

# Non-conforming Crouzeix-Raviar element approximation for Stekloff eigenvalues in inverse scattering

Yidu Yang · Yu Zhang · Hai Bi

Received: date / Accepted: date

**Abstract** In this paper, we use the non-conforming Crouzeix-Raviart element method to solve a Stekloff eigenvalue problem arising in inverse scattering. The weak formulation corresponding to this problem is non-selfadjoint and does not satisfy  $H^1$ -elliptic condition, and its Crouzeix-Raviart element discretization does not meet the Strang lemma condition. We use the standard duality techniques to prove an extension of Strang lemma. And we prove the convergence and error estimate of discrete eigenvalues and eigenfunctions using the spectral perturbation theory for compact operators. Finally, we present some numerical examples not only on uniform meshes but also in an adaptive refined meshes to show that the Crouzeix-Raviart method is efficient for computing real and complex eigenvalues as expected.

**Keywords** Stekloff eigenvalue · Nonconforming Crouzeix-Raviart element · Strang lemma · Error estimates.

## 1 Introduction

Stekloff eigenvalue problems have important physical background and many applications. For instance, they appear in the analysis of stability of mechanical

---

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos.11561014,11761022 ).

---

Yidu Yang (✉)  
School of Mathematical Sciences, Guizhou Normal University, Guiyang, 550001, China.  
E-mail: ydyang@gznu.edu.cn

Yu Zhang  
School of Mathematical Sciences, Guizhou Normal University, Guiyang, 550001, China.  
E-mail: zhang\_hello\_hi@126.com

Hai Bi  
School of Mathematical Sciences, Guizhou Normal University, Guiyang, 550001, China.  
E-mail: bihaimath@gznu.edu.cn

oscillators immersed in a viscous fluid (see [28] and the references therein), in the study of surface waves [10], in the study of the vibration modes of a structure in contact with an incompressible fluid [11] and in the analysis of the antiplane shearing on a system of collinear faults under slip-dependent friction law [19]. Hence, the finite element methods for solving these problems have attracted more and more scholars' attention. Till now, systematical and profound studies on the finite element approximation mainly focus on Stekloff eigenvalue problems which satisfy  $H^1$ -elliptic condition (see, e.g., [3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 13, 15, 22, 34, 36, 37, 41, 46, 47] and the references therein).

Recently Cakoni et al. [21] study a new Stekloff eigenvalue problem arising from the inverse scattering theory:

$$\Delta u + k^2 n(x)u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial \gamma} = -\lambda u \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\Omega$  is a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  ( $d = 2, 3$ ),  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \gamma}$  is the outward normal derivative,  $k$  is the wavenumber and  $n(x) = n_1(x) + i\frac{n_2(x)}{k}$  is index of refraction that is a bounded complex valued function with  $n_1(x) > 0$  and  $n_2(x) \geq 0$ .

Note that the weak formulation of (1.1) (see (2.1)) does not satisfy  $H^1$ -elliptic condition. Cakoni et al. [21] analyze the mathematics properties of (1.1) and use conforming finite element method to solve it. Liu et al. [38] then study error estimates of conforming finite element eigenvalues for (1.1).

In this paper, we will study the non-conforming Crouzeix-Raviart element (C-R element) approximation for the problem. The C-R element was first introduced by Crouzeix and Raviart in [29] in 1973 to solve the stationary Stokes equation. It was also used to solve linear elasticity equations (see [33, 16]), the Laplace equation/eigenvalues (see [7, 14, 17, 23, 24, 25, 31]), Darcy's equation [2], Stekloff eigenvalue (see [3, 13, 36, 41, 47]) and so on. The features of our work are as follows:

1. As we know, the convergence and error estimates of the non-conforming finite element method for an eigenvalue problem is based on the convergence and error estimates of the non-conforming finite element method for the corresponding source problem, and Strang lemma (see [44]) is a fundamental analysis tool. However, the sesquilinear form in the C-R element discretization here does not meet the Strang lemma condition. To overcome this difficulty, referring to §5.7 in [17], we use the standard duality techniques to prove an extension of Strang lemma (see Theorem 2). Based on the theorem, we prove the convergence and error estimates of the C-R method for the corresponding source problem. The current paper, to our knowledge, is the first investigation of applying and extending Strang lemma to elliptic boundary value problem that the corresponding sesquilinear form is non-selfadjoint and not coercive.
2. Cakoni et al. [21] write (1.1) as an equivalent eigenvalue problem of the Neumann-to-Dirichlet operator  $T$ . In this paper, we write the C-R element approximation of (1.1) as an equivalent eigenvalue problem of the discrete operator  $T_h$ , and prove  $T_h$  converges  $T$  in the sense of norm in  $L^2(\partial\Omega)$ ,

thus using Babuska-Osborn spectral approximation theory [8] we prove first the convergence and error estimates of C-R finite element eigenvalues and eigenfunctions for the problem (1.1).

3. We implement some numerical experiments not only on uniform meshes but also in adaptive refined meshes. It can be seen that the C-R method is efficient for computing real and complex eigenvalues as expected. In addition, we discover, when the index of refraction  $n(x)$  is real and the corresponding eigenfunctions are singular, the C-R element eigenvalues approximate the exact ones from above and conforming finite element eigenvalues approximate the exact ones from below, thus we get the upper and lower bounds of eigenvalues.

It should be pointed out that the theoretical analysis and conclusions in this paper are also valid for the extension Crouzeix-Raviart element [35].

In this paper, regarding the basic theory of finite element methods, we refer to [8, 17, 27, 40, 43].

Throughout this paper,  $C$  denotes a positive constant independent of  $h$ , which may not be the same constant in different places. For simplicity, we use the symbol  $a \lesssim b$  to mean that  $a \leq Cb$ .

## 2 Preliminary

In this paper, we assume  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  ( $d = 2, 3$ ) is a polygonal ( $d = 2$ ) or polyhedron ( $d = 3$ ) domain. Let  $H^s(\Omega)$  denote the Sobolev space with real order  $s$  on  $\Omega$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_s$  is the norm on  $H^s(\Omega)$  and  $H^0(\Omega) = L^2(\Omega)$ , and  $H^s(\partial\Omega)$  denotes the Sobolev space with real order  $s$  on  $\partial\Omega$  with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{s,\partial\Omega}$ .

Cakoni et al. [21] give the weak form of (1.1): Find  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $u \in H^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ , such that

$$a(u, v) = -\lambda \langle u, v \rangle, \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega), \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$a(u, v) = (\nabla u, \nabla v) - (k^2 n u, v), \quad (u, v) = \int_{\Omega} u \bar{v} dx, \quad \langle u, v \rangle = \int_{\partial\Omega} u \bar{v} ds.$$

The source problem associated with (1.1) is as follows: Find  $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$  such that

$$a(\varphi, v) = \langle f, v \rangle, \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega). \quad (2.2)$$

Consider the Neumann eigenvalue problem

$$\Delta u + k^2 n(x)u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial \gamma} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \quad (2.3)$$

In this paper, we always assume  $k^2$  is not an interior Neumann eigenvalue of (2.3). Under this assumption, according to [21] the Neumann-to-Dirichlet

map  $T : L^2(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\partial\Omega)$  can be defined as follows. Let  $f \in L^2(\partial\Omega)$ , define  $A : L^2(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega)$  by

$$a(Af, v) = \langle f, v \rangle, \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega), \quad (2.4)$$

and  $Tf = (Af)'$ , where  $'$  denotes the restriction to  $\partial\Omega$ . And (2.1) can be stated as the operator form:

$$Tw = \mu w. \quad (2.5)$$

(2.1) and (2.5) are equivalent, namely, if  $(\mu, w) \in \mathbb{C} \times L^2(\partial\Omega)$  is an eigenpair of (2.5), then  $(\lambda, Aw)$  is an eigenpair of (2.1),  $\lambda = -\mu^{-1}$ ; conversely, if  $(\lambda, u)$  is an eigenpair of (2.1), then  $(\mu, u')$  is an eigenpair of (2.5),  $\mu = -\lambda^{-1}$ .

From [21] we know  $T : L^2(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\partial\Omega)$  is compact. If  $n(x)$  is real, then  $T$  is also self-adjoint.

Consider the dual problem of (2.1): Find  $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $u^* \in H^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$a(v, u^*) = -\overline{\lambda^*} \langle v, u^* \rangle, \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega). \quad (2.6)$$

The source problem associated with (2.6) is as follows: Find  $\varphi^* \in H^1(\Omega)$  such that

$$a(v, \varphi^*) = \langle v, g \rangle, \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega), \quad (2.7)$$

Define the corresponding Neumann-to-Dirichlet operator operator  $T^* : L^2(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\partial\Omega)$  by

$$a(v, A^*g) = \langle v, g \rangle, \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega), \quad (2.8)$$

and  $T^*g = (A^*g)'$ . Then (2.6) has the equivalent operator form:

$$T^*u^* = -\lambda^{*-1}u^*. \quad (2.9)$$

It can be proved that  $T^*$  is the adjoint operator of  $T$  in the sense of inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ . In fact, from (2.4) and (2.8) we have

$$\langle Tf, g \rangle = a(Af, A^*g) = \langle f, A^*g \rangle = \langle f, T^*g \rangle, \quad \forall f, g \in L^2(\partial\Omega).$$

Note that since  $T^*$  is the adjoint operator of  $T$ , the primal and dual eigenvalues are connected via  $\lambda = \overline{\lambda^*}$ .

Let  $\pi_h = \{\kappa\}$  be a regular  $d$ -simplex partition of  $\Omega$  (see [27], pp. 131). We denote  $h = \max_{\kappa \in \pi_h} h_\kappa$  where  $h_\kappa$  is the diameter of element  $\kappa$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}_h$  denote the set of all  $(d-1)$ -faces of elements  $\kappa \in \pi_h$ . We split this set as follows:  $\mathcal{E}_h = \mathcal{E}_h^i \cup \mathcal{E}_h^b$ , with  $\mathcal{E}_h^i$  and  $\mathcal{E}_h^b$  being the sets of inner and boundary edges, respectively. Let  $S^h$  be the C-R element space defined on  $\pi_h$ :

$$S^h = \{v \in L^2(\Omega) : v|_\kappa \in P_1(\kappa), v \text{ is continuous at the barycenters of the } (d-1)\text{-faces of element } \kappa, \forall \kappa \in \pi_h\}.$$

The C-R element approximation of (2.1) is: Find  $\lambda_h \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $u_h \in S^h \setminus \{0\}$ , such that

$$a_h(u_h, v) = -\lambda_h \langle u_h, v \rangle, \quad \forall v \in S^h, \quad (2.10)$$

where  $a_h(u_h, v) = \sum_{\kappa \in \pi_h} \int_{\kappa} (\nabla u_h \cdot \nabla \bar{v} - k^2 n(x) u_h \bar{v}) dx$ .

Define  $\|v\|_h = (\sum_{\kappa \in \pi_h} \|v\|_{1,\kappa}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ ,  $\|v\|_{1,\kappa}^2 = \int_{\kappa} (\sum_{i=1}^d |\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i}|^2 + |v|^2) dx$ . Evidently,  $\|\cdot\|_h$  is the norm on  $S^h$  and it is easy to know that  $a_h(\cdot, \cdot)$  is not uniformly  $S^h$ -elliptic.

The C-R element approximation of (2.2) is: Find  $\varphi_h \in S^h$ , such that

$$a_h(\varphi_h, v) = \langle f, v \rangle, \quad \forall v \in S^h. \quad (2.11)$$

Since  $k^2$  is not an interior Neumann eigenvalue of (2.3), from spectral approximation theory we know that when  $h$  is properly small  $k^2$  also is not a C-R element eigenvalue for (2.3). So the discrete source problem (2.11) is uniquely solvable. Thus, we can define the discrete operator  $A_h : L_2(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow S^h$ , satisfying

$$a_h(A_h f, v) = \langle f, v \rangle, \quad \forall v \in S^h. \quad (2.12)$$

Let us denote by  $\delta S^h$  the function space defined on  $\partial\Omega$ , which are restriction of functions in  $S^h$  to  $\partial\Omega$ . Define the discrete operator  $T_h : L_2(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow \delta S^h \subset L_2(\partial\Omega)$ , satisfying  $T_h f = (A_h f)'$ . Then (2.12) has the equivalent operator form:

$$T_h w_h = \mu_h w_h, \quad (2.13)$$

namely, if  $(\mu_h, w_h) \in \mathbb{C} \times L^2(\partial\Omega)$  is an eigenpair of (2.13), then  $(\lambda_h, A_h w_h)$  is an eigenpair of (2.10),  $\lambda_h = -\mu_h^{-1}$ ; conversely, if  $(\lambda_h, u_h)$  is an eigenpair of (2.10), then  $(\mu_h, u_h')$  is an eigenpair of (2.13),  $\mu_h = -\lambda_h^{-1}$ .

The non-conforming finite element approximation of (2.6) is given by: Find  $\lambda_h^* \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $u_h^* \in S^h \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$a_h(v, u_h^*) = -\overline{\lambda_h^*} \langle v, u_h^* \rangle, \quad \forall v \in S^h. \quad (2.14)$$

The C-R element approximation of (2.7) is: Find  $\varphi_h^* \in S^h$ , such that

$$a_h(v, \varphi_h^*) = \langle v, g \rangle, \quad \forall v \in S^h. \quad (2.15)$$

Define the discrete operator  $A_h^* : L^2(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow S^h$  satisfying

$$a_h(v, A_h^* g) = \langle v, g \rangle, \quad \forall v \in S^h, \quad (2.16)$$

and denote  $T_h^* g = (A_h^* g)'$ , then (2.16) has the following equivalent operator form

$$T_h^* u_h^* = -\lambda_h^{*-1} u_h^*. \quad (2.17)$$

It can be proved that  $T_h^*$  is the adjoint operator of  $T_h$  in the sense of inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ . Hence, the primal and dual eigenvalues are connected via  $\lambda_h = \overline{\lambda_h^*}$ .

We need the following regularity estimates which play an important role in our theoretical analysis. Note that for  $v \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$ ,  $\langle f, v \rangle$  has a continuous extension, still denoted by  $\langle f, v \rangle$ , to  $f \in H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$ .

**Lemma 1** For any  $f \in H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$ , let  $\langle f, v \rangle$  be the dual product on  $H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega) \times H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$  in (2.2), then there exists a unique solution  $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$  to (2.2) such that

$$\|\varphi\|_1 \lesssim \|f\|_{-\frac{1}{2}, \partial\Omega}. \quad (2.18)$$

*Proof* Since  $k^2$  is not an interior Neumann eigenvalue of (2.3), there exists a unique solution  $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$  to (2.2). Denote

$$b(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \overline{\nabla v} + n(x)u\overline{v}dx.$$

Referring to the proof of (14.11) in [27], it is easy to verify that  $\sqrt{\text{Re}b(v, v)} = (\int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^2 + n_1(x)|v|^2 dx)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  is a norm on  $H^1(\Omega)$  that is equivalent to the norm  $\|\cdot\|_1$ . (2.3) can be rewritten as: Find  $\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $u \in H^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$b(u, v) = \tilde{\lambda}(nu, v), \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega), \quad (2.19)$$

Since  $k^2$  is not an interior Neumann eigenvalue for (2.3),  $k^2 + 1$  is not an eigenvalue of (2.19). Define the map  $B : H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega)$  by

$$b(Bg, v) = (ng, v), \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega). \quad (2.20)$$

Then (2.19) has the operator form:

$$Bu = \tilde{\lambda}^{-1}u.$$

And  $B$  is compact,  $\frac{1}{k^2+1}$  is not an eigenvalue of  $B$ . So  $(B - \frac{1}{k^2+1}I)^{-1} : H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow H^1(\Omega)$  is bounded. Let  $\psi \in H^1(\Omega)$  be solution the following equation:

$$b(\psi, v) = \langle f, v \rangle, \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega), \quad (2.21)$$

then we have  $\|\psi\|_1 \lesssim \|f\|_{-\frac{1}{2}, \partial\Omega}$ . From (2.20) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} a(\varphi, v) &= b(\varphi, v) - (k^2 + 1)(n\varphi, v) \\ &= b(\varphi, v) - (k^2 + 1)b(B\varphi, v) = b((I - (k^2 + 1)B)\varphi, v), \end{aligned}$$

which, together with (2.2) and (2.21), yields

$$b((I - (k^2 + 1)B)\varphi, v) = b(\psi, v) \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega),$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi\|_1 &= \left\| \left( \frac{1}{k^2 + 1}I - B \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{k^2 + 1} \psi \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \left\| \left( \frac{1}{k^2 + 1}I - B \right)^{-1} \right\|_1 \frac{1}{k^2 + 1} \|\psi\|_1 \lesssim \|f\|_{-\frac{1}{2}, \partial\Omega}, \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 2** Assume that  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is a polygonal with  $\omega$  being the largest interior angle, and  $\varphi$  is the solution of (2.2). Let  $f \in L^2(\partial\Omega)$ , then  $\varphi \in H^{1+\frac{\pi}{2}}(\Omega)$  and

$$\|\varphi\|_{1+\frac{\pi}{2}} \leq C_\Omega \|f\|_{0,\partial\Omega}; \quad (2.22)$$

let  $f \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$ , then  $\varphi \in H^{1+r}(\Omega)$  satisfying

$$\|\varphi\|_{1+r} \leq C_\Omega \|f\|_{\frac{1}{2},\partial\Omega}, \quad (2.23)$$

where  $r \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ ,  $r = r_0 = 1$  when  $\omega < \pi$ , and  $r < r_0 = \frac{\pi}{\omega}$  when  $\omega > \pi$ , and  $C_\Omega$  is a priori constant.

*Proof* Consider the auxiliary boundary value problem:

$$\Delta\varphi_1 + \varphi_1 = 0, \quad \frac{\partial\varphi_1}{\partial\gamma} = f, \quad (2.24)$$

$$\Delta\varphi_2 + \varphi_2 = -k^2 n(x)(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2) + \varphi_1 + \varphi_2, \quad \frac{\partial\varphi_2}{\partial\gamma} = 0. \quad (2.25)$$

Let  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  be the solution of (2.24) and (2.25), respectively, then it is easy to see that  $\varphi = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2$ . Since  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ , from classical regularity results (see[32], or Proposition 4.1 in [3] and Proposition 4.4 in [11]) we have

$$\|\varphi_1\|_{1+(\frac{1}{2}+s)r} \lesssim \|f\|_{s,\partial\Omega}, \quad s = 0, \frac{1}{2},$$

and from classical regularity result for the Laplace problem with homogeneous Neumann boundary condition we have

$$\|\varphi_2\|_{1+r} \lesssim \| -k^2 n(x)(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2) + \varphi_1 + \varphi_2 \|_{0,\Omega}.$$

Thus we get

$$\|\varphi\|_{1+(\frac{1}{2}+s)r} \lesssim \|\varphi_1\|_{1+(\frac{1}{2}+s)r} + \|\varphi_2\|_{1+(\frac{1}{2}+s)r} \lesssim \|f\|_{s,\partial\Omega} + \|\varphi\|_0, \quad s = 0, \frac{1}{2}.$$

Substituting (2.18) into the above inequality we get (2.22) and (2.23).  $\square$

**Remark 1** (Regularity in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ ). When  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  is a polyhedron domain, regularity of the solution of the Neumann problem (2.24) has been discussed by many scholars. Referring Theorem 4 in [42] and Remark 2.1 in [34], and using the argument of Lemma 2 in this paper, we think the following regularity assumption  $R(\Omega)$  is reasonable:

$R(\Omega)$ . Assume that  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  is a polyhedron domain, and  $\varphi$  is the solution of (2.2). Let  $f \in L^2(\partial\Omega)$ , then there is  $\iota \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  dependent on  $\Omega$  such that  $\varphi \in H^{1+\iota}(\Omega)$  and

$$\|\varphi\|_{1+\iota} \leq C_\Omega \|f\|_{0,\partial\Omega}. \quad (2.26)$$

It is easy to know that Lemmas 1-2 and Remark 1 are also valid for the dual problem (2.7).

### 3 The consistency term and the extension of Strang lemma

Define  $S^h + H^1(\Omega) = \{w_h + w : w_h \in S^h, w \in H^1(\Omega)\}$ .

Let  $\varphi$  and  $\varphi^*$  be the solution of (2.2) and (2.7), respectively. Define the consistency terms: For any  $v \in S^h + H^1(\Omega)$ ,

$$D_h(\varphi, v) = a_h(\varphi, v) - \langle f, v \rangle, \quad (3.1)$$

$$D_h^*(v, \varphi^*) = a_h(v, \varphi^*) - \langle v, g \rangle. \quad (3.2)$$

In order to analyze error estimates of the consistency terms, we need the following trace inequalities.

**Lemma 3**  $\forall w \in H^\varrho(\kappa)$ ,  $\frac{1}{2} \leq \varrho \leq 1$ , there holds

$$\|w\|_{0, \partial\kappa} \lesssim h_\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|w\|_{0, \kappa} + h_\kappa^{\varrho - \frac{1}{2}} |w|_{\varrho, \kappa}, \quad \forall \kappa \in \pi_h. \quad (3.3)$$

*Proof* The conclusion is followed by using the trace theorem on the reference element and the scaling argument. See, e.g., Lemma 2.2 in [47].  $\square$

**Lemma 4** Let  $\varphi \in H^{1+t}(\Omega)$  ( $0 < t < \frac{1}{2}$ ) be the solution of (2.2), then there holds

$$\|\nabla\varphi \cdot \gamma\|_{t-\frac{1}{2}, \ell} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{1+t, \kappa} \quad \forall \kappa \in \pi_h, \ell \in \partial\kappa. \quad (3.4)$$

*Proof* Inequality (3.4) is contained in the proof of Corollary 3.3 on page 1384 of [12], see also Lemma 2.1 in [20]. For the convenience of readers, we write the proof here.

For any  $g \in H^{\frac{1}{2}-t}(\ell)$ , it is proven by going to a reference element and using the inverse trace theorem that there exists a lifting  $w_g$  of  $g$  such that  $w_g \in H^{1-t}(\kappa)$ ,  $w_g|_\ell = g$ ,  $w_g|_{\partial\kappa \setminus \ell} = 0$ , and

$$\|\nabla w_g\|_{-t, \kappa} + h_\kappa^{t-1} \|w_g\|_{0, \kappa} \leq C \|g\|_{\frac{1}{2}-t, \ell}. \quad (3.5)$$

From Green's formula, (2.2), Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the definition of the dual norm and (3.5) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\ell \nabla\varphi \cdot \gamma \bar{g} ds &= \int_\ell \nabla\varphi \cdot \gamma \overline{w_g} ds = \int_\kappa \Delta\varphi \overline{w_g} dx + \int_\kappa \nabla\varphi \cdot \overline{\nabla w_g} dx \\ &= \int_\kappa -k^2 n \varphi \overline{w_g} dx + \int_\kappa \nabla\varphi \cdot \overline{\nabla w_g} dx \lesssim \| -k^2 n \varphi \|_{0, \kappa} \| \overline{w_g} \|_{0, \kappa} + \| \nabla\varphi \|_{t, \kappa} \| \overline{\nabla w_g} \|_{-t, \kappa} \\ &\lesssim \| -k^2 n \varphi \|_{0, \kappa} h_\kappa^{1-t} \| g \|_{\frac{1}{2}-t, \ell} + \| \nabla\varphi \|_{t, \kappa} \| g \|_{\frac{1}{2}-t, \ell} \lesssim \| \varphi \|_{1+t, \kappa} \| g \|_{\frac{1}{2}-t, \ell}, \end{aligned}$$

thus by the definition of the dual norm we obtain

$$\|\nabla\varphi \cdot \gamma\|_{t-\frac{1}{2}, \ell} = \sup_{g \in H^{\frac{1}{2}-t}(\ell)} \frac{|\int_\ell \nabla\varphi \cdot \gamma \bar{g} ds|}{\|g\|_{\frac{1}{2}-t, \ell}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{1+t, \kappa}.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$



Based on the standard argument (see, for example [3, 36, 47]), the following consistency error estimates will be proved.

**Theorem 1** *Let  $\varphi$  and  $\varphi^*$  be the solution of (2.2) and (2.7), respectively, and suppose that  $\varphi, \varphi^* \in H^{1+t}(\Omega)$ , then*

$$|D_h(\varphi, v)| \lesssim h^t \|\varphi\|_{1+t} \|v\|_h, \quad \forall v \in S^h + H^1(\Omega), \quad (3.6)$$

$$|D_h^*(v, \varphi^*)| \lesssim h^t \|\varphi^*\|_{1+t} \|v\|_h, \quad \forall v \in S^h + H^1(\Omega), \quad (3.7)$$

where  $t \in (0, 1]$ .

*Proof* Let  $[[\cdot]]$  denote the jump across an inner face  $\ell \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$ . Then by Green's formula we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} D_h(\varphi, v) &= a_h(\varphi, v) - \langle f, v \rangle = \int_{\Omega} (-\Delta\varphi - k^2 n(x)\varphi) \bar{v} dx \\ &\quad + \sum_{\kappa \in \pi_h} \int_{\partial\kappa} \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\gamma} \bar{v} ds - \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\gamma} \bar{v} ds = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{E}_h^i} \int_{\ell} \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\gamma} [[\bar{v}]] ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Let  $\ell$  be a  $(d-1)$ -face of  $\kappa$ , define

$$P_{\ell}f = \frac{1}{|\ell|} \int_{\ell} f ds, \quad P_{\kappa}f = \frac{1}{|\kappa|} \int_{\kappa} f dx.$$

For  $\ell \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$ , suppose that  $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \in \pi_h$  such that  $\kappa_1 \cap \kappa_2 = \ell$ . Since  $[v]$  is a linear function vanishing at the barycenters of  $\ell$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\ell} \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\gamma} [[v]] ds \right| &= \left| \int_{\ell} \left( \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\gamma} - P_{\ell} \left( \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\gamma} \right) \right) [[v]] ds \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\ell} \left( \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\gamma} - P_{\ell} \left( \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\gamma} \right) \right) ([v] - P_{\ell}[[v]]) ds \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\ell} \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\gamma} \overline{([v] - P_{\ell}[[v]])} ds \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Then, when  $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ , using Schwarz inequality we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\ell} \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\gamma} \overline{([v] - P_{\ell}[[v]])} ds \right| &\leq \sum_{i=1,2} \|\nabla\varphi \cdot \gamma - P_{\ell}(\nabla\varphi \cdot \gamma)\|_{0,\ell} \|v|_{\kappa_i} - P_{\ell}(v|_{\kappa_i})\|_{0,\ell} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1,2} \|\nabla\varphi \cdot \gamma - P_{\kappa_i}(\nabla\varphi \cdot \gamma)\|_{0,\ell} \|v|_{\kappa_i} - P_{\kappa_i}(v|_{\kappa_i})\|_{0,\ell}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

by (3.3) and the standard error estimates for  $L^2$ -projection, we deduce

$$\|\nabla\varphi \cdot \gamma - P_{\kappa_i}(\nabla\varphi \cdot \gamma)\|_{0,\ell} \lesssim h^{t-\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{1+t,\kappa_i}, \quad \|v|_{\kappa_i} - P_{\kappa_i}(v|_{\kappa_i})\|_{0,\ell} \lesssim h^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{1,\kappa_i}.$$

Substituting the above two estimates into (3.9), we obtain

$$\left| \int_{\ell} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \gamma} \overline{[[v]]} ds \right| \lesssim \sum_{i=1,2} h^t \|\varphi\|_{1+t, \kappa_i} \|v\|_{1, \kappa_i}, \quad (3.11)$$

and substituting (3.11) into (3.8) we conclude that (3.6) holds.

When  $t < \frac{1}{2}$ , from (3.9) we deduce that

$$\left| \int_{\ell} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \gamma} \overline{[[v]]} ds \right| \leq \|\nabla \varphi \cdot \gamma\|_{t-\frac{1}{2}, \ell} \|[[v]] - P_{\ell}[[v]]\|_{\frac{1}{2}-t, \ell}. \quad (3.12)$$

By using inverse estimate, (3.3) and the error estimate of  $L^2$ -projection, we derive

$$\|[[v]] - P_{\ell}[[v]]\|_{\frac{1}{2}-t, \ell} \lesssim h_{\ell}^{t-\frac{1}{2}} \|[[v]] - P_{\ell}[[v]]\|_{0, \ell} \lesssim \sum_{i=1,2} h_{\kappa_i}^t \|v\|_{1, \kappa_i}.$$

Substituting the above estimate and (3.4) into (3.12), we obtain

$$\left| \int_{\ell} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \gamma} \overline{[[v]]} ds \right| \lesssim \sum_{i=1,2} \|\varphi\|_{1+t, \kappa_i} h_{\kappa_i}^t \|v\|_{1, \kappa_i},$$

plugging the above inequality into (3.8) we also get (3.6).

Using the same argument as above, we can prove (3.7).  $\square$

The C-R element approximation (2.11) of (2.2) does not satisfy the condition of Strang lemma, that is  $a_h(\cdot, \cdot)$  is not uniformly  $S^h$ -elliptic. To overcome this difficulty, Inspired by the works in §5.7 in [17], next we use standard duality techniques to prove an extension version of the well-known Strang lemma. First, we will use the standard duality argument to prove that  $\|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_0$  is a quantity of higher order than  $\|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_h$ .

Introduce the auxiliary problem: Find  $\psi \in H^1(\Omega)$ , such that

$$a(v, \psi) = (v, g), \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega). \quad (3.13)$$

Let  $\psi$  be solution of (3.13), then from elliptic regularity estimates for homogeneous Neumann boundary value problem we know that there exists  $r_N > 0$ , such that

$$\|\psi\|_{1+r_N} \lesssim \|g\|_0. \quad (3.14)$$

Let  $\hat{E}_h(v, \psi) = a_h(v, \psi) - (v, g)$ , then

$$|\hat{E}_h(v, \psi)| \lesssim h^{r_N} \|\psi\|_{1+r_N} \|v\|_h, \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega) + S^h. \quad (3.15)$$

**Lemma 5** *Let  $\varphi$  and  $\varphi_h$  be the solution of (2.2) and (2.11), respectively, and let  $\varphi^*$  and  $\varphi_h^*$  be the solution of (2.7) and (2.15), respectively, then*

$$\|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_0 \lesssim h^{r_N} \|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_h, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\|\varphi^* - \varphi_h^*\|_0 \lesssim h^{r_N} \|\varphi^* - \varphi_h^*\|_h. \quad (3.17)$$

*Proof* By Riesz representation theorem we have

$$\|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_0 = \sup_{g \in L^2(\Omega), g \neq 0} \frac{|(\varphi - \varphi_h, g)|}{\|g\|_0}. \quad (3.18)$$

Let  $\psi_I \in S^h$  be C-R non-conforming finite element interpolation function of  $\psi$ , then according to the interpolation theory (see [27]) we have

$$\|\psi - \psi_I\|_h \lesssim h^{r_N} \|\psi\|_{1+r_N}. \quad (3.19)$$

By computing, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, \psi - \psi_I \rangle &= \langle f, \psi \rangle - \langle f, \psi_I \rangle = a(\varphi, \psi) - a_h(\varphi_h, \psi_I) \\ &= a(\varphi, \psi) - a_h(\varphi, \psi_I) + a_h(\varphi, \psi_I) - a_h(\varphi_h, \psi_I) \\ &= a_h(\varphi, \psi - \psi_I) + a_h(\varphi - \varphi_h, \psi_I) \\ &= a_h(\varphi, \psi - \psi_I) + a_h(\varphi - \varphi_h, \psi_I - \psi) + a_h(\varphi - \varphi_h, \psi), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} a_h(\varphi, \psi - \psi_I) + a_h(\varphi - \varphi_h, \psi) &= a_h(\varphi, \psi - \psi_I) - \langle f, \psi - \psi_I \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle f, \psi - \psi_I \rangle + a_h(\varphi - \varphi_h, \psi) - (\varphi - \varphi_h, g) + (\varphi - \varphi_h, g) \\ &= D_h(\varphi, \psi - \psi_I) + \hat{E}_h(\varphi - \varphi_h, \psi) + \langle f, \psi - \psi_I \rangle + (\varphi - \varphi_h, g), \end{aligned}$$

combining the above two inequalities we get

$$(\varphi - \varphi_h, g) = a_h(\varphi - \varphi_h, \psi - \psi_I) - D_h(\varphi, \psi - \psi_I) - \hat{E}_h(\varphi - \varphi_h, \psi).$$

Substituting the above equality into (3.18) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_0 &\leq \sup_{g \in L^2(\Omega), g \neq 0} \frac{|a_h(\varphi - \varphi_h, \psi - \psi_I)|}{\|g\|_0} \\ &\quad + \sup_{g \in L^2(\Omega), g \neq 0} \frac{|D_h(\varphi, \psi - \psi_I) + \hat{E}_h(\varphi - \varphi_h, \psi)|}{\|g\|_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

Let  $I_h^C$  be the Lagrange interpolation operator,  $I_h^C \psi \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap S^h$ , according definition of  $D_h(\varphi, v)$  we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |D_h(\varphi, \psi - \psi_I)| &= |D_h(\varphi, I_h^C \psi - \psi_I)| = |a_h(\varphi - \varphi_h, I_h^C \psi - \psi_I)| \\ &\lesssim \|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_h \|I_h^C \psi - \psi_I\|_h \lesssim h^{r_N} \|\psi\|_{1+r_N} \|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_h. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Substituting (3.15), (3.19) and (3.21) into (3.20) we obtain the desired result (3.16).

Using the same argument as (3.16) we can prove (3.17).  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove the following extension of Strang lemma.

**Theorem 2** Let  $\varphi$  and  $\varphi_h$  be the solution of (2.2) and (2.11), respectively, then

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{v \in S^h} \|\varphi - v\|_h + \sup_{v \in S^h \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|D_h(\varphi, v)|}{\|v\|_h} &\lesssim \|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_h \\ &\lesssim \inf_{v \in S^h} \|\varphi - v\|_h + \sup_{v \in S^h \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|D_h(\varphi, v)|}{\|v\|_h}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Let  $\varphi^*$  and  $\varphi_h^*$  be the solution of (2.7) and (2.15), respectively, then

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{v \in S^h} \|\varphi^* - v\|_h + \sup_{v \in S^h \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|D_h^*(v, \varphi^*)|}{\|v\|_h} &\lesssim \|\varphi^* - \varphi_h^*\|_h \\ &\lesssim \inf_{v \in S^h} \|\varphi^* - v\|_h + \sup_{v \in S^h \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|D_h^*(v, \varphi^*)|}{\|v\|_h}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

*Proof* Denote

$$\mathcal{A}_h(u, v) = a_h(u, v) + K(u, v), \quad \forall u, v \in S^h + H^1(\Omega). \quad (3.24)$$

where  $K > \|k^2 n\|_{0, \infty}$ . Then we know that  $\mathcal{A}_h$  satisfies the uniform  $S^h$ -ellipticity:

$$|\mathcal{A}_h(v, v)| \geq \min\{1, K - \|k^2 n\|_{0, \infty}\} \|v\|_h^2, \quad \forall v \in S^h. \quad (3.25)$$

And thus, for any  $v \in S^h$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_h - v\|_h^2 &\lesssim |\mathcal{A}_h(\varphi_h - v, \varphi_h - v)| \\ &= C|a_h(\varphi - v, \varphi_h - v) + \langle f, \varphi_h - v \rangle - a_h(\varphi, \varphi_h - v) + K\|\varphi_h - v\|_0^2|. \end{aligned}$$

When  $\|\varphi_h - v\|_h \neq 0$ , dividing both sides of the above by  $\|\varphi_h - v\|_h$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_h - v\|_h &\lesssim \|\varphi - v\|_h + \frac{|a_h(\varphi, \varphi_h - v) - \langle f, \varphi_h - v \rangle|}{\|\varphi_h - v\|_h} + K\|\varphi_h - v\|_0 \\ &\lesssim \|\varphi - v\|_h + \sup_{v \in S^h \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|D_h(\varphi, v)|}{\|v\|_h} + \|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_0. \end{aligned}$$

From the triangular inequality and (3.16) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_h &\leq \|\varphi - v\|_h + \|v - \varphi_h\|_h \\ &\lesssim \|\varphi - v\|_h + \sup_{v \in S^h \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|D_h(\varphi, v)|}{\|v\|_h} + h^{r_N} \|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_h. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality of (3.22) is proved. From

$$|a_h(\varphi - \varphi_h, v)| \leq \|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_h \|v\|_h, \quad \forall v \in S^h,$$

we get

$$\|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_h \geq \frac{|a_h(\varphi, v) - a_h(\varphi_h, v)|}{\|v\|_h} = \frac{|D_h(\varphi, v)|}{\|v\|_h},$$

which together with  $\|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_h \geq \inf_{v \in \mathcal{S}^h} \|\varphi - v\|_h$  we obtain the first inequality of (3.22).

Similarly we can prove (3.23). The proof is completed.  $\square$

Now we can state the error estimates of C-R element approximation for (2.2) and (2.7).

**Theorem 3** *Under the conditions of Theorem 2, further assume that  $\varphi, \varphi^* \in H^{1+t}(\Omega)$  with  $t \in [s, 1]$ , and  $R(\Omega)$  holds when  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ , then*

$$\|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_h \leq Ch^t \|\varphi\|_{1+t}, \quad (3.26)$$

$$\|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_{0,\partial\Omega} \leq Ch^{t+s} \|\varphi\|_{1+t} \quad (3.27)$$

$$\|\varphi^* - \varphi_h^*\|_h \leq Ch^t \|\varphi^*\|_{1+t}, \quad (3.28)$$

$$\|\varphi^* - \varphi_h^*\|_{0,\partial\Omega} \leq Ch^{t+s} \|\varphi^*\|_{1+t}, \quad (3.29)$$

where  $s = \frac{r}{2}$  when  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $s = \iota$  when  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ .

*Proof* From Theorem 2, the interpolation error estimate and Theorem 1 we can obtain (3.26) and (3.28). By Nitsche technique we can deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_{0,\partial\Omega} &\lesssim \|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_h \sup_{g \in L^2(\partial\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|\varphi^* - \varphi_h^*\|_h}{\|g\|_{0,\partial\Omega}} \\ &+ \sup_{g \in L^2(\partial\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|D_h(\varphi, \varphi^* - \varphi_h^*)| + |D_h^*(\varphi - \varphi_h, \varphi^*)|}{\|g\|_{0,\partial\Omega}}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting (3.6), (3.7), (3.26) and (3.28) into the above inequality, and using the regularity estimates (2.22) and (2.26), we get (3.27). Similarly we can prove (3.29). The proof is completed.  $\square$

#### 4 Error estimates of discrete Stekloff eigenvalues

In this paper we suppose that  $\{\lambda_j\}$  and  $\{\lambda_{j,h}\}$  are enumerations of the eigenvalues of (2.1) and (2.10) respectively according to the same sort rule, and let  $\lambda = \lambda_m$  be the  $m$ th eigenvalue with the algebraic multiplicity  $q$  and the ascent  $\alpha$ ,  $\lambda_m = \lambda_{m+1} = \dots, \lambda_{m+q-1}$ . when  $\|T_h - T\|_{0,\partial\Omega} \rightarrow 0$ ,  $q$  eigenvalues  $\lambda_{m,h}, \dots, \lambda_{m+q-1,h}$  of (2.10) will converge to  $\lambda$ .

Let  $M(\lambda)$  be the space of generalized eigenvectors associated with  $\lambda$  and  $T$ , let  $M_h(\lambda_{i,h})$  be the space of generalized eigenvectors associated with  $\lambda_{i,h}$  and  $T_h$ , and let  $M_h(\lambda) = \sum_{i=m}^{m+q-1} M_h(\lambda_{i,h})$ . In view of the dual problem (2.6) and (2.14), the definitions of  $M(\lambda^*)$ ,  $M_h(\lambda_{i,h}^*)$  and  $M_h(\lambda^*)$  are analogous to  $M(\lambda)$ ,  $M_h(\lambda_{i,h})$  and  $M_h(\lambda)$ .

Given two closed subspaces  $V$  and  $U$ , denote

$$\delta(V, U) = \sup_{\substack{u \in V \\ \|u\|_{0,\partial\Omega} = 1}} \inf_{v \in U} \|u - v\|_{0,\partial\Omega}, \quad \hat{\delta}(V, U) = \max\{\delta(V, U), \delta(U, V)\}.$$

And denote  $\hat{\lambda}_h = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{j=m}^{m+q-1} \lambda_{j,h}$ .

Thanks to [8], we get the following Theorem 4.

**Theorem 4** *Suppose  $M(\lambda), M(\lambda^*) \subset H^{1+t}(\Omega)$ , and  $R(\Omega)$  holds when  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ . Then*

$$\hat{\delta}(M(\lambda), M_h(\lambda)) \lesssim h^{s+t}, \quad (4.1)$$

$$|\hat{\lambda}_h - \lambda| \lesssim h^{2t}, \quad (4.2)$$

$$|\lambda - \lambda_{j,h}| \lesssim h^{\frac{2t}{\alpha}}, \quad j = m, m+1, \dots, m+q-1; \quad (4.3)$$

suppose  $u_h$  is an eigenfunction corresponding to  $\lambda_{j,h}$  ( $j = m, m+1, \dots, m+q-1$ ),  $\|u_h\|_{0,\partial\Omega} = 1$ , then there exists an eigenfunction  $u$  corresponding to  $\lambda$ , such that

$$\|u_h - u\|_{0,\partial\Omega} \lesssim h^{(s+t)\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\|u_h - u\|_h \lesssim h^t + h^{(s+t)\frac{1}{\alpha}}; \quad (4.5)$$

where  $s = \frac{r}{2}$  when  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $s = t$  when  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ .

*Proof* From (3.27) with  $t = s$  we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|T - T_h\|_{0,\partial\Omega} &= \sup_{f \in L^2(\partial\Omega), \|f\|_{0,\partial\Omega}=1} \|Tf - T_h f\|_{0,\partial\Omega} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{f \in L^2(\partial\Omega), \|f\|_{0,\partial\Omega}=1} h^{2s} \|Af\|_{1+s} \lesssim h^{2s} \|f\|_{0,\partial\Omega} \lesssim h^{2s} \rightarrow 0 \quad (h \rightarrow 0). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Thus from Theorem 7.1, Theorem 7.2 (inequality (7.12)), Theorem 7.3 and Theorem 7.4 in [8] we get

$$\hat{\delta}(M(\lambda), M_h(\lambda)) \lesssim \|(T - T_h)|_{M(\lambda)}\|_{0,\partial\Omega}, \quad (4.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda - \hat{\lambda}_h| &\lesssim \sum_{i,j=m}^{m+q-1} |\langle (T - T_h)\varphi_i, \varphi_j^* \rangle| \\ &\quad + \|(T - T_h)|_{M(\lambda)}\|_{0,\partial\Omega} \|(T^* - T_h^*)|_{M(\lambda^*)}\|_{0,\partial\Omega}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda - \lambda_h| &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{i,j=m}^{m+q-1} |\langle (T - T_h)\varphi_i, \varphi_j^* \rangle| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|(T - T_h)|_{M(\lambda)}\|_{0,\partial\Omega} \|(T^* - T_h^*)|_{M(\lambda^*)}\|_{0,\partial\Omega} \right\}^{1/\alpha}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

$$\|u_h - u\|_{0,\partial\Omega} \leq C \|(T_h - T)|_{M(\lambda)}\|_{0,\partial\Omega}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \quad (4.10)$$

where  $\varphi_m, \dots, \varphi_{m+q-1}$  are any basis for  $M(\lambda)$  and  $\varphi_m^*, \dots, \varphi_{m+q-1}^*$  are the dual basis in  $M(\lambda^*)$ .

From (3.27) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|(T - T_h)|_{M(\lambda)}\|_{0,\partial\Omega} &= \sup_{f \in M(\lambda), \|f\|_{0,\partial\Omega}=1} \|Tf - T_h f\|_{0,\partial\Omega} \\ &\lesssim h^{s+t} \sup_{f \in M(\lambda), \|f\|_{0,\partial\Omega}=1} \|Af\|_{1+t}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Similarly we have

$$\|(T^* - T_h^*)|_{M(\lambda^*)}\|_{0,\partial\Omega} \lesssim h^{s+t} \sup_{f \in M(\lambda^*), \|f\|_{0,\partial\Omega}=1} \|A^* f\|_{1+t}. \quad (4.12)$$

Substituting (4.11) into (4.7) and (4.10) we get (4.1) and (4.4), respectively.

The remainder is to prove (4.2), (4.3) and (4.5). By an easy calculation, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (T - T_h)\varphi_i, \varphi_j^* \rangle &= \langle T\varphi_i, \varphi_j^* \rangle - \langle T_h\varphi_i, \varphi_j^* \rangle \\ &= a_h(A\varphi_i, A^*\varphi_j^*) - a_h(A_h\varphi_i, A_h^*\varphi_j^*) \\ &= a_h(A\varphi_i - A_h\varphi_i, A^*\varphi_j^*) + a_h(A_h\varphi_i, A^*\varphi_j^* - A_h^*\varphi_j^*) \\ &= a_h(A\varphi_i - A_h\varphi_i, A^*\varphi_j^*) + a_h(A\varphi_i, A^*\varphi_j^* - A_h^*\varphi_j^*) \\ &\quad - a_h(A\varphi_i - A_h\varphi_i, A^*\varphi_j^* - A_h^*\varphi_j^*). \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Noting

$$\begin{aligned} a_h(A\varphi_i - A_h\varphi_i, A^*\varphi_j^*) &= D_h^*(A\varphi_i - A_h\varphi_i, A^*\varphi_j^*) + \langle T\varphi_i - T_h\varphi_i, \varphi_j^* \rangle, \\ a_h(A\varphi_i, A^*\varphi_j^* - A_h^*\varphi_j^*) &= D_h(A\varphi_i, A^*\varphi_j^* - A_h^*\varphi_j^*) + \langle \varphi_i, T^*\varphi_j^* - T_h^*\varphi_j^* \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and  $\langle T\varphi_i - T_h\varphi_i, \varphi_j^* \rangle = \langle \varphi_i, T^*\varphi_j^* - T_h^*\varphi_j^* \rangle$ , from (4.13) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (T - T_h)\varphi_i, \varphi_j^* \rangle &= -D_h^*(A\varphi_i - A_h\varphi_i, A^*\varphi_j^*) - D_h(A\varphi_i, A^*\varphi_j^* - A_h^*\varphi_j^*) \\ &\quad + a_h(A\varphi_i - A_h\varphi_i, A^*\varphi_j^* - A_h^*\varphi_j^*), \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

which, together with (3.6), (3.7), (3.26) and (3.28), yields

$$|\langle (T - T_h)\varphi_i, \varphi_j^* \rangle| \lesssim h^{2t}. \quad (4.15)$$

Substituting (4.15), (4.11) and (4.12) into (4.8) and (4.9) we get (4.2) and (4.3), respectively.

From (2.1) and (2.4) we get

$$a(u, v) = a(A(-\lambda u), v), \quad \forall v \in H^1(\Omega),$$

noting that  $k^2$  is not an eigenvalue of (2.3), we have  $u = -\lambda Au$ . Similarly, using (2.10) and (2.12) we can get  $u_h = -\lambda_h A_h u_h$ . Thus from (3.26), (2.18), (2.22), (2.26), (4.3) and (4.4) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_h + \lambda A_h u\|_h &= \|-\lambda_h A_h u_h + \lambda A_h u\|_h = \|A_h(\lambda_h u_h - \lambda u)\|_h \\ &\leq \|(A - A_h)(\lambda u - \lambda_h u_h)\|_h + \|A(\lambda_h u_h - \lambda u)\|_h \\ &\lesssim h^s \|A(\lambda u - \lambda_h u_h)\|_{1+s} + \|\lambda_h u_h - \lambda u\|_{0,\partial\Omega} \lesssim \|\lambda_h u_h - \lambda u\|_{0,\partial\Omega} \lesssim h^{(t+s)\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \end{aligned}$$

and by the triangular inequality

$$\|u_h - u\|_h \leq \|u_h + \lambda A_h u\|_h + \|\lambda Au - \lambda A_h u\|_h \lesssim h^{(t+s)\frac{1}{\alpha}} + h^t,$$

i.e., (4.5) holds. The proof is completed.  $\square$

**Table 1** The eigenvalues on the square:  $n = 4$ .

dof	$\lambda_{1,h}$	$\lambda_{2,h}$	$\lambda_{3,h}$	$\lambda_{4,h}$	$\lambda_{5,h}$	$\lambda_{6,h}$
3136	2.2018805	-0.2116751	-0.2116708	-0.9069429	-2.7589883	-2.7522381
12416	2.2023533	-0.2121076	-0.2121070	-0.9077740	-2.7664177	-2.7646187
49408	2.2024690	-0.2122160	-0.2122159	-0.9079851	-2.7683097	-2.7678463
197120	2.2024977	-0.2122431	-0.2122431	-0.9080383	-2.7687870	-2.7686695

**Table 2** The eigenvalues on the L-shaped domain:  $n = 4$ .

dof	$\lambda_{1,h}$	$\lambda_{2,h}$	$\lambda_{3,h}$	$\lambda_{4,h}$	$\lambda_{5,h}$	$\lambda_{6,h}$
9344	2.5335485	0.8592520	0.1246281	-1.0845725	-1.0901869	-1.4147102
37120	2.5333019	0.8583814	0.1245509	-1.0851154	-1.0909141	-1.4163502
147968	2.5332364	0.8580275	0.1245311	-1.0852527	-1.0911151	-1.4167642
590848	2.5332194	0.8578847	0.1245261	-1.0852873	-1.0911726	-1.4168682

**Table 3** The eigenvalues on the square with a slit:  $n = 4$ .

dof	$\lambda_{1,h}$	$\lambda_{2,h}$	$\lambda_{3,h}$	$\lambda_{4,h}$	$\lambda_{5,h}$	$\lambda_{6,h}$
12448	1.4848728	0.4698829	-0.1840366	-0.6898362	-1.8987837	-1.9264514
49472	1.4847611	0.4658257	-0.1841411	-0.6900139	-1.8995947	-1.9278655
197248	1.4847266	0.4637839	-0.1841672	-0.6900592	-1.8998016	-1.9283610
787712	1.4847163	0.4627589	-0.1841737	-0.6900708	-1.8998539	-1.9285538

## 5 Numerical experiments

Consider the problem (1.1) on the test domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ , where  $\Omega$  is the square  $(-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2})^2$ , or  $\Omega = (-1, 1)^2 \setminus ([0, 1] \times (-1, 0])$  is an L-shaped domain with the largest inner angle  $\omega = \frac{3}{2}\pi$ , or  $\Omega = (-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2})^2 \setminus \{0 \leq x \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, y = 0\}$  is the square with a slit which the largest inner angle  $\omega = 2\pi$ , and  $k = 1$ ,  $n(x) = 4$  or  $n(x) = 4 + 4i$ .

We use Matlab 2012a to solve (1.1) on a Lenovo ideaPad PC with 1.8GHZ CPU and 8GB RAM. Our program is compiled under the package of iFEM [26].

### 5.1 Numerical experiments on uniform meshes

We adopt a uniform isosceles right triangulation  $\pi_h$ . The numerical results on the square, the L-shaped domain and the slit domain are listed in Tables 1-6. The error curves of the C-R eigenvalues are showed in Figs. 1-3.

From Lemma 2, the regularity results, we know that for the square domain  $2r_0 = 2$ , for the L-shaped domain  $2r_0 = \frac{4}{3}$ , for the unit square with a slit  $2r_0 = 1$ . From Fig. 1 we can see that the convergence order of  $\lambda_{1,h}, \lambda_{2,h} \cdots, \lambda_{6,h}$  are approximately equal to 2 on the square domain; from Fig. 2 we can see that the convergence order of  $\lambda_{2,h}$  is approximately equal to  $\frac{4}{3} \approx 1.333333$  on the L-shaped domain, and the eigenfunction corresponding to  $\lambda_2$  has lower



**Table 4** The eigenvalues on the square:  $n = 4 + 4i$ .


dof	$\lambda_{1,h}$	$\lambda_{2,h}$	$\lambda_{3,h}$	$\lambda_{4,h}$	$\lambda_{5,h}$	$\lambda_{6,h}$
3136	0.687353 +2.494448i	-0.342514 +0.85089i	-0.342525 +0.850899i	-0.948908 +0.539844i	-2.779702 +0.53745i	-2.786716 +0.539647i
12416	0.686749 +2.495075i	-0.342915 +0.850782i	-0.342916 +0.850784i	-0.949807 +0.540029i	-2.792169 +0.539839i	-2.794033 +0.540444i
49408	0.686601 +2.495238i	-0.343014 +0.850755i	-0.343014 +0.850756i	-0.950034 +0.540079i	-2.795417 +0.540498i	-2.795897 +0.540656i
197120	0.686564 +2.495280i	-0.343038 +0.850749i	-0.343038 +0.850749i	-0.950091 +0.540092i	-2.796245 +0.540671i	-2.796367 +0.540711i


**Table 5** The eigenvalues on the L-shaped domain:  $n = 4 + 4i$ .

dof	$\lambda_{1,h}$	$\lambda_{2,h}$	$\lambda_{3,h}$	$\lambda_{4,h}$	$\lambda_{5,h}$	$\lambda_{6,h}$
9344	0.513857 +2.881404i	0.398298 +1.459758i	-0.076964 +1.042587i	-1.438567 +0.803689i	-1.654555 +0.766423i	-2.513849 +0.570528i
37120	0.514176 +2.882086i	0.397512 +1.459328i	-0.077125 +1.042656i	-1.440022 +0.804437i	-1.656531 +0.766548i	-2.516699 +0.571289i
147968	0.514259 +2.882263i	0.397218 +1.459129i	-0.077165 +1.042672i	-1.440388 +0.80463i	-1.657092 +0.766548i	-2.517426 +0.571486i
590848	0.514280 +2.882308i	0.397106 +1.459043i	-0.077175 +1.042677i	-1.440479 +0.804678i	-1.657258 +0.766534i	-2.517610 +0.571536i


**Table 6** The eigenvalues on the square with a slit:  $n = 4 + 4i$ .

dof	$\lambda_{1,h}$	$\lambda_{2,h}$	$\lambda_{3,h}$	$\lambda_{4,h}$	$\lambda_{5,h}$	$\lambda_{6,h}$
12448	0.918974 +1.770802i	0.299813 +1.003519i	-0.262446 +0.757437i	-0.741837 +0.608741i	-2.615356 +0.561764i	-2.840331 +0.493956i
49472	0.919206 +1.770795i	0.296211 +1.001745i	-0.262573 +0.757447i	-0.742028 +0.608765i	-2.618344 +0.562409i	-2.845935 +0.493673i
197248	0.919276 +1.770791i	0.294417 +1.000826i	-0.262604 +0.757449i	-0.742076 +0.608772i	-2.619113 +0.562579i	-2.847993 +0.493444i
787712	0.919297 +1.770789i	0.293522 +1.000356i	-0.262612 +0.75745i	-0.742088 +0.608774i	-2.619310 +0.562623i	-2.848830 +0.493306i

**Fig. 1** The error curves of the first six eigenvalues on the square (left:  $n = 4$ , right:  $n = 4 + 4i$ )



**Fig. 2** The error curves of the first six eigenvalues on the L-shaped domain (left:  $n = 4$ , right:  $n = 4 + 4i$ )



**Fig. 3** The error curves of the first six eigenvalues on the square with a slit (left:  $n = 4$ , right:  $n = 4 + 4i$ )

smoothness than others; from Fig. 3 we can see that the convergence order of  $\lambda_{2,h}$  is approximately equal to 1 on the slit domain, and the eigenfunction corresponding to  $\lambda_2$  is also less smoother than others, which coincides with the theoretical results.

## 5.2 Numerical experiments on adaptive meshes

In practical finite element computations, it is desirable to carry out the computations in an adaptive fashion (see, e.g., [1, 9, 18, 43, 45] and references cited therein). For the C-R element approximation of Stekloff eigenvalue problem, the a posteriori error estimates have been developed by [41]. Referring to [41] in this subsection we give the a posteriori error estimators by formal deduction, and implement adaptive computation for (1.1).

Let  $\ell \in \mathcal{E}_h^i$  shared by elements  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_2$ , i.e.,  $\ell = \partial\kappa_1 \cap \partial\kappa_2$ . We choose a unit normal vector  $\gamma_\ell$ , pointing outwards  $\kappa_2$ , and we set the jumps of the normal derivatives of  $v_h$  across  $\ell$  as

$$[[\nabla v_h]]_\gamma = \nabla v_h|_{\kappa_2} \cdot \gamma_\ell - \nabla v_h|_{\kappa_1} \cdot \gamma_\ell.$$

Denote  $\gamma_\ell = (\gamma_{\ell 1}, \gamma_{\ell 2})$ , then the tangent  $t_\ell = (-\gamma_{\ell 2}, \gamma_{\ell 1})$  on  $\ell$ , and we write the jumps of the tangential derivatives of  $v_h$  across  $\ell$  as

$$[[\nabla v_h]]_t = \nabla v_h|_{\kappa_2} \cdot t_\ell - \nabla v_h|_{\kappa_1} \cdot t_\ell.$$

Notice that these values are independent of the chosen direction of the normal vector  $\gamma_\ell$ .

Now we define the a posteriori error indicators  $\eta_\kappa(u_h)$  on  $\kappa$  and  $\eta(u_h)$  on  $\Omega$  for the primal eigenfunction  $u_h$ :

For each  $\ell \in \mathcal{E}$ , let

$$J_{\ell,t}(u_h) = \begin{cases} [[\nabla u_h]]_t, & \text{if } \ell \in \mathcal{E}^i, \\ 0 & \text{if } \ell \in \mathcal{E}^b, \end{cases} \quad J_{\ell,\gamma}(u_h) = \begin{cases} [[\nabla u_h]]_\gamma, & \text{if } \ell \in \mathcal{E}^i, \\ 2(\nabla u_h \cdot \gamma_\ell - \lambda_h u_h)|_\ell & \text{if } \ell \in \mathcal{E}^b, \end{cases}$$

and let

$$\eta_\kappa(u_h)^2 = |\kappa| \|k^2 n u_h\|_{0,\kappa}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell \in \partial\kappa} |\ell| \|J_{\ell,\gamma}(u_h)\|_{0,\ell}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell \in \partial\kappa} |\ell| \|J_{\ell,t}(u_h)\|_{0,\ell}^2,$$

$$\eta^2(u_h) = \sum_{\kappa \in \pi_h} \eta_\kappa(u_h)^2.$$

Similarly, we define the a posteriori error indicators  $\eta_\kappa(u_h^*)$  on  $\kappa$  and  $\eta(u_h^*)$  on  $\Omega$  for the dual eigenfunction  $u_h^*$ .

We use  $\sum_{\kappa \in \pi_h} (\eta_\kappa^2(u_h) + \eta_\kappa^2(u_h^*))$  as the a posteriori error indicator of  $\lambda_h$ . Using

the indicator and consulting the existing standard adaptive algorithms (see, e.g., [26,30,39]), we solve (1.1). From Figs. 2-3 we find that the eigenfunction associated with  $\lambda_2$  is singular, so in our numerical experiments we compute the approximation of the second eigenvalue  $\lambda_2$ , and the numerical results on the L-shaped domain and the slit domain are listed in Table 7 and Table 8, respectively.

We show the curves of error and the a posteriori error estimators obtained by adaptive computing for the eigenvalue  $\lambda_{2,h}$  in Figs. 4-5. It can be seen from them that the error curves and the error estimators' curves are both basically parallel to the line with slope -1, which indicate that the a posteriori error estimators of numerical eigenvalues are reliable and efficient and  $\lambda_{2,h}$  achieves the convergence rate  $O(h^2)$ . From tables and figures we also see that under the same *dof*, the accuracy of approximate eigenvalues computed on adaptive meshes is far higher than that of approximate eigenvalues computed on uniform meshes.

### 5.3 The lower/upper bound of the Stekloff eigenvalues


We find in Tables 1-8 that the C-R element eigenvalues show the tendency to decrease as the increase of *dof* when the index of refraction  $n(x)$  is real and the corresponding eigenfunctions are singular. It is easy to know that the conforming finite element eigenvalues approximate the exact ones from below

**Table 7** The second eigenvalues on adaptive meshes on the L-shaped domain.

$l$	dof	$\lambda_{2,h}(n=4)$	$l$	dof	$\lambda_{2,h}(n=4+4i)$
1	9344	0.859246	1	9344	0.398302+1.459749i
2	10022	0.858839	2	9494	0.398303+1.459755i
25	202370	0.857844	37	216512	0.397113+1.459061i
26	225490	0.857841	38	242302	0.397112+1.459059i
27	249481	0.857838	39	286483	0.397108+1.459048i
28	276807	0.857832	40	310425	0.397092+1.459023i
29	331662	0.857821	41	340309	0.397092+1.459023i
30	387329	0.857817	42	391833	0.397084+1.459016i

**Table 8** The second eigenvalues on adaptive meshes on the square with a slit.


$l$	dof	$\lambda_{2,h}(n=4)$	$l$	dof	$\lambda_{2,h}(n=4+4i)$
1	12448	0.469884	1	12448	0.299812+1.003523i
2	12472	0.467948	2	12607	0.298475+1.002875i
25	170854	0.461819	60	241012	0.292782+0.999958i
26	192640	0.461803	61	250930	0.292782+0.999958i
27	222566	0.461788	62	260992	0.292761+0.999943i
28	261309	0.461786	63	295455	0.292741+0.999931i
29	298511	0.461783	64	311350	0.292738+0.999931i
30	335598	0.461779	65	338930	0.292725+0.999926i

**Fig. 4** The error curves of the second eigenvalues on the L-shaped domain (left:  $n=4$ , right:  $n=4+4i$ )

when  $n(x)$  is real. So we also use the P1 conforming element to compute, and obtain reference value of the exact eigenvalues by averaging the P1 conforming eigenvalues  $\lambda_{j,h}^C$  and the C-R element eigenvalues  $\lambda_{j,h}$ . We list them in Tables 9-10.

## References

1. Ainsworth, M., Oden, J.T.: A posteriori error estimates in the finite element analysis. Wiley-Inter science, New York (2011)
2. Ainsworth, M.: Robust a posteriori error estimation for nonconforming finite element approximation. SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 42, 2320-2341 (2005)



**Fig. 5** The error curves of the second eigenvalues on the square with a slit (left:  $n = 4$ , right:  $n = 4 + 4i$ )

**Table 9** The reference eigenvalues  $\lambda_j(L)$  on the L-shaped domain and  $\lambda_j(\text{Slit})$  on the square with a slit:  $n = 4$ .

$j$	$\lambda_{j,h}$	$\lambda_{j,h}^C$	$\lambda_j(L)$	$\lambda_{j,h}$	$\lambda_{j,h}^C$	$\lambda_j(\text{Slit})$
1	2.533219	2.533209	2.533214	1.484716	1.484710	1.484713
2	0.8578847	0.85777495	0.8578171	0.4627589	0.4612150	0.4619870
3	0.1245261	0.1245229	0.1245245	-0.1841737	-0.1841765	-0.1841751
4	-1.085287	-1.085303	-1.085295	-0.6900708	-0.6900769	-0.6900738
5	-1.091173	-1.091207	-1.091190	-1.899854	-1.899878	-1.899866
6	-1.416868	-1.416912	-1.416890	-1.928554	-1.928784	-1.928669

**Table 10** The reference eigenvalues  $\lambda_j(L)$  on the L-shaped domain and  $\lambda_j(\text{Slit})$  on the square with a slit:  $n = 4 + 4i$ .

$j$	$\lambda_{j,h}$	$\lambda_{j,h}^C$	$\lambda_j(L)$	$\lambda_{j,h}$	$\lambda_{j,h}^C$	$\lambda_j(\text{Slit})$
1	0.5142799	0.5143106	0.5142952	0.9192965	0.9193164	0.9193065
	+2.882308i	+2.882334i	+2.882321i	+1.770789i	+1.770782i	+1.770786i
2	0.3971057	0.3969716	0.3970387	0.2935223	0.2917372	0.2926298
	+1.459043i	+1.458911i	+1.458977i	+1.000356i	+0.9993946i	+0.9998754i
3	-0.0771754	-0.0771792	-0.0771773	-0.2626120	-0.2626151	-0.2626135
	+1.042677i	+1.042673i	+1.042675i	+0.7574501i	+0.7574481i	+0.7574491i
4	-1.440479	-1.440535	-1.440507	-0.7420884	-0.7420981	-0.7420933
	+0.8046784i	+0.8047093i	+0.8046939i	+0.6087744i	+0.6087755i	+0.6087749i
5	-1.657258	-1.657409	-1.657333	-2.619310	-2.619442	-2.619376
	+0.7665341i	+0.7664933i	+0.7665137i	+0.5626232i	+0.5626581i	+0.5626407i
6	-2.517610	-2.517765	-2.517687	-2.848830	-2.850239	-2.849534
	+0.5715365i	+0.5715597i	+0.5715481i	+0.4933060i	+0.4929997i	+0.4931528i

- Alonso, A., Russo, A.D.: Spectral approximation of variationally-posed eigen-value problems by nonconforming methods. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 223, 177-197 (2009)
- Andreev, A.B., Todorov, T.D.: Isoparametric finite element approximation of a Steklov eigenvalue problem. *IMA. J. Numer. Anal.* 24, 309-322 (2004)
- Armentano, M.G.: The effect of reduced integration in the Steklov eigenvalue problem. *Math. Mod. and Numer. Anal. (M<sup>2</sup>AN)* 38, 27-36 (2004)
- Armentano, M.G., Padra, C.: A posteriori error estimates for the Steklov eigenvalue problem. *Appl. Numer. Math.* 58, 593-601 (2008)

7. Armentano, M.G., Duran, R.G.: Asymptotic lower bounds for eigenvalues by nonconforming finite element methods. *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.* 17, 92-101 (2004)
8. Babuska, I., Osborn, J.E.: Eigenvalue Problems. in: P. G. Ciarlet, J. L. Lions(Eds), *Finite Element Methods (Part I)*, pp. 641-787, in: *Handbook of Numerical Analysis*, Vol. 2, Elsevier Science Publishers, North-Holand (1991)
9. Babuska, I., Rheinboldt, W.C.: Error estimates for adaptive finite element computations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 15, 736-754 (1978)
10. Bergman, S., Schiffer, M.: *Kernel Functions and Elliptic Differential Equations in Mathematical Physics*. Academic Press, New York (1953)
11. Bermudez, A., Rodriguez, R., Santamarina, D.: A finite element solution of an added mass formulation for coupled fluid-solid vibrations. *Numer. Math.* 87, 201-227 (2000)
12. Bernardi, C., Hecht, F.: Error indicators for the mortar finite element discretization of Laplace equation. *Math. Comp.* 71(240), 1371-1403 (2001)
13. Bi, H., Yang, Y.: A two-grid method of the non-conforming Crouzeix-Raviart element for the Steklov eigenvalue problem. *Appl. Math. Comput.* 217, 9669-9678 (2011)
14. Boffi, D.: Finite element approximation of eigenvalue problems. *Acta Numerica*, 1-120 (2010)
15. Bramble, J.H., Osborn, J.E.: Approximation of Steklov eigenvalues of non-selfadjoint second order elliptic operators. in: A. K. Aziz, (Ed.), *Math. Foundations of the Finite Element Method with Applications to PDE*, PP.387-408, Academic, New York (1972)
16. Brenner, S.C., Sung, L.Y.: Linear finite element methods for planar linear elasticity. *Math. Comp.* 59, 321-338 (1992)
17. Brenner, S.C., Scott, L.R.: *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*. 2nd ed.. Springer-Verlag, New York (2002)
18. Brenner, S.C.:  $C^0$  interior penalty methods. In *Frontiers in Numerical Analysis-Durham 2010*, Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering 85, pp. 79-147, Springer-Verlag (2012)
19. Bucur, D., Ionescu, I.R.: Asymptotic analysis and scaling of friction parameters. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys. (ZAMP)* 57, 1042-1056 (2006)
20. Cai, Z., Ye, X., Zhang, S.: Discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods for interface problems: a priori and a posteriori error estimations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 49, 1761-1787 (2011)
21. Cakoni, F., Colton, D., Meng, S., Monk, P.: Stekloff eigenvalues in inverse scattering. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 76(4), 1737-1763 (2016)
22. Cao, L., Zhang, L., Allegritto, W., Lin, Y.: Multiscale asymptotic method for Steklov eigenvalue equations in composite media. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 51, 273-296 (2013)
23. Carstensen, C., Hu, J., Orlando, A.: Framework for the a posteriori error analysis of nonconforming finite elements. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 45, 68-82 (2007)
24. Carstensen, C., Hoppe, R.H.W.: Convergence analysis of an adaptive nonconforming finite element method. *Numer. Math.* 103, 251-266 (2006)
25. Carstensen, C., Gedicke, J.: Guaranteed lower bounds for eigenvalues. *Math. Comp.* 83, 2605-2629 (2014)
26. Chen, L.: iFEM: an innovative finite element methods package in MATLAB. Technical Report, University of California at Irvine (2009)
27. Ciarlet, P.G.: Basic error estimates for elliptic problems. in: P. G. Ciarlet, J. L. Lions(Eds), *Finite Element Methods (Part I)*, pp.21-343, in: *Handbook of Numerical Analysis*, Vol. 2, Elsevier Science Publishers, North-Holand (1991)
28. Conca, C., Planchard, J., Vanninathanm, M.: *Fluid and Periodic Structures*. John Wiley & Sons, New York (1995)
29. Crouzeix, M., Raviart, P.A.: Conforming and nonconforming finite element methods for solving the stationary stokes equations. *RAIRO. Anal. Numer.* 3, 33-75 (1973)
30. Dai, X., Xu, J., Zhou, A.: Convergence and optimal complexity of adaptive finite element eigenvalue computations. *Numer. Math.* 110, 313-355 (2008)
31. Dari, E., Durán, R., Padra, C., Vampa, V.: A posteriori error estimators for nonconforming finite element methods. *RAIRO Model. Math. Anal. Numer.* 30, 385-400 (1996)
32. Dauge, M.: Elliptic boundary value problems on corner domains: smoothness and asymptotics of solutions. in: *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol.1341. Springer, Berlin (1988)

33. Falk, R.S.: Nonconforming finite element methods for the equations of linear elasticity. *Math. Comp.* 57, 529-550 (1991)
34. Garau, E.M., Morin, P.: Convergence and quasi-optimality of adaptive FEM for Steklov eigenvalue problems. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* 31(3), 914-946 (2011)
35. Hu, J., Huang, Y., Lin, Q.: The lower bounds for eigenvalues of elliptic operators by Nonconforming finite element methods. *J. Sci Comput.* 61, 196-221 (2014)
36. Li, Q., Lin, Q., Xie, H.: Nonconforming finite element approximations of the Steklov eigenvalue problems and its lower bound approximations. *Appl. Math.* 58, 129-151 (2013)
37. Li, M., Lin, Q., Zhang, S.: Extrapolation and superconvergence of the Steklov eigenvalue problems. *Adv. Comput. Math.* 33, 25-44 (2010)
38. Liu, J., Sun, J., Turner, T.: Spectral indicator method for a non-selfadjoint Steklov eigenvalue problem. ar Xiv: 1804.02582V1 [math. NA] 7 Apr (2018)
39. Morin, P., Nochetto, R.H., Siebert, K.: Convergence of adaptive finite element methods. *SIAM Rev.* 44, 631-658 (2002)
40. Oden, J.T., Reddy, J.N.: An Introduction to the Mathematical Theory of Finite Elements. Courier Dover Publications, New York (2012)
41. Russo, A.D., Alonso, A.E.: A posteriori error estimates for nonconforming approximations of Steklov eigenvalue problems. *Comput. Math. Appl.* 62(11), 4100-4117 (2011)
42. Savaré, G.: Regularity results for elliptic equations in Lipschitz domains. *J. Funct. Anal.* 152, 176-201 (1998)
43. Shi, Z., Wang, M.: Finite Element Methods. Science Press, Beijing (2013)
44. Strang, G., Fix, G.J.: An analysis of the finite element method. Prentice-Hall, New York (1973)
45. Verfürth, R.: A review of a posteriori error estimates and adaptive mesh-refinement techniques. Wiley-Teubner, New York (1996)
46. Xie, H.: A type of multilevel method for the Steklov eigenvalue problem. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* 34, 592-608 (2014)
47. Yang, Y., Li, Q., Li, S.: Nonconforming finite element approximations of the Steklov eigenvalue problem. *Appl. Numer. Math.* 59, 2388-2401 (2009)