Spectral correctness of the discontinuous Galerkin approximation of the first-order form of Maxwell's equations with discontinuous coefficients

Alexandre Ern, Jean-Luc Guermond

Spectral correctness of the discontinuous Galerkin approximation of the first-order form of Maxwell's equations with discontinuous coefficients*

Alexandre Ern† Jean-Luc Guermond‡

Draft version February 9, 2024

Abstract

The paper analyzes the discontinuous Galerkin approximation of Maxwell's equations written in first-order form and with non-homogeneous magnetic permeability and electric permittivity. Although the Sobolev smoothness index of the solution may be smaller than $\frac{1}{2}$, it is shown that the approximation converges strongly and is therefore spectrally correct. The convergence proof uses the notion of involution and is based on a deflated inf-sup condition and a duality argument. One essential idea is that the smoothness index of the dual solution is always larger than $\frac{1}{2}$ irrespective of the regularity of the material properties.

Keywords. Maxwell's equations, involution, finite elements, discontinuous Galerkin, duality argument, spectral correctness

MSC. 65M60, 65M12, 65N30, 35L02, 35L05, 35Q61

1 Introduction

The main motivation of the present work is the construction of space and time approximation techniques for nonlinear conservation equations such as the Euler–Maxwell equations or in ideal magnetohydrodynamics. Our objective is to construct approximation methods that are invariant-domain and involution preserving. For instance, for the Euler–Maxwell equations, the invariant domain concerns pointwise values of the density and the energy, whereas the involutions mean that the magnetic and electric fields remain in the image of the curl operator (in the absence of free charges), as stated by Gauss's laws. Preserving the involutions is essential to establish compactness of the solution operator, and ensures that the approximate solution behaves properly over long times (see, e.g., Dafermos [24], Campos Pinto and Sonnendrücker [14]).

In the paper, we focus on the discontinuous Galerkin (dG) approximation of Maxwell's equations written as first-order conservation equations. Our main result establishes that the dG approximation is involution preserving and spectrally correct. We do so by proving the strong convergence

†CERMICS, Ecole des Ponts, 77455 Marne-la-Vallee Cedex 2, France and INRIA Paris, 75589 Paris, France

‡Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University 3368 TAMU, College Station, TX 77843, USA.

*This material is based upon work supported in part by the National Science Foundation grant DMS2110868, the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, USAF, under grant/contract number FA9550-18-1-0397, the Army Research Office, under grant number W911NF-19-1-0431, and the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contracts B640889. The support of INRIA through the International Chair program is acknowledged.

in the $\boldsymbol{L}^2$-norm of the discrete solution operator. We emphasize that our goal is not to approximate the Maxwell eigenvalue problem per se, and that, for that specific purpose, it may be more convenient to work with the second-order formulation of Maxwell's equations. However, working with the second-order formulation is not an option in the context of magnetohydrodynamics. This is why we insist on working with the first-order formulation.

The dG approximation of Maxwell's equations written in first-order form and with constant properties has been shown to be spectrally correct in [30]. The main limitation of [30] though is that it relies on the solution to the boundary-value problem having a Sobolev smoothness index larger than $\frac{1}{2}$ for square integrable right-hand sides. The argument presented in [30] fails when the magnetic permeability and electric permittivity are discontinuous as the smoothness index of the solution to the boundary-value problem is lower than $\frac{1}{2}$ in this case. The result presented in the paper significantly improves that reported in [30] since it is based on two novel arguments. The first one consists of establishing stability by proving a deflated inf-sup condition (see Lemma 5.1). The second key idea is based on the observation that, irrespective of the smoothness of the magnetic permeability and electric permittivity, the solution to the dual problem lives in a Sobolev space with a smoothness regularity index that is always larger than $\frac{1}{2}$ (see Lemma 5.3). Strong convergence of the dG approximation is then proved by using a duality argument à la Aubin–Nitsche, following the seminal work by Schatz [37]. In the context of dG methods, a duality argument inspired by [37] is used in Chaumont-Frelet [15] for the Helmholtz problem and in Chaumont-Frelet and Ern [16] for Maxwell's equations in second-order form in the frequency domain.

The eigenvalue problem for Maxwell's equations with discontinuous properties written in second-order form has been investigated in Buffa and Perugia [12], and the dG approximation has been shown therein to be spectrally correct. The method has been numerically tested in Buffa et al. [13]. Conforming methods using edge elements have been investigated in Ciarlet [21] and in [28] for solving the boundary-value problem with low regularity. A stabilized continuous finite element method has been studied in Bonito et al. [9] and has been shown to be spectrally correct when the Sobolev smoothness index is smaller than $\frac{1}{2}$. Very few papers have addressed the dG approximation of Maxwell's equations in first-order form. Numerical experiments performed in Hesthaven and Warburton [32, §5] and [33, p. 513-514] have revealed that the dG approximation performs well in the time domain and that the approximation of the eigenvalue problem seems to be spurious-free even when the magnetic permeability and electric permittivity are discontinuous. Similar observations are made in Alvarez et al. [1, §V] and Cohen and Duruflé [22, §5]. We provide here a mathematical proof of these observations.

The paper is organized as follows. We introduce the eigenvalue problem and recall some theoretical results from the literature in §2. The discrete dG setting is described in §3. We give in Lemma 3.1 and (35) a precise characterization of the discrete involutions satisfied by the discrete eigenvalue problem. Section 4 contains two preliminary results: discrete Poincaré–Steklov inequalities for involution-preserving discrete fields (Lemma 4.1) and a consistency bound for the discrete curl operators introduced in the dG setting (Lemma 4.2). The error analysis is performed in §5. The two main steps are the deflated inf-sup condition established in Lemma 5.1 and the duality argument developed in §5.2. The main convergence result of the paper is stated in Theorem 5.9. Finally, some standard results on Helmholtz decompositions are collected in Appendix A. We point out that the present analysis can be extended to establish that the dG approximation of the grad-div problem written in first-order form converges strongly, which, in turn, implies that the dG approximation of the linear wave equation written in first-order form is involution-preserving and spectrally correct; the details are omitted for brevity.

2 Continuous setting

In this section, we present the functional setting to formulate the exact eigenvalue problem and the associated boundary-value problem. Most of the results listed here can be found in the literature; see e.g., Amrouche et al. [2], Birman and Solomyak [4], Bramble and Pasciak [11], Costabel [23], Dautray and Lions [25], Girault and Raviart [31], Hiptmair [34].

2.1 Domain, model parameters, involutions

We consider a material with magnetic permeability, μ, and electric permittivity, ϵ, occupying the domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 3$, which is assumed to be an open, bounded, connected polyhedron with Lipschitz boundary. The boundary of D is denoted ∂D and its unit outward normal $\boldsymbol{n}_D$. For simplicity, we assume that D is a Lipschitz polyhedron, so that it can be covered exactly by affine simplicial meshes. The domain D can have a general topology. In particular, D can be multiply connected and ∂D can have several connected components. The material properties μ and ϵ can be heterogeneous, and in particular, they can take discontinuous values. To fix the ideas, we assume that there is a partition of D into a finite number of disjoint Lipschitz polyhedra such that μ and ϵ are piecewise smooth on this partition.

The magnetic permeability and electric permittivity of vacuum are denoted μ_0, ϵ_0, respectively. To simplify the presentation, we assume throughout the paper that the ratios $\mu_0^{-1}\mu$ and $\epsilon_0^{-1}\epsilon$ are of order unity, so that these ratios can be hidden in the generic constants used in the error analysis. To be dimensionally consistent, we introduce a length scale, ℓ_D, associated with D; it can be for instance the diameter of D. Recalling that $\mathfrak{c} := (\mu_0\epsilon_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is the speed of light, we introduce the quantity $\omega := \mathfrak{c}\ell_D^{-1}$ which scales as the reciprocal of a time scale.

In what follows, for positive real numbers A, B, we abbreviate as $A \lesssim B$ the inequality $A \le CB$, where C is a generic constant whose value can change at each occurrence as long as it is independent of the mesh size (whenever relevant), the parameters μ_0, ϵ_0, ℓ_D, ω, and any fields involved in the inequality. The value of C can depend on the ratios $\operatorname{ess\,inf} \frac{\mu}{\mu_0}$, $\operatorname{ess\,sup} \frac{\mu}{\mu_0}$, $\operatorname{ess\,inf} \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_0}$, and $\operatorname{ess\,sup} \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_0}$, and on the shape-regularity of the mesh and the polynomial degree used in the dG approximation (whenever relevant).

Let us consider Maxwell's eigenvalue problem: Find $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and a nonzero pair of fields $\boldsymbol{H}, \boldsymbol{E} : D \to \mathbb{C}^d$ such that

$$-\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E} = \frac{\omega}{\lambda}\mu\boldsymbol{H}, \qquad \nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H} = \frac{\omega}{\lambda}\epsilon\boldsymbol{E}, \qquad \boldsymbol{H}\times\boldsymbol{n}|_{\partial D} = \boldsymbol{0}. \tag{1}$$

An important observation is that $\mu\boldsymbol{H}$ is in the image of the curl operator, and $\epsilon\boldsymbol{E}$ is in the image of the curl operator acting on fields with zero tangential boundary condition. Following the terminology used in Boillat [7], Dafermos [24], we henceforth refer to these properties as involutions.

2.2 Functional spaces

We now formalize the notion of involution by introducing a proper functional framework. We use standard notation for Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces. We use boldface fonts for $\mathbb{C}^d$-valued fields and functional spaces composed of such fields. The space $\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)$ is composed of Lebesgue integrable fields that are square integrable, and its canonical inner product is denoted $(\cdot,\cdot)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}$. As the solution to Maxwell's problem is a pair $(\boldsymbol{H}, \boldsymbol{E})$, we introduce the product space $L^c := \boldsymbol{L}^2(D)\times\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)$. It is convenient to consider the norm

$$\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^c} := \big\{\|\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}^2 + \|\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{g}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}^2\big\}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2}$$

Next, we define the Hilbert space

$$\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D) := \{\boldsymbol{h} \in \boldsymbol{L}^2(D) \mid \nabla\times\boldsymbol{h} \in \boldsymbol{L}^2(D)\}, \tag{3}$$

equipped with the natural graph norm $\|\boldsymbol{h}\|^2_{\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D)} := \|\boldsymbol{h}\|^2_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \ell_D^2\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{h}\|^2_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}$. We also consider the closed subspace

$$\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D) := \{\boldsymbol{h} \in \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D) \mid \gamma^{\mathrm{c}}_{\partial D}(\boldsymbol{h}) = \boldsymbol{0}\}, \tag{4}$$

where $\gamma^{\mathrm{c}}_{\partial D} : \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D) \to \boldsymbol{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\partial D)$ is the extension by density of the tangent trace operator such that $\gamma^{\mathrm{c}}_{\partial D}(\boldsymbol{h}) = \boldsymbol{h}|_{\partial D}\times\boldsymbol{n}_D$ for every smooth field $\boldsymbol{h} \in \boldsymbol{H}^r(D)$, $r > \frac{1}{2}$, with $\boldsymbol{n}_D$ the unit outward normal to D. We consider the operators $\nabla\times : \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D) \ni \boldsymbol{e} \longmapsto \nabla\times\boldsymbol{e} \in \boldsymbol{L}^2(D)$ and $\nabla_0\times : \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D) \ni \boldsymbol{h} \longmapsto \nabla\times\boldsymbol{h} \in \boldsymbol{L}^2(D)$. These operators are adjoint to each other since we have

$$(\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{e})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} = (\boldsymbol{h},\nabla\times\boldsymbol{e})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}, \quad \forall(\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{e}) \in \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D)\times\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D). \tag{5}$$

Since the operators $\nabla_0\times$ and $\nabla\times$ are closed, the involution properties for (1) are equivalent to asserting that

$$\mu\boldsymbol{H} \in \mathrm{im}(\nabla\times) = (\ker\nabla_0\times)^\perp, \qquad \epsilon\boldsymbol{E} \in \mathrm{im}(\nabla_0\times) = (\ker\nabla\times)^\perp, \tag{6}$$

where the symbol $^\perp$ denotes the orthogonality in $\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)$. Thus, after setting

$$\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\boldsymbol{0};D) := \ker\nabla\times = \{\boldsymbol{e} \in \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D) \mid \nabla\times\boldsymbol{e} = \boldsymbol{0}\}, \tag{7a}$$
$$\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\boldsymbol{0};D) := \ker\nabla_0\times = \{\boldsymbol{h} \in \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D) \mid \nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{h} = \boldsymbol{0}\}, \tag{7b}$$

it is natural to introduce the following closed subspaces:

$$\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\mu,0} := \{\boldsymbol{h} \in \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D) \mid \mu\boldsymbol{h} \in \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\boldsymbol{0};D)^\perp\}, \tag{8a}$$
$$\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\epsilon} := \{\boldsymbol{e} \in \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D) \mid \epsilon\boldsymbol{e} \in \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\boldsymbol{0};D)^\perp\}, \tag{8b}$$
$$\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{0} := \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D) \cap \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\boldsymbol{0};D)^\perp, \tag{8c}$$
$$\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}} := \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D) \cap \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\boldsymbol{0};D)^\perp. \tag{8d}$$

Introducing the $\boldsymbol{L}^2$-orthogonal projections

$$\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}} : \boldsymbol{L}^2(D) \to \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\boldsymbol{0};D), \tag{9a}$$
$$\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0 : \boldsymbol{L}^2(D) \to \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\boldsymbol{0};D), \tag{9b}$$

we can rewrite

$$\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\mu,0} = \{\boldsymbol{h} \in \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D) \mid \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0(\mu\boldsymbol{h}) = \boldsymbol{0}\}, \tag{10a}$$
$$\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\epsilon} = \{\boldsymbol{e} \in \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D) \mid \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}(\epsilon\boldsymbol{e}) = \boldsymbol{0}\}, \tag{10b}$$
$$\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{0} = \{\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D) \mid \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \boldsymbol{0}\}, \tag{10c}$$
$$\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}} = \{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D) \mid \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \boldsymbol{0}\}, \tag{10d}$$

and the involution properties (6) are equivalent to asserting that

$$\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0(\mu\boldsymbol{H}) = \boldsymbol{0}, \qquad \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}(\epsilon\boldsymbol{E}) = \boldsymbol{0}. \tag{11}$$

Remark 2.1 (Topology of D)**.** *Referring to the Appendix for the notation, the definition* (67) *and the characterization* (69) *give* $\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp=\boldsymbol{H}^\Gamma(\mathrm{div}=0;D)$*, and* $\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp=\boldsymbol{H}_0^\Sigma(\mathrm{div}=0;D)$*, so that*

$$\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,0}^{\mathrm{c}}=\Big\{\boldsymbol{\eta}\in\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D)\mid\nabla\cdot(\mu\boldsymbol{\eta})=0,\ \textstyle\int_{\Gamma_i}\mu\boldsymbol{\eta}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\,\mathrm{d}s=0,\ \forall i\in\{1{:}I\}\Big\},\tag{12a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon}^{\mathrm{c}}=\Big\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\in\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D)\mid\ \nabla\cdot(\epsilon\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})=0,\ \textstyle\int_{\Sigma_j}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\,\mathrm{d}s=0,\ \forall j\in\{1{:}J\}\Big\},\tag{12b}$$

$$\boldsymbol{X}_{0}^{\mathrm{c}}=\Big\{\boldsymbol{\eta}\in\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D)\cap\boldsymbol{H}(\mathrm{div}=0;D)\mid\ \textstyle\int_{\Gamma_i}\boldsymbol{\eta}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\,\mathrm{d}s=0,\ \forall i\in\{1{:}I\}\Big\},\tag{12c}$$

$$\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}=\Big\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\in\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D)\cap\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathrm{div}=0;D)\mid\ \textstyle\int_{\Sigma_j}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\,\mathrm{d}s=0,\ \forall j\in\{1{:}J\}\Big\}.\tag{12d}$$

When the topology of D is trivial, we have $\boldsymbol{X}_0^{\mathrm{c}}=\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D)\cap\boldsymbol{H}(\mathrm{div}=0;D)$ *and* $\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}=\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D)\cap\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathrm{div}=0;D)$*. In this case, the involutions* (6) *are equivalent to Gauss's laws (in the absence of free charges), i.e.,* $\nabla\cdot(\varepsilon\boldsymbol{E})=0$ *and* $\nabla\cdot(\mu\boldsymbol{H})=0$*. This is no longer the case when the topology of D is nontrivial.*

2.3 Preliminary results

We now recall standard results about the operators $\nabla\times$ and $\nabla_0\times$ which we are going to invoke later in the paper.

Lemma 2.2 (Isomorphisms)**.** *The following operators are isomorphisms:*

$$\nabla\times:\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}\to\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp,\qquad\nabla_0\times:\boldsymbol{X}_0^{\mathrm{c}}\to\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp,\tag{13a}$$

$$\nabla\times:\boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon}^{\mathrm{c}}\to\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp,\qquad\nabla_0\times:\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,0}^{\mathrm{c}}\to\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp.\tag{13b}$$

Proof. See Appendix. □

The operators $\nabla\times$ and $\nabla_0\times$ can be extended by density to $\nabla\times:\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)\to(\boldsymbol{X}_0^{\mathrm{c}})'$ and $\nabla_0\times:\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)\to(\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}})'$. The following result is a straightforward consequence of Lemma 2.2; see also Bramble and Pasciak [11, §4-5].

Corollary 2.3 (Weak Poincaré–Steklov (in)equalities)**.** *The following holds:*

$$\|\boldsymbol{e}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}=\ell_D\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{e}\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}_0^{\mathrm{c}})'},\qquad\forall\boldsymbol{e}\in\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp,\tag{14a}$$

$$\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}=\ell_D\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{h}\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}})'},\qquad\forall\boldsymbol{h}\in\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp,\tag{14b}$$

with $\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{e}\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}_0^{\mathrm{c}})'}:=\sup_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\in\boldsymbol{X}_0^{\mathrm{c}}}\frac{|(\boldsymbol{e},\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}|}{\ell_D\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}}$, $\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{h}\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}})'}:=\sup_{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\in\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}}\frac{|(\boldsymbol{h},\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}|}{\ell_D\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}}$.

The next result is a consequence of the elliptic regularity theory and is proved in Bonito et al. [8], Jochmann [35]. It generalizes a result due to Costabel [23, Thm. 2] (see also Birman and Solomyak [4, Thm. 3.1]) for either constant or smooth properties, and in this case the smoothness index is $s=\frac12$ in a Lipschitz domain. One has $s\in(\frac12,1]$ if D is a Lipschitz polyhedron (see Amrouche et al. [2, Prop. 3.7]) and $s=1$ if D is convex (see [2, Thm. 2.17]). The reader is also referred to Ciarlet [20, Thm. 16] for particular situations with heterogeneous properties for which smoothness is established with $s>\frac12$.

Lemma 2.4 (Regularity shift)**.** (i) *There is $s'\in(\frac12,1]$ such that, for all $(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\in\boldsymbol{X}_0^{\mathrm{c}}\times\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}$,*

$$|\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s'}(D)}\lesssim\ell_D^{1-s'}\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)},\qquad|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s'}(D)}\lesssim\ell_D^{1-s'}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}.\tag{15}$$

(ii) *There is $s\in(0,\frac12]$ such that, for all $(\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{e})\in\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,0}^{\mathrm{c}}\times\boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon}^{\mathrm{c}}$,*

$$|\boldsymbol{h}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s}(D)}\lesssim\ell_D^{1-s}\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{h}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)},\qquad|\boldsymbol{e}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s}(D)}\lesssim\ell_D^{1-s}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{e}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}.\tag{16}$$

2.4 Eigenvalue and boundary-value problems

Using the notation introduced above, the eigenvalue problem (1) consists of seeking $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and a nonzero pair $(\boldsymbol{H}, \boldsymbol{E}) \in \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\mu,0} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\epsilon}$ so that

$$-\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E} = \frac{\omega}{\lambda}\mu\boldsymbol{H}, \qquad \nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H} = \frac{\omega}{\lambda}\epsilon\boldsymbol{E}. \tag{17}$$

We now define the boundary-value operator $T : L^{\mathrm{c}} \to L^{\mathrm{c}}$ associated with (17). For all $(\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{g}) \in L^{\mathrm{c}}$, one cannot simply require that the pair $(\boldsymbol{H}, \boldsymbol{E}) := T(\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{g})$ solves $-\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E} = \omega\mu\boldsymbol{f}$ and $\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H} = \omega\epsilon\boldsymbol{g}$ (the factor ω is only introduced for dimensional consistency). Indeed, this problem only makes sense if $\mu\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathrm{im}(\nabla\times) = \ker(\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0)$ and $\epsilon\boldsymbol{g} \in \mathrm{im}(\nabla_0\times) = \ker(\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}})$. To circumvent this difficulty, we define $T(\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{g})$ as the unique pair $(\boldsymbol{H}, \boldsymbol{E}) \in \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\mu,0} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\epsilon}$ so that

$$-\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E} = \omega(\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0)(\mu\boldsymbol{f}), \tag{18a}$$

$$\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H} = \omega(\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}})(\epsilon\boldsymbol{g}). \tag{18b}$$

The existence and uniqueness of the solution to (18) is a consequence of (13b) and the definition of the projectors $\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}$.

Lemma 2.5 (A priori estimates and compactness)**.** (i) *The solution* $(\boldsymbol{H}, \boldsymbol{E}) \in \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\mu,0} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\epsilon}$ *of* (18) *satisfies the a priori estimate*

$$\ell_D\big(\mu_0^{\frac12}\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \epsilon_0^{\frac12}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big) \lesssim \|(\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}. \tag{19a}$$

(ii) *There is* $s \in (0, \frac12]$ *such that*

$$|\boldsymbol{H}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^s(D)} \lesssim \ell_D^{1-s}\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}, \quad |\boldsymbol{E}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^s(D)} \lesssim \ell_D^{1-s}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}, \tag{19b}$$

and the operator $T : L^{\mathrm{c}} \to L^{\mathrm{c}}$ *is compact.*

Proof. (i) (18) gives $\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \le \omega\|\mu\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \lesssim \omega\mu_0^{\frac12}\|\mu^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}$ and, similarly, we obtain $\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \lesssim \omega\varepsilon_0^{\frac12}\|\varepsilon^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{g}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}$. The estimate (19a) is obtained by observing that $\omega\mu_0^{\frac12}\epsilon_0^{\frac12} = \ell_D^{-1}$.

(ii) The estimates (19b) come from (16) and imply the compactness of T owing to the Rellich–Kondrachov embedding theorem. □

Notice that for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$, the nonzero pair $(\boldsymbol{H}, \boldsymbol{E}) \in \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\mu,0} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\epsilon}$ solves the eigenvalue problem (17) if and only if $\big(\lambda, (\boldsymbol{H}, \boldsymbol{E})\big)$ is an eigenpair of T.

Remark 2.6 (Equivalent definition)**.** *An equivalent definition of the operator* $T : L^{\mathrm{c}} \to L^{\mathrm{c}}$ *is that, for all* $(\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{g}) \in L^{\mathrm{c}}$, $T(\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{g}) := (\boldsymbol{H}, \boldsymbol{E})$ *is the unique pair in* $\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; D) \times \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}; D)$ *solving the boundary-value problem*

$$\omega\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0(\mu\boldsymbol{H}) - \nabla\times\boldsymbol{E} = \omega(\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0)(\mu\boldsymbol{f}), \tag{20a}$$

$$\omega\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}(\epsilon\boldsymbol{E}) + \nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H} = \omega(\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}})(\epsilon\boldsymbol{g}). \tag{20b}$$

Indeed, since $\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0((\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0)(\mu\boldsymbol{f})) = \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}((\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}})(\epsilon\boldsymbol{g})) = \boldsymbol{0}$ *and*

$$\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0(\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E}) = \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}(\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}) = \boldsymbol{0},$$

the pair $(\boldsymbol{H}, \boldsymbol{E}) \in \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; D) \times \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}; D)$ *solves* (20) *iff the pair* $(\boldsymbol{H}, \boldsymbol{E})$ *sits in* $\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\mu,0} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\epsilon}$ *and solves* (18)*.*

Remark 2.7 (Shifting or not shifting)**.** *One traditional way of dealing with the boundary-value problem consists of avoiding the use of the projections* $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}$ *by adding a zero-order term to the operator. Specifically, one considers a shifted operator* $S : L^{\mathrm{c}} \to L^{\mathrm{c}}$ *defined as follows: For all* $(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g}) \in L^{\mathrm{c}}$*,* $S(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g}) := (\boldsymbol{H},\boldsymbol{E})$ *is the pair in* $\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D)\times\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D) \subset L^{\mathrm{c}}$ *such that*

$$\omega\mu\boldsymbol{H} - \nabla\times\boldsymbol{E} = \omega\mu\boldsymbol{f}, \tag{21a}$$

$$\omega\epsilon\boldsymbol{E} + \nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H} = \omega\epsilon\boldsymbol{g}. \tag{21b}$$

This problem is well-posed and has a unique solution. One observes that $(\lambda,(\boldsymbol{H},\boldsymbol{E}))$ *is an eigenpair of the operator* T *iff* $(\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda},(\boldsymbol{H},\boldsymbol{E}))$ *is an eigenpair of the operator* S*. Hence, the shifting does not change the eigenstructure of the problem, and one can address the spectral correctness of the approximation of* (17) *by proving the spectral correctness of the approximation to the shifted problem. The slight difficulty is that the operator* S *is not compact, so that one cannot invoke the now standard Bramble–Babuška–Osborn theory. One can instead invoke the theory developed in Descloux et al. [26]; see for instance Property 1 and Theorem 2 therein. For instance, this is the approach followed in Buffa and Perugia [12] for the dG approximation of the Maxwell operator in second-order form. The route we follow in the paper is different: instead of shifting the problem, we formulate the boundary-value problem by projecting the data on the involuting-preserving space* $\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,0}^{\mathrm{c}}\times\boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon}^{\mathrm{c}}$*. We shall proceed similarly at the discrete level and project the data on the discrete counterpart of* $\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,0}^{\mathrm{c}}\times\boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon}^{\mathrm{c}}$*. The key advantage of this approach is that we can then apply the usual theory for the spectral approximation of compact operators.*

3 Discrete eigenvalue problem

In this section, we introduce the discrete setting to formulate the discrete eigenvalue problem.

3.1 DG setting

Let $(\mathcal{T}_h)_{h\in\mathcal{H}}$ be a shape-regular family of affine simplicial meshes such that each mesh covers D exactly and is compatible with the partition of D associated with the discontinuities of the material properties. For simplicity, we assume in the paper that the meshes are quasi-uniform. The symbol K denotes a generic mesh cell, h_K its diameter, and $\boldsymbol{n}_K$ its outward unit normal. We define $\tilde{h}$ as the piecewise constant function on $\mathcal{T}_h$ such that $\tilde{h}|_K = h_K$ for all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$; we set $h := \|\tilde{h}\|_{L^\infty(D)}$. The set of mesh faces, $\mathcal{F}_h$, is split into the subset of mesh interfaces, say $\mathcal{F}_h^\circ$, and the subset of mesh boundary faces, say $\mathcal{F}_h^\partial$. Each interface is shared by two distinct mesh cells which we denote K_l, K_r. Each boundary face is shared by one mesh cell, K_l, and the boundary, ∂D. For every mesh face $F \in \mathcal{F}_h$, h_F denotes the diameter of F. Every mesh interface $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\circ$ is oriented by the unit normal, $\boldsymbol{n}_F$, pointing from K_l to K_r. Every boundary face $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\partial$ is oriented by the unit normal $\boldsymbol{n}_F := \boldsymbol{n}_D$.

Let $k \geq 0$ be the polynomial degree. We insist that $k = 0$ is a legitimate choice for the theory developed in the paper. Let $\mathbb{P}_{k,d}$ be the vector space over $\mathbb{C}$ composed of d-variate polynomials of total degree at most k and set $\mathbb{P}_{k,d} := [\mathbb{P}_{k,d}]^d$. Consider the vector-valued broken polynomial spaces

$$\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) := \{\boldsymbol{w}_h \in \boldsymbol{L}^2(D) \mid \boldsymbol{w}_{h|K} \in \mathbb{P}_{k,d},\, \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}. \tag{22}$$

We define the $\boldsymbol{L}^2$-orthogonal projection onto the broken polynomial space $\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$,

$$\boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{b}} : \boldsymbol{L}^2(D) \to \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h). \tag{23}$$

For all $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, all $F \in \mathcal{F}_h$ with $F \subset \partial K$, and all $\boldsymbol{w}_h \in \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$, we define the local trace operators such that $\gamma_{K,F}^{\mathrm{g}}(\boldsymbol{w}_h)(\boldsymbol{x}) := \boldsymbol{w}_h|_K(\boldsymbol{x})$, $\gamma_{K,F}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{w}_h)(\boldsymbol{x}) := \boldsymbol{w}_h|_K(\boldsymbol{x}) \times \boldsymbol{n}_F$ for a.e. $\boldsymbol{x} \in F$. Then, for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\circ$ and $\mathrm{x} \in \{\mathrm{g}, \mathrm{c}\}$, we define the jump and average operators such that

$$[\![\boldsymbol{w}_h]\!]_F^{\mathrm{x}} := \gamma_{K_l,F}^{\mathrm{x}}(\boldsymbol{w}_h) - \gamma_{K_r,F}^{\mathrm{x}}(\boldsymbol{w}_h), \quad \{\!\{\boldsymbol{w}_h\}\!\}_F^{\mathrm{x}} := \frac{1}{2}\big(\gamma_{K_l,F}^{\mathrm{x}}(\boldsymbol{w}_h) + \gamma_{K_r,F}^{\mathrm{x}}(\boldsymbol{w}_h)\big). \tag{24a}$$

To allow for more compact expressions, we also set $[\![\boldsymbol{w}_h]\!]_F^{\mathrm{x}} := \{\!\{\boldsymbol{w}_h\}\!\}_F^{\mathrm{x}} := \gamma_{K_l,F}^{\mathrm{x}}(\boldsymbol{w}_h)$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\partial$. We define the jump sesquilinear forms such that for all $\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h \in \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$,

$$s_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{h}_h) := \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h} ([\![\boldsymbol{H}_h]\!]_F^{\mathrm{c}}, [\![\boldsymbol{h}_h]\!]_F^{\mathrm{c}})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(F)}, \quad s_h^{\mathrm{c},\circ}(\boldsymbol{E}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h) := \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\circ} ([\![\boldsymbol{E}_h]\!]_F^{\mathrm{c}}, [\![\boldsymbol{e}_h]\!]_F^{\mathrm{c}})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(F)}.$$

These sesquilinear forms induce the following seminorms which we henceforth call jump seminorms:

$$|\boldsymbol{h}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}} := s_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{h}_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \qquad |\boldsymbol{e}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ} := s_h^{\mathrm{c},\circ}(\boldsymbol{e}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{25}$$

The discrete curl operators

$$\boldsymbol{C}_{h0} : \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \to \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h), \qquad \boldsymbol{C}_h : \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \to \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \tag{26}$$

are defined as follows: For all $(\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h) \in \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \times \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$, $\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{h}_h)$ and $\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{e}_h)$ are the unique members of $\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ such that the following identities hold true for all $\boldsymbol{e}_h', \boldsymbol{h}_h' \in \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$:

$$(\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{h}_h), \boldsymbol{e}_h')_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} := (\nabla_h \times \boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h')_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h} ([\![\boldsymbol{h}_h]\!]_F^{\mathrm{c}}, \{\!\{\boldsymbol{e}_h'\}\!\}_F^{\mathrm{g}})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(F)}, \tag{27a}$$

$$(\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{e}_h), \boldsymbol{h}_h')_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} := (\nabla_h \times \boldsymbol{e}_h, \boldsymbol{h}_h')_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h^\circ} ([\![\boldsymbol{e}_h]\!]_F^{\mathrm{c}}, \{\!\{\boldsymbol{h}_h'\}\!\}_F^{\mathrm{g}})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(F)}, \tag{27b}$$

where $\nabla_h \times$ denotes the broken curl operator (evaluated cellwise). The following integration by parts formula holds (compare with (5)):

$$(\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{h}_h), \boldsymbol{e}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} = (\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{e}_h))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}, \quad \forall (\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h) \in \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \times \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h). \tag{28a}$$

3.2 Discrete eigenvalue problem and discrete involution

We define the discrete space $L_h^{\mathrm{c}} := \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \times \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$. Notice that $L_h^{\mathrm{c}} \subset L^{\mathrm{c}}$. We define the sesquilinear form $a_h : L_h^{\mathrm{c}} \times L_h^{\mathrm{c}} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_h\big((\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h), (\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h)\big) := & -(\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h), \boldsymbol{h}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + (\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h), \boldsymbol{e}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \\ & + \kappa_{\mathrm{H}} s_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{h}_h) + \kappa_{\mathrm{E}} s_h^{\mathrm{c},\circ}(\boldsymbol{E}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h), \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

with $\kappa_{\mathrm{H}} := \mu_0 \omega \ell_D = (\mu_0/\epsilon_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\kappa_{\mathrm{E}} := \epsilon_0 \omega \ell_D = (\epsilon_0/\mu_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}$; notice that $\kappa_{\mathrm{H}} \kappa_{\mathrm{E}} = 1$. The discrete eigenvalue problem consists in finding $\lambda_h \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and a nonzero pair $(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h) \in L_h^{\mathrm{c}}$ such that

$$a_h\big((\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h), (\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h)\big) = \frac{\omega}{\lambda_h} \big((\mu \boldsymbol{H}_h, \epsilon \boldsymbol{E}_h), (\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h)\big)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D) \times \boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}. \tag{30}$$

Introducing the operator $A_h : L_h^{\mathrm{c}} \to L_h^{\mathrm{c}}$ such that, for all $(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h), (\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h) \in L_h^{\mathrm{c}}$,

$$\big(A_h(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h), (\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h)\big)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D) \times \boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} := a_h\big((\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h), (\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h)\big),$$

the discrete eigenvalue problem (30) can be rewritten as

$$A_h(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h) = \frac{\omega}{\lambda_h}(\mu \boldsymbol{H}_h, \epsilon \boldsymbol{E}_h). \tag{31}$$

Hence, the discrete involution property consists of requesting that $(\mu \boldsymbol{H}_h, \epsilon \boldsymbol{E}_h)$ is in the range of A_h, i.e., a member of $\ker(A_h^{\mathsf{T}})^{\perp}$ (notice that $A_h^{\mathsf{T}} : L_h^{\mathrm{c}} \to L_h^{\mathrm{c}}$ and recall that the symbols $^{\mathsf{T}}$ and $^{\perp}$ refer to the orthogonality in $\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)$). Thus, our first step is to identify the kernel of A_h^{T}.

Lemma 3.1 (Discrete involution)**.** *The following holds:*

$$\ker(A_h^{\mathsf{T}}) = \big(\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \cap \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; D)\big) \times \big(\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \cap \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; D)\big). \tag{32}$$

Proof. (1) Let $(\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h) \in \ker(A_h^{\mathsf{T}})$, i.e., we have $a_h\big((\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h), (\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h)\big) = 0$ for all $(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h) \in L_h^{\mathrm{c}}$. This implies $a_h\big((\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h), (\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h)\big) = 0$, and we infer from (29) and (28a) that $|\boldsymbol{h}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}} = |\boldsymbol{e}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ} = 0$. Hence, $\boldsymbol{h}_h \in \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; D)$ and $\boldsymbol{e}_h \in \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}; D)$. This, in turn, implies that it is legitimate to consider the test functions $\boldsymbol{H}_h = \boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{e}_h) = \nabla \times \boldsymbol{e}_h$ and $\boldsymbol{E}_h = \boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{h}_h) = \nabla_0 \times \boldsymbol{h}_h$, which gives $\nabla_0 \times \boldsymbol{h}_h = \nabla \times \boldsymbol{e}_h = \mathbf{0}$. In conclusion, $\ker(A_h^{\mathsf{T}}) \in \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; D) \times \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; D)$.

(2) The proof of $\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; D) \times \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; D) \subset \ker(A_h^{\mathsf{T}})$ is similar. □

Our next important result is that $\ker(A_h^{\mathsf{T}})$ can be characterized by means of curl-free Nédélec finite element subspaces. Let $\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ be the $\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}; D)$-conforming finite element space composed of the piecewise Nédélec polynomials of the first family and of degree $k \geq 0$, and let $\boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ be its subspace composed of discrete fields with zero tangential trace on ∂D. We set

$$\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; \mathcal{T}_h) := \{\boldsymbol{e}_h \in \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \mid \nabla \times \boldsymbol{e}_h = \mathbf{0}\}, \tag{33a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; \mathcal{T}_h) := \{\boldsymbol{h}_h \in \boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \mid \nabla_0 \times \boldsymbol{h}_h = \mathbf{0}\}. \tag{33b}$$

Notice that $\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ is not a subspace of $\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ (actually $\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \subsetneq \boldsymbol{P}_{k+1}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$), but we are going to make use of the following well-known results (see, e.g., [29, Chap. 15&18]):

$$\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \cap \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; D) = \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; \mathcal{T}_h), \tag{34a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \cap \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; D) = \boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; \mathcal{T}_h). \tag{34b}$$

Therefore, (32) can be reformulated as follows:

$$\ker(A_h^{\mathsf{T}}) = \boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; \mathcal{T}_h) \times \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; \mathcal{T}_h). \tag{35}$$

Since the discrete involutions are equivalent to being $\boldsymbol{L}^2$-orthogonal to $\ker(A_h^{\mathsf{T}})$, it is natural to define the $\boldsymbol{L}^2$-orthogonal projections

$$\boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{c}} : \boldsymbol{L}^2(D) \to \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; \mathcal{T}_h), \tag{36a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}} : \boldsymbol{L}^2(D) \to \boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; \mathcal{T}_h), \tag{36b}$$

and to introduce the following discrete subspaces:

$$\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,h0}^{\mathrm{c}} := \{\boldsymbol{h}_h \in \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \mid \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mu \boldsymbol{h}_h) = \mathbf{0}\}, \tag{37a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon,h}^{\mathrm{c}} := \{\boldsymbol{e}_h \in \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \mid \boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\epsilon \boldsymbol{e}_h) = \mathbf{0}\}. \tag{37b}$$

In conclusion, the discrete involutions associated with the discrete eigenvalue problem (31) can be rewritten as

$$\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mu \boldsymbol{H}_h) = \boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\epsilon \boldsymbol{E}_h) = \mathbf{0}. \tag{38}$$

Remark 3.2 (Simplices)**.** *The identities* (34) *only hold true for simplicial finite elements. The result is false on quadrangles and hexahedra. Actually, the dG approximation of Maxwell's equations on quadrangles and hexahedra is not spectrally correct. The reader is referred to Buffa and Perugia [12, Rem. 7.14] and Boffi et al. [6, Rem. 3], where similar observations are made in the context of the approximation of Maxwell's equations written in second-order form.*

3.3 Discrete boundary-value problem

We now define $T_h : L^{\mathrm{c}} \to L^{\mathrm{c}}_h \subset L^{\mathrm{c}}$, the discrete counterpart of the operator $T : L^{\mathrm{c}} \to L^{\mathrm{c}}$ defined in Section 2.4. For all $(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g}) \in L^{\mathrm{c}}$, we let $T_h(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g}) := (\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h)$ be the unique pair in $\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\mu,h0} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\epsilon,h}$ so that the following equality holds for all $(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}_h) \in \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\mu,h0} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\epsilon,h}$,

$$a_h\big((\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h),(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}_h)\big) := \omega\big((\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_{h0})(\mu\boldsymbol{f}),\boldsymbol{h}_h\big)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \omega\big((\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_{h})(\epsilon\boldsymbol{g}),\boldsymbol{e}_h\big)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}. \tag{39}$$

Notice in passing that equality actually holds in (39) for all $(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}_h) \in L^{\mathrm{c}}_h$ because $\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\mu,h0} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\epsilon,h} = (\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_{h0})(\mu L^{\mathrm{c}}_h)\times(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_{h})(\epsilon L^{\mathrm{c}}_h)$ and $\ker(A_h^{\mathsf{T}}) = \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_{h0}(\mu L^{\mathrm{c}}_h)\times\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_{h}(\epsilon L^{\mathrm{c}}_h)$. The following result is a consequence of Lemma 5.1(ii) below.

Lemma 3.3 (Discrete well-posedness)**.** *The problem* (39) *has a unique solution.*

As (39) also holds for all $(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}_h) \in L^{\mathrm{c}}_h$, we infer that for all $\lambda_h \neq 0$ and all $(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h) \in L^{\mathrm{c}}_h$, $\big(\lambda_h,(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h)\big)$ is an eigenpair of T_h iff $\big(\frac{1}{\lambda_h},(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h)\big)$ is eigenpair of A_h (see (31)). Therefore, proving that the spectrum of T_h is pollution-free is equivalent to proving that the spectrum of A_h is pollution-free. We do so in Section 5 by establishing that $\lim_{h\to 0}\|T-T_h\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{\mathrm{c}};L^{\mathrm{c}})} = 0$.

Remark 3.4 (Equivalent definition)**.** *In the same spirit as in Remark 2.6 and as in [30], we can devise an equivalent definition of the discrete operator $T_h : L^{\mathrm{c}} \to L^{\mathrm{c}}_h$. We introduce the augmented sesquilinear form $a^{\pi}_h : L^{\mathrm{c}}_h \times L^{\mathrm{c}}_h \to \mathbb{C}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} a^{\pi}_h\big((\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h),(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}_h)\big) := {}& \omega(\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_{h0}(\mu\boldsymbol{H}_h),\boldsymbol{h}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \omega(\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_{h}(\epsilon\boldsymbol{E}_h),\boldsymbol{e}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \\ & + a_h\big((\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h),(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}_h)\big). \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Then, for all $(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g}) \in L^{\mathrm{c}}$, $T_h(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g}) := (\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h)$ is defined as the unique pair in L^{c}_h such that, for all $(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}_h) \in L^{\mathrm{c}}_h$,

$$a^{\pi}_h\big((\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h),(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}_h)\big) := \omega\big((\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_{h0})(\mu\boldsymbol{f}),\boldsymbol{h}_h\big)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \omega\big((\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_{h})(\epsilon\boldsymbol{g}),\boldsymbol{e}_h\big)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}. \tag{41}$$

One readily verifies that the pair $(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h) \in L^{\mathrm{c}}_h$ solves (41) *iff $(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h)$ sits in $\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\mu,h0} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}_{\epsilon,h}$ and solves* (39)*.*

4 Preliminary results

In this section, we establish two preliminary results: two discrete Poincaré–Steklov inequalities in the involution-preserving subspaces defined by (37) and a consistency bound on the discrete curl operators.

4.1 Quasi-interpolation operators

In what follows, we invoke two types of quasi-interpolation operators. The first type of operators, considered in the proof of Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 5.11, are the averaging operators

$\mathcal{I}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c,av}} : \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \to \boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ and $\mathcal{I}_h^{\mathrm{c,av}} : \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \to \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ analyzed in [27, §6]. The key approximation property of these operators is that, for all $\boldsymbol{v}_h \in \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$,

$$\|\boldsymbol{v}_h - \mathcal{I}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c,av}}(\boldsymbol{v}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \lesssim h^{\frac{1}{2}} |\boldsymbol{v}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}}, \qquad \|\boldsymbol{v}_h - \mathcal{I}_h^{\mathrm{c,av}}(\boldsymbol{v}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \lesssim h^{\frac{1}{2}} |\boldsymbol{v}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ}. \tag{42}$$

The second type of operators, invoked in the proof of Lemma 4.1, Lemma 5.1, and Lemma 5.11, are the commuting approximation operators $\mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}} : \boldsymbol{L}^2(D) \to \boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ $\mathcal{J}_h^{\mathrm{c}} : \boldsymbol{L}^2(D) \to \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ devised in [29, §23.3] following the seminal ideas in Arnold et al. [3], Christiansen [18], Christiansen and Winther [19], Schöberl [38]. The properties of these operators invoked in the paper are the following: (i) they are projections; (ii) they map curl-free fields to curl-free fields; (iii) they are stable in $\boldsymbol{L}^2$ and enjoy optimal approximation properties in the $\boldsymbol{L}^2$-norm for fields in $\boldsymbol{H}^r(D)$, $r \in (0,1]$. As these operators are not locally defined, their approximation properties involve the global mesh-size. This is not an issue here since we have assumed the meshes to be quasi-uniform. We notice that an interesting extension of our work is to lift this restriction by considering the operators devised in Chaumont-Frelet and Vohralík [17].

4.2 Discrete Poincaré–Steklov inequalities

We prove in this section discrete versions of the Poincaré–Steklov (in)equalities stated in Corollary 2.3. Recall the discrete involution-preserving subspaces $\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,h0}^{\mathrm{c}}$ and $\boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon,h}^{\mathrm{c}}$ defined in (37).

Lemma 4.1 (Discrete Poincaré–Steklov inequalities)**.** *The following holds:*

$$\|\boldsymbol{h}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \lesssim \ell_D \|\nabla_0 \times \boldsymbol{h}_h\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}})'} + h^{\frac{1}{2}} |\boldsymbol{h}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}}, \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{h}_h \in \boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,h0}^{\mathrm{c}}, \tag{43a}$$

$$\|\boldsymbol{e}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \lesssim \ell_D \|\nabla \times \boldsymbol{e}_h\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}_0^{\mathrm{c}})'} + h^{\frac{1}{2}} |\boldsymbol{e}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ}, \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{e}_h \in \boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon,h}^{\mathrm{c}}. \tag{43b}$$

Proof. We only prove (43a) since the proof of (43b) is similar. We revisit the proof of Lemma 3.2 in [30] to account for the presence of discontinuous material properties. Let $\boldsymbol{h}_h \in \boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,h0}^{\mathrm{c}}$. We define

$$\boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}} := \mathcal{I}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c,av}}(\boldsymbol{h}_h), \qquad \boldsymbol{\xi} := \boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}}).$$

As $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; D)^{\perp}$, the weak Poincaré–Steklov (in)equality (14b) gives

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} = \ell_D \|\nabla_0 \times \boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}})'} = \ell_D \|\nabla_0 \times \boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}}\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}})'}. \tag{44}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}} \in \boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$, we have $\mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}}) = \boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}}$, whence

$$\boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}) = \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}})).$$

The commuting property of $\mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}$ implies that

$$\nabla_0 \times (\boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\xi})) = \nabla_0 \times (\mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}}))) = \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{d}}(\nabla_0 \times (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}}))) = \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{d}}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}.$$

Hence, $\boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \in \boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathcal{T}_h) \cap \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; D) = \boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; \mathcal{T}_h)$. As $\boldsymbol{h}_h \in \boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,h0}^{\mathrm{c}}$, we have $\mu \boldsymbol{h}_h \in \boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbf{curl} = \mathbf{0}; \mathcal{T}_h)^{\perp}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{h}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}^2 &= (\mu \boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{h}_h - \boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + (\mu \boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + (\mu \boldsymbol{h}_h, \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \\ &= (\mu \boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{h}_h - \boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + (\mu \boldsymbol{h}_h, \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}.\end{aligned}$$

Invoking the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, the $\boldsymbol{L}^2$-stability of $\mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}$, and (44), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_0^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{h}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} &\lesssim \|\boldsymbol{h}_h - \boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \\ &\lesssim \|\boldsymbol{h}_h - \boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \ell_D \|\nabla_0 \times \boldsymbol{h}_h^{\mathrm{c}}\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}})'}.\end{aligned}$$

Using the triangle inequality, the inequality $\ell_D\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\rm c})'}\le\|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}$ which holds for all $\boldsymbol{\phi}\in\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)$, and the approximation properties of $\mathcal{I}_{h0}^{\rm c,av}$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_0^{-\frac12}\|\mu^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{h}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}&\lesssim\|\boldsymbol{h}_h-\boldsymbol{h}_h^{\rm c}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+\ell_D\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{h}_h\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\rm c})'}\\&\lesssim h^{\frac12}|\boldsymbol{h}_h|_{\rm J}^{\rm c}+\ell_D\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{h}_h\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\rm c})'}.\end{aligned}$$

This proves (43a). □

4.3 Consistency bound on discrete curl operators

Since $\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\rm b}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ is not a subset of $\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D)$, it is useful to define the spaces

$$\boldsymbol{V}_\sharp^{\rm H}:=\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D)+\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\rm b}(\mathcal{T}_h),\qquad\boldsymbol{V}_\sharp^{\rm E}:=\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D)+\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\rm b}(\mathcal{T}_h).\tag{45}$$

It is then convenient to extend the jump sesquilinear forms and the discrete curl operators defined above to the spaces $\boldsymbol{V}_\sharp^{\rm H}$ and $\boldsymbol{V}_\sharp^{\rm E}$. To this purpose, we notice that although the sums in (45) are not direct, every field $\boldsymbol{h}_h$ in $\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D)\cap\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\rm b}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ satisfies $[\![\boldsymbol{h}_h]\!]_F^{\rm c}=\boldsymbol{0}$ for all $F\in\mathcal{F}_h$, and $\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{h}_h)=\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{h}_h$ because $\nabla_0\times\big(\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D)\cap\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\rm b}(\mathcal{T}_h)\big)\subset\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\rm b}(\mathcal{T}_h)$. Similarly, every field $\boldsymbol{e}_h$ in $\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D)\cap\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\rm b}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ satisfies $[\![\boldsymbol{e}_h]\!]_F^{\rm c}=\boldsymbol{0}$ for all $F\in\mathcal{F}_h^\circ$, and $\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{e}_h)=\nabla\times\boldsymbol{e}_h$. It is therefore legitimate to set, for all $\boldsymbol{h}=\tilde{\boldsymbol{h}}+\boldsymbol{h}_h\in\boldsymbol{V}_\sharp^{\rm H}$ with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{h}}\in\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D)$ and $\boldsymbol{h}_h\in\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\rm b}(\mathcal{T}_h)$, and for all $\boldsymbol{e}=\tilde{\boldsymbol{e}}+\boldsymbol{e}_h\in\boldsymbol{V}_\sharp^{\rm E}$ with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{e}}\in\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D)$ and $\boldsymbol{e}_h\in\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\rm b}(\mathcal{T}_h)$,

$$\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{h}):=\nabla_0\times\tilde{\boldsymbol{h}}+\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{h}_h),\qquad[\![\boldsymbol{h}]\!]_F^{\rm c}:=[\![\boldsymbol{h}_h]\!]_F^{\rm c},\ \forall F\in\mathcal{F}_h,\tag{46a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{e}):=\nabla\times\tilde{\boldsymbol{e}}+\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{e}_h),\qquad[\![\boldsymbol{e}]\!]_F^{\rm c}:=[\![\boldsymbol{e}_h]\!]_F^{\rm c},\ \forall F\in\mathcal{F}_h^\circ.\tag{46b}$$

For simplicity, we use the same symbols for the extended operators; in particular, we now have $\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}:\boldsymbol{V}_\sharp^{\rm H}\to\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)$ and $\boldsymbol{C}_h:\boldsymbol{V}_\sharp^{\rm E}\to\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)$. The following commutators are useful to estimate the defects introduced by the above extensions:

$$\delta_h(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}):=(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\nabla\times\boldsymbol{e})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}-(\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{h}_h),\boldsymbol{e})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)},\tag{47a}$$

$$\delta_h^\circ(\boldsymbol{e}_h,\boldsymbol{h}):=(\boldsymbol{e}_h,\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{h})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}-(\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{e}_h),\boldsymbol{h})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)},\tag{47b}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}_h\in\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\rm b}(\mathcal{T}_h)$, all $\boldsymbol{e}\in\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D)$, and all $\boldsymbol{h}\in\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D)$.

Lemma 4.2 (Consistency bound on discrete curl operators)**.** *The following inequalities hold for all $(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}_h)\in\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\rm b}(\mathcal{T}_h)\times\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\rm b}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ and all $(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\in\boldsymbol{X}_0^{\rm c}\times\boldsymbol{X}^{\rm c}$,*

$$|\delta_h(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})|\lesssim(h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\ell_D^{\frac12}|\boldsymbol{h}_h|_{\rm J}^{\rm c}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)},\tag{48a}$$

$$|\delta_h^\circ(\boldsymbol{e}_h,\boldsymbol{\eta})|\lesssim(h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\ell_D^{\frac12}|\boldsymbol{e}_h|_{\rm J}^{\rm c,\circ}\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)},\tag{48b}$$

where $s'\in(\frac12,1]$ is the regularity pickup introduced in (15)*.*

Proof. We only prove (48a) since the proof of the other estimate is similar. Let $\boldsymbol{h}_h\in\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\rm b}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\in\boldsymbol{X}^{\rm c}$. Using the definition of the commutator (47a) and integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_h(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})&=(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}-(\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{h}_h),\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\\&=(\nabla_h\times\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h}([\![\boldsymbol{h}_h]\!]_F^{\rm c},\{\!\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\}\!\}_F^{\rm g})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(F)}-(\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{h}_h),\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}.\end{aligned}$$

Notice that the summation over the mesh faces is meaningful since the regularity estimate (15) implies that $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \boldsymbol{H}^{s'}(D)$ with $s' > \frac{1}{2}$. Moreover, we have $(\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{h}_h), \boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} = (\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{h}_h), \boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{b}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}$. Thus, using the definition (27a) of the operator $\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_h(\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) &= (\nabla_h \times \boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h} (\llbracket \boldsymbol{h}_h \rrbracket_F^{\mathrm{c}}, \{\!\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\}\!\}_F^{\mathrm{g}})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(F)} - (\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{h}_h), \boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{b}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \\
&= (\nabla_h \times \boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{b}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h} (\llbracket \boldsymbol{h}_h \rrbracket_F^{\mathrm{c}}, \{\!\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{b}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\}\!\}_F^{\mathrm{g}})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(F)} \\
&= \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_h} (\llbracket \boldsymbol{h}_h \rrbracket_F^{\mathrm{c}}, \{\!\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{b}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\}\!\}_F^{\mathrm{g}})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(F)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $|\delta_h(\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon})| \lesssim h^{s'-\frac{1}{2}} |\boldsymbol{h}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}} |\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s'}(D)}$. The assertion follows by invoking the regularity estimate (15). □

5 Strong convergence

The goal of this section is to establish our main result, namely that $\lim_{h \to 0} \|T - T_h\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{\mathrm{c}}; L^{\mathrm{c}})} = 0$. The proof consists of two main steps. First, we establish a deflated inf-sup condition restricted to the involution-preserving subspaces $\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,h0}^{\mathrm{c}} \times \boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon,h}^{\mathrm{c}}$. Then we prove convergence by using a duality argument à la Aubin–Nitsche. The essential part of the argument is that the smoothness index of the dual solution is always larger than $\frac{1}{2}$ even if the coefficients are heterogeneous. Using the duality argument seems to be necessary as relying on the deflated inf-sup condition is not enough to prove convergence when the smoothness index of the solution is less than $\frac{1}{2}$.

5.1 Deflated inf-sup condition

We equip the space L_h^{c} with the mesh-dependent norm

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h)\|_{\flat,h} := \omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h)\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}} \\
&+ \kappa_{\mathrm{H}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \big\{ \|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{h}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + |\boldsymbol{h}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}} \big\} + \kappa_{\mathrm{E}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \big\{ \|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{e}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + |\boldsymbol{e}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ} \big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Recall also the norm defined in (2), i.e., $\|(\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}^2 := \|\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{f}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}^2 + \|\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{g}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}^2$.

Lemma 5.1 (Deflated inf-sup condition)**.** (i) *The following holds for every discrete pair* $(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h)$ *in* $\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,h0}^{\mathrm{c}} \times \boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon,h}^{\mathrm{c}}$*:*

$$\omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\flat,h} \lesssim \sup_{(\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h) \in L_h^{\mathrm{c}}} \frac{|a_h\big((\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h), (\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h)\big)|}{\|(\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h)\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}}. \tag{50}$$

(ii) *The discrete boundary-value problem* (39) *is well-posed, and its solution satisfies the a priori estimate* $\|(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\flat,h} \lesssim \omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}$.

Proof. Let $\mathbb{S}$ denote the supremum on the right-hand side of (50).

(1) Taking $(\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h) := (\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h)$ and using integration by parts (see (28a)) gives

$$\kappa_{\mathrm{H}} (|\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}})^2 + \kappa_{\mathrm{E}} (|\boldsymbol{E}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ})^2 = a_h\big((\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h), (\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h)\big) \leq \mathbb{S} \|(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}. \tag{51}$$

(2) Taking $(\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h) := (-\kappa_{\mathrm{E}}\tilde{h}\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h), \boldsymbol{0})$ and using that $\kappa_{\mathrm{H}}\kappa_{\mathrm{E}} = 1$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_{\mathrm{E}}\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}^2 &= a_h((\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h), (\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h)) - \kappa_{\mathrm{H}} s_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{h}_h)\\ &\le \mathbb{S}\|\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{h}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + s_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \tilde{h}\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h)).\end{aligned}$$

We bound the first term on the right-hand side as follows:

$$\|\mu^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{h}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \lesssim (\mu_0\ell_D\kappa_{\mathrm{E}})^{\frac{1}{2}}\kappa_{\mathrm{E}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} = \omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}\kappa_{\mathrm{E}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)},$$

where we used that $h \le \ell_D$ and $\ell_D\mu_0\kappa_{\mathrm{E}} = \omega^{-1}$. We invoke a discrete trace inequality to obtain $|\tilde{h}\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h)|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}} \lesssim \|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}$ for the second term. Using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and using again that $\kappa_{\mathrm{H}}\kappa_{\mathrm{E}} = 1$, this gives

$$\kappa_{\mathrm{E}}\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}^2 \lesssim \big(\omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbb{S} + \kappa_{\mathrm{H}}^{\frac{1}{2}}|\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}}\big)\kappa_{\mathrm{E}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}.$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\kappa_{\mathrm{E}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \lesssim \omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbb{S} + \kappa_{\mathrm{H}}^{\frac{1}{2}}|\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}}.$$

Similarly, testing (39) with $(\boldsymbol{h}_h, \boldsymbol{e}_h) := (\boldsymbol{0}, \kappa_{\mathrm{H}}\tilde{h}\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h))$ gives

$$\kappa_{\mathrm{H}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \lesssim \omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbb{S} + \kappa_{\mathrm{E}}^{\frac{1}{2}}|\boldsymbol{E}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ}.$$

Gathering the above two bounds and invoking (51) gives

$$\kappa_{\mathrm{H}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \kappa_{\mathrm{E}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \lesssim \omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{S}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{52}$$

(3) We now estimate $\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}_h\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}})'}$ and $\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E}_h\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}_0^{\mathrm{c}})'}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}$. Recalling the definition of the commutator δ_h in (47a) and setting $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h := \mathcal{J}_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} &= (\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h), \boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \delta_h(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\\ &= (\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h), \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + (\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h), \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \delta_h(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\\ &= a_h((\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{E}_h), (\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)) + (\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h), \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \delta_h(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}),\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h$ has zero tangential jumps. Using the approximation properties of $\mathcal{J}_h^{\mathrm{c}}$, the commutator estimate (48a), and the estimate $\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + h^{s'}|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s'}(D)} \lesssim \ell_D\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}$ (which follows from the Poincaré–Steklov inequality $\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \lesssim \ell_D\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}$ and the regularity property (15) since $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}$), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|(\boldsymbol{H}_h, \nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}| &\lesssim \mathbb{S}\,\epsilon_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + h^{s'-\frac{1}{2}}\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s'}(D)}\\ &\quad + (h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac{1}{2}}\ell_D^{\frac{1}{2}}|\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\\ &\lesssim \big\{\epsilon_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbb{S} + (h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac{1}{2}}\ell_D^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + |\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}})\big\}\\ &\quad \times \ell_D\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, recalling the definition of $\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}_h\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}})'}$ introduced in Corollary 2.3, we have

$$\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}_h\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}})'} \lesssim \epsilon_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbb{S} + (h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac{1}{2}}\ell_D^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + |\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}}).$$

We proceed similarly to establish the estimate

$$\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E}_h\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}_0^{\mathrm{c}})'}\lesssim\mu_0^{\frac12}\mathbb{S}+(h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\ell_D^{-\frac12}(\|\tilde h^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+|\boldsymbol{E}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ}).$$

(4) Since $\boldsymbol{H}_h\in\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,h0}^{\mathrm{c}}$, we use the discrete Poincaré–Steklov inequality (43a) in Lemma 4.1 and the above estimate on $\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}_h\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}})'}$ to infer that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mu^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{H}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}&\lesssim\mu_0^{\frac12}\|\boldsymbol{H}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\\&\lesssim\mu_0^{\frac12}(\ell_D\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}_h\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}})'}+h^{\frac12}|\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}})\\&\le\mu_0^{\frac12}(\ell_D\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}_h\|_{(\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}})'}+(h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\ell_D^{\frac12}|\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}})\\&\lesssim\omega^{-1}\big\{\mathbb{S}+(h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\omega^{\frac12}\kappa_{\mathrm{H}}^{\frac12}(\|\tilde h^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+|\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}})\big\},\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $h^{\frac12}\le(h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\ell_D^{\frac12}$ on the third line, and $\ell_D(\mu_0\epsilon_0)^{\frac12}=\omega^{-1}$ and $\mu_0\ell_D\kappa_{\mathrm{H}}^{-1}=\omega^{-1}$ on the fourth line. We proceed similarly to establish that

$$\|\epsilon^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{E}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\lesssim\omega^{-1}\big\{\mathbb{S}+(h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\omega^{\frac12}\kappa_{\mathrm{E}}^{\frac12}(\|\tilde h^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+|\boldsymbol{E}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ})\big\}.$$

Gathering the above two bounds, invoking (51) and (52), and using $h\le\ell_D$ gives

$$\|(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}\lesssim\omega^{-1}\mathbb{S}+\omega^{-\frac12}\mathbb{S}^{\frac12}\|(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}^{\frac12}.$$

Invoking Young's inequality, we conclude that $\|(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}\lesssim\omega^{-1}\mathbb{S}$. Substituting this bound into (51) and (52) and putting everything together proves (50).

(5) The deflated inf-sup condition (50) readily implies that the boundary-value problem (39) admits a unique solution (recall that (39) actually holds for all $(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}_h)\in L_h^{\mathrm{c}}$). Moreover, the a priori estimate on the solution follows from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and (50). □

Remark 5.2 (Standard inf-sup condition)**.** *Using Lemma 3.1 and the deflated inf-sup condition* (50)*, one readily shows that, for all* $(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h)\in\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,h0}^{\mathrm{c}}\times\boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon,h}^{\mathrm{c}}$*,*

$$\omega^{\frac12}\|(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\flat,h}\lesssim\sup_{(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}_h)\in\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,h0}^{\mathrm{c}}\times\boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon,h}^{\mathrm{c}}}\frac{|a_h\big((\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h),(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}_h)\big)|}{\|(\boldsymbol{h}_h,\boldsymbol{e}_h)\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}},$$

i.e., the supremum can be restricted to $\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,h0}^{\mathrm{c}}\times\boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon,h}^{\mathrm{c}}$*. Letting* $J_h:\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,h0}^{\mathrm{c}}\times\boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon,h}^{\mathrm{c}}\to L_h^{\mathrm{c}}$ *be the canonical injection, the above inf-sup condition means that the restricted operator* $J_h^{\mathsf{T}}A_hJ_h$ *is an isomorphism over* $\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,h0}^{\mathrm{c}}\times\boldsymbol{X}_{\epsilon,h}^{\mathrm{c}}$*.*

5.2 Duality argument

Let $(\boldsymbol{H},\boldsymbol{E})$ be the solution to the continuous problem (20) and let $(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h)$ be the solution to the discrete problem (39). We define the errors

$$\boldsymbol{\delta h}:=\boldsymbol{H}-\boldsymbol{H}_h,\qquad\boldsymbol{\delta e}:=\boldsymbol{E}-\boldsymbol{E}_h.\tag{53}$$

We consider the following dual problem: Find $(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ in $\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D)\times\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D)$ such that

$$\omega\mu\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\eta})+\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}=\omega(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}})(\mu\boldsymbol{\delta h}),\tag{54a}$$

$$\omega\epsilon\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})-\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta}=\omega(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}})(\epsilon\boldsymbol{\delta e}).\tag{54b}$$

The following regularity estimate on the dual solution plays a key role in the analysis.

Lemma 5.3 (Well-posedness and stability)**.** (i) *The dual problem* (54) *has a unique solution* $(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$*, and this solution sits in* $\boldsymbol{X}_0^{\mathrm{c}}\times\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}$*.* (ii) *The solution* $(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ *satisfies the following a priori estimates with* $s'\in(\frac12,1]$*:*

$$\ell_D\big(\mu_0^{\frac12}\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+\epsilon_0^{\frac12}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big)\lesssim\|(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\delta e})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}},\tag{55a}$$

$$|\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s'}(D)}\lesssim\ell_D^{1-s'}\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)},\qquad|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s'}(D)}\lesssim\ell_D^{1-s'}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}.\tag{55b}$$

Proof. (i) Testing (54a) with $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ and testing (54b) with $\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ readily shows that $\|\mu^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\eta})\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}=\|\epsilon^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}=0$. This proves that

$$\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\eta})=\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})=\boldsymbol{0}.\tag{56}$$

The existence and uniqueness of a solution to (54) is then a direct consequence of (13a) in Lemma 2.2. Moreover, (56) means that $(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\in\boldsymbol{X}_0^{\mathrm{c}}\times\boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{c}}$.

(ii) The a priori estimate (55a) follows from (54), (56), and $\ell_D\omega(\mu_0\epsilon_0)^{\frac12}=1$. The a priori estimate (55b) is a consequence of the regularity estimate (15). □

Lemma 5.4 ($\boldsymbol{L}^2$-error representation)**.** *The following holds:*

$$\omega\|(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\delta e})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}^2=\theta_{\mathrm{app}}+\theta_{\mathrm{gal}}+\theta_{\mathrm{crl}}+\theta_{\mathrm{div}},\tag{57}$$

with the approximation error, the Galerkin orthogonality error, the curl commuting error, and the divergence conformity error defined as follows:

$$\theta_{\mathrm{app}}:=a_h((\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\delta e}),(\boldsymbol{\eta}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_h,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)),\tag{58a}$$

$$\theta_{\mathrm{gal}}:=a_h((\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\delta e}),(\boldsymbol{\eta}_h,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)),\tag{58b}$$

$$\theta_{\mathrm{crl}}:=\delta_h(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})-\delta_h^\circ(\boldsymbol{\delta e},\boldsymbol{\eta}),\tag{58c}$$

$$\theta_{\mathrm{div}}:=\omega\big\{(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\mu\boldsymbol{\delta h}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+(\boldsymbol{\delta e},\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}(\epsilon\boldsymbol{\delta e}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big\},\tag{58d}$$

with $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h:=\boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{b}}(\boldsymbol{\eta})$*,* $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h:=\boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{b}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$*,* $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{b}}$ *defined in* (23)*, and the commutators* δ_h *and* δ_h° *defined in* (47)*.*

Proof. We have $s_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\cdot,\boldsymbol{\eta})=s_h^{\mathrm{c},\circ}(\cdot,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})=0$. Recalling the definition of the sesquilinear form a_h (see (29)), the definition of the commutators (see (47)), and using that $\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}=\omega(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}})(\mu\boldsymbol{\delta h})$ and $-\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta}=\omega(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}})(\epsilon\boldsymbol{\delta e})$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}a_h((\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\delta e}),(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}))&=-(\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{\delta e}),\boldsymbol{\eta})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+(\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{\delta h}),\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\\&=-(\boldsymbol{\delta e},\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+\delta_h^\circ(\boldsymbol{\delta e},\boldsymbol{\eta})+(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}-\delta_h(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\\&=\omega\big\{(\boldsymbol{\delta h},(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}})(\mu\boldsymbol{\delta h}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+(\boldsymbol{\delta e},(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}})(\epsilon\boldsymbol{\delta e}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big\}-\theta_{\mathrm{crl}}\\&=\omega\big\{\|\mu^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{\delta h}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}^2+\|\epsilon^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{\delta e}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}^2\big\}-\theta_{\mathrm{div}}-\theta_{\mathrm{crl}}\\&=\omega\|(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\delta e})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}^2-\theta_{\mathrm{div}}-\theta_{\mathrm{crl}}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $a_h((\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\delta e}),(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}))=\theta_{\mathrm{app}}+\theta_{\mathrm{gal}}$, re-organizing the terms proves (57). □

We shall use the following a priori estimates which follow from Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 5.1(ii), respectively:

$$\ell_D\big(\mu_0^{\frac12}\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+\epsilon_0^{\frac12}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big)\lesssim\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}},\tag{59a}$$

$$\|(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\flat,h}\lesssim\omega^{\frac12}\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}.\tag{59b}$$

To alleviate the notation, we also set

$$c_{\mathrm{rot}}(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) := \ell_D\big(\mu_0^{\frac12}\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \epsilon_0^{\frac12}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big), \tag{60a}$$

and observe that $c_{\mathrm{rot}}(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) \lesssim \|(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\delta e})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}$ owing to (55a).

Lemma 5.5 (Bound on approximation error)**.** *The following holds:*

$$|\theta_{\mathrm{app}}| \lesssim (h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\omega\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}c_{\mathrm{rot}}(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}). \tag{61}$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{\mathrm{app}} = &-(\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{\delta e}),\boldsymbol{\eta}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + (\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{\delta h}),\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\\ &+\kappa_{\mathrm{H}}s_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\eta}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_h) + \kappa_{\mathrm{E}}s_h^{\mathrm{c},\circ}(\boldsymbol{\delta e},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)\\ = &-(\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{\eta}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + (\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\\ &-\kappa_{\mathrm{H}}s_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{\eta}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_h) - \kappa_{\mathrm{E}}s_h^{\mathrm{c},\circ}(\boldsymbol{E}_h,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h),\end{aligned}$$

since $(\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h),\boldsymbol{\eta}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} = (\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h),\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} = 0$ by definition of the $\boldsymbol{L}^2$-orthogonal projection $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{b}}$ and since $s_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H},\cdot) = s_h^{\mathrm{c},\circ}(\boldsymbol{E},\cdot) = 0$. Invoking the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and the approximation properties of $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{b}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\big|-(\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{\eta}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + (\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big|\\ &\qquad\lesssim \|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}h^{s'}|\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s'}(D)} + \|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}h^{s'}|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s'}(D)}.\end{aligned}$$

Invoking the a priori estimate (59a) on $(\boldsymbol{H},\boldsymbol{E})$ and the regularity estimate (55b) on $(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ gives

$$\big|-(\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{\eta}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + (\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big| \lesssim (h/\ell_D)^{s'}\omega\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}c_{\mathrm{rot}}(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}).$$

Moreover, since $|\boldsymbol{\eta}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}} \lesssim h^{s'-\frac12}|\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s'}(D)} \lesssim (h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\ell_D^{\frac12}\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}$ and since $|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ} \lesssim (h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\ell_D^{\frac12}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}$, the a priori estimate (59b) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}&\big|\kappa_{\mathrm{H}}s_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{\eta}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_h) + \kappa_{\mathrm{E}}s_h^{\mathrm{c},\circ}(\boldsymbol{E}_h,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)\big|\\ &\qquad\lesssim \kappa_{\mathrm{H}}^{\frac12}|\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}}\kappa_{\mathrm{H}}^{\frac12}|\boldsymbol{\eta}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}} + \kappa_{\mathrm{E}}^{\frac12}|\boldsymbol{E}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ}\kappa_{\mathrm{E}}^{\frac12}|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ}\\ &\qquad\lesssim \omega^{\frac12}\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}(h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\big(\kappa_{\mathrm{H}}^{\frac12}\ell_D^{\frac12}\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \kappa_{\mathrm{E}}^{\frac12}\ell_D^{\frac12}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big)\\ &\qquad= (h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\omega\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}c_{\mathrm{rot}}(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}),\end{aligned}$$

since $\kappa_{\mathrm{H}}^{\frac12}\ell_D^{\frac12} = \omega^{\frac12}\ell_D\mu_0^{\frac12}$ and $\kappa_{\mathrm{E}}^{\frac12}\ell_D^{\frac12} = \omega^{\frac12}\ell_D\epsilon_0^{\frac12}$. Combining the above two estimates and using $h \le \ell_D$ proves the assertion. □

Lemma 5.6 (Bound on Galerkin orthogonality error)**.** *The following holds:*

$$|\theta_{\mathrm{gal}}| \lesssim (h/\ell_D)^{s'}\omega\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}c_{\mathrm{rot}}(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}). \tag{62}$$

Proof. We observe that

$$\theta_{\mathrm{gal}} = a_h((\boldsymbol{H},\boldsymbol{E}),(\boldsymbol{\eta}_h,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)) - a_h((\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h),(\boldsymbol{\eta}_h,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)).$$

Since $s_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H},\cdot)=s_h^{\mathrm{c},\circ}(\boldsymbol{E},\cdot)=0$, and $\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H})=\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}$, $\boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E})=\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}a_h((\boldsymbol{H},\boldsymbol{E}),(\boldsymbol{\eta}_h,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)) &= -(\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+(\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\\ &= \omega\big\{((\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}})(\mu\boldsymbol{f}),\boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+((\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}})(\epsilon\boldsymbol{g}),\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by definition of the discrete solution $(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h)$, we have

$$a_h((\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{E}_h),(\boldsymbol{\eta}_h,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h))=\omega\big\{((\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}})(\mu\boldsymbol{f}),\boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+((\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{c}})(\epsilon\boldsymbol{g}),\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big\}.$$

Hence, we have

$$\theta_{\mathrm{gal}}=\omega\big\{((\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}})(\mu\boldsymbol{f}),\boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+((\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{c}})(\epsilon\boldsymbol{g}),\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big\}.$$

We have $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\eta})=\boldsymbol{0}$ and, owing to Lemma 5.10 (see §5.3), we also have $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\eta})=\boldsymbol{0}$. Using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and the approximation properties of $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{b}}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\omega|((\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}})(\mu\boldsymbol{f}),\boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}| &= \omega|((\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}})(\mu\boldsymbol{f}),\boldsymbol{\eta}_h-\boldsymbol{\eta})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}|\\ &\lesssim \omega\mu_0^{\frac12}\|\mu^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}h^{s'}|\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s'}(D)}\\ &\lesssim \omega\mu_0^{\frac12}\|\mu^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}(h/\ell_D)^{s'}\ell_D\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\\ &\lesssim (h/\ell_D)^{s'}\omega\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}c_{\mathrm{rot}}(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}).\end{aligned}$$

A similar bound holds for $\omega|((\boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{c}}-\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}})(\epsilon\boldsymbol{g}),\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_h)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}|$. □

Lemma 5.7 (Bound on curl commuting error)**.** *The following holds:*

$$|\theta_{\mathrm{crl}}|\lesssim (h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\omega\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}c_{\mathrm{rot}}(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}). \tag{63}$$

Proof. We observe that

$$\theta_{\mathrm{crl}}=-\delta_h(\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})+\delta_h^{\circ}(\boldsymbol{E}_h,\boldsymbol{\eta}),$$

since $\delta_h(\boldsymbol{H},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})=\delta_h^{\circ}(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{\eta})=0$. Invoking Lemma 4.2 then gives

$$|\theta_{\mathrm{crl}}|\lesssim (h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\ell_D^{\frac12}\big\{|\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+|\boldsymbol{E}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ}\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big\}.$$

Using that $\ell_D\kappa_{\mathrm{H}}\epsilon_0=\omega^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\ell_D^{\frac12}|\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} &= \kappa_{\mathrm{H}}^{\frac12}|\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}}(\ell_D\kappa_{\mathrm{H}}\epsilon_0)^{-\frac12}\ell_D\epsilon_0^{\frac12}\|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\\ &\lesssim \omega^{\frac12}\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}\omega^{\frac12}c_{\mathrm{rot}}(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\\ &= \omega\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}c_{\mathrm{rot}}(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}).\end{aligned}$$

A similar bound holds true for $\ell_D^{\frac12}|\boldsymbol{E}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ}\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 5.8 (Bound on divergence conformity error)**.** *The following estimate holds with* $\sigma:=\min(s,s'-\frac12)>0$*:*

$$|\theta_{\mathrm{div}}|\lesssim (h/\ell_D)^{\sigma}\omega\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}\|(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\delta e})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}. \tag{64}$$

Proof. The proof crucially relies on Lemma 5.11 recorded below in §5.3. Since $\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_{h0}(\mu\boldsymbol{\delta h})=\boldsymbol{0}$, we can apply the estimate (66a) with $\boldsymbol{B}:=\mu\boldsymbol{\delta h}$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned}\big|(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0(\mu\boldsymbol{\delta h}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big|\lesssim\Big\{&(h/\ell_D)^s\ell_D^s|\boldsymbol{H}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^s(D)}+(h/\ell_D)^{s'}\ell_D\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\\&+(h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\ell_D^{\frac12}(\|\tilde h^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+|\boldsymbol{H}_h|^{\mathrm{c}}_{\mathrm{J}})\Big\}\|\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0(\mu\boldsymbol{\delta h})\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\ell_D^s|\boldsymbol{H}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^s(D)}\lesssim\ell_D\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\le\mu_0^{-\frac12}\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}$ owing to the continuous a priori estimate (59a) and also invoking the discrete a priori estimate (59b), we obtain since $h\le\ell_D$ and $s\le s'$,

$$\begin{aligned}\big|(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0(\mu\boldsymbol{\delta h}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big|&\lesssim(h/\ell_D)^\sigma\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}\mu_0^{-\frac12}\|\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0(\mu\boldsymbol{\delta h})\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\\&\lesssim(h/\ell_D)^\sigma\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}\|\mu^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{\delta h}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}.\end{aligned}$$

Proceeding similarly, one proves that

$$\big|(\boldsymbol{\delta e},\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}(\epsilon\boldsymbol{\delta e}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big|\lesssim(h/\ell_D)^\sigma\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}\|\epsilon^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{\delta e}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}.$$

Putting the above two bounds together proves the claim. □

We are now ready to state the main result of the paper which, owing to standard spectral approximation results (see, e.g., Bramble and Osborn [10, Lem. 2.2], Osborn [36, Thm. 3&4], Boffi [5, Prop. 7.4]), proves the spectral correctness of the dG approximation. Recall that $\sigma:=\min(s,s'-\frac12)>0$.

theorem 5.9 (Convergence)**.** *We have* $\|T-T_h\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^{\mathrm{c}};L^{\mathrm{c}})}\lesssim(h/\ell_D)^\sigma$.

Proof. Combining the $\boldsymbol{L}^2$-error representation formula (57) together with the bounds from Lemmas 5.5–5.8 and since $c_{\mathrm{rot}}(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\lesssim\|(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\delta e}\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}$ owing to (55a), we infer that

$$\omega\|(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\delta e})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}^2\lesssim(h/\ell_D)^\sigma\omega\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}\|(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\delta e})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}},$$

where we used that $\sigma\le s'-\frac12<s'$ and $h\le\ell_D$. This implies that $\|(\boldsymbol{\delta h},\boldsymbol{\delta e})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}\lesssim(h/\ell_D)^\sigma\|(\boldsymbol{f},\boldsymbol{g})\|_{L^{\mathrm{c}}}$, whence the claim. □

5.3 Technical lemmas

We start by recording the following result whose proof is omitted for brevity.

Lemma 5.10 (Discrete projections)**.** *The following holds:*

$$\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_{h0}\circ\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0=\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_{h0},\qquad\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_h\circ\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}=\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_h.\tag{65}$$

Next we establish a result that plays a central role in the analysis to estimate the divergence conformity error.

Lemma 5.11 (Divergence conformity)**.** *Let* $s\in(0,\frac12]$*. For all* $\boldsymbol{H}\in\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D)\cap\boldsymbol{H}^s(D)$*, all* $\boldsymbol{H}_h\in\boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$*, and all* $\boldsymbol{B}\in\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)$ *satisfying* $\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{B})=\boldsymbol{0}$*, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\big|(\boldsymbol{H}-\boldsymbol{H}_h,\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0(\boldsymbol{B}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big|\lesssim\Big\{&(h/\ell_D)^s\ell_D^s|\boldsymbol{H}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^s(D)}+(h/\ell_D)^{s'}\ell_D\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\\&+(h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac12}\ell_D^{\frac12}(\|\tilde h^{\frac12}\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}+|\boldsymbol{H}_h|^{\mathrm{c}}_{\mathrm{J}})\Big\}\|\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}_0(\boldsymbol{B})\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)},\end{aligned}\tag{66a}$$

and for all $\boldsymbol{E} \in \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}; D) \cap \boldsymbol{H}^s(D)$*, all* $\boldsymbol{E}_h \in \boldsymbol{P}_k^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$*, and all* $\boldsymbol{D} \in \boldsymbol{L}^2(D)$ *satisfying* $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_h^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{D}) = \boldsymbol{0}$*, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\big|(\boldsymbol{E} - \boldsymbol{E}_h, \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{D}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big| \lesssim \Big\{ &(h/\ell_D)^s \ell_D^s |\boldsymbol{E}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^s(D)} + (h/\ell_D)^{s'} \ell_D \|\nabla\times\boldsymbol{E}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \\ &+ (h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac{1}{2}} \ell_D^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{C}_h(\boldsymbol{E}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + |\boldsymbol{E}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c},\circ}) \Big\} \|\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{D})\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}, \end{aligned} \tag{66b}$$

where $s' \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ *results from the regularity estimate* (15)*.*

Proof. We only prove the estimate (66a), since the proof of (66b) is similar.

(1) Using the commuting property of $\mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}$, we obtain $\nabla\times\mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h)) = \boldsymbol{0}$. This implies that $\mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h))$ is a member of $\boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbf{curl} = \boldsymbol{0}; \mathcal{T}_h)$. Moreover, invoking Lemma 5.10, we have $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{B})) = \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{B}) = \boldsymbol{0}$ by assumption. Hence, $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{B}) \in \boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbf{curl} = \boldsymbol{0}; \mathcal{T}_h)^{\perp}$. This, in turn, implies the following identity:

$$(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{B}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} = (\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h)), \boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{B}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}.$$

Using the $\boldsymbol{L}^2$-orthogonality of $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}$ followed by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality gives

$$\big|(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h, \boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{B}))_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}\big| \le \|(\boldsymbol{I} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}})(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h))\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \|\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{B})\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}.$$

It remains to bound $\|(\boldsymbol{I} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}})(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h))\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}$.

(2) Let us set $\boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}} := \mathcal{I}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c,av}}(\boldsymbol{H}_h)$ and $\boldsymbol{w} := \boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}})$. Then $\boldsymbol{w} \in \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}; D)$ with $\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{w} = \nabla_0\times(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}})$, and $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{w}) = \boldsymbol{0}$. Hence, $\boldsymbol{w}$ is a member of $\boldsymbol{X}_0^{\mathrm{c}}$. The regularity estimate (15) followed by the triangle inequality give

$$|\boldsymbol{w}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s'}} \lesssim \ell_D^{1-s'} \|\nabla_0\times(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}})\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \le \ell_D^{1-s'} (\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}).$$

Invoking the triangle inequality, the approximation properties of $\mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}$, and the fact that $(\boldsymbol{I} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}})(\boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}}) = \boldsymbol{0}$ (since $\boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}} \in \boldsymbol{P}_{k0}^{\mathrm{c}}(\mathcal{T}_h)$), this implies that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|(\boldsymbol{I} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}})(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}}))\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \\ &\quad\lesssim \|(\boldsymbol{I} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}})(\boldsymbol{w})\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \|(\boldsymbol{I} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}})(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}})\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \\ &\quad\lesssim h^{s'} |\boldsymbol{w}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^{s'}(D)} + \|(\boldsymbol{I} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}})(\boldsymbol{H})\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \\ &\quad\lesssim (h/\ell_D)^{s'} \ell_D (\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}) + (h/\ell_D)^s \ell_D^s |\boldsymbol{H}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^s(D)}.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, invoking the triangle inequality, an inverse inequality, and the approximation properties of $\mathcal{I}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c,av}}$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} &\lesssim \|\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}} - \boldsymbol{H}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + \|\boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \\ &\lesssim h^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + |\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}}).\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\boldsymbol{I} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}})(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}}))\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \lesssim{}& (h/\ell_D)^{s'} \ell_D \|\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + (h/\ell_D)^s \ell_D^s |\boldsymbol{H}|_{\boldsymbol{H}^s(D)} \\ &+ (h/\ell_D)^{s'-\frac{1}{2}} \ell_D^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\tilde{h}^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{C}_{h0}(\boldsymbol{H}_h)\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + |\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}}).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, using the triangle inequality, the $\boldsymbol{L}^2$-stability of $\mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}}$ and that of $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}$, and the approximation properties of $\mathcal{I}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c,av}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\boldsymbol{I} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}})(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h))\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} &\lesssim \|(\boldsymbol{I} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}})(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}}))\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \\ &\quad + \|(\boldsymbol{I} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}})(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}} - \boldsymbol{H}_h))\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} \\ &\lesssim \|(\boldsymbol{I} - \mathcal{J}_{h0}^{\mathrm{c}})(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_0^{\mathrm{c}}(\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{H}_h^{\mathrm{c}}))\|_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} + h^{\frac{1}{2}} |\boldsymbol{H}_h|_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{c}}.\end{aligned}$$

The assertion follows readily. □

A Helmholtz decompositions

In this appendix, we recall some useful results on Helmholtz decompositions; these results are mostly drawn from Amrouche et al. [2], Dautray and Lions [25], and Girault and Raviart [31]. We also give a short proof of Lemma 2.2.

A.1 Topology of D

Recall that D is an open, bounded, Lipschitz polyhedron of $\mathbb{R}^3$. We denote Γ_0 the boundary of the only unbounded connected component of $\mathbb{R}^3\backslash\overline{D}$. If ∂D is not connected, i.e., $\partial D \neq \Gamma_0$, we denote $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i\in\{1:I\}}$ the connected components of ∂D that are different from Γ_0 (see, e.g., [31, p. 37], [2, p. 835], [25, p. 217]). If D is not simply connected, we assume that there exist J cuts ($(d-1)$-dimensional smooth manifolds) $\{\Sigma_j\}_{j\in\{1:J\}}$ that make the open set $D^\Sigma := D\backslash\bigcup_{j\in\{1:J\}}\Sigma_j$ simply connected. Additional regularity assumptions on these cuts as stated in [2, Hyp. 3.3, p. 836] are assumed to hold true.

A.2 Helmholtz decompositions

We consider the subspaces

$$\boldsymbol{H}^\Gamma(\mathrm{div}=0;D) := \{\boldsymbol{v}\in\boldsymbol{H}(\mathrm{div}=0;D)\mid \textstyle\int_{\Gamma_i}\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\,\mathrm{d}s=0,\forall i\in\{1{:}I\}\},\tag{67a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{H}_0^\Sigma(\mathrm{div}=0;D) := \{\boldsymbol{v}\in\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathrm{div}=0;D)\mid \textstyle\int_{\Sigma_j}\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\,\mathrm{d}s=0,\forall j\in\{1{:}J\}\}.\tag{67b}$$

The following $\boldsymbol{L}^2$-orthogonal decompositions hold true:

$$\boldsymbol{L}^2(D) = \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)\overset{\perp}{\oplus}\boldsymbol{H}^\Gamma(\mathrm{div}=0;D),\tag{68a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{L}^2(D) = \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)\overset{\perp}{\oplus}\boldsymbol{H}_0^\Sigma(\mathrm{div}=0;D).\tag{68b}$$

In other words, we have

$$\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp = \boldsymbol{H}^\Gamma(\mathrm{div}=0;D),\tag{69a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp = \boldsymbol{H}_0^\Sigma(\mathrm{div}=0;D).\tag{69b}$$

For all $q\in L^2(D)$ such that $q|_{D^\Sigma}\in H^1(D^\Sigma)$, we denote by $\nabla_\Sigma q$ the broken gradient of q such that $(\nabla_\Sigma q)(\boldsymbol{x}) = (\nabla q|_{D^\Sigma})(\boldsymbol{x})$ for a.e. $\boldsymbol{x}\in D$. For all $i\in\mathbb{N}$, let c_i denote any real number. We define

$$H^1_\Gamma(D) := \{q\in H^1(D)\mid q|_{\Gamma_0}=0, q|_{\Gamma_i}=c_i,\forall i\in\{1{:}I\}\},\tag{70a}$$

$$H^1_\Sigma(D) := \{q\in L^2(D)\mid q|_{D^\Sigma}\in H^1(D^\Sigma),\ [\![q]\!]|_{\Sigma_j}=c_j,\forall j\in\{1{:}J\}\}.\tag{70b}$$

Then, the following $\boldsymbol{L}^2$-orthogonal decompositions also hold true:

$$\boldsymbol{L}^2(D) = \nabla H^1_\Gamma(D)\overset{\perp}{\oplus}\nabla\times\boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D),\tag{71a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{L}^2(D) = \nabla_\Sigma H^1_\Sigma(D)\overset{\perp}{\oplus}\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl};D).\tag{71b}$$

A.3 Proof of Lemma 2.2

We only prove that the operators $\nabla\times : \boldsymbol{X}_\epsilon^{\rm c} \to \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp$ and $\nabla_0\times : \boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,0}^{\rm c} \to \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp$ are isomorphisms, since the other proof is similar. (Recall that the spaces $\boldsymbol{X}_\epsilon^{\rm c}$ and $\boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,0}^{\rm c}$ are defined in (8).)

(1) Integration by parts readily shows that $\nabla\times\boldsymbol{e} \in \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp$ for all $\boldsymbol{e} \in \boldsymbol{X}_\epsilon^{\rm c}$ and $\nabla_0\times\boldsymbol{h} \in \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp$ for all $\boldsymbol{h} \in \boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,0}^{\rm c}$.

(2) Injectivity. Let $\boldsymbol{e} \in \boldsymbol{X}_\epsilon^{\rm c}$ be such that $\nabla\times\boldsymbol{e} = \mathbf{0}$. Then, $\boldsymbol{e} \in \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)$, and by definition of $\boldsymbol{X}_\epsilon^{\rm c}$, we infer that $(\epsilon\boldsymbol{e},\boldsymbol{e})_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} = 0$. This proves that $\boldsymbol{e} = \mathbf{0}$. Hence, the operator $\nabla\times : \boldsymbol{X}_\epsilon^{\rm c} \to \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp$ is injective. The proof that the operator $\nabla_0\times : \boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,0}^{\rm c} \to \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp$ is injective is similar.

(3) Surjectivity. Let $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp$. Since every $q \in H_\Gamma^1(D)$ satisfies $\nabla q \in \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)$, we have $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in (\nabla H_\Gamma^1(D))^\perp$. Owing to (71a), we infer that there is $\boldsymbol{e}' \in \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl};D)$ such that $\nabla\times\boldsymbol{e}' = \boldsymbol{\theta}$. Let $p \in H_\Sigma^1(D)$ be the unique function solving $(\epsilon\nabla_\Sigma p, \nabla_\Sigma q)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)} = (\epsilon\boldsymbol{e}', \nabla_\Sigma q)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(D)}$ for all $q \in H_\Sigma^1(D)$. Set $\boldsymbol{e} := \boldsymbol{e}' - \nabla_\Sigma p$. We have $\nabla\times\boldsymbol{e} = \nabla\times\boldsymbol{e}' = \boldsymbol{\theta}$, and $\epsilon\boldsymbol{e} \in (\nabla_\Sigma H_\Sigma^1(D))^\perp$. Owing to (71b), we infer that $\epsilon\boldsymbol{e}$ is in the range of the $\nabla_0\times$ operator. Integration by parts readily implies that $\epsilon\boldsymbol{e} \in \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp$. In summary, we have shown that $\boldsymbol{e} \in \boldsymbol{X}_\epsilon^{\rm c}$ and that $\nabla\times\boldsymbol{e} = \boldsymbol{\theta}$. This proves the surjectivity of the operator $\nabla\times : \boldsymbol{X}_\epsilon^{\rm c} \to \boldsymbol{H}_0(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp$. The proof that the operator $\nabla_0\times : \boldsymbol{X}_{\mu,0}^{\rm c} \to \boldsymbol{H}(\mathbf{curl}=\mathbf{0};D)^\perp$ is surjective is similar.

References

[1] J. Alvarez, L. Angulo, A. Rubio Bretones, and S. G. Garcia. A spurious-free discontinuous Galerkin time-domain method for the accurate modeling of microwave filters. *IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory and Techniques*, 60(8):2359–2369, 2012.

[2] C. Amrouche, C. Bernardi, M. Dauge, and V. Girault. Vector potentials in three-dimensional non-smooth domains. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 21(9):823–864, 1998.

[3] D. N. Arnold, R. S. Falk, and R. Winther. Finite element exterior calculus, homological techniques, and applications. *Acta Numer.*, 15:1–155, 2006.

[4] M. S. Birman and M. Z. Solomyak. L_2-theory of the Maxwell operator in arbitrary domains. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 42(6):75, 1987.

[5] D. Boffi. Finite element approximation of eigenvalue problems. *Acta Numer.*, 19:1–120, 2010.

[6] D. Boffi, M. Costabel, M. Dauge, and L. Demkowicz. Discrete compactness for the *hp* version of rectangular edge finite elements. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 44(3):979–1004, 2006. ISSN 0036-1429.

[7] G. Boillat. Involutions des systèmes conservatifs. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 307 (17):891–894, 1988.

[8] A. Bonito, J.-L. Guermond, and F. Luddens. Regularity of the Maxwell equations in heterogeneous media and Lipschitz domains. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 408(2):498–512, 2013.

[9] A. Bonito, J.-L. Guermond, and F. Luddens. An interior penalty method with C^0 finite elements for the approximation of the Maxwell equations in heterogeneous media: convergence analysis with minimal regularity. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 50(5):1457–1489, 2016.

[10] J. H. Bramble and J. E. Osborn. Rate of convergence estimates for nonselfadjoint eigenvalue approximations. *Math. Comp.*, 27:525–549, 1973.

[11] J. H. Bramble and J. E. Pasciak. A new approximation technique for div-curl systems. *Mathematics of Computation*, 73(248):1739–1762, 2004.

[12] A. Buffa and I. Perugia. Discontinuous Galerkin approximation of the Maxwell eigenproblem. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 44(5):2198–2226, 2006.

[13] A. Buffa, P. Houston, and I. Perugia. Discontinuous Galerkin computation of the Maxwell eigenvalues on simplicial meshes. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 204(2):317–333, 2007.

[14] M. Campos Pinto and E. Sonnendrücker. Gauss-compatible Galerkin schemes for time-dependent Maxwell equations. *Math. Comp.*, 85(302):2651–2685, 2016.

[15] T. Chaumont-Frelet. Duality analysis of interior penalty discontinuous galerkin methods under minimal regularity and application to the a priori and a posteriori error analysis of helmholtz problems. Technical report, INRIA, 2023. `https://inria.hal.science/hal-03765207`.

[16] T. Chaumont-Frelet and A. Ern. Duality argument of the discontinuous galerkin approximation of maxwell's equations in the frequency domain. Technical report, INRIA, 2023.

[17] T. Chaumont-Frelet and M. Vohralík. A stable local commuting projector and optimal hp approximation estimates in H(curl). Technical report, INRIA, 2023. `https://inria.hal.science/hal-03817302`.

[18] S. H. Christiansen. Stability of Hodge decompositions in finite element spaces of differential forms in arbitrary dimension. *Numer. Math.*, 107(1):87–106, 2007.

[19] S. H. Christiansen and R. Winther. Smoothed projections in finite element exterior calculus. *Math. Comp.*, 77(262):813–829, 2008.

[20] P. Ciarlet, Jr. On the approximation of electromagnetic fields by edge finite elements. Part 1: Sharp interpolation results for low-regularity fields. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 71(1):85–104, 2016.

[21] P. Ciarlet, Jr. On the approximation of electromagnetic fields by edge finite elements. Part 1: Sharp interpolation results for low-regularity fields. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 71(1):85–104, 2016.

[22] G. Cohen and M. Duruflé. Non spurious spectral-like element methods for maxwell's equations. *Journal of Computational Mathematics*, 25(3):282–304, 2007.

[23] M. Costabel. A remark on the regularity of solutions of Maxwell's equations on Lipschitz domains. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 12(4):365–368, 1990.

[24] C. M. Dafermos. Quasilinear hyperbolic systems with involutions. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 94(4):373–389, 1986.

[25] R. Dautray and J.-L. Lions. *Mathematical analysis and numerical methods for science and technology. Vol. 3. Spectral theory and applications*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 1990.

[26] J. Descloux, N. Nassif, and J. Rappaz. On spectral approximation. Part 1. The problem of convergence. *RAIRO. Analyse numérique*, 12(2):97–112, 1978.

[27] A. Ern and J.-L. Guermond. Finite element quasi-interpolation and best approximation. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 51(4):1367–1385, 2017.

[28] A. Ern and J.-L. Guermond. Analysis of the edge finite element approximation of the Maxwell equations with low regularity solutions. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 75(3):918–932, 2018.

[29] A. Ern and J.-L. Guermond. *Finite Elements I: Approximation and Interpolation*, volume 72 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer Nature, Cham, Switzerland, 2021.

[30] A. Ern and J.-L. Guermond. The discontinuous galerkin approximation of the grad-div and curl-curl operators in first-order form is involution-preserving and spectrally correct. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 61(6):2940–2966, 2023.

[31] V. Girault and P.-A. Raviart. *Finite element methods for Navier–Stokes equations. Theory and algorithms*. Springer Series in Computational Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 1986.

[32] J. S. Hesthaven and T. Warburton. Nodal high-order methods on unstructured grids. I. Time-domain solution of Maxwell's equations. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 181(1):186–221, 2002.

[33] J. S. Hesthaven and T. Warburton. High-order nodal discontinuous Galerkin methods for the Maxwell eigenvalue problem. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 362 (1816):493–524, 2004.

[34] R. Hiptmair. Finite elements in computational electromagnetism. *Acta Numer.*, 11:237–339, 2002.

[35] F. Jochmann. Regularity of weak solutions of Maxwell's equations with mixed boundary-conditions. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 22(14):1255–1274, 1999.

[36] J. E. Osborn. Spectral approximation for compact operators. *Math. Comp.*, 29:712–725, 1975.

[37] A. H. Schatz. An observation concerning Ritz-Galerkin methods with indefinite bilinear forms. *Math. Comp.*, 28:959–962, 1974.

[38] J. Schöberl. Commuting quasi-interpolation operators for mixed finite elements. Technical Report ISC-01-10-MATH, Texas A&M University, 2001. URL `www.isc.tamu.edu/publications-reports/tr/0110.pdf`.