank and hence there exists a unique least squares solution of

$$W_\ell[\tilde{u}_j]_{j \in J_\ell} = [f(x_j)]_{j \in J_\ell}, \quad \ell = 1, \ldots, m. \tag{6}$$

Under certain regularity assumptions that involve in particular the quasi-uniformity of $X$ and the existence of an atlas $\mathcal{A} = \{(U_\ell, \varphi_\ell)\}_{\ell=1}^m$ with sufficiently nice $U_\ell \subset \mathcal{M}$ such that $X \cap U_\ell = X_\ell := \{x_j : j \in J_\ell\}$ and $X_\ell$, $X_k$ significantly overlap whenever $U_\ell \cap U_k \neq \emptyset$, we show in Theorem 1 that

$$\max_{j \in J} |u(x_j) - \hat{u}_j| = O(h_A^{s-2\kappa-d-r_0}), \quad r_0 := \max\{0, \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor - 2\kappa + 1\},$$

and there exists $\tilde{u} \in H^{s+2\kappa}(\mathcal{M})$ such that $\tilde{u}(x_j) = \hat{u}_j$, $j \in J$, and

$$\|u - \tilde{u}\|_{H^{2\kappa+r}(\mathcal{M})} = O(h_A^{s-2\kappa-d-r}), \quad 0 \leq r < s - \kappa,$$

where $h_A$ is the maximum diameter of the sets $\varphi_\ell(U_\ell)$. This shows the pointwise convergence of the method for $h_A \to 0$ when $s > \max\{2\kappa, \frac{d}{2} + 1\} + d$, and convergence in $H^{2\kappa}(\mathcal{M})$ when $s > 2\kappa + d$.

The results apply in particular to the operators of the form $L = (-\Delta_{\mathcal{M}} + \alpha I)^\kappa$, $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha > 0$, where $\Delta_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator, $I$ is the identity, and $\mathcal{M} = S^d$ is the $d$-dimensional sphere. In this case the differentiation matrices $W_\ell$ may be efficiently computed by employing restrictions to $S^d$ of the Matérn or Wendland kernels for the ambient Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to auxiliary statements on various topics needed in the main parts of the paper, such as equivalent norms for Sobolev spaces on manifolds, properties of reproducing kernels and self-adjoint differential operators, sampling inequalities and local differentiation matrices. The method and error bounds are presented in Section 3 and a proof is given in Section 4.

### 2 Preliminaries

We denote the partial derivative of a real function $u$ defined on a subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ by $\partial^\alpha u := \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|} u}{\partial x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots \partial x_d^{\alpha_d}}$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$ and $|\alpha| := \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i$. We will extensively use the Leibniz product rule and the estimates that follow from the multivariate chain rule, see e.g. Sections 1.2, 1.63 and 3.41 in [1].

The cardinality of a finite set $X$ will be denoted $#X$, and $\partial S$ will stand for the boundary of a set $S$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ or $\mathcal{M}$. We will use the usual notations $C(S)$, $C^\infty(S)$, $L^\infty(S)$, $L^2(S)$ for the spaces of continuous, infinitely differentiable, essentially bounded or square integrable functions on appropriate subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$ or $\mathcal{M}$.

Apart from the usual restriction $f|_S$ for a subset $S$ of the domain of definition of a function $f$, we denote by $f|_X$ the vector $[f(x)]_{x \in X}$ when $X$ is a finite set, and by $w|_I$ the vector $[w_j]_{j \in I}$, for any $w = [w_j]_{j \in J}$ and a subset $I \subset J$. 

3
In what follows various “constants” denoted $C$, $C_1$, $C_2$, etc. will be different at different occurrences and depend on the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ (and thus on $d$) on default. We will explicitly list other parameters these constant may depend on in each case unless stated otherwise.

2.1 Sobolev spaces on manifolds

Recall that in the case of integer $s \geq 0$, Sobolev spaces $H^s(\Omega)$ are defined on any open set $\Omega$ as Hilbert spaces with the norm

$$\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} = \left( \sum_{k=0}^{s} |u|_{H^k(\Omega)}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad |u|_{H^k(\Omega)} := \left( \sum_{|\alpha| = k} \|\partial^\alpha u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

(7)

in particular, $H^0(\Omega) = L^2(\Omega)$. When $s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\Omega$ is a Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, we refer to [3] for the definition of $H^s(\Omega)$ as the restriction to $\Omega$ of the space $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ defined as the Bessel potential space. The Bessel norm for $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is equivalent to (7) when $s \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. However, the definition via restriction, if applied to non-Lipschitz domains and integer $s$, leads in general to smaller spaces due to the lack of extension of some functions with a finite norm (7), see e.g. [10, p. 287]. Even for Lipschitz domains, where extension theorems guarantee the equivalence of (7) to the restriction norm, the constants of equivalence depend on $\Omega$ and must be taken into account when they influence estimates.

Below, when we speak of a norm for $H^s(\Omega)$ or $H^s(\mathcal{M})$ we will always assume that it is generated by an inner product, and the notations $\| \cdot \|_{H^s(\Omega)}$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\| \cdot \|_{H^s(\mathcal{M})}$, $\mathcal{M}$ a manifold, are reserved for the specific norms defined in (7) and (8), respectively.

It follows from the properties of $\hat{\gamma}_\ell$ that the sets $\hat{U}_\ell := \{ x \in \mathcal{M} : \hat{\gamma}_\ell(x) > c \} \subset \hat{U}_\ell$, $\ell = 1, \ldots, \hat{n}$, form an open cover of $\mathcal{M}$ when $c = 0$, and hence also for all sufficiently small $c > 0$. We say that a finite smooth atlas $\mathcal{A} = \{(U_\ell, \varphi_\ell)\}_{\ell=1}^{n}$ for $\mathcal{M}$ is $c$-admissible, where $c > 0$, if for each $\ell = 1, \ldots, n$ there exists $k = k(\ell)$ such that $U_\ell \subset \hat{U}_k$ and $\varphi_\ell = \hat{\varphi}_k|_{U_\ell}$. The covering number of $\mathcal{A}$ is defined as

$$\mu_\mathcal{A} := \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq m} \# \{ j : U_j \cap U_\ell \neq \emptyset \}.$$

(9)

Lemma 1. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{(U_\ell, \varphi_\ell)\}_{\ell=1}^{n}$ be a $c$-admissible atlas for $\mathcal{M}$ for some $c > 0$. Then for all integer $s \geq 0$,

$$C_1 \|u\|_{H^s(\mathcal{M})} \leq \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \| u \circ \varphi_\ell^{-1} \|_{H^s(\varphi_\ell(U_\ell))}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C_2 \sqrt{\mu_\mathcal{A}} \|u\|_{H^s(\mathcal{M})}, \quad u \in H^s(\mathcal{M}),$$

(10)
where $C_1 > 0$ depends only on $s$, the choice of the atlas $\hat{A}$ and the partition of unity $\hat{\Gamma}$, and $C_2$ depends in addition on $c$.

Proof. Let $L_k := \{\ell : U_\ell \cap \hat{U}_k \neq \emptyset\}$. Then $\hat{U}_k \subset \bigcup_{\ell \in L_k} U_\ell$ and hence

$$
\|u \hat{\gamma}_k \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 = \|u \hat{\gamma}_k \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}\|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi}_k(U_\ell \cap \hat{U}_k))}^2 \leq \sum_{\ell \in L_k} \|u \hat{\gamma}_k \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}\|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi}_k(U_\ell \cap \hat{U}_k))}^2.
$$

Since $\hat{\varphi}_k^{-1} = \varphi_\ell^{-1} \circ \hat{\varphi}_k(\ell) \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}$ on $\hat{\varphi}_k(U_\ell \cap \hat{U}_k)$, we have by the Leibniz and the chain rules,

$$
\|u \hat{\gamma}_k \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}\|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi}_k(U_\ell \cap \hat{U}_k))}^2 \leq C\|u \circ \varphi_\ell^{-1}\|_{H^s(\varphi_\ell(U_\ell \cap \hat{U}_k))}^2,
$$

where $C$ depends only on the size of derivatives of order up to $s$ of the functions $\hat{\gamma}_k \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}$ and the transition maps $\hat{\varphi}_j \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}$ of $\hat{A}$, and the (nonzero) determinants of their Jacobi matrices. Finally,

$$
\sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{n}} \|u \circ \varphi_\ell^{-1}\|_{H^s(\varphi_\ell(U_\ell))}^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{n}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \|u \circ \varphi_\ell^{-1}\|_{H^s(\varphi_\ell(U_\ell))}^2
$$

and we deduce the first inequality in (10).

On the other hand, for each $k = 1, \ldots, \hat{n}$,

$$
\sum_{\ell=1 \atop k(\ell)=k}^{n} \|u \circ \varphi_\ell^{-1}\|_{H^s(\varphi_\ell(U_\ell))}^2 \leq \mu A \mu \|u \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}\|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi}_k(U_\hat{k}))}^2.
$$

By applying the Leibniz product rule to $\frac{1}{\gamma_k} \cdot (u \hat{\gamma}_k)$ and estimating the $L^2$-norm of the products of (bounded) derivatives of $\frac{1}{\gamma_k} \circ \hat{\varphi}_k$ with derivatives of $u \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}$, we obtain

$$
\|u \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}\|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi}_k(U_\hat{k}))} \leq C\|u \hat{\gamma}_k \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)},
$$

where $C$ depends only on $\hat{A}$, $\hat{\Gamma}$, $c$ and $s$. This completes the proof of the second inequality in (10). \hfill \square

Note that (10) holds without any assumptions about the boundaries of the sets $\varphi_\ell(U_\ell)$. In particular, they do not need to be Lipschitz domains. If they are, then we can extend the functions $u|_{U_\ell}$ to $\mathcal{M}$, which will be useful in Section 2.2 for establishing an equivalent norm for $H^s(\mathcal{M})$ in terms of a reproducing kernel. For any pair of open sets $\Omega \subset \Omega' \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\mathcal{E}_s(\Omega, \Omega')$ denote the extension constant

$$
\mathcal{E}_s(\Omega, \Omega') = \sup_{u \in H^s(\Omega)} \inf\{\|\tilde{u}\|_{H^s(\Omega')}/\|u\|_{H^s(\Omega)} : u \in H^s(\Omega), \tilde{u}|\Omega = u\}.
$$

In the case $\Omega' = \mathbb{R}^d$ we write $\mathcal{E}_s(\Omega) := \mathcal{E}_s(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$. The extension constant $\mathcal{E}_s(\Omega)$ is finite for Lipschitz domains due to extension theorems.
Lemma 2. Let $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ be a domain such that $U \subset \hat{U}_k^c$ for some $c > 0$ and $k$, and the extension constant $\mathcal{E}_s(\hat{\varphi}_k(U))$ is finite for an integer $s \geq 0$. Then for any $u : U \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $u \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1} \in H^s(\hat{\varphi}_k(U))$ there exists a function $\tilde{u} \in H^s(\mathcal{M})$ such that $\tilde{u}|_U = u$ and
\[
\|\tilde{u}\|_{H^s(\mathcal{M})} \leq C\mathcal{E}_s(\hat{\varphi}_k(U))\|u \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}\|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi}_k(U))},
\]
where $C$ depends only on $\hat{A}, \hat{\Gamma}, s, c$.

Proof. Let $w \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be an extension of $u \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}$ such that
\[
\|w\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 2\mathcal{E}_s(\hat{\varphi}_k(U))\|u \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}\|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi}_k(U))}.
\]
We define $\tilde{u}$ as follows,
\[
\tilde{u}(x) = \begin{cases} (\chi_{k,c}w \circ \hat{\varphi}_k)(x), & \text{if } x \in \hat{U}_k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}
\]
where $\chi_{k,c} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a cutoff function, see e.g. [31], that satisfies
\[
\chi_{k,c}(x) = 1, \quad x \in \hat{\varphi}_k(\hat{U}_k^c), \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_{k,c}(x) = 0, \quad x \notin \hat{\varphi}_k(\hat{U}_k).
\]
Then $\tilde{u}|_U = u$, and for any $\ell$ by the Leibniz and the chain rules,
\[
\|\tilde{u}\hat{\gamma}_\ell \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|(\hat{\gamma}_\ell \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1})(\chi w \circ \hat{\varphi}_k \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1})\|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi}_k(\hat{U}_k \cap \hat{U}_l))} \leq C_1\|w\|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi}_k(\hat{U}_k \cap \hat{U}_l))},
\]
where $C_1$ depends only on $c, s$ and the choice of $\hat{A}, \hat{\Gamma}$ and the cutoff function $\chi_{k,c}$. Clearly, cutoff functions $\chi_{k,c}, k = 1, \ldots, \hat{n}$, may be chosen once and for all as soon as other parameters are fixed. Hence
\[
\|\tilde{u}\|_{H^s(\mathcal{M})}^2 = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\hat{n}} \|\tilde{u}\hat{\gamma}_\ell \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \leq 4\hat{n}C_1^2\mathcal{E}_s^2(\hat{\varphi}_k(U))\|u \circ \hat{\varphi}_k^{-1}\|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi}_k(U))}^2. \quad \square
\]

2.2 Reproducing kernels

We first recall some basic facts about reproducing kernels and kernel based interpolation, see [1] [3] [19] [20] [31] [57] for details, and then discuss reproducing kernels for Sobolev spaces.

Functions $K : \Omega \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ will be called kernels on $\Omega$, where $\Omega$ is any set. For a kernel $K$ and two sets $S, T$, $K|_{S \times T}$ stands for the restriction of $K$ to $S \times T$, and for two finite sets $X, Y$ we also denote by $K|_{X \times Y}$ the matrix $[K(x, y)]_{x \in X, y \in Y}$. To simplify the notation we set $K_S := K|_{S \times S}$ and $K_X := K|_{X \times X}$. For an operator $A$ that can be applied to one or both of the arguments of the kernel $K$, we write $A_1K$ or $A_2K$ in order to clarify whether $A$ is applied to the first or the second argument. We will also use the notation $K_A := A_1K$. 
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A kernel $K : \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be symmetric if $K(x, y) = K(y, x)$ for all $x, y \in \Omega$, and positive (semi-)definite if the matrix $K|_X$ is positive (semi-)definite for any finite subset $X$ of $\Omega$.

If $K$ is a symmetric positive semi-definite kernel on a set $\Omega$, then there is a unique Hilbert space $H_K = H_K(\Omega)$ of functions on $\Omega$ called native space of $K$, with the inner product denoted by $(\cdot, \cdot)_K = (\cdot, \cdot)_{K,\Omega}$ and norm by $\| \cdot \|_K = \| \cdot \|_{K,\Omega}$, such that

$$K(\cdot, y) \in H_K \text{ for all } y \in \Omega,$$

$$(f, K(\cdot, y))_K = f(y) \text{ for all } f \in H_K, \ y \in \Omega. \quad (13)$$

A Hilbert space $H$ of functions on $\Omega$ admits a kernel $K$ with these properties if and only if the linear functional $\delta_x f := f(x)$ of point evaluation is bounded on $H$ for all $x \in \Omega$. Then $K$ is a reproducing kernel of $H$, and $H$ is said to be a reproducing kernel Hilbert space.

The identity $(13)$ means that $K(\cdot, y)$ is the Riesz representer of the linear functional $\delta_y \in H_K^*$. Moreover, the kernel $K$ delivers Riesz representers for all bounded linear functionals.

**Lemma 3** (**57**, Theorem 16.7). For any bounded linear functional $\gamma \in H_K^*$, the Riesz representer of $\gamma$ is the function $\gamma_1 K = \gamma_2 K$ that belongs to $H_K$.

Assume that $K$ is positive definite. The kernel sums of the form

$$\sigma = \sum_{j=1}^n c_j K(\cdot, x_j), \quad c_j \in \mathbb{R}, \ x_j \in \Omega, \quad (14)$$

are dense in $H_K(\Omega)$, and their kernel norm is given explicitly by

$$\|\sigma\|_K^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^n c_i c_j K(x_i, x_j). \quad (15)$$

Given $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subset \Omega$, and data $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}$, the kernel sum $(14)$ is uniquely determined by the interpolation conditions $\sigma(x_i) = a_i, \ i = 1, \ldots, n$. We will call it the kernel interpolant of this data. In the case when $a_i = v(x_i), \ i = 1, \ldots, n$, for some $v \in H_K$, we say that $\sigma$ is the kernel interpolant of $v$. It satisfies

$$(v - \sigma, \sigma)_K = 0 \quad (16)$$

and hence

$$\|v - \sigma\|_K^2 + \|\sigma\|_K^2 = \|v\|_K^2. \quad (17)$$

The restriction $K|_G$ on a subset $G \subset \Omega$ is obviously also a symmetric positive semi-definite kernel. Thanks to $(15)$, any kernel sum $(14)$ satisfies

$$\|\sigma\|_{K,G} = \|\sigma\|_K \quad \text{whenever } \ X \subset G. \quad (18)$$

The native space of $K|_G$ can be described as follows.
Lemma 4 ([4]). If $K$ is a reproducing kernel on $\Omega$ and $G \subset \Omega$, then $K|_G$ is a reproducing kernel on $G$ with native space $H_K(G) = \{u|_G : u \in H_K(\Omega)\}$, and

$$\|u\|_{K,G} = \min\{\|\tilde{u}\|_{K,\Omega} : \tilde{u} \in H_K(\Omega), \tilde{u}|_G = u\}.$$ 

If $\Omega$ is an open set in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then by Sobolev embedding $H^s(\Omega)$ is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space as long as $s > d/2$. Every (equivalent) norm for $H^s(\Omega)$ corresponds to a positive definite kernel on $\Omega$.

Lemma 5. Let $K : \Omega \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be a reproducing kernel for $H^s(\Omega)$, $s > d/2$. Then $\partial_1^\beta K(x,\cdot) \in H^s(\Omega)$ for all $x \in \Omega$ and all $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+$ satisfying $|\beta| < s - d/2$.

Proof. By Sobolev embedding (applied to a ball centered at $x$ and contained in $\Omega$) the linear functionals $\gamma$ of the form $\gamma v = \partial^\beta v(x)$, $v \in H^s(\Omega)$, are bounded on $H^s(\Omega) = H_K$ for all $x \in \Omega$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+$ with $|\beta| < s - d/2$. Hence the statement follows by Lemma 3.

The next statement follows immediately from Lemma 4.

Lemma 6. Let $\Omega, G$ be two open sets in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $G \subset \Omega$, and let $K$ be a reproducing kernel for $H^s(\Omega)$, where $s > d/2$. Then $H_K(G) \subset H^s(G)$ and

$$\|u\|_{H^s(G)} \leq C_1\|u\|_{K,G}, \quad u \in H_K(G).$$

Moreover, if the extension constant $E_s(G, \Omega)$ is finite, then $H_K(G) = H^s(G)$ and

$$\|u\|_{K,G} \leq C_2E_s(G, \Omega)\|u\|_{H^s(G)}, \quad u \in H_K(G).$$

The constants $C_1, C_2$ depend only on the constants of equivalence between $\|\cdot\|_{K,\Omega}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H^s(\Omega)}$.

If $\mathcal{M}$ is a smooth closed manifold of dimension $d$, then $H^s(\mathcal{M})$ is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space when $s > d/2$. It may however be difficult to compute the reproducing kernel such that its native space coincides with a given norm of $H^s(\mathcal{M})$. If an orthonormal basis is known for a Sobolev space, for example for $L^2(\mathcal{M}) = H^0(\mathcal{M})$, then reproducing kernels can be constructed via infinite series, see e.g. [33, 36] and [57, Section 17.4]. We discuss this in somewhat more detail in Section 2.3.

If $\mathcal{M}$ is embedded into $\mathbb{R}^m$, $m > d$, then in view of the trace theorems (see e.g. [3, Theorem 2.3.7]) reproducing kernels $K$ for $H^s(\mathcal{M})$, $s > d/2$, can be obtained by restricting to $\mathcal{M}$ one of explicitly known positive definite kernels defined on $\mathbb{R}^m$ with the native space norm equivalent to $H^{s+(m-d)/2}(\mathbb{R}^m)$. The best known examples are Matérn and Wendland kernels.

The Matérn kernel is given by

$$M_{s,d}(x, y) = \Phi_{s,d}(x - y), \quad \Phi_{s,d}(x) := \frac{1}{2\pi_1(s)}K_{s-d/2}(\|x\|_2)\|x\|_2^{s-d/2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^m,$$

where $K_{\nu}(x)$ denotes the modified Bessel function of second kind. The native space norm $\|\cdot\|_{\Phi_{s,d}}$ coincides with the Bessel potential norm of $H^{s+(m-d)/2}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ since the $m$-dimensional Fourier transform of $\Phi_{s,d}$ is $(1 + \|\omega\|_2^2)^{-s-(m-d)/2}$. 

The native space of the Wendland compactly supported kernel $W_{m,\ell}(x, y) = \phi_{m,\ell}(\|x - y\|_2)$, $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, see [57], is norm equivalent to $H^{s+(\ell-d)/2}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ for $s = (d+1)/2 + \ell$ (where $m \geq 3$ if $\ell = 0$). Hence, in the case when $s-d/2 \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$, the restriction of $W_{m,r}$, $m > d$, $r = \lfloor s-d/2 \rfloor + 1$, is a reproducing kernel for $H^s(\mathcal{M})$.

If $U$ is an open set in $\mathcal{M}$ and $\varphi : U \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is a homeomorphism from $U$ to $\varphi(U) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, then $K_\varphi(x, y) := K(\varphi^{-1}(x), \varphi^{-1}(y))$, $x, y \in \varphi(U)$, is obviously the reproducing kernel for the Hilbert space

$$H_K(\varphi(U)) = \{ u \circ \varphi^{-1} : u \in H_K(U) \}$$

isometric to $H_K(U)$, with the norm given by

$$\| u \circ \varphi^{-1} \|_{K_\varphi, \varphi(U)} = \| u \|_{K, U}.$$

We show an analogue of Lemma 6.

**Lemma 7.** Let $K$ be a reproducing kernel for $H^s(\mathcal{M})$, with an integer $s > d/2$, and let $U \subset \mathcal{M}$ be a domain such that $U \subset \hat{U}_k^c$ for some $c > 0$ and $k$. Then $H_K(\hat{\varphi_k}(U)) \subset H^s(\hat{\varphi_k}(U))$ and

$$\| u \circ \hat{\varphi_k}^{-1} \|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi_k}(U))} \leq C_1 \| u \|_{K, U}, \quad u \in H_K(U).$$

Moreover, if the extension constant $\mathcal{E}_s(\hat{\varphi_k}(U))$ is finite, then $H_K(\hat{\varphi_k}(U)) = H^s(\hat{\varphi_k}(U))$ and

$$\| u \|_{K, U} \leq C_2 \mathcal{E}_s(\hat{\varphi_k}(U)) \| u \circ \hat{\varphi_k}^{-1} \|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi_k}(U))}, \quad u \in H_K(U).$$

The constants $C_1, C_2$ depend only on $K$, $\hat{A}$, $\hat{\Gamma}$, $c$ and $s$.

**Proof.** Let $v \in H_K(\hat{\varphi_k}(U))$, that is $v = u \circ \hat{\varphi_k}^{-1}$ for some $u \in H_K(U)$. Then $u$ is the restriction to $U$ of a function in $H_K(\mathcal{M})$, denoted $u$ again. By Lemma [4] we assume without loss of generality that $\| u \|_{K, U} = \| u \|_{K, \mathcal{M}}$. As in the proof of Lemma [1] we obtain by (11),

$$\| u \circ \hat{\varphi_k}^{-1} \|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi_k}(U))} \leq \| u \circ \hat{\varphi_k}^{-1} \|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi_k}(U))} \leq C \| u \circ \hat{\varphi_k}^{-1} \|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \| u \|_{H^s(\mathcal{M})},$$

where $C$ depends only on $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$, $\hat{\Gamma}$, $c$ and $s$. Since the norms $\| \cdot \|_{K, \mathcal{M}}$ and $\| \cdot \|_{H^s(\mathcal{M})}$ are equivalent, the first assertion of the lemma follows.

We now assume that $\mathcal{E}_s(\hat{\varphi_k}(U)) < \infty$. For any $v \in H^s(\hat{\varphi_k}(U))$, the function $u = v \circ \hat{\varphi_k}$ is by Lemma [2] the restriction to $U$ of a function $\tilde{u} \in H^s(\mathcal{M})$ such that

$$\| \tilde{u} \|_{H^s(\mathcal{M})} \leq C \mathcal{E}_s(\hat{\varphi_k}(U)) \| v \|_{H^s(\hat{\varphi_k}(U))},$$

where $C$ depends only on $c, s, \hat{\mathcal{A}}, \hat{\Gamma}$. Since $H^s(\mathcal{M}) = H_K(\mathcal{M})$ with equivalent norms, it follows from Lemma [4] that $\| u \|_{K, U} \leq C \| \tilde{u} \|_{H^s(\mathcal{M})}$, where $C$ depends only on $K, \hat{\mathcal{A}}, \hat{\Gamma}$. Hence $v \in H_K(\hat{\varphi_k}(U))$, and the second assertion follows. \qed
2.3 Differential operators

Assuming that \( \mathcal{M} \) is a smooth compact manifold of dimension \( d \) without boundary, we say that a differential operator \( L \) on \( \mathcal{M} \) has smooth coefficients if its coefficients \( a_{\ell,\alpha} \) in local coordinates,

\[
Lu \circ \hat{\phi}_t^{-1} = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} a_{\ell,\alpha} \partial^\alpha (u \circ \hat{\phi}_t^{-1}), \quad u : \hat{U}_\ell \to \mathbb{R}, \quad a_{\ell,\alpha} : \hat{\phi}_t(\hat{U}_\ell) \to \mathbb{R},
\]

are infinitely differentiable and uniformly bounded, such that for some constants \( C_{\alpha\beta} \),

\[
\| \partial^\beta a_{\ell,\alpha} \|_{L^\infty(\hat{\phi}_t(\hat{U}_\ell))} \leq C_{\alpha\beta}, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+, \quad |\alpha| \leq m, \quad \ell = 1, \ldots, \hat{n}. \quad (20)
\]

Consider an elliptic operator \( L \) with smooth coefficients and even order \( m = 2\kappa \). In fact, all elliptic operators have even order if \( d > 2 \) \[3\]. For all \( t \in \mathbb{R} \), \( L \) is a bounded linear operator from \( H^t(\mathcal{M}) \) to \( H^{t-2\kappa}(\mathcal{M}) \). Moreover, its inverse is a bounded linear operator from \( H^{t-2\kappa}(\mathcal{M}) \) to \( H^t(\mathcal{M}) \) as soon as the null space \( N(L) = \{ u : Lu = 0 \} \) of \( L \) is trivial \[3\] Theorem 6.2.1], which implies \[2\].

Since \( H^{t_1}(\mathcal{M}) \) is compactly embedded in \( H^{t_2}(\mathcal{M}) \) for \( t_1 < t_2 \) \[3\] Theorem 2.3.1], the operator \( L^{-1} : H^t(\mathcal{M}) \to H^t(\mathcal{M}) \) is compact for any \( t \in \mathbb{R} \). Hence the spectrum of \( L \) consists of isolated eigenvalues of finite multiplicity with no finite accumulation points. Assume that \( L \), as an unbounded operator on \( H^s(\mathcal{M}) \) with domain \( H^{s+2\kappa}(\mathcal{M}) \), is positive and self-adjoint with respect to an inner product \( (\cdot, \cdot)_s \) in \( H^s(\mathcal{M}) \), that is, \( (Lv, v)_s > 0 \) for all \( v \in H^{s+2\kappa}(\mathcal{M}) \setminus \{0\} \) and \( (Lv, w)_s = (v, Lw)_s \) for all \( v, w \in H^{s+2\kappa}(\mathcal{M}) \). Then it follows from the spectral theorem (see e.g. \[36\] Theorem 7.17], where real valued Hilbert spaces are considered) that there exists an orthonormal basis of \( H^s(\mathcal{M}) \) consisting of eigenfunctions \( e_j, j \in \mathbb{N} \), of \( L \), such that

\[
Lv = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j c_j e_j, \quad L^{-1}v = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-1} c_j e_j \quad \text{for any} \quad v = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j e_j \in H^s(\mathcal{M}),
\]

where \( \lambda_j > 0 \) are the eigenvalues of \( L \) and \( c_j \in \mathbb{R} \). This implies for all \( k \in \mathbb{N} \),

\[
H^{s-km}(\mathcal{M}) = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^k c_j e_j : \|c\|_2 < \infty \right\}, \quad H^{s+km}(\mathcal{M}) = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-k} c_j e_j : \|c\|_2 < \infty \right\},
\]

where \( \|c\|_2^2 := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j^2 \), and by interpolation (see e.g. \[3\] Section 13]),

\[
H^t(\mathcal{M}) = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{(s-t)/m} c_j e_j : \|c\|_2 < \infty \right\}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.
\]

The norm in \( H^t(\mathcal{M}) \) defined by \( \| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{(s-t)/m} c_j e_j \|_t := \|c\|_2 \) is equivalent to the standard Sobolev norms, and \( \lambda_j^{(s-t)/m} e_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots \), is an orthonormal basis with respect to this norm. It is easy to see that \( L \) is positive and self-adjoint with respect to the corresponding inner products \( (\cdot, \cdot)_t, t \in \mathbb{R} \). Note that eigenfunctions \( e_j \) belong to \( H^t(\mathcal{M}) \) for
all \( t \in \mathbb{R} \), and thus to \( C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \) since the eigenspaces of \( L \) are independent of the choice of \( s \) and inner product in \( H^s(\mathcal{M}) \). The eigenvalues \( \lambda_j \), numbered in nondecreasing order with multiplicities taken into account satisfy \( \lambda_j = j^{2\kappa/d}(C + o(1)), j \to \infty \), where \( C \) is a positive constant independent of \( j \), see [2, Theorem 6.1.1].

If \( s > d/2 \), then \( H^s(\mathcal{M}) \) is embedded into \( C(s,M) \), and hence \( H^s(\mathcal{M}) \) is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space. It is easy to see that its kernel corresponding to the inner product \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_s \) is given by

\[
K(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e_j(x)e_j(y),
\]

where the series is a well defined real function on \( \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \) since for each fixed \( x \in \mathcal{M} \) the sequence \( e_j(x) = (v_x, e_j), j = 1, 2, \ldots \), where \( v_x \in H^s(\mathcal{M}) \) is the Riesz representer of the point evaluation functional at \( x \), is square summable. If \( t > d/2 \), then the kernel of \( H^t(\mathcal{M}) \) for the norm \( \| \cdot \|_t \) is given by

\[
L_1^{2(s-t)/m}K(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{2(s-t)/m} e_j(x)e_j(y),
\]

where the powers of \( L \) are defined by

\[
L^\theta v = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^\theta c_j e_j, \quad v = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j e_j, \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R},
\]

such that

\[
\| L^\theta v \|_t = \| v \|_{t+m\theta}, \quad t, \theta \in \mathbb{R}, \quad v \in H^{t+m\theta}(\mathcal{M}).
\]

Since \( \lambda_j > 0 \) for all \( j \), the kernels \( K_{L^\theta} = L^\theta K \) are positive definite whenever \( s-\theta \kappa > d/2 \).

We summarize in the following lemma the main findings of this section.

**Lemma 8.** Let \( L \) be an elliptic differential operator of order \( 2\kappa \) with smooth coefficients and trivial null space, and let \( K \) be a reproducing kernel for \( H^s(\mathcal{M}) \), where \( s > d/2 \). Assume that \( L \) is positive and self-adjoint with respect to the inner product of \( H^s(\mathcal{M}) \) defined by \( K \). Then \( K_{L^\theta} = L_1^{\theta} K \) is a positive definite reproducing kernel for \( H^{s-\theta \kappa}(\mathcal{M}) \) for any \( \theta \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( s-\theta \kappa > d/2 \). In particular, \( K_{L^{-1}} \) is a reproducing kernel for \( H^{s+\kappa}(\mathcal{M}) \). If \( s > \kappa + d/2 \), then \( K_L \) is a reproducing kernel for \( H^{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{M}) \) and

\[
\| L v \|_{K_L} = \| v \|_{K_{L^{-1}}}, \quad v \in H^{s+\kappa}(\mathcal{M}).
\]

Note that Lemma 8 also holds for certain classes of pseudodifferential operators on \( \mathcal{M} \), see [2, 3].

**Lemma 9.** Under the hypotheses of Lemma 8, \( K(\cdot, x) \in H^{s+2\kappa r}(\Omega) \) for all \( x \in \Omega \), where \( r \) is any integer satisfying \( 2\kappa r < s-d/2 \). In particular, \( K(\cdot, x) \in H^{s+2\kappa}(\Omega) \) for all \( x \in \Omega \) if \( s > 2\kappa + d/2 \).
Proof. By Lemma 5, \( L_1^* K(x, \cdot) \in H^s(\Omega) \) for all \( x \in \Omega \) as soon as \( 2\kappa_1 < s - d/2 \). Since the kernel \( L_1^* K \) is symmetric, it follows that \( L_1^* K(\cdot, x) \in H^s(\Omega) \) for all \( x \in \Omega \), and the statement is obtained by applying (2) to \( u = K(\cdot, x) \) and the operator \( L^* \) of order \( 2\kappa_1 \).

In the case of the \( d \)-dimensional sphere \( \mathcal{M} = S^d \) of particular interest is a class of elliptic pseudodifferential operators \([23]\) that can be represented in the form

\[
Lv = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j c_j e_j, \quad v = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j e_j, \quad \lambda_j > 0, \quad j \in \mathbb{N},
\]

where \( e_j \) are the spherical harmonics, that is the eigenfunctions of the Laplace-Beltrami operator \( \Delta_{\mathcal{M}} \), normalized with respect to the standard inner product of \( L^2(S^d) \). For \( d = 2 \) these operators have important applications in physical geodesy.

In particular, operators of the form

\[
L = (-\Delta_{\mathcal{M}} + \alpha I)^\kappa, \quad \kappa \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \alpha > 0,
\]

where \( I \) is the identity operator, are elliptic differential operators of order \( 2\kappa \) on \( S^d \) with smooth coefficients and trivial null spaces. These operators satisfy (24) and are positive and self-adjoint with respect to the inner products for Sobolev spaces \( H^s(S^d) \), \( s > d/2 \), generated by reproducing kernels of the type

\[
K(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_j c_j(x)e_j(y),
\]

with appropriately decaying positive real sequences \( \{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \). Explicit zonal kernels \( K(x, y) = \psi(x^T y) \) with this property are obtained as restrictions to \( S^d \) of radially symmetric kernels (radial basis functions) \( K(x, y) = \phi(||x - y||_2) \), \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \) since \( ||x - y||_2 = \sqrt{2 - 2x^T y} \) if \( ||x||_2 = ||y||_2 = 1 \), see e.g. \([57, \text{Section 17.2}]\). In particular, the hypotheses of Lemma 8 are satisfied for the differential operators (25) and kernels for \( H^s(S^d) \) obtained by restricting to \( S^d \) the Matérn and Wendland kernels for \( \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \).

If \( \mathcal{M} \) is a Cartesian product of multiple spheres, possibly of different dimensions, then appropriate kernels with respect to which operators (25) are positive and self-adjoint are obtained for \( H^s(\mathcal{M}) \) by taking tensor products of corresponding spherical restrictions of the Matérn and Wendland kernels. This follows from the fact that tensor products of kernels may be identified with the kernels of the tensor products of the respective reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces, see e.g. \([11]\). This covers in particular the \( d \)-dimensional torus \( \mathcal{M} = T^d \) \([36]\) and hence the periodic boundary value problems for the operators \( L = (-\Delta + \alpha I)^\kappa \) on cuboids, where \( \Delta \) is the \( d \)-dimensional Laplace operator.

Differential operators (25) on arbitrary Riemannian manifolds also satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 8, see \([3]\). However, closed form formulas for the kernels of the form (26), where \( e_j \) are the eigenfunctions of \( \Delta_{\mathcal{M}} \), are not available in general.
2.4 Sampling inequalities

Sampling inequalities bound a weaker Sobolev norm of a function $f$ in terms of its values on a finite set $X \subset \Omega$ and a stronger Sobolev norm of $f$, see the survey [45] and references therein. In Lemma 10 we follow a standard way of proving sampling inequalities, as e.g. in [38, 58], but obtain a local version that makes use of the diameter of the domain $\Omega$ as the discretization parameter $h$ instead of the fill distance of $X$. Therefore our estimates (27), (28) depend on a polynomial Lebesgue constant that is usually not present explicitly in the estimates thanks to a requirement that $X$ is sufficiently dense in $\Omega$. We refer to [15, Section 4] for a demonstration that this requirement is too restrictive for the setting of local error bounds we will apply the sampling inequalities in Section 2.6.

For any finite $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we consider the Lebesgue function

$$\lambda_r(y, Y) = \sup \{|p(y)| : \|p|_Y\|_\infty \leq 1 \text{ for all } p \in \Pi_r^d\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad r \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $\Pi_r^d$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, denotes the space of $d$-variate polynomials of total order at most $r$ (or degree less than $r$). Note that $\lambda_r(y, Y) < \infty$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ if and only if $Y$ is a $r$-determining set, that is $p \in \Pi_r^d$ and $p|_Y = 0$ imply $p \equiv 0$. For any set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the Lebesgue constant is given by

$$\lambda_r(S, Y) = \sup_{y \in S} \lambda_r(y, Y).$$

Note that the Lebesgue constant is the reciprocal of the norming constant [28]. On the other hand, the Lebesgue function is a special case of a growth function [11, 16], and we rely in the proof on a general duality theory for growth functions [16, Theorem 9] that replaces the “local polynomial reproduction” arguments, compare [57, Chapter 3].

For any bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote by $\chi(\Omega)$ its chunkiness parameter [8], the quotient of the diameter of $\Omega$ to the maximum radius of a ball $B \subset \Omega$ such that $\Omega$ is star-shaped with respect to $B$. Clearly, $\chi(\Omega) < \infty$ if and only if $\Omega$ is bounded and star-shaped with respect to a ball. It is known that such domains satisfy the Lipschitz condition, see [10, Section 4.3] or [34, Section 1.3.2].

**Lemma 10.** Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with $\chi(\Omega) \leq \chi$ for some constant $\chi < \infty$, let $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subset \Omega$ be an r-determining set for some integer $r > d/2$, and let $v \in H^r(\Omega)$. We set $h = \text{diam}(\Omega)$. Then for any integer $k$ with $0 \leq k < r$,

$$|v|_{H^k(\Omega)} \leq Ch^{-k}\lambda_r(\Omega, X)(h^{d/2}\|v|_X\|_\infty + h^r|v|_{H^r(\Omega)}), \quad (27)$$

where $C$ depends only on $r, d$ and $\chi$. Moreover, for any $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$ with $|\beta| < r - d/2$,

$$|\partial^\beta v(x)| \leq C h^{-|\beta|}\lambda_r(\Omega, X)(\|v|_X\|_\infty + h^{r-d/2}|v|_{H^r(\Omega)}), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad (28)$$

where $C$ depends only on $r, d$ and $\chi$. 
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Proof. By Sobolev embedding we identify \( v \) with an \( m \) times continuously differentiable function in \( \Omega \), where \( m \) is the largest integer such that \( m < r - d/2 \). By Proposition 4.3.2, equation (4.1.18) and Lemma 4.3.8 in [8] there is a polynomial \( p \in \Pi^d \) such that

\[
|\partial^\beta v(x) - \partial^\beta p(x)| \leq C_1 h^{r-|\beta|-d/2}|v|_{H^r(\Omega)}, \quad x \in \Omega, \quad |\beta| < r - d/2,
\]

(29)

\[
|v - p|_{H^k(\Omega)} \leq C_2 h^{r-k}|v|_{H^r(\Omega)}, \quad k \leq r,
\]

(30)

where both \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) depend only on \( r, d \) and \( \chi \).

Let \( \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \) with \( |\alpha| = k \). Since \( X \) is \( r \)-determining, for any \( x \in \Omega \) there exist weights \( w_j \in \mathbb{R} \) such that

\[
\partial^\alpha p(x) = \sum_{j=1}^n w_j p(x_j) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^n |w_j| = \sup \{ \partial^\alpha q(x) : q \in \Pi^d_r, \|q\| \leq 1 \},
\]

see [16, Theorem 9]. By Markov inequality (see e.g. [38, Proposition 2.2]),

\[
|\partial^\alpha q(x)| \leq C_3 h^{-k}\|q\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \quad q \in \Pi^d_r,
\]

where \( C_3 \) depends only on \( r, d \) and \( \chi \). Hence

\[
\sum_{j=1}^n |w_j| \leq C_3 h^{-k}\lambda_r(\Omega, X).
\]

By (29),

\[
|v(x_j) - p(x_j)| \leq C_1 h^{r-d/2}|v|_{H^r(\Omega)}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n.
\]

Hence

\[
|\partial^\alpha p(x)| = \left| \sum_{j=1}^n w_j v(x_j) + \sum_{j=1}^n w_j (p(x_j) - v(x_j)) \right|
\]

\[
\leq C_3 h^{-k}\lambda_r(\Omega, X)\left(\|v\|_{L^\infty} + C_1 h^{r-d/2}|v|_{H^r(\Omega)} \right),
\]

(31)

which implies

\[
\|\partial^\alpha p\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_4 C_3 h^{-k+d/2}\lambda_r(\Omega, X)\left(\|v\|_{L^\infty} + C_1 h^{r-d/2}|v|_{H^r(\Omega)} \right),
\]

where \( C_4 \) depends only on \( d \). By (30),

\[
\|\partial^\alpha v - \partial^\alpha p\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_2 h^{-k}|v|_{H^r(\Omega)},
\]

and (27) follows since \( \|\partial^\alpha v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\partial^\alpha v - \partial^\alpha p\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\partial^\alpha p\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \) and \( \lambda_r(\Omega, X) \geq 1 \). Similarly, (28) follows directly from (29) and (31). \qed
2.5 Extension constants

Since we will need to bound the extension constants $E_s(\hat{\varphi}_k(U))$ uniformly for families of local subdomains $U \subset M$, we consider the question of estimating $E_s(\Omega)$ for Lipschitz domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

A bounded domain $\Omega$ satisfies the Lipschitz condition if it has a locally Lipschitz boundary, that is, each point on the boundary of $\Omega$ has a neighborhood whose intersection with $\partial \Omega$ is the graph of a function satisfying the Lipschitz condition. Since $\partial \Omega$ is compact, there is a finite system $L$ consisting of $N_L$ open sets in $\mathbb{R}^d$ that cover $\partial \Omega$ such that their intersections with $\partial \Omega$ are the graphs of continuous functions with Lipschitz constants not exceeding some number $M_L$. Such a system is not unique, and a smaller $M_L$ may be obtained at the expense of increasing $N_L$. We will call any such system $L$ a Lipschitz cover of $\partial \Omega$. Apart from $N_L$ and $M_L$, another parameter of $L$ important for the extension constant is a number $r_L > 0$ such that for each $x \in \partial \Omega$ the ball with radius $r_L$ centered at $x$ is contained in one of the sets of $L$. It is easy to see that a positive $r_L$ exists for any Lipschitz cover.

The Stein Extension Theorem [54] shows that $E_s(\Omega)$ is bounded from the above by a constant depending only on $d, s, N_L, M_L$ and $r_L$.

Since we will need bounds for $E_s(\Omega)$ for domains with diameter tending to zero, we will use the parameter $\tau_L := r_L / \text{diam}(\Omega)$ in place of $r_L$. The following estimate follows immediately from the results in [54, Section 3.1.5].

**Lemma 11.** Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain star-shaped with respect to a ball, and let $L$ be a Lipschitz cover of its boundary. If $\chi(\Omega) \leq \chi$, $N_L \leq N$, $M_L \leq M$ and $\tau_L \geq \tau > 0$, then for any integer $s \geq 0$,

$$E_s(\Omega) \leq Ch^{-d/2}, \quad h = \text{diam}(\Omega),$$

where $C$ depends only on $d, s, \chi, N, M$ and $\tau$.

2.6 Local differentiation matrices

Let $L$ be a differential operator of order $m$ on $M$, $K$ the reproducing kernel of a Hilbert space $H_K(M)$ embedded into $C^m(M)$, and $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subset M$. For any $u \in C^m(M)$, an approximation of $Lu$ can be obtained by applying $L$ to the kernel interpolant

$$\sigma = \sum_{j=1}^n c_j K(\cdot, x_j), \quad \sigma(x_j) = u(x_j), \quad j = 1, \ldots, n,$$

$$Lu \approx L\sigma = \sum_{j=1}^n c_j K_L(\cdot, x_j).$$

In particular, the approximation $L\sigma|_X$ of $Lu|_X$ can be computed with the help of the differentiation matrix $W_X$,

$$L\sigma|_X = W_X u|_X, \quad \text{where} \quad W_X := K_L|_X (K|_X)^{-1}. \quad (32)$$
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If \( U \) is an open set in \( \mathcal{M} \) and \( \varphi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \) is a homeomorphism from \( U \) to \( U^\varphi := \varphi(U) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \), then we denote by \( L^\varphi \) the differential operator \( L \) in the local coordinates defined by \( \varphi \), that is

\[
L^\varphi v := L(v \circ \varphi) \circ \varphi^{-1}
\]

for any sufficiently smooth function \( v \) on \( U^\varphi \). Then the kernel \( K^\varphi(x, y) = K(\varphi^{-1}(x), \varphi^{-1}(y)) \) of the space \( H_K(U^\varphi) \) defined in (19) obviously satisfies

\[
L_i^\varphi K^\varphi = (L_i K)^\varphi, \quad i = 1, 2.
\]

In particular,

\[
W_X = K^\varphi_{X^\varphi}(K^\varphi|_{X^\varphi})^{-1},
\]

where \( K^\varphi_{X^\varphi} := L^\varphi_i K^\varphi \) and \( X^\varphi := \varphi(X) \).

**Lemma 12.** Let \( L \) be a differential operator on \( \mathcal{M} \) of order \( m \) with smooth coefficients, and let \( K \) be a reproducing kernel for \( H^s(\mathcal{M}) \), with an integer \( s > m + d/2 \). Furthermore, let \( X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subset U \) for an open set \( U \subset \hat{U}_k^c \subset \mathcal{M} \) for some \( k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and \( c > 0 \). For \( \varphi = \hat{\varphi}_k \), assume that \( U^\varphi \) is star-shaped with respect to a ball, with \( \chi(U^\varphi) \leq \chi < \infty \), and \( X^\varphi \) is an \( r \)-determining set for some \( r > m + d/2 \) such that \( K(\cdot, x) \in H^r(\mathcal{M}) \) for all \( x \in \mathcal{M} \). Then for any \( u \in H^r(\mathcal{M}) \),

\[
\|L u\|_X - W_X u|_X \|_\infty \leq C_1 \lambda_r(U^\varphi, X^\varphi) h^{r-m-d/2} |u^\varphi - \sigma^\varphi|_{H^r(U^\varphi)},
\]

where \( h = \text{diam}(U^\varphi) \), \( u^\varphi := u \circ \varphi^{-1} \), \( \sigma^\varphi := \sigma \circ \varphi^{-1} \) and \( C_1 \) depends only on \( r, d, \chi \) and \( L \). Moreover, if \( X^\varphi \) is an \( s \)-determining set and \( u \in H^s(\mathcal{M}) \), then

\[
\|L u\|_X - W_X u|_X \|_\infty \leq C_2 \lambda_s(U^\varphi, X^\varphi) h^{s-m-d/2} \|u\|_{K^\varphi}
\]

\[
\leq C_3 \lambda_s(U^\varphi, X^\varphi) \mathcal{E}_s(U^\varphi) h^{s-m-d/2} \|u^\varphi\|_{H^s(U^\varphi)},
\]

where \( C_2, C_3 \) depend in addition on \( K, \hat{\mathcal{A}}, \hat{\Gamma} \) and \( c \).

**Proof.** By Sobolev embedding, the condition \( r > m + d/2 \) ensures that \( u \in C^m(\mathcal{M}) \), hence \( Lu \) is well defined as a continuous function on \( \mathcal{M} \) as soon as \( u \in H^r(\mathcal{M}) \). Since \( U^\varphi \) is a Lipschitz domain, it follows that \( \mathcal{E}_s(U^\varphi) < \infty \), and Lemma 7 shows that \( K^\varphi \) is a reproducing kernel for \( H^s(U^\varphi) \). Since \( s > m + d/2 \), \( H^s(U^\varphi) \) is embedded into \( C^m(\mathcal{M}) \). Moreover, \( \sigma^\varphi \in H^r(U^\varphi) \) as a linear combination of the functions \( K^\varphi(\cdot, x_j) \), \( j = 1, \ldots, n \).

In view of (32) and (33), the \( i \)-th component of the vector \( Lu|_X - W_X u|_X \) has the form

\[
Lu(x_i) - L \sigma(x_i) = L^\varphi u^\varphi(x_i^\varphi) - L^\varphi \sigma^\varphi(x_i^\varphi),
\]

where \( x_i^\varphi = \varphi(x_i) \). Since \( (u^\varphi - \sigma^\varphi)|_{X^\varphi} = 0 \), the sampling inequality (28) implies

\[
|L^\varphi u^\varphi(x_i^\varphi) - L^\varphi \sigma^\varphi(x_i^\varphi)| \leq C \lambda_r(U^\varphi, X^\varphi) h^{r-m-d/2} |u^\varphi - \sigma^\varphi|_{H^r(U^\varphi)},
\]

where \( C \) depends only on \( r, d, \chi \) and the constants in (20), which implies (34).
In the case \( r = s \) the condition that \( K(\cdot, x) \in H^s(\mathcal{M}) \) for all \( x \in \mathcal{M} \) is satisfied since \( K \) is a reproducing kernel for \( H^s(\mathcal{M}) \), and we have by Lemma 7

\[
|u^\varphi - \sigma^\varphi|_{H^s(U^\varphi)} \leq \|u^\varphi - \sigma^\varphi\|_{H^s(U^\varphi)} \leq C\|u - \sigma\|_{K,U},
\]

where \( C \) depends only on \( K, \hat{A}, \hat{\Gamma}, c \) and \( s \). Then the minimum norm property (17) of the kernel interpolant implies \( \|u - \sigma\|_{K,U} \leq \|u\|_{K,U} \), and (35) follows.

Finally, by Lemma 7 \( \|u\|_{K,U} \leq C\mathcal{E}_s(U^\varphi)\|u^\varphi\|_{H^s(U^\varphi)} \), where \( C \) depends only on \( K, \hat{A}, \hat{\Gamma}, c \) and \( s \), which implies (36).

Different types of local error bounds for kernel based numerical differentiation can be found in [15, 17].

Note that for an operator \( L \) and kernel \( K \) satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 8 the estimate (34) holds, thanks to Lemma 9 for all \( r \) satisfying \( 2\kappa + d/2 < r < 2s - d/2 \) such that \( r - s \) is a multiple of \( 2\kappa \). Hence, it holds in this case for all integer \( r \) with \( 2\kappa + d/2 < r \leq s + 2\kappa \).

### 3. A meshless finite difference method

Assume that \( L \) is an elliptic differential operator on \( \mathcal{M} \) of order \( 2\kappa \) with smooth coefficients and trivial null space, and \( K \) is a reproducing kernel for \( H^s(\mathcal{M}) \), where \( s > \kappa + d/2 \), such that \( L \) is positive and self-adjoint with respect to the inner product \((\cdot, \cdot)_K\) of \( H^s(\mathcal{M}) \) defined by \( K \). As in Section 2.1 we denote by \( \|u\|_{H^s(\mathcal{M})} \) the norm of \( H^s(\mathcal{M}) \) associated with a fixed finite smooth atlas \( \hat{A} = \{(\hat{U}_k, \hat{\varphi}_k)\}_{k=1}^n \) and a smooth partition of unity \( \hat{\Gamma} = \{\hat{\gamma}_k\}_{k=1}^n \) subordinate to it.

We consider the equation \( Lu = f \), with continuous \( f \), and look for a discrete solution \( \hat{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n \) to approximate \( u \) on a given set of nodes \( X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subset \mathcal{M} \).

Let \( X_\ell = \{x_j : j \in J_\ell\} \neq \emptyset, \ell = 1, \ldots, m \), with \( J_\ell \subset J := \{1, \ldots, n\} \), be such that \( X_\ell = X \cap U_\ell, \ell = 1, \ldots, m \), for an atlas \( A = \{(U_\ell, \varphi_\ell)\}_{\ell=1}^m \) of \( \mathcal{M} \). Then \( \bigcup_{\ell=1}^m X_\ell = X \). We set \( X_\ell^\varphi := \varphi_\ell(X_\ell), U_\ell^\varphi := \varphi_\ell(U_\ell), n_\ell := \#X_\ell \). Consider the local differentiation matrices \( W_\ell := W_{X_\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\ell \times n_\ell} \) of (32), that is

\[
W_\ell = K_L|_{X_\ell}(K|_{X_\ell})^{-1} = K_L^\varphi|_{X_\ell^\varphi}(K^\varphi|_{X_\ell^\varphi})^{-1}, \quad \ell = 1, \ldots, m.
\]

The kernel \( K_L^\varphi \) is well defined and positive definite by Lemma 8 and hence the matrices \( W_\ell \) are symmetric and positive definite.

We now set up an overdetermined linear system

\[
WMv = F
\]

with unknown vector \( v \in \mathbb{R}^N \), the block diagonal matrix

\[
W = \text{diag}(W_1, \ldots, W_m) := \begin{bmatrix} W_1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & W_m \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}, \quad N := n_1 + \cdots + n_m,
\]
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the incidence matrix
\[
M = \begin{bmatrix}
M_1 \\
\vdots \\
M_m
\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}, \quad M_\ell = [\delta_{ij}]_{i \in J_\ell, j \in J_\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\ell \times n_\ell}, \quad \delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } i = j, \\
0 & \text{otherwise}, 
\end{cases}
\]
and the right hand side vector
\[
F = \begin{bmatrix}
F_1 \\
\vdots \\
F_m
\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad F_\ell := f|_{X_\ell}.
\]

The matrix $WM$ has the full rank $n$ since $W$ is non-singular and rank $M = n$.

We determine the discrete solution $\hat{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as the unique least squares solution of (38), such that
\[
\|WM\hat{u} - F\|_2 = \min_{v \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|WMv - F\|_2.
\] (39)

Note that (38) can be more explicitly written as
\[
W_\ell v|_{J_\ell} = f|_{X_\ell}, \quad \ell = 1, \ldots, m,
\] (40)
and hence, in line with the main idea of meshless generalized finite differences, each linear equation in (38) is derived from a numerical differentiation formula
\[
Lu(x_i) \approx \sum_{j \in J_\ell} w^{(\ell)}_{i,j} u(x_j), \quad i \in J_\ell,
\]
where the weight vector $[w^{(\ell)}_{i,j}]_{j \in J_\ell}$ is the row of $W_\ell$ corresponding to the node $x_i$. Since
\[
\|WMv - F\|_2^2 = \sum_{\ell=1}^m \|W_\ell v|_{J_\ell} - f|_{X_\ell}\|_2^2,
\] (41)
we in fact minimize in (39) the sum of squared residuals of the numerical differentiation on the subsets $X_\ell$.

Thus, $\hat{u}$ is well-defined for any node set $X$ and any atlas $A$ as soon as $L$ is positive and self-adjoint with respect to the inner product defined by a reproducing kernel $K$ for $H^s(M)$ with $s > \kappa + d/2$. However, in order to estimate the error of the discrete solution $\hat{u}$,
\[
\|\hat{u} - u|_X\|_\infty,
\] (42)
we will assume that
\[
s \text{ is an integer satisfying } s > 2\kappa + d/2,
\] (43)
and make the following assumptions about $A$ and $X$:
A is c-admissible with respect to \( \hat{A} = \{(\hat{U}_\ell, \hat{\varphi}_k)\}_{k=1}^{\hat{n}} \) and \( \hat{\Gamma} \), for some \( c = c_A > 0 \).

(A2) Each \( U_\ell^\varphi \) is bounded and star-shaped with respect to a ball. Thus,
\[
\chi_A := \max_{\ell = 1, \ldots, n} \chi(U_\ell^\varphi)
\]
is finite.

(A3) For all \( \ell \) and \( p \) such that \( U_p \cap U_\ell \neq \emptyset \), the set \( \varphi_\ell(X_p \cap X_\ell) \) is an \((s + \kappa)\)-determining set.

For \( r \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \), let
\[
\lambda_r(A, X) := \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq m} \max_{i \in I_\ell} \lambda_r(U_\ell^\varphi, \varphi_\ell(X_i \cap X_\ell)),
\]
where
\[
I_\ell := \{i : U_i \cap U_\ell \neq \emptyset\}.
\]
By (A3), \( \lambda_{s + \kappa}(A, X) < \infty \).

We will also need some further parameters of \( X \) and \( A \). The main parameter to measure the error against will be
\[
h_A = \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq m} h_\ell, \quad \text{where} \quad h_\ell := \text{diam}(U_\ell^\varphi).
\]
Furthermore, let
\[

\nu_{X, A} := \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq m} n_\ell.
\]
We denote by \( \delta_{X, A} \) the separation distance of the set \( X \) with respect to the atlas \( A \), that is, the largest \( \delta > 0 \) such that for each \( \ell = 1, \ldots, m \), the open balls of radius \( \delta \) centered at \( \varphi_\ell(x_j) \) for all \( j \in J_\ell \) are pairwise disjoint and contained in \( U_\ell^\varphi \),
\[
\delta_{X, A} := \min_{1 \leq \ell \leq m} \min \left\{ \text{dist}(X_\ell^\varphi, \partial U_\ell^\varphi), \frac{1}{2} \min_{j \in J_\ell} \text{dist} \left( \varphi_\ell(x_j), X_\ell^\varphi \setminus \{\varphi_\ell(x_j)\} \right) \right\}. \tag{44}
\]

To measure the quasi-uniformity of \( X \), we define
\[
q_{X, A} := h_A / \delta_{X, A}.
\]
Note that
\[
\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq m} \frac{h_i}{h_j} \leq q_{X, A}
\]
since \( \delta_{X, A} < h_\ell \leq h_A \) for all \( \ell \).

It follows from (A2) that the domains \( U^\varphi_\ell \) satisfy the Lipschitz condition. For each \( \ell \), we choose a Lipschitz cover \( \mathcal{L} \) of \( \partial U^\varphi_\ell \) and consider \( N_\ell = N_\mathcal{L}, M_\ell = M_\mathcal{L}, \tau_\ell = \tau_\mathcal{L} \), as defined in Section 2.5. Let
\[
N_A := \max_{\ell = 1, \ldots, n} N_\ell, \quad M_A := \max_{\ell = 1, \ldots, n} M_\ell, \quad \tau_A := \min_{\ell = 1, \ldots, n} \tau_\ell,
\]
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and

$$\mathcal{E}_r(\mathcal{A}) := \max_{\ell=1,...,n} \mathcal{E}_r(U^\varphi_{\ell}), \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}_+. $$

Finally, we choose a smooth partition of unity $\Gamma = \{ \gamma_\ell \}_{\ell=1}^n$ subordinate to $\mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\gamma_\ell \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M}), \quad \gamma_\ell \geq 0, \quad \text{supp} \gamma_\ell \subset U_\ell, \quad \sum_{\ell=1}^n \gamma_\ell = 1, \quad (45)$$

and set

$$\eta_r(\mathcal{A}) := \max \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq m, |a| \leq r} \| \partial^a g_\ell \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad (46)$$

where

$$g_\ell(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{\partial \varphi(x)}{\partial \varphi^{-1}(h_\ell x)}, & \text{if } h_\ell x \in U^\varphi_{\ell}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Example 1.** Assume that each $U^\varphi_{\ell}$ contains a ball $B_\ell$ of radius $\rho_\ell$ centered at the origin of $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $h_\ell \leq \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$ for each $x \in \mathcal{M}$ there is an $\ell$ with $\| \varphi_\ell(x) \|_2 \leq \alpha \rho_\ell$ for some fixed positive $\alpha < 1$. (In particular, we may choose $U_\ell = \varphi^{-1}_\ell(y_\ell + B_\ell)$ for suitable centers $y_\ell \in \varphi_\ell(U^\varphi_{\ell})$ and radii $\rho_\ell$, and define the subsets $X_\ell$ of $\varphi_\ell$ as $X_\ell = \varphi_\ell \cap U_\ell$.) Let $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be an infinitely differentiable bump function supported on the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^d$, for example $\Psi(x) = \psi(|x|^2)$, with $\psi \in C^\infty[0, \infty), \psi(0) = 1, \psi(k)(0) = 0, k \in \mathbb{N}, \psi(t) > 0$ and $\psi'(t) \leq 0$ for $0 \leq t < 1$, and $\psi(t) = 0$ for $t \geq 1$. We set

$$\tilde{\gamma}_\ell(x) := \begin{cases} \psi(\varphi_\ell(x)/\rho_\ell), & x \in U_\ell, \\ 0, & x \in \mathcal{M} \setminus U_\ell, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\gamma_\ell(x) = \tilde{\gamma}_\ell(x)/\tilde{\gamma}(x), \quad \ell = 1, \ldots, m, \quad \tilde{\gamma}(x) := \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{\gamma}_i(x).$$

Then

$$\tilde{\gamma}(x) \geq \psi(\alpha^2) > 0, \quad x \in \mathcal{M},$$

each function $g_\ell$ is supported in the ball of radius $\rho_\ell/h_\ell$ centered at the origin, and for $x$ in this ball,

$$g_\ell(x) = \frac{\mathcal{E}(h_\ell x/\rho_\ell)}{\tilde{\gamma}(\varphi^{-1}_\ell(h_\ell x))},$$

with

$$\tilde{\gamma}(\varphi^{-1}_\ell(h_\ell x)) = \sum_{i \in I_\ell(x)} \varphi_\ell((\varphi_i \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell)(h_\ell x)/\rho_i),$$

$$I_\ell(x) := \{ i : \varphi^{-1}_\ell(h_\ell x) \in U_i \} \subset \{ i : U_\ell \cap U_i \neq \emptyset \}.$$
Note that more general domains e.g. unions of ellipsoids may be used instead of balls as supports of the partition of unity functions \( \gamma_t \) if we want to estimate the smallest possible constant \( \eta_t(A) \) for a given choice of \( U_t \) and \( X_t = X \cap U_t \).

We stress that in contrast to the partition of unity methods \([5, 25, 30]\), \( \Gamma \) is not used in the computation of the discrete solution \( \hat{u} \approx u|_X \), and we only need the existence of partitions of unity with bounded constants \( \eta_t(A) \) in order to prove the error bounds.

**Theorem 1.** Let \( L \) be an elliptic differential operator of order \( 2\kappa \) with smooth coefficients and trivial null space, and let \( K \) be a reproducing kernel for a Sobolev space \( H^s(M) \) with an integer \( s \) satisfying \( s > 2\kappa + d/2 \), such that \( L \) is positive and self-adjoint with respect to the inner product defined by \( K \). Assume that a set of nodes \( X \) and an atlas \( A = \{ (U_t, \phi_t) \}_{t=1}^m \) satisfy (A1)-(A3). For any \( f \in H^{s-\kappa}(M) \), let \( u \in H^{s+\kappa}(M) \) be the solution of \( Lu = f \), and let \( \hat{u} \) be the discrete approximate solution determined by (39). Then there exists a function \( \hat{u} \in H^{s+2\kappa}(M) \) such that \( \hat{u}|_X = \hat{u} \) and for all \( 0 \leq r < s - \kappa \),

\[
\| u - \hat{u} \|_{H^{2\kappa+r}(M)} \leq C_1 h_A^{s-2\kappa-d-r} \| u \|_{H^{s}(M)} + C_2 h_A^{s-\kappa-d/2-r} \| u \|_{H^{s+\kappa}(M)},
\]

where \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are independent of \( f, u \) and \( h_A \). If \( \mu_A \leq \mu, \lambda_{s+\kappa}(A,X) \leq \lambda, c_A \leq c, \chi_A \leq \chi, \nu_{X,A} \leq \nu, q_{X,A} \leq q, \eta_{s+\kappa}(A) \leq \eta, N_A \leq N, M_A \leq M, \tau_A \geq \tau \), for some positive real \( \mu, \lambda, c, \chi, \nu, q, \eta, N, M, \tau \), there are constants \( C_1, C_2 \) in (47) depending only on \( \mu, \lambda, c, \chi, \nu, q, \eta, N, M, \tau \). Moreover,

\[
\| u \|_{X} - \hat{u} \|_{X} \|_{\infty} \leq C_1 h_A^{s-2\kappa-d-r_0} \| u \|_{H^{s}(M)} + C_2 h_A^{s-\kappa-d/2-r_0} \| u \|_{H^{s+\kappa}(M)},
\]

where \( r_0 = \max \{0, [\frac{d}{2}] - 2\kappa + 1 \} \), with the same properties of the constants \( C_1, C_2 \).

The proof of Theorem 1 will be given in Section 4.

Note that convergence in \( H^{2\kappa+r}(M) \) as \( h_A \to 0 \) follows from (47) only when \( 0 \leq r < s - 2\kappa - d \), thus under a stricter assumption than (13),

\[
s > 2\kappa + d,
\]

and the discrete convergence follows from (18) under the assumption that

\[
s > \max\{2\kappa, \frac{d}{2} + 1 \} + d.
\]

In particular, in the discrete case in order for the power of \( h_A \) to be positive, we need

\[
s > 2\kappa + d + r_0 = \max\{2\kappa + d, d + \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor + 1 \},
\]

which is equivalent to \( s > \max\{2\kappa, \frac{d}{2} + 1 \} + d \) since \( s \) is integer.

For example, for \( \kappa = 1 \) and \( d \leq 3 \) we obtain the Sobolev norm convergence with the order

\[
\| u - \hat{u} \|_{H^{2\kappa+r}(M)} = \mathcal{O}(h_A^{s-d-2-r}) \quad \text{if} \quad s \geq d + 3, \quad 0 \leq r \leq s - d - 3,
\]

and the discrete norm convergence

\[
\| u \|_{X} - \hat{u} \|_{X} = \mathcal{O}(h_A^{s-d-2}) \quad \text{if} \quad s \geq d + 3.
\]
In fact, local interpolation functions $\tilde{u}_\ell$ of the proof in Section 4 may be a good suggestion for the evaluation of the approximate solution and derived quantities such as gradient. Alternatively, for the same purpose we may use the function $\tilde{u}$ of the proof (see Section 4), which however requires an implementation of the partition of unity $\Gamma$, or the kernel interpolant to $\hat{u}$, which requires solving a non-sparse linear system with the matrix $K|_X$ and evaluation of a kernel sum with $n$ terms.

4 Proof of Theorem 1

Recall that we assume that $\mu_A \leq \mu$, $\lambda_{s+\kappa}(A, X) \leq \lambda$, $c_A \leq c$, $\chi_A \leq \chi$, $\nu_{X,A} \leq \nu$, $q_{X,A} \leq q$, $\eta_{s+\kappa}(A) \leq \eta$. Then also $\lambda_r(A, X) \leq \lambda$ for all $r \leq s + \kappa$, in particular for $r = s$ and $r = s - \kappa$. The constants denoted by $C, C_1, C_2, \ldots$ in this section will be independent of $f, u, h_A, \delta_X, A$, and the Lipschitz cover parameters $N_A, M_A, \tau_A$. They in general depend on $M, L, K, \hat{A}$ and the partition of unity $\hat{\Gamma}$ that we use to fix the Sobolev norms, as well as on $\mu, \lambda, c, \chi, \nu, q, \eta$. We assume without loss of generality that $h_A \leq 1$. Then also $\delta_{X,A} \leq 1$.

By (36) and (A1)–(A3),

$$\|W\ell u|_{X_\ell} - Lu|_{X_\ell}\|_\infty \leq CE_s(U_\ell^2)h_A^{s-2\kappa-d/2}\|u \circ \varphi_\ell^{-1}\|_{H^s(U_\ell^2)}, \quad \ell = 1, \ldots, m.$$  

Since, in view of (II),

$$\|WM\hat{u} - F\|_2^2 \leq \|WMu|_X - F\|_2^2 = \sum_{\ell=1}^m \|W\ell u|_{X_\ell} - Lu|_{X_\ell}\|_2^2,$$

we obtain by Lemma II

$$\varepsilon_1 := \|WM\hat{u} - F\|_2 \leq CE_s(A)h_A^{s-2\kappa-d/2}\|u\|_{H^s(M)}. \quad (49)$$

We will construct a function $\tilde{u} \in H^{s+\kappa}(M)$ such that $\tilde{u}|_X = \hat{u}$, and estimate its distance to $u$ in Sobolev spaces of lower order as in (47). We define local interpolants $\tilde{u}_\ell$ on the sets $X_\ell$ and then combine them together with the help of a partition of unity. For each $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$, let

$$\tilde{u}_\ell(x) = \sum_{j \in J_\ell} c_j K(x, x_j),$$

where the coefficients $c_j$ are uniquely determined by the interpolation conditions

$$\tilde{u}_\ell|_{X_\ell} = \hat{u}|_{J_\ell}. \quad (50)$$

By (57), $L\tilde{u}_\ell|_{X_\ell} = W\ell \tilde{u}_\ell|_{X_\ell}$. Hence

$$L\tilde{u}_\ell|_{X_\ell} = W\ell \tilde{u}_\ell|_{J_\ell}, \quad (51)$$
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Moreover, by Lemma 8 \( \tilde{u}_\ell \in H^{s+2\kappa}(\mathcal{M}) \). By (2) and Lemma 8
\[
\|\tilde{u}_\ell\|_{H^{s+2\kappa}(\mathcal{M})} \leq C\|L\tilde{u}_\ell\|_{K_L}. \tag{52}
\]
It follows from (51) and (41) that
\[
\sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \|L\tilde{u}_\ell|_{\mathcal{X}_\ell} - Lu|_{\mathcal{X}_\ell}\|^2_2 = \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \|W_\ell \hat{u}|_{J_\ell} - Lu|_{\mathcal{X}_\ell}\|^2_2 = \|WM\hat{u} - F\|^2_2 = \varepsilon_1^2. \tag{53}
\]
Our next goal is to estimate the \( K_L \)-norm of \( L\tilde{u}_\ell \). Note that due to (18),
\[
\|L\tilde{u}_\ell\|_{K_L} = \|L\tilde{u}_\ell\|_{K_L,U_{\ell}}, \quad \mathcal{X}_\ell \subset U_{\ell}. \]
Let
\[
u_\ell \in \text{span}\{K(\cdot,x_j) : j \in J_\ell\}
\]
be the kernel sum determined by the interpolation conditions
\[
Lu|_{X_\ell} = Lu|_{X_\ell}.
\]
Then \( Lu_\ell \) is the \( K_L \)-kernel interpolant of \( f = Lu \). By Lemma 8 \( K_L \) is a reproducing kernel for \( H^{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{M}) \), and by Lemma 7 and (A2), \( H_{K_L}(U_{\ell}) = H^{s-\kappa}(U_{\ell}^\circ) \). Hence, by (18) and the minimum norm property (17), since \( \mathcal{X}_\ell \subset U_{\ell} \),
\[
\|Lu_\ell\|_{K_L} = \|Lu_\ell\|_{K_L,U_{\ell}} \leq \|f\|_{K_L,U_{\ell}},
\]
and by Lemma 7
\[
\|f\|_{K_L,U_{\ell}} \leq C\mathcal{E}_{s-\kappa}(U_{\ell}^\circ)\|f \circ \varphi_{\ell}^{-1}\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(U_{\ell}^\circ)}. \tag{54}
\]
It follows by Lemma 11 that
\[
\sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \|Lu_\ell\|^2_{K_L} \leq C\mathcal{E}_{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{A})\|f\|^2_{H^{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{M})}. \tag{54}
\]
Consider the functions \( v_\ell = L\tilde{u}_\ell - Lu_\ell, \ell = 1, \ldots, m \), that satisfy
\[
\sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \|v_\ell|_{X_\ell}\|^2_2 \leq \varepsilon_1^2,
\]
thanks to (53). Let
\[
\psi_\ell = \sum_{j \in J_\ell} v_\ell(x_j) \Psi_{j,\delta}^\ell, \quad \Psi_{j,\delta}^\ell(x) := \begin{cases} \Psi(\varphi_{\ell}(x) / \delta), & x \in U_{\ell}, \\ \varphi_{\ell}(x) / \delta, & x \in \mathcal{M} \setminus U_{\ell}, \end{cases} \quad \varphi_{\ell}(x) = \varphi(\|x\|^2_2) \text{ is a radially symmetric bump function in } C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ supported on the unit ball, as in Example 1, and } \delta = \delta_{X,A} \leq 1.
\]
Then the supports of the functions \( \Psi_{j,\delta}, j \in J_\ell \), are pairwise disjoint and hence
\[
\psi_\ell|_{X_\ell} = v_\ell|_{X_\ell}
\]
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and
\[
|\psi_\ell \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell|_{H^r(U_\ell^r)} = \delta^{-r+d/2} |\psi|_{H^r(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|v_\ell\|_2, \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}_+,
\]
which implies (since in particular \(\delta \leq 1\)),
\[
\sum_{\ell=1}^m \|\psi_\ell \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(U_\ell^r)}^2 \leq \varepsilon_1^2 \sum_{r=0}^{s-\kappa} |\psi|_{H^r(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \delta^{-2r+d} \leq \varepsilon_1^2 \|\psi\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \delta^{-2(s-\kappa)+d}.
\]
By (18), the minimum norm property (17) of \(v_\ell\) as the \(K_L\)-kernel interpolant of \(\psi_\ell \in H_{K_L}(U_\ell)\), and by Lemma 7
\[
\|v_\ell\|_{K_L} = \|v_\ell\|_{K_L,U_\ell} \leq C \mathcal{E}_{s-\kappa}(U_\ell^r) \|\psi_\ell \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(U_\ell^r)}.
\]
Since \(\delta^{-1} \leq q h_A^{-1}\),
\[
\sum_{\ell=1}^m \|v_\ell\|_{K_L}^2 \leq C \mathcal{E}_{s-\kappa}(A) \varepsilon_2^2 h_A^{-2(s-\kappa)+d}.
\]
Combining this with (54), we obtain for \(L\bar{u}_\ell = Lu_\ell + v_\ell\),
\[
\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^m \|L\bar{u}_\ell\|_{K_L}^2\right)^{1/2} \leq C_{s-\kappa}(A) \left( C_1 \|f\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{M})} + C_2 \varepsilon_1 h_A^{-2+\kappa+d/2}\right). \tag{55}
\]
We set
\[
\bar{u} := \sum_{\ell=1}^m \gamma_\ell \bar{u}_\ell,
\]
where \(\{\gamma_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^m\) is the smooth partition of unity subordinate to \(A\). Note that \(\bar{u} \in H^{s+2\kappa}(\mathcal{M})\), which follows from the same property of \(\bar{u}_\ell\). It follows from (50) and (15) that
\[
\bar{u}|_X = \bar{u}. \tag{56}
\]
We now use (55) and the properties of the partition of unity in order to obtain an estimate for \(\|L\bar{u}\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{M})}\). By Lemma 11
\[
\|L\bar{u}\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{M})} \leq C \sum_{\ell=1}^m \|L\bar{u}_\ell \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(U_\ell^r)}.
\]
For each \(\ell = 1, \ldots, m\),
\[
\|L\bar{u}_\ell \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(U_\ell^r)} \leq \|L\bar{u}_\ell \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(U_\ell^r)} + \|L(\bar{u} - \bar{u}_\ell) \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(U_\ell^r)}.
\]
By Lemma 7 and (18),
\[
\|L\bar{u}_\ell \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(U_\ell^r)} \leq C \|L\bar{u}_\ell\|_{K_L},
\]
and we will be able to estimate the terms of this type by applying (55). It follows from (20) and the Leibniz rule that
\[
\|L(\bar{u} - \bar{u}_\ell) \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(U_\ell^r)} \leq C \|(\bar{u} - \bar{u}_\ell) \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(U_\ell^r)}.
\]
By the definition of $\tilde{u}$,

$$\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_\ell = \sum_{p \in I_\ell \setminus \{\ell\}} \gamma_p (\tilde{u}_p - \tilde{u}_\ell) \quad \text{in } U_\ell, \quad I_\ell = \{ i : U_i \cap U_\ell \neq \emptyset \}.$$  

Applying the Leibniz rule again, we obtain for $|\alpha| \leq s + \kappa$,

$$\partial^\alpha ((\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_\ell) \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell) = \sum_{p \in I_\ell \setminus \{\ell\}} \sum_{\beta \leq \alpha} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} \partial^{\alpha - \beta} (\gamma_p \circ \varphi^{-1}_p) \partial^\beta ((\tilde{u}_p - \tilde{u}_\ell) \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell) \quad \text{in } U^p_\ell.$$  

By (46),

$$\|\partial^\alpha (\gamma_p \circ \varphi^{-1}_p)\|_{L^\infty(U^p_\ell)} = h_\ell^{2|\alpha|} \|\partial^\alpha g\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq h_\ell^{2|\alpha|} \eta_{s+\kappa}(A) \leq \eta h_\ell^{2|\alpha|}.$$  

Hence

$$\|\partial^\alpha ((\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_\ell) \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell)\|_{L^2(U^p_\ell)} \leq C \sum_{p \in I_\ell \setminus \{\ell\}} \sum_{\beta \leq \alpha} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} h_\ell^{2|\beta|} \|\partial^\beta ((\tilde{u}_p - \tilde{u}_\ell) \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell)\|_{L^2(U^p_\ell)}.$$  

Let $p \in I_\ell \setminus \{\ell\}$. By (50),

$$\tilde{u}_p|_{X_p \cap J_\ell} = \tilde{u}|_{J_p \cap J_\ell} = \tilde{u}_\ell|_{X_p \cap X_\ell}.$$  

Hence, it follows from (27) that for $|\beta| < s + \kappa$,

$$\|\partial^\beta ((\tilde{u}_p - \tilde{u}_\ell) \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell)\|_{L^2(U^p_\ell)} \leq C h_\ell^{s+\kappa-|\beta|} (\tilde{u}_p - \tilde{u}_\ell) \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell |_{H^{s+\kappa}(U^p_\ell)}.$$  

By Lemma 1

$$|(\tilde{u}_p - \tilde{u}_\ell) \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell|_{H^{s+\kappa}(U^p_\ell)} \leq C \|\tilde{u}_p - \tilde{u}_\ell\|_{H^{s+\kappa}(A)}.$$  

By (52),

$$\|\tilde{u}_p - \tilde{u}_\ell\|_{H^{s+\kappa}(A)} \leq C (\|\tilde{L}\tilde{u}_p\|_{K_L} + \|\tilde{L}\tilde{u}_\ell\|_{K_L}).$$  

By combining these estimates, since $h_A \leq 1$ and hence $h_\ell^{s+\kappa-|\alpha|} \leq 1$, we obtain

$$\|(\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_\ell) \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell\|_{H^{s+\kappa}(U^p_\ell)} \leq C \sum_{p \in I_\ell \setminus \{\ell\}} (\|\tilde{L}\tilde{u}_p\|_{K_L} + \|\tilde{L}\tilde{u}_\ell\|_{K_L}). \quad (57)$$  

This implies

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^m \|L(\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_\ell) \circ \varphi^{-1}_\ell\|_{H^{s+\kappa}(U^p_\ell)}^2 \leq C \sum_{\ell=1}^m \|\tilde{L}\tilde{u}_\ell\|_{K_L}^2.$$  

Summarizing the estimates, we get

$$\|L\tilde{u}\|_{H^{s+\kappa}(A)} \leq C \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^m \|\tilde{L}\tilde{u}_\ell\|_{K_L}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$  
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and hence by (55),

\[ \|L\tilde{u}\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{M})} \leq C_1\|f\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{M})} + C_2\varepsilon_1\widetilde{h}^{-s+\kappa+d/2}_A. \]  

(58)

Finally, we will estimate Sobolev norms of \( Lu - L\tilde{u} \) by applying Lemma 10 locally, which in turn will give us estimates for \( u - \tilde{u} \) thanks to (2). Since \( X = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^m X_\ell \), it follows from (53) that

\[ \|L\tilde{u}\|_{X} - Lu\|_{X} \leq \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^m \|L\tilde{u}\|_{X_\ell}^2 - Lu\|_{X_\ell}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2, \]  

(59)

where

\[ \varepsilon_2 := \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^m \|L\tilde{u}\|_{X_\ell}^2 - Lu\|_{X_\ell}^2 \right)^{1/2}. \]

By (51) and (56),

\[ L\tilde{u}\|_{X_\ell} = W_\ell\tilde{u}\|_{J_\ell} = W_\ell\tilde{u}\|_{X_\ell}. \]

By construction, \( \tilde{u}_\ell \) is the kernel interpolant to \( \tilde{u} \) on \( X_\ell \), compare (50) and (56). Hence by (34),

\[ \|L\tilde{u}\|_{X_\ell} - W_\ell\tilde{u}\|_{X_\ell} \leq C\|\tilde{u}_\ell\|_{H^{s+\kappa}(U^\varphi_\ell)}. \]

In view of (57),

\[ \varepsilon_2^2 \leq \nu \sum_{\ell=1}^m \|L\tilde{u}\|_{X_\ell} - W_\ell\tilde{u}\|_{X_\ell}\|_{X_\ell}^2 \leq C\|\tilde{u}_\ell\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(U^\varphi_\ell)}^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^m \|L\tilde{u}\|_{X_\ell}^2. \]

and by (55) we get

\[ \varepsilon_2 \leq \mathcal{E}_{s-\kappa}(A)(C_1\|L\tilde{u}\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{M})} + C_2\varepsilon_1). \]  

(60)

Let \( v = L\tilde{u} - Lu \). Then \( v \in H^{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{M}) \) and

\[ \varepsilon_3 := \|v\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{M})} \leq \|L\tilde{u}\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{M})} + \|Lu\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{M})}. \]

Hence by (58),

\[ \varepsilon_3 \leq \mathcal{E}_{s-\kappa}(A)(C_1\|Lu\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(\mathcal{M})} + C_2\varepsilon_1\widetilde{h}^{-s+\kappa+d/2}_A), \]  

(61)

and by (59),

\[ \|v\|_{X} \leq \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2. \]

By Lemma 10 for any integer \( r \) with \( 0 \leq r < s - \kappa \), and each \( \ell = 1, \ldots, m, \)

\[ |v \circ \varphi_\ell^{-1}|_{H^r(U^\varphi_\ell)} \leq C\|\tilde{\varphi}_\ell^{-r}\|_{H^{d/2}(U^\varphi_\ell)} \|v\|_{X_\ell}\| + \|\varphi_\ell^{-1}\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(U^\varphi_\ell)}. \]
Hence by Lemma 1,

$$\|v\|_{H^r(M)}^2 \leq C \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \|v \circ \varphi_{\ell}^{-1}\|_{H^r(U^\ell)}^2$$

\[ \leq C \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} h^{d-2r}_{\ell} \|v|_{X_{\ell}}\|_\infty^2 + h^{2(s-\kappa-r)}_{A} \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \|v \circ \varphi_{\ell}^{-1}\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(U^\ell)}^2 \right) \]

\[ \leq C_1 h^{d-2r}_{A} \|v|_{X}\|_2^2 + C_2 h^{2(s-\kappa-r)}_{A} \|v\|_{H^{s-\kappa}(M)}^2. \]

It follows in view of (2) that for any $0 < r < s - \kappa$,

$$\|u - \tilde{u}\|_{H^{r+2\kappa}(M)} \leq C_1 h_{A}^{d/2-r} (\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2) + C_2 h_{A}^{s-\kappa-r} \varepsilon_3. \quad (62)$$

By (19), (60) and (61),

$$\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 \leq C_1 \mathcal{E}_{s}(A) h_{A}^{s-2\kappa-d/2} \|u\|_{H^{s}(M)} + C_2 \mathcal{E}_{s-\kappa}(A) h_{A}^{s-\kappa-d/2} \|L \|_{H^{s}(M)},$$

$$\varepsilon_3 \leq \mathcal{E}_{s-\kappa}(A) (C_1 \|L \|_{H^{s}(M)} + C_2 \mathcal{E}_{s}(A) h_{A}^{s-\kappa} \|u\|_{H^{s}(M)}).$$

Hence by (62),

$$\|u - \tilde{u}\|_{H^{r+2\kappa}(M)} \leq \mathcal{E}_{s-\kappa}(A) (C_1 \mathcal{E}_{s}(A) h_{A}^{s-2\kappa-r} \|u\|_{H^{s}(M)} + C_2 \mathcal{E}_{s}(A) h_{A}^{s-\kappa-r} \|L u\|_{H^{s}(M)}).$$

By using (2) again, we arrive at

$$\|u - \tilde{u}\|_{H^{r+2\kappa}(M)} \leq \mathcal{E}_{s-\kappa}(A) (C_1 \mathcal{E}_{s}(A) h_{A}^{s-2\kappa-r} \|u\|_{H^{s}(M)} + C_2 \mathcal{E}_{s}(A) h_{A}^{s-\kappa-r} \|L u\|_{H^{s}(M)}), \quad (63)$$

which implies (47) in view of Lemma 11.

To show (48) we use Sobolev embedding of $H^{2\kappa+r}(M)$ into $C(M)$ as soon as $2\kappa+r > d/2$. It is easy to see that $r_0$ in (48) is the smallest integer $r$ satisfying this inequality.
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