Manifolds with many small wormholes: norm resolvent and spectral convergence

Colette Anné, Olaf Post

Manifolds with many small wormholes: norm resolvent and spectral convergence

Colette Anné and Olaf Post

Laboratoire de Mathématiques Jean Leray, CNRS – Nantes Université , Faculté des Sciences, BP 92208, 44322 Nantes, France
Email address: colette.anne@univ-nantes.fr

Fachbereich 4 – Mathematik, Universität Trier, 54286 Trier, Germany
Email address: olaf.post@uni-trier.de

Abstract. We present results concerning the norm convergence of resolvents for wild perturbations of the Laplace-Beltrami operator. This article is a continuation of our analysis on wildly perturbed manifolds presented in [AP21]. We study here manifolds with an increasing number of small (i.e., short and thin) handles added. The handles can also be seen as *wormholes*, as they connect different parts being originally far away. We consider two situations: if the small handles are distributed too sparse the limit operator is the unperturbed one on the initial manifold, the handles are *fading*. On the other hand, if the small handles are dense in certain regions the limit operator is the Laplace-Beltrami operator acting on functions which are identical on the two parts joined by the handles, the handles hence produce *adhesion*. Our results also apply to non-compact manifolds. Our work is based on a norm convergence result for operators acting in varying Hilbert spaces described in the book [P12] by the second author.

1. Introduction

In this article, we continue our study of norm convergence of the resolvents of Laplacians on manifolds with *wild perturbations* initiated in [AP21]. *Wild perturbations* refers here to increase the complexity of topology, a terminology already used in [RT75]. In the context of homogenisation, some authors call such spaces *manifolds with complicated* or *complex microstructure* (cf. [BdMK95, BdMK97, BdMCK97, BdMK98, Kh08, KhSt08]).

In [AP21] we have studied the convergence of the Laplace-Beltrami operator on manifolds (not necessarily compact) under the removal of tiny obstacles, such as many small balls. Here, we study in the same spirit the perturbation of adding many thin and short handles. As in [AP21] we look at two situations: *fading*, which means that in the limit one does not see the handles, and *adhering* where the handles or wormholes change the limit object: in the adhering case, two isometric parts of the space joint by many thin handles with a length tending to zero are identified. For the effect of *long* thin handles, i.e., handles shrinking to a one-dimensional interval of *positive* length, we refer e.g. to [A87, AC95, Kh13].

1.1. Main results and examples

We consider an m-dimensional (for convenience) complete Riemannian manifold (X, g) of *bounded geometry* with $m \geq 2$, remove many small balls $B_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{p\in I_\varepsilon} B_\varepsilon(p)$ of radius ε and attach many thin handles $C_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{p\in I_\varepsilon^-} C_\varepsilon(p)$ to $X_\varepsilon = X \setminus B_\varepsilon$. The resulting manifold is called $(M_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon)$; the procedure is described in detail in Subsection 2.3, see also

Date: January 23, 2025, 17:15, *File:* add-handles-arxiv.tex.
2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 58J50; Secondary 35P15, 53C23.

Figure 1. In the following, we briefly describe the parameters of the attached handles $C_\varepsilon(p) \cong [0,\ell_\varepsilon] \times \varepsilon\mathbb{S}^{m-1}$, how to attach them and the location of the points $p \in I_\varepsilon \subset X$:

- the *(handle) radius* ε;
- the *(handle) length* ℓ_ε;
- the *centres of balls* $p \in I_\varepsilon \subset X$ where the handles are attached to the original manifold X: we assume that $I_\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon^- \cup I_\varepsilon^+$ (disjoint union) and that there is a bijection $\bar{\cdot}\colon I_\varepsilon^- \longrightarrow I_\varepsilon^+$; the handles are indexed by points $p \in I_\varepsilon^-$; and the handles are attached at the boundary of $X \setminus B_\varepsilon(p)$ and $X \setminus B_\varepsilon(\bar{p})$;
- the balls are *ε-separated* (i.e. $d(p,q) \geq 2\varepsilon$ for $p,q \in I_\varepsilon$ and $p \neq q$) and *N-uniformly η_ε-covered*, i.e., there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ (independent of ε) such that each point in the union of the family $(B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p))_{p\in I_\varepsilon}$ is contained in maximal N balls, see (2.1). We call η_ε the *uniform cover distance*.

As in the case of manifolds with obstacles in our previous article [AP21], we describe two opposite situations:

- **Fading handles:** here the effect of the handles or wormholes is not seen, i.e., the limit operator is the Laplacian on the original manifold, provided

$$\eta_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha, \quad \ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\lambda \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} 0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{m-2}{m} \text{ and } 0 < \lambda < 1 \quad \text{or} \\ \frac{m-2}{m} \leq \alpha < 1 \text{ and } 0 < \lambda < (m-1) - m\alpha. \end{cases}$$

  see Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.5. If we want faster shrinking handle lengths, i.e., with $\lambda \geq 1$, we need a stricter condition on α, namely $\alpha < 1/3$ if $m = 3$ and $\alpha < 1/2$ if $m \geq 4$, see Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2. The case $m = 2$ is special, see the precise statements in the mentioned results.
- **Adhering handles:** in Theorem 3.13 and Corollary 3.14, we assume that the points $p \in I_\varepsilon^\pm$ are becoming denser in two open subsets $\Omega^\pm$ of X. Moreover, we assume that Ω^- is isometric with Ω^+ and that (for simplicity here) $\ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon$. Then, in the limit, the handles or wormholes "*adhere*" the two sets Ω^- and Ω^+ provided

$$\frac{\eta_\varepsilon^m}{\widetilde{\varepsilon}\varepsilon^{m-2}} \to 0, \quad \frac{\varepsilon}{\eta_\varepsilon} \to 0,$$

  and some other technical assumptions, see Subsection 3.2 for details and Figure 5 for a visualisation. Here, $\widetilde{\varepsilon}$ can be chosen $\widetilde{\varepsilon} = \mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^\alpha)$ in the case of flat identified parts (Lemma 3.19), or $\widetilde{\varepsilon} = 1$ if all parts are identified ($\Omega^+ \cup \Omega^- = X$, see Corollary 3.18); in particular, we need

$$\frac{m-2}{m-1} < \alpha < 1 \quad \text{resp.} \quad \frac{m-2}{m} < \alpha < 1;$$

  in Figures 7 and 8, the above parameter region (for $\lambda = 1$) is given by the line segment between B and $\widetilde{E}$ resp. B and E, see also these figures for the precise parameter region.

In all three theorems and its corollaries, we show convergence of the energy forms leading to a generalised norm resolvent convergence of the associated Laplacians: Since the perturbation changes the spaces on which the operators act, we define a "distance" δ_ε between two energy forms $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ and $\mathfrak{d}_0$, acting in different Hilbert spaces, called *δ_ε-quasi-unitary equivalence*. The generalised abstract theory (see Appendix C) assures that if $\delta_\varepsilon \to 0$, then a *generalised norm resolvent convergence* holds for the associated Laplace-like operators on varying spaces (Proposition C.3). This powerful tool and many consequences (like convergence of eigenvalues, eigenfunctions, functions of the operators such as spectral projections, the heat operator, see e.g. Theorem C.4) was first introduced by the second author in [P06, Appendix] and is explained in detail in the monograph [P12]. For a related concept of Weidmann (see [W00, Sec. 9.3]) and its comparison with the one used here we refer to [PZ22] or [PZ24] and references therein.

Let us stress that we do not need a compactness assumption on the space or on the resolvents as in some of the previous works; note that these works mostly show some sort of *strong* resolvent convergence (cf. Subsection 1.2). Moreover, our approach allows precise estimates on the convergence speed implying the same convergence speed for the spectra of the resolvents, see Theorem C.4.

1.2. Previous works

Handles added to a manifold are sometimes also called *wormholes* according to John Wheeler, cf. [Wh62]: one might travel in space-time via a "shortcut" from one part of the space-time to another one like a worm in an apple.

To the best of our knowledge, the study of adding handles to a manifold was initiated by Chavel and Feldman [CF81] who considered the "fading" case (in our notation), i.e., they gave a sufficient condition under which one has convergence of the eigenvalues of a manifold with a thin and short handle attached towards the eigenvalues of the original compact manifold. In particular, Chavel and Feldman concluded that one cannot hear asymptotically the topology of the manifold (the eigenvalues converge, but the topology is different). A sufficient condition for the eigenvalue convergence given in [CF81] is a uniform lower bound on an isoperimetric constant of the (compact) manifold with handles. Under this condition, the Dirichlet spectrum of the handle has lower bound of order ε^{-2} and volume of order ε^m. In our notation this means that $\lambda \geq 1$, i.e., the handle length has to shrink at least of order ε. Our analysis shows that the uniform lower bound on the isoperimetric constant is not necessary as we still have fading handles (not seen in the spectrum) for $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $\alpha = 0$.

In subsequent works, the first author of this paper studied in [A87, AC95] thin handles shrinking to a one-dimensional interval of positive length, which contribute to the limit spectrum via its Dirichlet spectrum. In [AC95], the authors also considered the spectra of Laplacians on differential forms.

Maybe one of the first papers dealing with spaces of increasing topological complexity and convergence of related Laplacians is the work of Rauch and Taylor [RT75], where Euclidean domains with (many) small obstacles are considered and strong resolvent convergence of Dirichlet or Neumann Laplacians is shown. Manifolds with many thin handles have been treated also in [BdMK95, BdMK97, N98, BdMK98, DMGM01, Kh08, KhSt08, Kh09]. In particular, a similar problem to ours is treated in [BdMK95, BdMK97], where the authors consider manifolds connected by an increasing number of small and short handles (among related spaces). They show that in the critical case and below (in our notation, $\eta_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha$ with $\alpha \leq (m-2)/m$ if $m \geq 3$ and ε-homothetic handles, i.e., $\lambda = 1$), solutions of the heat equations converge (in a strong sense) to a homogenised version with certain parts of the spaces identified. In [BdMK98] it is shown that harmonic vector fields converge towards a homogenised solution.

The question with many handles has also been studied via Γ-convergence in the preprints [N98, DMGM01]. As in our case, an increasing sequence of handles is attached to a compact manifold (in [N98] it is a sphere, in [DMGM01] one connects two isometric manifolds via thin handles). The situation resembles again our adhering case without any ambient (unidentified) parts. Note that Γ-convergence is somehow equivalent with *strong* resolvent convergence; while our results imply *norm* resolvent convergence and estimates on the convergence speed.

Khrabustovskyi [Kh13] treated a situation similar to ours (but only convergence of spectra is shown): he attaches an increasing number of small handles to two copies of a given manifold. His situation resembles our adhering case, but note that our model also allows parts of the manifold which are not identified. Theorem 3.17 and Corollary 3.18 describe the situation closest to the one of [Kh13, Thm. 2.6]; and we are able to cover a parameter range (α, λ) closest to the optimal one of [Kh13, Thm. 2.6]. In particular for

dimensions $m \in \{2,3,4\}$ and handle lengths shrinking as ε^λ with $0 < \lambda < 1$, we generalise Khrabustovskyi's work to generalised norm resolvent convergence with estimates on the convergence speed. Here, our result is stronger in the sense that we allow non-compact manifolds and that our results imply (generalised) norm resolvent convergence instead of just convergence of eigenvalues. For a detailed comparison of Khrabustovskyi's and our results, we refer to Remark 3.20. We will treat operator norm convergence for the interesting homogenisation case (boundary between fading and adhering case) and also for other interesting models analysed e.g. in [BdMK97] in a forthcoming publication.

(Generalised) norm resolvent convergence for homogenisation problems using methods as in this paper was first shown (to the best of our knowledge) in [KhP18], see also the references therein and [ChDR18] for an alternative approach. Note that in most of the works using Γ-convergence or related concepts, one has to assume that the underlying manifold is *compact*. We do not need this assumption in our case here.

We have announced Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.5 in a weaker version in [AP20, Thm. 5.1]: namely we stated Corollary 3.5 only for $0 < \lambda < 1 - 2\alpha$. Similarly, Theorem 3.13 is announced in[AP20, Thm .6.1] again under weaker assumptions. The reason for the better estimates here is a more detailed analysis of an optimal Sobolev trace estimate, see Remark 2.6.

1.3. Structure of the article

In Subsection 2.1 we collect some basic facts on manifolds and energy forms. In Subsection 2.2 we recall the non-concentrating property (Definition 2.1) already used in [AP21]. Moreover, we define in Subsection 2.3 the space M_ε obtained from a complete manifold X by adding many handles of radius ε and length ℓ_ε, and its natural energy form $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ and Laplacian. In Section 3 we state the main results on fading handles (Theorems 3.1 and 3.4) and on adhering handles (Theorem 3.13) together with examples. In Section 4 we present some estimates of the harmonic extension on the handles. In Section 5 we prove the main results in the fading case, and in Section 6 we prove the main result in the adhering case. In Appendix A, we provide some estimates on Euclidean balls and calculate the asymptotic expansion of the optimal constant in a Sobolev trace estimate in terms of two radii, see Proposition A.6; improving a previous estimate. The improvement is crucial when comparing our results with the ones of [Kh13]. In Appendix B we recall the notion of bounded geometry (Definition B.1) and we compare norms on small balls in complete Riemannian manifolds of bounded geometry with the Euclidean case. Finally, Appendix C contains the general concept of norm convergence of operators acting in varying Hilbert spaces.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Andrii Khrabustovskyi for helpful comments concerning this article. OP would like to thank the Fédération Recherche Mathématiques des Pays de Loire for the hospitality at the *Université de Nantes*. CA would like to thank the *University of Trier* for the hospitality.

2. Setting of the problem

2.1. Energy forms, Laplacians and harmonic radius on a Riemannian manifold with bounded geometry

Let (X, g) be a complete Riemannian manifold of dimension $m \geq 2$. Under suitable assumptions, our results also hold for manifolds with boundary or non-complete manifolds. We sometimes indicate how manifolds with boundary can be treated (e.g. in

Subsection 3.3). The Riemannian measure induced by g is denoted by $\mathrm{d}g$. The Riemannian measure allows us to define the Hilbert space $\mathsf{L}_2(X,g)$ of square-integrable (equivalence classes of) functions with norm given by

$$\|u\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(X,g)} \coloneqq \int_X |u|^2 \,\mathrm{d}g.$$

The *energy form* associated with (X,g) is defined by

$$\mathfrak{d}_{(X,g)}(u) \coloneqq \int_X |du|^2_g \,\mathrm{d}g$$

for u in the Sobolev space $\mathsf{H}^1(X,g)$, which can be defined as the completion of smooth functions with compact support, under the so-called *energy norm* given by

$$\|u\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(X,g)} \coloneqq \int_X \big(|u|^2 + |du|^2_g\big) \,\mathrm{d}g.$$

Here, du is a section into the cotangent bundle T^*M and $|\cdot|_g$ the Euclidean norm induced by g on it. Note that by definition, $\mathfrak{d}_{(X,g)}$ is a closed quadratic form with $\operatorname{dom}\mathfrak{d}_{(X,g)} = \mathsf{H}^1(X,g)$. The *Laplacian* $\Delta_{(X,g)}$ (in our notation $\Delta_{(X,g)} \geq 0$) associated with (X,g) is the operator associated with the energy form $\mathfrak{d}_{(X,g)}$. The Laplacian is a self-adjoint, non-negative and unbounded operator and hence introduces a scale of Hilbert spaces $\mathscr{H}^k \coloneqq \operatorname{dom}((\Delta_{(X,g)}+1)^{k/2})$ with norms $u \mapsto \|(\Delta_{(X,g)}+1)^{k/2}u\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(X,g)}$ for $k \geq 0$.

We review briefly some facts already cited in [AP21, Sec. 3] on manifolds of *bounded geometry* in Appendix B.

2.2. The non-concentrating property

A main tool of our analysis is the property called "non-concentrating" in [AP21, Subsec.. 3.3].

2.1. Definition (non-concentrating property)**.** Let (X,g) be a Riemannian manifold, $A \subset B \subset X$ and $\delta > 0$. We say that (A,B) is *δ-non-concentrating* (of order 1) if

$$\|f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(A,g)} \leq \delta \|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(B,g)}$$

for all $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(B,g)$.

Note that if $\widetilde{B} \supset B$, $\widetilde{A} \subset A$ and if (A,B) is δ-non-concentrating, then also $(\widetilde{A},\widetilde{B})$ is δ-non-concentrating.

Typically, $A = A_\varepsilon$ is an open subset of the manifold X and $\delta = \delta_\varepsilon \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$; the name "non-concentrating" comes from the fact that if $f = f_\varepsilon$ is a normalised eigenfunction with eigenvalue λ_ε bounded in ε, then f_ε cannot concentrate on A_ε as $\varepsilon \to 0$. The definition of "δ-non-concentrating" allows us to quantify how much a function $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(B)$ is not concentrated in $A \subset B$. In [AP21, Rem. 3.8] further explanations on this concept are given. A related result can be found in [MKh06, Lem. 4.9].

Once we have the non-concentrating property, we can immediately conclude a similar estimate for the derivatives:

2.2. Proposition (see [AP21, Prp. 3.9])**.** *Assume that (A,B) is δ-non-concentrating, then (A,B) is δ-non-concentrating of order 2, i.e.,*

$$\|df\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(A,g)} \leq \delta \|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^2(B,g)}$$

for all $f \in \mathsf{H}^2(B,g)$.

2.3. Remark (how to get back to graph norms)**.** The H^2-norm in Proposition 2.2 can be applied to balls and summed to a global H^2-norm on a Riemannian manifold (X,g). Proposition B.2 then allows us to pass from this H^2-norm to the graph norm of the corresponding Laplacian on (X,g). We apply this argument only for ε-independent spaces in order to avoid complications in tracing parameters in $C_{\text{ell.reg}} = C_{\text{ell.reg}}(X,g)$.

We now want to show the non-concentrating property for a union of many balls, cf. Proposition 2.5. In order to compare estimates on Euclidean balls with ones on geodesic balls, we need a uniform lower bound on the harmonic radius $r_0 > 0$, see Proposition B.3 and the text before. For simplicity, we assume that $r_0 \leq 1$.

2.4. Definition (ε-separation and N-uniform η-cover)**.** Let $r_0, \eta, \varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon < \eta < r_0$.

(i) A set $I \subset X$ is called *ε-separated* if for any two distinct points $p, q \in I$ one has $d(p,q) \geq 2\varepsilon$.

(ii) We say that I has *η-cover number* $N \in \mathbb{N}^* := \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ if

$$\big|\big\{\, p \in I \,\big|\, x \in B_\eta(p) \,\big\}\big| \leq N \qquad \text{for all } x \in X. \tag{2.1}$$

We say that I is *uniformly η-covered* or that I has an *uniform η-cover* if there is $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that I has η-cover number N.

(iii) For $\varepsilon \in (0, r_0)$ we denote

$$B_\varepsilon(I) = \bigcup_{p \in I} B_\varepsilon(p)$$

the union of all open balls with centre in I.

If I is ε-separated and N-uniformly η-covered, then we call ε the *radius* and η the *N-uniform* (or simply) *uniform cover distance* of $B_\varepsilon := B_\varepsilon(I)$.

Note that the union $B_\varepsilon(I)$ is disjoint if I is ε-separated. The term "uniform cover distance" refers to how close points in I can be in order to still have control over the cover number of the η-ball cover $B_\eta(I)$.

As an example for the non-concentrating property we show it for the union of many balls. The corresponding estimate in the Euclidean space is provided in Corollary A.12; as we have a better optimal constant than in previous publications, we include a proof in the appendix.

2.5. Proposition (non-concentrating property for union of balls)**.** *Let (X, g) be a complete Riemannian manifold of bounded geometry (cf. Definition B.1) and harmonic radius $r_0 > 0$. Let $\eta \in (0, r_0)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \eta)$. Assume that I is ε-separated and has η-cover number $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$, then for all $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta(I), g)$ we have*

$$\|f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_\varepsilon(I),g)} \leq C_m(\varepsilon, \eta) \|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta(I),g)}, \tag{2.2}$$

where $C_m(\varepsilon, \eta) = N^{1/2} K^{(m+1)/2} C_m^{\mathrm{eucl}}(\varepsilon, \eta)$ with a positive constant K depending only on the geometry of (X, g) and where $C_m^{\mathrm{eucl}}(\varepsilon, \eta)$ is given in (A.18).

Proof. The estimates for Euclidean balls follow from (A.18) and (A.2). Moreover, from Corollary B.6 we obtain the extra factors $K^{m/4} K^{(m+2)/4} = K^{(m+1)/2}$ from the deviation of the manifold to the Euclidean case, cf. Corollary B.6. Passing from the sum over the individual squared norms over balls $B_\eta(p)$ to the union $B_\eta(I)$ gives the extra factor $N^{1/2}$ in the inequality. □

Estimate (2.2) can be restated by saying that $(B_\varepsilon(I), B_\eta(I))$ is δ-non-concentrating (of order 1) with $\delta = C_m(\varepsilon, \eta)$. For the asymptotic expansion of the optimal constant $C_m^{\mathrm{eucl}}(\varepsilon, \eta)$ we refer to Corollary A.12 in Appendix A.

2.6. Remark (on the new constant)**.** With some efforts, we show in Appendix A that

$$C_m(\varepsilon, \eta) = \mathrm{O}\Big(\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta^m} + \varepsilon^2 [-\log \varepsilon]_2\Big)^{1/2}\Big),$$

where $[\dots]_2$ appears only if $m = 2$, and the order in ε and η is optimal. We previously estimated

$$C_m(\varepsilon, \eta) = \mathrm{O}\Big(\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\eta^2}\Big[-\log \frac{\varepsilon}{\eta}\Big]_2\Big)^{1/2}\Big), \tag{2.3}$$

in [AP21, Lem. 3.10]. With our new optimal estimate of $C_m(\varepsilon, \eta)$, we come much closer to similar results on manifolds with handles already proven by [Kh13], see Remark 3.20. If we insist on an estimate of the form $C_m(\varepsilon, \eta) \leq c_m(\varepsilon/\eta)^\beta$ (for $m \geq 3$) as in our previous publications, e.g. [AP21, Lem. 3.10], then we must have $\beta = 1$. Note that a simple scaling argument leads only to the estimate (2.3), so we really need the more advanced arguments such as in Appendix A for the better constant.

2.3. Manifolds with handles and their Laplacians

Definition of the handles. Let (X, g) be a complete connected Riemannian manifold of dimension $m \geq 2$ of *bounded geometry* (cf. Definition B.1). In particular, the harmonic radius $r_0 > 0$ is then positive (cf. Proposition B.3). For each $\varepsilon \in (0, r_0)$, let $\eta_\varepsilon \in (0, r_0)$ such that $0 < \varepsilon < \eta_\varepsilon$. We specify the dependence of η_ε on ε later. Moreover, let I_ε be an ε-separated subset of X, i.e., if $p, q \in I_\varepsilon$ with $p \neq q$, then $d(p, q) \geq 2\varepsilon$. Let

$$B_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{p \in I_\varepsilon}^{\cdot} B_\varepsilon(p) \qquad \text{and} \qquad X_\varepsilon = X \setminus B_\varepsilon.$$

Additionally, we assume that I_ε splits into two disjoint subsets

$$I_\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon^- \cup I_\varepsilon^+$$

such that there is a bijective map $\bar{\cdot}\colon I_\varepsilon^- \longrightarrow I_\varepsilon^+$. We call such a set $I_\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon^- \cup I_\varepsilon^+$ a *split set*.



FIGURE 1. The manifold M_ε obtained from X (here the top and lower flat region) by removing many small balls $B_\varepsilon(p)$ of radius ε by attaching handles $C_\varepsilon(p)$. The small dotted lines mean identification.

If (N, h) is a Riemannian manifold, we use the notation εN for some $\varepsilon > 0$ to denote the scaled Riemannian manifold $(N, \varepsilon^2 h)$.

For each $p \in I_\varepsilon^-$ we specify a *handle* or *cylinder* of radius $\varepsilon \in (0, r_0)$ and length $\ell_\varepsilon > 0$ (again, we specify the dependency of ℓ_ε on ε later), namely we set

$$C_\varepsilon(p) \coloneqq [0, \ell_\varepsilon] \times \varepsilon\mathbb{S} \times \{p\},$$

i.e., the underlying space is $[0, \ell_\varepsilon] \times \mathbb{S} \times \{p\}$ with metric $g_\varepsilon = \mathrm{d}s^2 + \varepsilon^2 g_{\mathbb{S}}$. Here, $g_{\mathbb{S}}$ is the standard metric on the $(m-1)$-dimensional sphere $\mathbb{S} \coloneqq \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$.

We denote by

$$\partial^- C_\varepsilon(p) \coloneqq \{0\} \times \mathbb{S} \times \{p\} \qquad \text{resp.} \qquad \partial^+ C_\varepsilon(p) \coloneqq \{\ell_\varepsilon\} \times \mathbb{S} \times \{p\}$$

the lower resp. upper boundary of $C_\varepsilon(p)$ (see Figure 1). Moreover, let

$$C_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{p \in I_\varepsilon^-}^{\cdot} C_\varepsilon(p)$$

be the disjoint union of the isometric handles labelled by $p \in I_\varepsilon^-$.

We glue C_ε to $X_\varepsilon = X \setminus B_\varepsilon$ by identifying $\partial^- C_\varepsilon(p)$ with $\partial B_\varepsilon(p)$ and $\partial^+ C_\varepsilon(p)$ with $\partial B_\varepsilon(\bar{p})$ for each handle labelled by $p \in I_\varepsilon^-$. We denote the resulting space by

$$M_\varepsilon = (X_\varepsilon \cup C_\varepsilon)/\!\sim,$$

where $\sim$ denotes the identification.

2.7. Remarks.

(i) Note that there is some freedom how we identify the spheres of $\partial^\pm C_\varepsilon(p)$ with the spheres $\partial B_\varepsilon(p)$ and $\partial B_\varepsilon(\bar{p})$. We fix these identifications, and it will play no further role in our analysis.

(ii) To make this identification isometric, we would have to suppose that the metric on X is Euclidean near the points of I_ε. This is a rather strict constraint as we allow the index set I_ε to vary as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Moreover, the manifold M_ε is not smooth where the handles are glued, it is only a topological manifold.

We show in Proposition 2.9 that we can modify the metric g on X_ε into g'_ε in such a way that $(X_\varepsilon, g'_\varepsilon)$ is Euclidean on $B_{2\varepsilon}$. In particular, the corresponding forms are $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^a)$-quasi-unitary equivalent, where $a \in (0,1)$ is the local Hölder exponent of the metric, see Proposition B.3. In addition, we use this flattened manifold $(X_\varepsilon, \widetilde{g}_\varepsilon)$ and define a smooth manifold $(\widetilde{M}_\varepsilon, \widetilde{g}_\varepsilon)$ in Proposition 2.9 such that the form $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ and the natural energy form on $(\widetilde{M}_\varepsilon, \widetilde{g}_\varepsilon)$ are $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^a)$-quasi-unitarily equivalent.

It will be more convenient to work with the ε-independent space $\mathsf{L}_2(C, g_{\mathrm{can}})$, where

$$C = \bigcup_{p \in I_\varepsilon^-}^{\cdot} C(p), \quad C(p) \coloneqq C_1 \times \{p\}, \quad \text{and} \quad C_1 \coloneqq [0,1] \times \mathbb{S}$$

using the unitary map

$$\mathsf{L}_2(C_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon) \to \mathsf{L}_2(C, g_{\mathrm{can}}), \quad (h_p)_{p \in I_\varepsilon^-} \mapsto (\varepsilon^{(m-1)/2} \ell_\varepsilon \widetilde{h}_p)_{p \in I_\varepsilon^-} \quad \text{with} \quad \widetilde{h}_p(s, \theta) = h_p(s\ell_\varepsilon, \theta).$$

Here $g_{\mathrm{can}} = \mathrm{d}s^2 + g_{\mathbb{S}}$ is the canonical metric on each cylinder $[0,1] \times \mathbb{S}$. With this unitary map, we also have

$$\mathsf{L}_2(M_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon) \cong \mathsf{L}_2(X_\varepsilon, g) \oplus \mathsf{L}_2(C, g_{\mathrm{can}}) \cong \mathsf{L}_2(X_\varepsilon, g) \oplus (\mathsf{L}_2(C_1, g_{\mathrm{can}}))^{I_\varepsilon^-}.$$

2.8. Definition (canonical energy form on manifold with handles)**.** The canonical energy form $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ of the manifold M_ε with handles is defined on the domain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{dom} \mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon = \Big\{ U = (u, h) \in \mathsf{H}^1(X_\varepsilon, g) \times \mathsf{H}^1(C, g_{\mathrm{can}}) \,\Big|\, \\ \forall p \in I_\varepsilon^- : \; h_p(0, \cdot) = \sqrt{\varepsilon^{m-1} \ell_\varepsilon} \cdot u_p(\varepsilon, \cdot), \quad h_p(1, \cdot) = \sqrt{\varepsilon^{m-1} \ell_\varepsilon} \cdot u_{\bar{p}}(\varepsilon, \cdot) \Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.4a}$$

where $u_p(r,\theta)$ is the value of u on $B_\varepsilon(p)$ in spherical coordinates (r,θ) around $p \in I_\varepsilon$. Moreover, we set

$$\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon(U) \coloneqq \int_{X_\varepsilon} |du|^2 \,\mathrm{d}g + \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(h),$$

where

$$\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(h) = \sum_{p\in I_\varepsilon^-} \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon(p)}(h_p) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon(p)}(h_p) = \int_{C_1} \Big(\frac{1}{\ell_\varepsilon^2}|\partial_1 h_p|^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}|d_{\mathbb{S}} h_p|^2\Big)\,\mathrm{d}g_{\mathrm{can}}. \quad \text{(2.4b)}$$

Here, ∂_1 is the derivative with respect to the first (longitudinal) variable and $d_{\mathbb{S}}$ the exterior derivative with respect to the second variable $(s,\theta) \in C_1$.

It is easy to see that the energy form $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ is the natural form on the manifold M_ε, and that it is a closed form. The associated non-negative and self-adjoint operator Δ_ε is called the *energy operator* or *Laplacian* of M_ε. Its domain can be described explicitly as a collection of functions in $\mathsf{H}^2(X_\varepsilon, g)$ resp. $\mathsf{H}^2(C, g_{\mathrm{can}})$ satisfying the *gluing* conditions of (2.4a) together with conditions involving the normal derivative on the different common boundaries, see for instance [A87].

As already mentioned, our definition of the space M_ε and its canonical energy form $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ is close to the natural energy form $\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}_\varepsilon$ on a *smooth* manifold $\widetilde{M_\varepsilon}$ in the sense of quasi-unitary equivalence (see Appendix C for the definition of this concept):

2.9. Proposition (modification to a smooth manifold)**.** *Let M_ε and $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ as above. Then there is a smooth manifold $\widetilde{M_\varepsilon}$ such that its natural energy form $\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}_\varepsilon$ is $\widetilde{\delta}_\varepsilon$-quasi-unitarily equivalent with $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ with $\widetilde{\delta}_\varepsilon = \mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^a)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, where $a \in (0,1)$ appears as local Hölder exponent in* (B.1a).

Proof. We proceed in two steps. First, we change the metric g on each ball $B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p)$ into

$$g'_{p,\varepsilon} \coloneqq \chi_{p,\varepsilon} g_{\mathrm{eucl},p} + (1-\chi_{p,\varepsilon}) g,$$

where $\chi_{p,\varepsilon}(x) \coloneqq \chi(d(p,x)/\varepsilon)$ for $x \in B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p)$ and where $\chi\colon [0,\infty) \longrightarrow [0,1]$ is a smooth function with $\chi(s) = 1$ for $s \in [0,2]$ and $\chi(s) = 0$ for $s \geq 3$. Moreover, $g_{\mathrm{eucl},p}$ is the Euclidean metric on $B_{r_0}(p)$ introduced in (B.2). Note that balls around p are the same with respect to both metrics g and g'_ε, and that $(B_{2\varepsilon}(p), g'_{p,\varepsilon})$ is flat.

Let $A'_{p,\varepsilon}$ be the endomorphism measuring the deviation of $g'_{p,\varepsilon}$ from g on $B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p)$ (called *relative distortion* of g'_ε from g in [P12, Sec. 5.2]). In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(A'_{p,\varepsilon}\xi,\xi) \coloneqq g'_{p,\varepsilon}(\xi,\xi) &= \chi_{p,\varepsilon} g_{\mathrm{eucl},p}(\xi,\xi) + (1-\chi_{\varepsilon,p}) g(\xi,\xi) \\ &= g\Big(\big(\chi_{p,\varepsilon} A_{\mathrm{eucl},p} + (1-\chi_{p,\varepsilon})\,\mathrm{id}\big)\xi, \xi\Big) \\ &= g\Big(\chi_{p,\varepsilon}\big(A_{\mathrm{eucl},p} - \mathrm{id}\big) + \mathrm{id}\big)\xi, \xi\Big), \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$A'_{p,\varepsilon} - \mathrm{id} = \chi_{p,\varepsilon}(A_{\mathrm{eucl},p} - \mathrm{id})$$

on $B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p)$. Moreover, we have

$$\|A'_{p,\varepsilon} - \mathrm{id}\|_{\mathsf{C}(B_{3\varepsilon}(p))} \leq \|A_{\mathrm{eucl},p} - \mathrm{id}\|_{\mathsf{C}(B_{3\varepsilon}(p))} \leq mk3^a\varepsilon^a$$

uniformly in $p \in I_\varepsilon$ using Corollary B.5. If we choose now $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$ with $\varepsilon_0 = \min\{(2mk3^a)^{-1/a}, r_0/3\}$, then the above norm of the difference $A'_{p,\varepsilon} - \mathrm{id}$ is smaller than or equal to $1/2$.

As $g'_{p,\varepsilon}$ equals g outside $B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p)$, we can define a metric g'_ε on X equal to $g'_{p,\varepsilon}$ on $B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p)$ for each $p \in I_\varepsilon$. Note that (X, g'_ε) is flat on $B_{2\varepsilon}$. We denote its relative distortion from g by A'_ε, and on $B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p)$ it equals $A'_{p,\varepsilon}$ given above. Now [P12, Thm. 5.2.6] applies,

namely the canonical energy forms on (X_ε, g) and $(X_\varepsilon, g'_\varepsilon)$ are $\delta'_\varepsilon = \mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^a)$-quasi-unitarily equivalent with

$$\delta'_\varepsilon = 4\|A'_\varepsilon - \mathrm{id}\|_{\mathsf{C}(X)} \leq 4mk3^a\varepsilon^a = \mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^a).$$

In a second step, we smoothen the metric: Note that the Riemannian manifold $(M_\varepsilon, g'_\varepsilon)$ constructed as $(M_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon)$, but with (X_ε, g) replaced by $(X_\varepsilon, g'_\varepsilon)$ is non-smooth at the gluing of the identification of the handles: in polar coordinates on $B_{2\varepsilon}(p) \setminus B_\varepsilon(p)$ (we drop now the dependence of p in the notation), the metric is $g'_\varepsilon = \mathrm{d}s^2 + r_\varepsilon(s)^2 g_{\mathbb{S}}$ with $r_\varepsilon(s) = s$ for $s \in [\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon]$ and $r_\varepsilon(s) = \varepsilon$ for $s \in [0, \varepsilon]$. We change the non-smooth function r_ε into a smooth function $\widetilde{r}_\varepsilon$ such that $\mathrm{e}^{-\varepsilon} \leq \widetilde{r}_\varepsilon(s)/r_\varepsilon(s) \leq \mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon}$ for all s. We call the resulting metric $\widetilde{g}_\varepsilon$ which is of the form $\mathrm{d}s^2 + \widetilde{r}_\varepsilon(s)^2 g_{\mathbb{S}}$ on X_ε and we have defined a Riemannian manifold $(M_\varepsilon, \widetilde{g}_\varepsilon)$. Again by [P12, Thm. 5.2.6], the two canonical energy forms on $(M_\varepsilon, g'_\varepsilon)$ and $(M_\varepsilon, \widetilde{g}_\varepsilon)$ are δ''_ε-quasi-unitarily equivalent with δ''_ε of order ε provided $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$. Using the transitivity of quasi-unitary equivalence we obtain that $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}_\varepsilon$ are $14(\delta'_\varepsilon + \delta''_\varepsilon)$-quasi-unitary equivalent (cf. [PS19, Prp. 1.6], correcting the erroneous proof of Prp. 4.4.16 of [P12]. □

3. Main Results

We consider different settings (i.e., assumptions on the parameters ℓ_ε (the handle length), η_ε (the uniform cover distance of the points $I_\varepsilon^\pm$) and the set of points $I_\varepsilon^\pm$, where the handles are attached. Recall from Subsection 2.3 that $M_\varepsilon = X_\varepsilon \cup C_\varepsilon/\!\sim$ denotes the manifold with many small handles $C_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{p \in I_\varepsilon^-} C_\varepsilon(p)$ of length $\ell_\varepsilon > 0$ and transversal radius $\varepsilon > 0$ attached to X_ε, where X_ε is obtained from X by removing disjoint balls $B_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{p \in I_\varepsilon} B_\varepsilon(p)$ of radius $\varepsilon > 0$. Recall that r_0 denotes a lower bound on the harmonic radius, cf. Proposition B.3.

In each situation, we prove that the quadratic form $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ is δ_ε-*quasi-unitary equivalent* to a limit quadratic form, with $\delta_\varepsilon \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. The concept of quasi-unitary equivalence is presented in Appendix C. It assures that the resolvents of the corresponding Laplacians converges, if intertwined with some "good" bounded operators $J_\varepsilon \colon \mathscr{H}_0 \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}_\varepsilon$ which permit the transplantation of functions of the limit space $\mathscr{H}_0$ ($\mathsf{L}_2(X, g)$ or a subspace of it) on the manifold with handles $\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon = \mathsf{L}_2(M_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon)$, namely we obtain

$$\left\| J_\varepsilon(\Delta_0 + 1)^{-1} - (\Delta_\varepsilon + 1)^{-1} J_\varepsilon \right\| \leq 7\delta_\varepsilon \to 0$$

(Proposition C.3). As a consequence, we also have convergence of spectra as in Theorem C.4.

We have first two results of convergence where in the limit, the handles are no longer seen. We call such handles *fading*:

3.1. Fading handles

In our first main theorem, we just "ignore" the handles by the use of a cut-off function (in the same way as the Dirichlet problem for many small holes, see [AP21, Sec. 5]). In this subsection, we assume that there is

- $\eta_\varepsilon \in (0, r_0)$ with $\varepsilon < \eta_\varepsilon$ (later the uniform cover distance)
- an ε-separated split set $I_\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon^- \uplus I_\varepsilon^+$ with uniform η_ε-cover (where we join the handles) and
- $\ell_\varepsilon > 0$ (later the handle length).

Here, the handles are too *sparse*, i.e., they are uniformly η_ε-covered and η_ε tends to 0 rather slowly (slower than ζ_ε defined in the next theorem).

3.1. Theorem (fading handles I). *Let X be a complete Riemannian manifold of dimension $m \geq 2$ with bounded geometry. Assume that*

(i) **Length shrinking:** *$\ell_\varepsilon \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$;*

(ii) $\omega_\varepsilon := \dfrac{\zeta_\varepsilon}{\eta_\varepsilon} \to 0$ *as* $\varepsilon \to 0$, *where*

$$\zeta_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} \varepsilon^{\alpha_m} & (m \geq 3), \\ |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha_2} & (m = 2), \end{cases} \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \alpha_m \begin{cases} = 1/2 & (m \geq 5), \\ \in (0, 1/2) & (m = 4), \\ = 1/3 & (m = 3), \\ = 1/2 & (m = 2); \end{cases}$$

Then the energy form $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ *on the manifold* M_ε *with small handles of length* ℓ_ε *and radius* ε *and the energy form* $\mathfrak{d}_0$ *on the original manifold* X *are* δ_ε*-quasi unitarily equivalent of order* 2 *with partially isometric identification operators, where* $\delta_\varepsilon \to 0$ *as* $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Let us now specify the dependence of the parameters on ε:

3.2. Corollary (fading handles I). *Within the setting of Theorem 3.1, assume that*

(i) *the handle length fulfils* $\ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\lambda$ *for some* $\lambda > 0$;
(ii) *the uniform cover distance is* $\eta_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha r_0$ *for* $m \geq 3$ *resp.* $\eta_\varepsilon = |\log \varepsilon|^{-\alpha} r_0$ *for* $m = 2$ *and* $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_m)$.

Then the energy form $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ *on the manifold* M_ε *with small handles of length* ℓ_ε *and radius* ε *and the energy form* $\mathfrak{d}_0$ *on the original manifold* X *are* δ_ε*-quasi unitarily equivalent of order* 2 *with partially isometric identification operators, where*

$$\delta_\varepsilon = \mathrm{O}\Big(\varepsilon^{\min\left\{\lambda, \frac{\alpha_m - \alpha}{4(1-\alpha_m)}, \frac{\alpha_m + \alpha}{2}\right\}}\Big) \quad \textit{resp.} \quad \delta_\varepsilon = \mathrm{O}\Big(|\log \varepsilon|)^{-\frac{1/2+\alpha}{2}} \big|\log|\log \varepsilon|\big|^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big)$$

for $m \geq 3$ *resp.* $m = 2$.

3.3. Remark (fading handles I: meaning of the conditions).

(i) The condition $\ell_\varepsilon \to 0$ is rather natural, as if $\ell_\varepsilon \to \ell_0 > 0$ then in the limit we obtain for each handle an interval $[0, \ell_0]$ together with the Dirichlet Laplacian on it (see e.g. [A87, AC95, Kh13]). In the parameter range of Figure 2, this condition gives the horizontal λ-axis as bound of the allowed parameter region.
(ii) Condition (ii) implies that the ratio *radius per uniform cover distance* $\varepsilon/\eta_\varepsilon$ tends to 0:

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{\eta_\varepsilon} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\zeta_\varepsilon} \cdot \omega_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} \varepsilon^{1-\alpha_m} \omega_\varepsilon \to 0, & m \geq 3, \\ \varepsilon |\log \varepsilon|^{1/2} \omega_\varepsilon \to 0, & m = 2. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, this implies that

$$\delta_{\mathrm{ball},\varepsilon} = C_m(\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) = \mathrm{O}\Big(\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{\eta_\varepsilon}\Big)^{m/2} + \varepsilon[-\log \varepsilon]_2^{1/2}\Big)$$

In addition, if ℓ_ε is bounded in ε (as a consequence of (i)), then we conclude that $\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} \to 0$: we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} &= \mathrm{O}\Big(\Big(\Big(\frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} + 1\Big)\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta_\varepsilon^m} + \varepsilon^2[-\log \varepsilon]_2\Big)\Big)^{1/2}\Big), \\ &= \begin{cases} \mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{(m-1-m\alpha_m)/2} \omega_\varepsilon^{m/2} + \varepsilon), & m \geq 3, \\ \varepsilon^{1/2} |\log \varepsilon|^{1/2} \omega_\varepsilon, & m = 2. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

as $m - 1 - m\alpha_m \geq 1$ for $m \geq 3$. We need $\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} \to 0$ in Corollary 4.5. In the spirit of Definition 2.1 the estimate in Corollary 4.5 means that the handles are $\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}$*-non-concentrating of order* 1 *for harmonic functions*.

Together with (i), we conclude that $\delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon} \to 0$, see Lemma 4.9. The estimate in Lemma 4.9 means that the handles are $\delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon}$*-non-concentrating of order* 1 *for all functions*.

(iii) The precise estimate δ_ε on the convergence speed is given in (5.3).

(iv) In our analysis the value $\alpha_m = 1/2$ is needed for the same reason as in [AP21, Rem. 5.8]: we want to remain in Sobolev spaces of order 2 and not higher, see Remark C.2. The optimal value would be $\widetilde{\alpha}_m = (m-2)/m$, and could possibly be reached with our methods by allowing a resolvent power on the right hand side such as $\|(J_\varepsilon R - R_\varepsilon J_\varepsilon)R^{k-2}\|$ for some $k > 2$ depending on m. From this weaker estimate, one can still conclude spectral convergence and other estimates; for details see [P06, P12].

We expect better results (at least for slowly shrinking handle length ℓ_ε) by comparing the functions on the perturbed domain with the harmonic extension on the handles of the functions on the unperturbed one. For a detailed discussion see Remark 3.7 and Figure 4. The estimates on the harmonic extension of a given function on X_ε onto the handles are given in Section 4.

3.4. Theorem (fading handles II)**.** *Let X be a complete Riemannian manifold of dimension $m \geq 2$ with bounded geometry. Assume that*

(i) **Length shrinking:** $\ell_\varepsilon \to 0$ *as* $\varepsilon \to 0$,

(ii) **Non-concentrating on the handles (of order 2 for harmonic functions):** $\delta'_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} \to 0$, *i.e.,*

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon \ell_\varepsilon}\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta_\varepsilon^m} + \varepsilon^2[-\log \varepsilon]_2\Big) \to 0$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Then the energy form $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ on the manifold M_ε with small handles of length ℓ_ε and radius ε and the energy form $\mathfrak{d}_0$ on the original manifold X are δ_ε-quasi unitarily equivalent of order 2 with partially isometric identification operators, where $\delta_\varepsilon \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

3.5. Corollary (fading handles II)**.** *Within the setting of Theorem 3.4, we assume that $\eta_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha r_0$ if $m \geq 2$ and that the handle length fulfils $\ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\lambda$. If*

$$\text{(i) } \lambda > 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \text{(ii) } \begin{cases} 0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{m-2}{m} \textit{ and } \lambda < 1 \quad \textit{or} \\ \frac{m-2}{m} \leq \alpha < 1 \textit{ and } \lambda < (m-1) - m\alpha, \end{cases}$$

then the energy form $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ on the manifold M_ε with handles of length ℓ_ε and radius ε and the energy form $\mathfrak{d}_0$ on the original manifold X are δ_ε-quasi unitarily equivalent of order 2 with partially isometric identification operators, where $\delta_\varepsilon = \mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{\min\{\lambda,(-\lambda+(m-1)-m\alpha))/2,(1-\lambda)/2\}})$.

3.6. Remark (fading handles II: meaning of the conditions)**.**

(i) The condition $\ell_\varepsilon \to 0$ is needed as usual, see Remark 3.3 (i).

(ii) Condition (ii) is equivalent with $\delta'_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} \to 0$; needed in Corollary 4.7. Actually, $\delta'_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}$ is of the same order as the square root of the expression in (ii). In the spirit of Definition 2.1 the estimate in Corollary 4.7 means that the handles are $\delta'_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}$-*non-concentrating of order* 2 *for harmonic functions*. This condition implies also that $\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} \to 0$, see Remark 4.10. Moreover, in the parameter range of Figure 3, this condition determines the parameter range inside the polygon $CDD'E$.

(iii) Conditions (i)–(ii) imply again that the ratio radius per uniform cover distance $\varepsilon/\eta_\varepsilon$ converges to 0:

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{\eta_\varepsilon} = \Big(\frac{1}{\varepsilon\ell_\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta_\varepsilon^m}\Big)^{1/m} (\varepsilon\ell_\varepsilon))^{1/m} \to 0$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$ using (i)–(ii).

(iv) The precise estimate δ_ε on the convergence speed is given in (5.4).

3.7. Remarks (comparision of both results and further remarks on the fading case)**.** We now discuss the two fading results Corollaries 3.2 and 3.5 and introduce some points in the (α, λ)-plane. Here, α enters as exponent in the uniform cover distance ($\eta_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha r_0$,



FIGURE 2. The range of the parameters α ($\eta_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha r_0$, the larger the denser the handles are) and λ ($\ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\lambda$, the larger the shorter the handles are) in which Corollary 3.2 is valid ($m \geq 3$). For the letters describing points in the (α, λ)-plane, see (3.2)). The estimate on the convergence speed is of order $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{(\alpha_m-\alpha)/(2(1-\alpha_m))})$ in the (infinite) rectangle $C'G(\alpha^*_m, \infty)(\alpha_m, \infty)$ (lightest grey), of order $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{(\alpha_m+\alpha)/2)})$ in the (infinite) rectangle $D^-(0, \infty)(\alpha^*_m, \infty)G$ (middle grey) resp. of order $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^\lambda)$ in the triangle $C'DD^-G$ (dark grey).



FIGURE 3. The range of the parameters α ($\eta_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha r_0$ in which Corollary 3.5 is valid. The estimate on the convergence speed is of order $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{(1-\lambda)/2})$ in the polygon $C'DD^-G$ (horizontal lines); of order $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{(-\lambda+(m-1)-m\alpha)/2})$ in the polygon (diagonal lines) resp. of order $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^\lambda)$ (dark grey).

for Corollary 3.2 only if $m \geq 3$); the larger α is, the denser the handles are. Moreover, λ is the exponent in the handle length ($\ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\lambda$);, the larger the shorter the handles are.

We first introduce some points needed to compare Corollaries 3.2 and 3.5, see also Figures 2–4 (we use similar letters as in [Kh13]):

$$
\begin{aligned}
&C = \Big(\frac{m-2}{m}, 0\Big), && C' = (\alpha_m, 0), && \hat{C} = \Big(\frac{m-2}{m}, \frac{1}{3}\Big),\\
&D = (0,0), && D' = (0,1), && D^- = \Big(0, \frac{\alpha_m}{2}\Big),\\
&\hat{D} = (0, 1/3), && E = \Big(\frac{m-2}{m}, 1\Big), && H = \Big(\alpha^*_m, \frac{\alpha_m}{2-\alpha_m}\Big),
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.2}
$$

where

$$
\alpha^*_m = \frac{\alpha_m^2}{2-\alpha_m}, \tag{3.3}
$$

i.e., $\alpha^*_3 = 1/15$, $\alpha^*_4 \in (0, 1/6)$ and $\alpha_m = 1/6$ for $m \geq 5$; we refer to the letters also later on.

Our two results complement each other:

(i) **Very fast length-shrinking handles; the case only covered by Corollary 3.2.** In any dimension $m \geq 2$, Corollary 3.2 applies for handles which length $\ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\lambda$



FIGURE 4. Comparison of the two fading results: horizontal light lines: only Corollary 3.5 applies; vertical light lines: only Corollary 3.2 applies; horizontal dark lines: Corollary 3.5 has better estimates than Corollary 3.2; vertical dark lines: Corollary 3.2 has better estimates than Corollary 3.5; grey area: both results have the same order on the convergence speed. Dotted area (only for $m \geq 5$): none of our results apply.

shrinks as fast as wanted, i.e., for any $\lambda > 0$. This is due to the fact that the cut-off function method used in Theorem 3.1 does not see the handles at all. The case when only Corollary 3.2 applies is the vertically lined infinite polygon given in Figure 4. On the other hand, the range of α is restricted by α_m, and this constant is not optimal for $m \geq 5$ for reasons explained in Remark 3.3 (ii); this is the dotted infinite rectangle in Figure 4.

(ii) **The case only in Corollary 3.5.** In any dimension $m \geq 2$, Corollary 3.5 applies in the parameter range for the triangle $((m-2)/m, 0) - ((m-2)/m, 1) - ((m-1)/m, 0)$. This range never appears in Corollary 3.2. Also, for $m \geq 5$, we allow $\alpha \in [\alpha_m, (m-2)/m)$, a range not covered by Corollary 3.2. Nevertheless, we have to restrict to slowly decaying handle lengths, namely to $\lambda < 1$; this restriction comes from $\delta'_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} \to 0$, and the bad term is the energy of the transversally constant part of a harmonic extension, the $1/\ell_\varepsilon^2$-term in (4.4c), entering in $\delta^\bullet_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}$ in Proposition 4.6, and finally also in $\delta'_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}$.

(iii) **Homothetically shrinking handles.** In particular, the case $\lambda \geq 1$ is allowed only Corollary 3.2. The case when $\ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon$ (i.e., the handles shrink homothetically $C_\varepsilon = \varepsilon C_1$); in other words, the length $\ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon$ shrinks as fast as the radius ε) is covered only by Corollary 3.2, but there is a gap for the values $1/2 \leq \alpha < (m-2)/m$ from dimension $m \geq 5$ not covered be neither Corollary 3.2 nor Corollary 3.5.

(iv) **Two-dimension case.** if $m = 2$ the scale of the uniform cover distance $\eta_{\hat\varepsilon}$ used in Corollary 3.2 (with $\hat\varepsilon$ instead of ε) is exponentially slower than η_ε used in Corollary 3.5 (with ε): if $\eta_{\hat\varepsilon} = (1/|\log \hat\varepsilon|)^\alpha$ of Corollary 3.2 for $\hat\varepsilon < 1$ equals $\eta_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha$ of Corollary 3.5, then $-1/\log \hat\varepsilon = \varepsilon$, i.e., $\hat\varepsilon = \mathrm{e}^{-1/\varepsilon}$, hence Corollary 3.5 covers also cases when the uniform cover distance decays much faster.

We present some examples in Subsection 3.3.

3.2. Adhering handles

The third theorem presents a situation where we obtain *adhering handles*. In this case the handles are so dense that they glue or identify two parts of the original manifold, gluing them together at the limit.

We first fix the assumptions on the parameters; recall that r_0 denotes a lower bound on the harmonic radius, cf. Proposition B.3:

3.8. Assumption (relation of handle length, radius and uniform cover distance)**.** We assume that for each $\varepsilon \in (0, r_0)$ the handle length $\ell_\varepsilon > 0$ and the uniform cover distance $\eta_\varepsilon > 0$ fulfil $0 < \varepsilon < \eta_\varepsilon \leq r_0$ and

(i) **Length shrinking:** $\ell_\varepsilon \to 0$,

(ii) **Non-concentrating on the handles (of order 1 for harmonic functions):** $\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} \to 0$, i.e.,

$$\Big(\frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} + 1\Big)\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta_\varepsilon^m} + \varepsilon^2[-\log\varepsilon]_2\Big) \to 0$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$,

(iii) **Non-concentrating of anti-symmetric functions:** $\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon} \to 0$, i.e.,

$$\frac{\eta_\varepsilon^m}{\varepsilon^{m-2}} \cdot \Big(\frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} + \Big[\log\frac{\eta_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big]_2\Big) \to 0$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$,

(iv) **Non-concentrating on the handles (of order 2 for harmonic functions without constant transversal part):** $\delta^\perp_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} \to 0$, i.e.,

$$\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{\ell_\varepsilon} + 1\Big)\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta_\varepsilon^m} + \varepsilon^2[-\log\varepsilon]_2\Big) \to 0$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

We give a concrete setting in Corollary 3.14 again with $\eta_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha r_0$ and $\ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\lambda$ for the parameters α and λ.

3.9. Remark (adhering handles: meaning of the conditions)**.**

(i) The condition $\ell_\varepsilon \to 0$ is needed as usual, see Remark 3.3 (i).

(ii) Condition (ii) is equivalent with $\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} \to 0$. Actually, $\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}$ is of the same order as the square root of the expression in (ii).

(iii) Condition (iii) is equivalent with $\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon} \to 0$ needed in Lemma 6.2. Actually, $\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon}$ is of the same order as the square root of the expression in (iii). In the spirit of Definition 2.1 the estimate in Lemma 6.2 means that the handles are $\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon}$-*non-concentrating of order* 1 *for functions anti-symmetric nearby the handles* (see Subsection 6.1 for a precise definition).

(iv) The last Condition (iv) is equivalent with $\delta^\perp_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} \to 0$ needed in Proposition 4.6 (see also Figure 9). Again, $\delta^\perp_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}$ is of the same order as the square root of the expression in (iv). In the spirit of Definition 2.1 the second estimate in Proposition 4.6 means that the handles are $\delta^\perp_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}$-*non-concentrating of order* 2 *for harmonic functions without constant transversal part.*

We now need conditions on the distributions of the points, where the handles are attached (see also Figure 5):

3.10. Assumption (isometric subsets and uniform cover)**.**

(i) We assume that Ω^- and Ω^+ are open, isometric and that $\Omega^-_{r_1}$ and $\Omega^+_{r_1}$ are disjoint and still isometric, where

$$\Omega^\pm_{r_1} := \{\, x \in X \mid d(x, \Omega^\pm) < r_1 \,\}$$

denotes the r_1-neighbourhood, i.e. we assume that there exist an $r_1 \in (0, r_0)$ and an isometry

$$\varphi\colon \Omega^-_{r_1} \longrightarrow \Omega^+_{r_1} \qquad \text{such that} \qquad \varphi(\Omega^-) = \Omega^+.$$

We set $\Omega = \Omega^- \cup \Omega^+$ and $\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} = \Omega^-_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} \cup \Omega^+_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}$ for $\widetilde{\varepsilon} \in (0, r_1)$.

(ii) We assume that there is $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and for each $\varepsilon \in (0, r_0)$ there is $\eta_\varepsilon \in (2\varepsilon, r_0)$ and an ε-separated split set $I_\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon^- \cup I_\varepsilon^+$ with $I_\varepsilon^\pm \subset \Omega^\pm$ such that $I_\varepsilon^+ = \varphi(I_\varepsilon^-)$ and that I_ε has N-uniform η_ε-cover (cf. (2.1), again the dependence of η_ε on ε will be specified later).



FIGURE 5. *Left:* The manifold M_ε with handles of radius ε and length ℓ_ε; medium grey: Ω^+ (top) and Ω^- (bottom), together with its $\widetilde{\varepsilon}$-neighbourhood $\Omega^+_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}$ and $\Omega^+_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}$ in medium and dark grey, respectively.
Right: The space after identification: one can think of the limit space as a piece of paper where the parts Ω^+ (top) and Ω^- (bottom) are glued together. The dotted line in the right figure is used to illustrate the effect of the symmetrisation operator Sf in Figure 11 for the proof of Theorem 3.13.

(iii) Finally, we assume that there is a function $\widetilde{\cdot}\colon (0,r_1) \longrightarrow (0,1]$, $\varepsilon \mapsto \widetilde{\varepsilon}$, with

$$\widetilde{\varepsilon} \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\delta_{\text{antisym},\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}} \to 0$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$, i.e.,

$$\widetilde{\varepsilon} \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Big(\frac{\eta_\varepsilon^m}{\widetilde{\varepsilon}\varepsilon^{m-2}} \cdot \Big(\frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} + \Big[\log \frac{\eta_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big]_2\Big)\Big)^{1/2} \to 0 \qquad \text{as} \qquad \varepsilon \to 0,$$

such that

$$\overline{\Omega}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} \subset \bigcup_{p\in I_\varepsilon} B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p),$$

i.e., $(B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p))_{p\in I_\varepsilon}$, is a uniform locally finite cover of $\overline{\Omega}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}$.

The estimate on the convergence speed $\delta_{\text{antisym},\varepsilon}$ is defined in Lemma 6.2. A necessary condition for such a covering to exist is that $\widetilde{\varepsilon}/\eta_\varepsilon$ is bounded in $\varepsilon > 0$. If $\eta_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha r_0$ and $\widetilde{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^\beta r_1$ for some $r_1 \in (0,1)$, then we necessarily have $\beta \geq \alpha$. The case $\beta = \alpha$ can actually be achieved in the situation of Lemma 3.19 below.

Summarising, we have

$$B_\varepsilon := \dot{\bigcup_{p\in I_\varepsilon}} B_\varepsilon(p) \subset \Omega \subset \Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} \subset B_{\eta_\varepsilon} := \bigcup_{p\in I_\varepsilon} B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}{\eta_\varepsilon} \text{ bounded},$$

see Figure 6. We give examples satisfying Assumption 3.10 in Subsection 3.3

We suppose that $\partial\Omega = \partial\Omega^- \cup \partial\Omega^+$ admits a uniform tubular r_1-neighbourhood in the sense of [AP21, Assumption 6.9]:

3.11. Assumption (uniform tubular neighbourhood)**.**

(i) We assume that $Y = \partial\Omega$ is a smooth[1] submanifold with embedding $\iota\colon Y \hookrightarrow X$ and induced metric $h := \iota^* g$.

(ii) We assume that Y *admits a uniform tubular (r_1-)neighbourhood*, i.e., Y has a global outwards normal unit vector field $\vec{N}$ and that there is $r_1 > 0$ such that

$$\exp\colon Y \times (-r_1, r_1) \longrightarrow X, \qquad (y,t) \mapsto \exp_y(t\vec{N}(y)) \tag{3.4}$$

is a diffeomorphism.

The previous assumption is fulfilled if $\partial\Omega$ is compact.

Let now, as before, $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ be the quadratic form of the manifold M_ε with handles of radius $\varepsilon > 0$ and length $\ell_\varepsilon > 0$ joining $\partial B_\varepsilon(p)$ and $\partial B_\varepsilon(\bar{p})$ with $\bar{p} = \varphi(p)$ for each $p \in I_\varepsilon^-$ (see Definition 2.8).

[1]One can relax the smoothness assumption to the case of Lipschitz manifolds. To keep this presentation simple, we will not go into details here.



FIGURE 6. The covering of $\Omega^{\pm}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}$ with η_ε-cover number $N = 3$.

The limit quadratic form $\mathfrak{d}_0$ is defined via

$$\mathscr{H}_0 = \{\, f \in \mathsf{L}_2(X,g) \,|\, \Gamma f = 0 \,\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathscr{H}_0^1 = \{\, f \in \mathsf{H}^1(X,g) \,|\, \Gamma f = 0 \,\}, \tag{3.5}$$

where

$$\Gamma f := (f - f \circ \varphi)\restriction_{\Omega^-} \tag{3.6}$$

and $\mathfrak{d}_0(f) = \|df\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(X,g)}$ for $f \in \mathscr{H}_0^1$. Note that

$$\Gamma\colon \mathsf{L}_2(X,g) \longrightarrow \mathsf{L}_2(\Omega^-,g) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Gamma\colon \mathsf{H}^1(X,g) \longrightarrow \mathsf{H}^1(\Omega^-,g)$$

are both bounded maps, hence $\mathfrak{d}_0$ is a closed quadratic form. We call $\mathfrak{d}_0$ the *identifying* energy form.

3.12. Remark (the Laplacian on the limit manifold)**.** (A unitary equivalent version of) the associated operator Δ_0 acts on $f = (f_{\mathrm{int}}, f_{\mathrm{ext}}) \in \mathsf{H}^2(\Omega^-) \oplus \mathsf{H}^2(X \setminus \mathring{\Omega})$ with $f_{\mathrm{int}} := f\restriction_{\overline{\Omega^-}}$ and $f_{\mathrm{ext}} := f\restriction_{X\setminus\Omega}$ as $\Delta_0 f = (2\Delta f_{\mathrm{int}}, \Delta f_{\mathrm{ext}})$ with conditions

$$f_{\mathrm{int}} = f^-_{\mathrm{ext}} = f^+_{\mathrm{ext}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad 2\partial_{\mathrm{int}} f_{\mathrm{int}} = \partial^-_{\mathrm{ext}} f^-_{\mathrm{ext}} + \partial^+_{\mathrm{ext}} f^+_{\mathrm{ext}},$$

where $f^-_{\mathrm{ext}} := f_{\mathrm{ext}}\restriction_{\partial\Omega^-}$ and $f^+_{\mathrm{ext}} := (f_{\mathrm{ext}} \circ \varphi)\restriction_{\partial\Omega^-}$ and where ∂_{int} is the (outwards) normal derivative on Ω^- and $\partial^-_{\mathrm{ext}}$ (resp. $\partial^+_{\mathrm{ext}}$) the (inwards) normal derivative on $X \setminus \Omega$ near $\partial\Omega^-$ (resp. near $\partial\Omega^+$ taken back to $\partial\Omega^-$ with φ, i.e., $\partial^+_{\mathrm{ext}} f^+_{\mathrm{ext}} := \partial^-_{\mathrm{ext}}(f_{\mathrm{ext}} \circ \varphi)$). This condition resembles a so-called weighted "Kirchhoff" condition on a metric graph; here in a higher dimensional version.

The next main result is now as follows:

3.13. Theorem (adhering handles identifying parts of the manifold)**.** *Let X be a complete Riemannian manifold of dimension $m \geq 2$ with bounded geometry and harmonic radius $r_0 > 0$. Assume that the parameters ε, η_ε and ℓ_ε fulfil Assumption 3.8. Moreover, assume that Assumptions 3.10 and 3.11 on the isometric subsets $\Omega^{\pm}$ and a uniform tubular neighbourhood and cover exist. Then the energy form $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ defined in Definition 2.8 is δ_ε-quasi-unitary equivalent of order 2 with the identifying energy form $\mathfrak{d}_0$ defined above with partially isometric identification operators, where $\delta_\varepsilon \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ is given in* (6.4).

3.14. Corollary (adhering handles)**.** *Within the setting of Theorem 3.13, we assume that $\partial\Omega$ is compact, that the uniform cover distance is $\eta_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha r_0$, that the handle length fulfils $\ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\lambda$ and that Assumption 3.10 holds with $\widetilde{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^\alpha r_1$ for some $r_1 \in (0,1)$. If*

(0) $0 \leq \alpha < 1$,
(i) $\lambda > 0$,
(ii) $\lambda > m\alpha - (m-1)$,
(iii) *if* $\lambda \geq 1$ *then* $\alpha \geq \frac{m-2}{m-1}$, *if* $\lambda \leq 1$ *then* $\lambda > (m-1)(1-\alpha)$,
(iv) $\lambda < (m+1) - m\alpha$.



FIGURE 7. The range inside $B\widetilde{F}\widetilde{E}\widetilde{C}$ is the range covered by our adhering case Corollary 3.14 (dark grey). The parameter range covered by [Kh13, Thm. 2.6] is given by the (unbounded) polygon $ABCEF$ (lighter grey), see Remark 3.20.

Then the energy form $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ on the manifold M_ε with small handles is δ_ε-quasi-unitary equivalent of order 2 with the identifying energy form $\mathfrak{d}_0$ defined above with partially isometric identification operators.

3.15. Remarks (adhering handles: meaning of the conditions II)**.** We comment now on the conditions of Corollary 3.14:

(i) (0) and (i) are used as usual to ensure that the handle length shrinks to 0 and that $\delta_{\mathrm{ball},\varepsilon} \to 0$, see Remark 3.3 (i).

(ii) Moreover, from (0) and (ii) we conclude that $\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} \to 0$, needed for Assumption 3.8 (ii). This condition gives the line segment $B\widetilde{C}$ in Figure 7.

(iii) Moreover, (iii) and $\alpha < 1$ ensure that $\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon} \to 0$, this is needed for Assumption 3.8 (iii), and also $\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon}/\varepsilon^\alpha \to 0$, needed for Assumption 3.10 (iii). The condition with $\lambda \geq 1$ gives the line segment $\widetilde{E}\widetilde{F}$ in Figure 7, the other the line segment $\widetilde{E}\widetilde{C}$.

(iv) Finally, (iv), (iii) and $\alpha < 1$ ensure that $\delta^\perp_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} \to 0$ needed for Assumption 3.8 (iv). This gives the line segment $B\widetilde{F}$ in Figure 7.

3.3. Examples and further remarks

The fading case: graph-like manifolds.

3.16. Example (The case $\alpha = 0$: Graph-like manifolds, spectral gaps and eigenvalues in gaps)**.** Let (V, E) be an infinite graph of bounded degree and let M_v be an isometric copy of a compact Riemannian manifold (M, g) for each vertex $v \in V$. Let $X = \bigcup_{v\in V} M_v$. For each $v \in V$ let $I_v \subset M_v$ be an η-separated set with $\deg v$ elements (as the degree $\deg v$ is uniformly bounded, $\eta > 0$ can be chosen to be independent of $v \in V$). Let $I := \bigcup_{v\in V} I_v$. As each edge $e \in E$ is adjacent with two vertices, we have a natural splitting $I = I^- \cup I^+$, and I^- can be identified with E. Let now M_ε be the manifold with handles obtained from X by gluing handles of radius $\varepsilon > 0$ and length $\ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\lambda$ for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ as above. Here, the set of points $I = I_\varepsilon$ is independent of ε, hence we can choose $\eta_\varepsilon = r_0$.

The resulting manifold can be seen as a graph-like manifold obtained from the graph (V, E) by replacing each vertex by a copy M_v of M and each edge joining the vertices v and w by a thin short handle from M_v to M_w. Moreover, Corollary 3.2 applies for all $\lambda > 0$. The estimate on the convergence speed is better using Corollary 3.5 for $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ $(m = 2)$ and $\lambda \in (\alpha_m/2, 1 - \alpha_m)$ $(m \geq 3)$, see Figure 4 with $\alpha = 0$.

(i) **Spectral gaps:** The spectrum of X is the one of M but each eigenvalue now has infinite multiplicity. Moreover, the spectrum of M_ε converges to the spectrum of X in any compact interval $[0, \Lambda]$ (cf. Theorem C.4). In particular, we have constructed a Riemannian manifold M_ε such that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ there is ε_k ($\varepsilon_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$) such that $\sigma(M_{\varepsilon_k})$ has at least k spectral gaps.

(ii) **Eigenvalues in gaps:** If we change M_v at one vertex and put there another manifold N of the same dimension (call the resulting graph-like manifold $\widetilde{M_\varepsilon}$) the essential spectrum of M_ε and $\widetilde{M_\varepsilon}$ agree. This is due to the fact that the perturbation appears only on a compact set (see e.g. [P03b, Thm. 4.1]). If M and N have different spectra then in the limit, there must be discrete spectrum, i.e., eigenvalues of finite multiplicity outside the essential spectrum.

In particular, our results extends the results [P03a, P03b, LlP08] for (perturbed) periodic manifolds to general graph-like manifolds.

The adhering case: two identical copies. Let us first treat the situation, when $X = \Omega^- \cup \Omega^+$ consists only of two isometric copies Ω^+ and Ω^- of a given manifold. If $\Omega^\pm$ has boundary, one has to take care of the position of the points $I_\varepsilon^\pm$ in order to avoid to be too close to the boundary, see e.g. (3.7) for concrete example.

In this simpler situation, we can drop some of the assumptions of Theorem 3.13 and obtain better results. In particular, this situation is the one (with Ω^+ and Ω^- being subsets of $\mathbb{R}^m$) considered in [Kh13]. As there are no points outside Ω, we do not need Assumption 3.11. Moreover, from Assumption 3.10 we only need (ii) (as (i) is automatically fulfilled: Ω^+ and Ω^- are already isometric by assumption).

But most important, we can drop (iii) and just have to assume that $\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon} \to 0$. The result on adhering handles now can be formulated stronger (formally, by setting $\widetilde{\varepsilon} = 0$ in parts of the proof of Theorem 3.13). In particular, we do not need the assumption $\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon}/\sqrt{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} \to 0$:

3.17. Theorem (adhering handles identifying two copies). *Let $X = \Omega^- \cup \Omega^+$ consist of two isometric copies of a given manifold. Assume that the parameters ε, η_ε and ℓ_ε fulfil Assumption 3.8. Moreover, assume that Assumption 3.10 (ii) is fulfilled, i.e., that $I_\varepsilon^\pm \subset \Omega^\pm$ has an N-uniform η_ε-cover (N independent on ε). Then the energy form $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ defined in Definition 2.8 is δ_ε-quasi-unitary equivalent of order 2 with the identifying energy form $\mathfrak{d}_0$ defined above with partially isometric identification operators, where $\delta_\varepsilon = \mathrm{O}(\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon}) + \mathrm{O}(\delta_{\mathrm{ball},\varepsilon}) + \mathrm{O}(\delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon}) + \mathrm{O}(\delta^\perp_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}) \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.*

Proof. The main proof is as in the proof of Theorem 3.13 given in Subsection 6.2. We only indicate the differences: as $\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} \setminus \Omega = \emptyset$ here, we only have $(2C'_{\mathrm{nbhd}}\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon})^2$ times the norm terms in (6.3f). In particular, the first term in (6.4) with $\widetilde{\varepsilon}$ can be replaced by $\mathrm{O}(\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon})$. □

In terms of the concrete parameter dependence, we have:

3.18. Corollary (adhering handles: two identical copies). *Let $X = \Omega^- \cup \Omega^+$ consist of two isometric copies of a given manifold. Moreover, we assume that the uniform cover distance is $\eta_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\alpha r_0$, and that the handle length fulfils $\ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\lambda$. If*

(0) $0 \leq \alpha < 1$,
(i) $\lambda > 0$,
(ii) $\lambda > m\alpha - (m-1)$ *(this gives the line segment BC in Figure 8),*

(iii) *if* $\lambda \geq 1$ *then* $\alpha \geq \frac{m-2}{m}$ *(line segment* $E((m-2)/(m-1), \infty)$ *in Figure 8), if* $\lambda \leq 1$ *then* $\lambda > m - 1 - m\alpha$*) (line segment EC in Figure 8),*

(iv) $\lambda < (m+1) - m\alpha$ *(this gives the line segment* $\widetilde{F}B$ *in Figure 8).*

Then the energy form $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ *on the manifold* M_ε *with small handles is* δ_ε*-quasi-unitary equivalent of order* 2 *with the identifying energy form* $\mathfrak{d}_0$ *defined above with partially isometric identification operators.*

Adhering case: flat identified parts — concrete split sets. Let X be a Riemannian manifold (or a subset of $\mathbb{R}^m$ with Dirichlet or Neumann boundary condition at ∂X). Assume that $\Omega^\pm$ are two isometric (with isometry φ), flat, open and disjoint subsets of X, i.e., without loss of generality we consider $\Omega^\pm$ as subsets of $\mathbb{R}^m$. We assume that $\partial\Omega^+$ and $\partial\Omega^-$ have distance at least $2r_1 > 0$ and both admit a uniform exterior tubular r_1-neighbourhood. Here, we need to strengthen the assumption and assume that we also have a uniform *interior* tubular r_1-neighbourhood, i.e., the map exp in (3.4) is a diffeomorphism for $t \in (-r_1, r_1)$.

We now define the ε-separated split set and $\widetilde{\varepsilon}$ as follows:

$$I_\varepsilon^- := \{\, p \in a\eta_\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^m \mid B_\varepsilon(p) \subset \Omega^- \,\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \widetilde{\varepsilon} = \eta_\varepsilon/3; \tag{3.7}$$

and we set $I_\varepsilon^+ := \varphi(I_\varepsilon^-)$. Later, we fix $a = 1/(2\sqrt{m})$. We then have:

3.19. Lemma. *If* $\varepsilon/\eta_\varepsilon \to 0$ *as* $\varepsilon \to 0$ *and if* $\partial\Omega$ *admits a uniform exterior and interior uniform tubular* r_1*-neighbourhood with* $\eta_\varepsilon/3 \leq r_1$ *then* $\widetilde{\varepsilon} = \eta_\varepsilon/3$ *and* I_ε *as above fulfil Assumption 3.10.*

Proof. We have to show that I_ε has η_ε-cover number N and that $\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} \subset \bigcup_{p\in I_\varepsilon} B_{\eta_\varepsilon(p)}$.

To start with the first assertion, we have to bound the cardinality of

$$\{\, p \in I_\varepsilon \,|\, x \in B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p) \,\}.$$

for any $x \in \Omega$; it suffices to show this for $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$. As the maximal distance of a point x to the grid $a\eta_\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^m$ is $(\sqrt{m}/2)a\eta_\varepsilon$ it is enough to bound the cardinality of the set

$$\left\{\, p \in I_\varepsilon \,\middle|\, |q-p| \leq (1 + a\sqrt{m}/2)\eta_\varepsilon \,\right\}$$

for some $q \in a\eta_\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^m$; without loss of generality again consider $q = 0$. But the latter number is bounded by the points in a hypercube with side length $(2 + a\sqrt{m} + 1)$, hence the cover number $N = (2 + a\sqrt{m} + 1)^m = (7/2)^m$ will work.

For the second assertion, let $x \in \Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}$, then there is $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that $d(x, x_0) < \widetilde{\varepsilon} = \eta_\varepsilon/3$. As $\partial\Omega$ has a uniform *interior* tubular r_1-neighbourhood and $\eta_\varepsilon/3 \leq r_1$, we can assume that there is $x_1 \in \Omega$ such that $x_0 \in B_{\eta_\varepsilon/3}(x_1)$ and $B_{\eta_\varepsilon/3}(x_1) \subset \Omega$. Now $B_{\eta_\varepsilon/3}(x_1)$ contains at least one point $p \in I_\varepsilon$ if ε is small enough (note that $\varepsilon/\eta_\varepsilon \to 0$, and that $1/3 > a\sqrt{m}/2 = 1/4$). Altogether we have

$$d(p, x) \leq |p - x_1| + |x_1 - x_0| + d(x_0, x_1) < \frac{\eta_\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\eta_\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\eta_\varepsilon}{3} = \eta_\varepsilon. \qquad \square$$

Comparing the results with Khrabustovskyi's results.

3.20. Remark (Comparision with results by Khrabustovskyi [Kh13])**.** In [Kh13] Khrabustovskyi considers a special case: the manifold M_ε is obtained from two isometric copies Ω^- and Ω^+ of an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^m$ joint by handles glued at balls with *periodically* placed centres $I_\varepsilon \subset \eta_\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^m$. This is a combination of the previous two situations (two identical copies and flat identified parts).

Here is a tabular showing the correspondence of our parameters and the ones in [Kh13]:



FIGURE 8. The range inside $BFEC$ is the range covered by our simplified adhering case Corollary 3.18 (dark grey). Here, "simplified" means that X consists only of two isometric manifolds Ω^- and Ω^+. The parameter range covered by [Kh13, Thm. 2.6] is again inside the polygon $ABCEF$ (lighter grey).

quantity	this article	[Kh13]
handle radius	ε	$d^\varepsilon = \boldsymbol{d}\varepsilon^{\widetilde{\alpha}}$
handle radius exponent	1	$\widetilde{\alpha} = 1/\alpha$
uniform cover distance	$\eta_\varepsilon = r_0\varepsilon^\alpha$	ε
uniform cover distance exponent	$\alpha = 1/\widetilde{\alpha}$	1
handle length	$\ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\lambda$	$q^\varepsilon = \boldsymbol{q}\varepsilon^\beta$
handle length exponent	$\lambda = \beta/\widetilde{\alpha}$	$\beta = \lambda/\alpha$

Moreover, the parameters (α, λ) transform into $(\widetilde{\alpha}, \beta) = (1/\alpha, \lambda/\alpha)$ in [Kh13, Ex. 2.8]. We use the same labels as in [Kh13, Fig. 2] for the parameter points (in our notation) given by

$$A = (1, \infty), \qquad B = (1, 1), \qquad C = \Big(\frac{m-1}{m}, 0\Big),$$
$$D = (0, 0), \qquad E = \Big(\frac{m-2}{m}, 1\Big), \qquad F = \Big(\frac{m-2}{m}, \infty\Big).$$

Moreover, we need

$$\widetilde{C} = \Big(\frac{2(m-1)}{2m-1}, \frac{m-1}{2m-1}\Big), \qquad \widetilde{E} = \Big(\frac{m-2}{m-1}, 1\Big), \qquad \widetilde{F} = \Big(\frac{m-2}{m-1}, \frac{2m-1}{m-1}\Big),$$
$$F' = \Big(\frac{m-2}{m}, 3\Big)$$

for our results (see Figures 7 and 8).

(i) **Fading case:** In Theorem 2.6 of [Kh13], the limit Hilbert space is $\mathscr{H} = \mathsf{L}_2(X) = \mathsf{L}_2(\Omega^-) \oplus \mathsf{L}_2(\Omega^+)$ covering the unbounded polygon $F(0, \infty)DCEF$ corresponding to our fading case only covering the light grey area. Our results do not cover the infinite rectangle $EE'(\alpha_m, \infty)((m-2)/m, \infty)$ (dotted area) in Figure 4).

(ii) An interesting case with a coupled operator appears on the polygonal line segment CEF in Figure 8. In this case, the limit operator acts still on the two copies, but with a *coupling* between them ($V > 0$ in [Kh13, Thm. 2.6]).

(iii) **Adhering case:** [Kh13, Thm. 2.5] covers the open unbounded polygon $ABCEFA$ corresponding to our adhering case Theorem 3.17 (see also Figure 8).

The discrepancy with the optimal parameter range used in the more general result Theorem 3.13 lead to a worse parameter region right of $\widetilde{C}\widetilde{E}\widetilde{F}$ in Figure 7 (instead of the optimal CEF in Figure 8) is due to our more general result (we allow parts which are not identified, leading to the additional condition $(\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon}/\sqrt{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} \to 0)$. If we consider the simplified adhering case (similar to the one treated in [Kh13]), then we do not cover the parameter range given by the infinite polygon $ABF'F$ in Figure 8.

(iv) The (open) segment from C to B is the case $p \in (0, \infty)$ (in the notation of [Kh13]) corresponding to a homogenised problem with non-trivial shift in the spectrum.

Note that Khrabustovskyi actually shows a weaker result, namely only the convergence of the spectra, not a generalised norm resolvent convergence and convergence speed estimates, as we do here.

We do not know whether (generalised) norm resolvent convergence in the parameter regions not covered by our results can hold or not.

4. Estimates on harmonic functions on handles

In this section, we collect the estimates on the handles used in the proofs. The situation is the one described previously in Subsection 2.3 with the same notations. We need estimates of the harmonic extension onto the handles.

4.1. Definition (harmonic extension on the handle)**.** For $u \in \mathsf{H}^1(X_\varepsilon, g)$ we denote by $\Phi_\varepsilon u \in \mathsf{H}^1(C, g_{\mathrm{can}})$ the harmonic extension of u on the handles, i.e., $\Phi_\varepsilon u = h$ minimises $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon(U)$ among all functions $U = (u, h) \in \operatorname{dom} \mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$ for a given $u \in \mathsf{H}^1(X_\varepsilon, g)$.

The notation $\Phi_\varepsilon u$ is justified as the minimiser $\Phi_\varepsilon u = h = (h_p)_{p \in I_\varepsilon^-}$ is unique for $u \in \mathsf{H}^1(X_\varepsilon, g)$. Moreover, h_p fulfils

$$\Delta_{C_\varepsilon} h_p \coloneqq -\partial_1^2 h_p + \left(\frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\right)^2 \Delta_{\mathbb{S}} h_p = 0$$

and

$$h_p(0, \cdot) = \sqrt{\varepsilon^{m-1}\ell_\varepsilon} \cdot u_p(\varepsilon, \cdot) \qquad \text{and} \qquad h_p(1, \cdot) = \sqrt{\varepsilon^{m-1}\ell_\varepsilon} \cdot u_{\bar{p}}(\varepsilon, \cdot) \tag{4.1}$$

for all $p \in I_\varepsilon^-$, where ∂_1 acts on the first (longitudinal) variable and $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}}$ is the Laplacian on the sphere acting on the second variable of h_p.

Denote by $\mathrm{M} \coloneqq \sqrt{\sigma(\mathbb{S})}$ the values[2] $\mu \geq 0$ such that μ^2 is an eigenvalue of $\mathbb{S}$, and by $(\varphi_\mu)_{\mu \in \mathrm{M}}$ the corresponding orthonormal basis of eigenfunctions. Strictly speaking, M is a so-called *multiset* where an element μ appears in M multiple times according to the multiplicity of μ^2 in $\sigma(\mathbb{S})$.

A separation of variables ansatz gives us

$$h_p = \sum_{\mu \in \mathrm{M}} h_p^\mu \otimes \varphi_\mu, \quad \text{or} \quad h_p(s, \theta) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathrm{M}} h_p^\mu(s) \varphi_\mu(\theta)$$

almost everywhere, the convergence is a priori only in $\mathsf{L}_2(C_1)$ (recall that $C_1 \coloneqq [0,1] \times \mathbb{S}$). As $h_p \in \mathsf{H}^1(C_1)$ the trace $h_p(s, \cdot) \in \mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})$ is well-defined for $s \in [0, 1]$. In particular, we have

$$\langle h_p(s, \cdot), \varphi_\mu \rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} = h_p^\mu(s),$$

[2]Actually, we know the spectrum of $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ explicitly: namely, we have $\mathrm{M} = \{ \sqrt{k(k+m-2)} \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N}^* \cup \{0\} \}$ by [Sh01, Thm. III.22.1]. Nevertheless, the precise values of M are irrelevant; only in the proof of Lemma 4.3 we make use of the fact that the first non-zero eigenvalue of M fulfils $\mu_1 = \sqrt{m-1} \geq 1$ in order to simplify some estimates.

and the boundary conditions at $s=0$ and $s=1$ yield

$$\sqrt{\varepsilon^{m-1}\ell_\varepsilon}\langle f_p(\varepsilon,\cdot),\varphi_\mu\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} = \langle h_p(0,\cdot),\varphi_\mu\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} = h_p^\mu(0) =: a_p^\mu$$
$$\sqrt{\varepsilon^{m-1}\ell_\varepsilon}\langle f_{\bar p}(\varepsilon,\cdot),\varphi_\mu\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} = \langle h_p(1,\cdot),\varphi_\mu\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} = h_p^\mu(1) =: a_{\bar p}^\mu$$

for $p\in I_\varepsilon^-$ (note the bar on $\bar p$ in the second line). Here,

$$h_p^\mu(s) = \begin{cases} a_{\bar p}^\mu s + a_p^\mu(1-s), & \mu=0 \\ a_{\bar p}^\mu \dfrac{\sinh(\mu_\varepsilon s)}{\sinh\mu_\varepsilon} + a_p^\mu \dfrac{\sinh(\mu_\varepsilon(1-s))}{\sinh\mu_\varepsilon}, & \mu>0, \end{cases} \quad \text{with} \quad \mu_\varepsilon = \frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\cdot\mu,$$

for $p\in I_\varepsilon^-$. With the notation of the next lemma, we have

$$h_p^\mu = h^{\mu_\varepsilon}_{a_{\bar p}^\mu, a_p^\mu}.$$

We need estimates of the longitudinal contribution. Note that in the next lemma we use the fact that $\mathbb{S}=\mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ is connected (for $m\geq 2$), i.e., that $\mu=0$ is a *simple* eigenvalue.

4.2. Lemma. *Let $a_\pm\in\mathbb{C}$, $\mu\geq 0$ and $h^\mu = h^\mu_{a_+,a_-}\colon [0,1]\longrightarrow\mathbb{C}$ be the function given by*

$$h^\mu(s) = \begin{cases} a_+ s + a_-(1-s), & \mu=0, \\ a_+\dfrac{\sinh(s\mu)}{\sinh\mu} + a_-\dfrac{\sinh((1-s)\mu)}{\sinh\mu}, & \mu>0. \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$\|h^\mu\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2([0,1])} \leq \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{2}\big(|a_+|^2+|a_-|^2\big), & \mu=0, \\ \dfrac{2}{3\mu}\big(|a_+|^2+|a_-|^2\big), & \mu>0 \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$\|\partial_1 h^\mu\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2([0,1])} \leq \begin{cases} 2\big(|a_+|^2+|a_-|^2\big), & \mu=0, \\ (\mu+2)\big(|a_+|^2+|a_-|^2\big), & \mu>0 \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. We have

$$\|h^\mu\|^2 = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{3}\big(|a_+|^2+\operatorname{Re}(a_+a_-)+|a_-|^2\big) = \dfrac{1}{6}|a_++a_-|^2 + \dfrac{1}{6}\big(|a_+|^2+|a_-|^2\big), & \mu=0 \\ \dfrac{1}{\mu}\Big(\underbrace{\dfrac{\sinh(2\mu)-2\mu}{4\sinh^2\mu}}_{\leq 1/2}\big(|a_+|^2+|a_-|^2\big) + \underbrace{\dfrac{\mu\cosh\mu-\sinh\mu}{\sinh^2\mu}}_{\leq 1/3}\operatorname{Re}(a_+a_-)\Big), & \mu>0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\|\partial_1 h^\mu\|^2 = \begin{cases} |a_+-a_-|^2, & \mu=0 \\ \mu\Big(\underbrace{\dfrac{\sinh(2\mu)+2\mu}{4\sinh^2\mu}}_{\leq 1+1/\mu}\big(|a_+|^2+|a_-|^2\big) + \underbrace{\dfrac{\mu\cosh\mu+\sinh\mu}{\sinh^2\mu}}_{\leq 2/\mu}\operatorname{Re}(a_+a_-)\Big), & \mu>0. \end{cases}$$

The Cauchy-Young inequality gives the result in both cases. □

Let now $h^\bullet = (h_p^\bullet)_{p\in I_\varepsilon^-}$ and $h^\perp = (h_p^\perp)_{p\in I_\varepsilon^-}$ with

$$h_p^\bullet := h_p^0\otimes\varphi_0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad h_p^\perp = h_p - h_p^\bullet = \sum_{\mu\in\mathrm{M}\setminus\{0\}} h_p^\mu\otimes\varphi_\mu.$$

Note that the dependence of h_p and $h_p^\perp$ on ε is not explicitly mentioned in the notation.

4.3. Lemma. *We have*

$$\|h^\bullet\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} \le \frac{1}{2}\sum_{p\in I_\varepsilon}|a^0_p|^2, \tag{4.4a}$$

$$\|h^\perp\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} \le \frac{\varepsilon}{\ell_\varepsilon}\sum_{p\in I_\varepsilon}\sum_{\mu\in \mathrm{M}\setminus\{0\}}|a^\mu_p|^2, \tag{4.4b}$$

$$\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(h^\bullet) = \frac{1}{\ell^2_\varepsilon}\sum_{p\in I^-_\varepsilon}\big|a^0_{\bar p}-a^0_p\big|^2 \le \frac{2}{\ell^2_\varepsilon}\sum_{p\in I_\varepsilon}|a^0_p|^2, \tag{4.4c}$$

$$\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(h^\perp) \le \sum_{p\in I_\varepsilon}\sum_{\mu\in \mathrm{M}\setminus\{0\}}\Big(\frac{\mu+1}{\varepsilon\ell_\varepsilon}+\frac{2}{\ell^2_\varepsilon}\Big)|a^\mu_p|^2. \tag{4.4d}$$

Proof. The first estimate follows directly from (4.2), as well as the second, where we have to replace μ by $\ell_\varepsilon/\varepsilon\cdot\mu \ge \ell_\varepsilon/\varepsilon\cdot\mu_1$ provided $\mu\in \mathrm{M}\setminus\{0\}$. As the square root μ_1 of the smallest non-zero eigenvalue of the unscaled sphere $\mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ is $\mu_1=\sqrt{m-1}\ge 1$ ([Sh01, Thm. III.22.1]), we use the estimate $2/(3\mu_1)\le 1$.

The third estimate follows from (4.3) and the definition of $\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}$ in (2.4b) and the fourth estimate follows from

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon(p)}(h^\mu_p) &= \frac{1}{\ell^2_\varepsilon}\|\partial_1 h^\mu_p\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2([0,1])}+\frac{\mu}{\varepsilon^2}\|h^\mu_p\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2([0,1])}\\
&\le \Big(\frac{\mu_\varepsilon+2}{\ell^2_\varepsilon}+\frac{2\mu}{3\mu_\varepsilon\varepsilon^2}\Big)\big(|a^\mu_{\bar p}|^2+|a^\mu_p|^2\big) = \Big(\frac{\mu+2\varepsilon/\ell_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon\ell_\varepsilon}+\frac{2}{3\varepsilon\ell_\varepsilon}\Big)\big(|a^\mu_{\bar p}|^2+|a^\mu_p|^2\big)\\
&\le \Big(\frac{\mu+1}{\varepsilon\ell_\varepsilon}+\frac{2}{\ell^2_\varepsilon}\Big)\big(|a^\mu_{\bar p}|^2+|a^\mu_p|^2\big)\end{aligned}$$

for $p\in I^-_\varepsilon$ using again (4.2)–(4.3), $2/3<1$ and the definition $\mu_\varepsilon=(\ell_\varepsilon/\varepsilon)\cdot\mu$. □

For the rest of this section we assume that I_ε is ε-separated with η-cover number $N\in\mathbb{N}^*$. From Lemma 4.2, (4.1) and some other estimates we conclude:

4.4. Proposition. *Let $\varepsilon,\eta\in(0,r_0)$ such that $0<\varepsilon<\eta$ then we have*

$$\|\Phi^\bullet_\varepsilon u\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} \le \ell_\varepsilon C'_m(\varepsilon,\eta)^2\|u\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta\setminus B_\varepsilon,g)} \quad \textit{and}$$
$$\|\Phi^\perp_\varepsilon u\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} \le \varepsilon C'_m(\varepsilon,\eta)^2\|u\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta\setminus B_\varepsilon,g)}$$

for $u\in\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta\setminus B_\varepsilon)$, where

$$C'_m(\varepsilon,\eta) := N^{1/2}K^{(m+2)/4}C'^{\mathrm{eucl}}_m(\varepsilon,\eta),$$

and where $C'^{\mathrm{eucl}}_m(\varepsilon,\eta)$ is defined in (A.12).

Proof. We have $\|\Phi^\bullet u\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})}=\|h^\bullet\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})}\le(1/2)\sum_{p\in I^-_\varepsilon}|a^0_p|^2$ by (4.4a). Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}|a^0_p|^2 &\le \|h_p(0,\cdot)\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})}\\
&= \varepsilon^{m-1}\ell_\varepsilon\|u_p(\varepsilon,\cdot)\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} = \ell_\varepsilon\|u_p(\varepsilon,\cdot)\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\partial B_\varepsilon(p),\iota^*_\varepsilon g_{\mathrm{eucl}})} && \text{(by (4.1))}\\
&\le \ell_\varepsilon C'(\partial B_\varepsilon, B_\eta(p)\setminus B_\varepsilon(p))^2\|u_p\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta(p)\setminus B_\varepsilon(p),g_{\mathrm{eucl}})} && \text{(by (A.4))}\\
&\le \ell_\varepsilon K^{(m+2)/2}C'(\partial B_\varepsilon, B_\eta(p)\setminus B_\varepsilon(p))^2\|u_p\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta(p)\setminus B_\varepsilon(p),g)} && \text{(by Corollary B.6)}\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$C'(\partial B_\varepsilon, B_\eta(p)\setminus B_\varepsilon(p)) \le C'(\partial B_\varepsilon, B_\eta(p)) = C'^{\mathrm{eucl}}_m(\varepsilon,\eta)$$

by Lemma A.4 and (A.12). The same is true for $p\in I^+_\varepsilon$ and $h_p(0,\cdot)$ replaced by $h_p(1,\cdot)$. Summing over $p\in I_\varepsilon$ gives

$$\sum_{p\in I_\varepsilon}|a^0_p|^2 \le \ell_\varepsilon C'_m(\varepsilon,\eta)^2\|u\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta\setminus B_\varepsilon,g)}. \tag{4.5}$$

For the second estimate we have

$$\|\Phi^\perp u\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} = \|h^\perp\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\ell_\varepsilon} \sum_{\mu\in \mathrm{M}\setminus\{0\}} |a_p^\mu|^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\ell_\varepsilon} \|h_p(0,\cdot)\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})}$$

by (4.4b) for the first inequality. The remaining estimate follows from (4.5) and the arguments just mentioned. □

Combining both estimates we obtain:

4.5. Corollary. *Let $\varepsilon, \eta = \eta_\varepsilon \in (0, r_0)$ such that $0 < \varepsilon < \eta_\varepsilon$ then we have*

$$\|\Phi_\varepsilon u\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} \leq \delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} \|u\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta\setminus B_\varepsilon,g)}$$

for $u \in \mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta \setminus B_\varepsilon)$, where

$$\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} := \big((\ell_\varepsilon + \varepsilon)\big)^{1/2} C'_m(\varepsilon,\eta) = \Big(\Big(\frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} + 1\Big)\varepsilon\Big)^{1/2} C'_m(\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon)$$

Similarly, we have for the quadratic form (now estimating over the entire balls B_η):

4.6. Proposition. *Let $\varepsilon, \eta = \eta_\varepsilon \in (0, r_0)$ such that $0 < \varepsilon < \eta$ then we have*

$$\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi^\bullet_\varepsilon f) \leq (\delta^\bullet_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon})^2 \|f\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta,g)} \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi^\perp_\varepsilon f) \leq (\delta^\perp_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon})^2 \|f\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^2(B_\eta,g)}$$

for $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta)$ resp. $f \in \mathsf{H}^2(B_\eta)$, where

$$\delta^\bullet_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} := \big(2\ell_\varepsilon^{-1}\big)^{1/2} C'_m(\varepsilon,\eta) = \Big(\frac{2}{\varepsilon\ell_\varepsilon}\Big)^{1/2} \varepsilon^{1/2} C'_m(\varepsilon,\eta) \qquad \textit{and}$$

$$\delta^\perp_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} := \Big(2(m-1)^{1/2} K^{(m+2)/2}\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{\ell_\varepsilon} + 1\Big)\Big)^{1/2} C_m(\varepsilon,\eta)$$

Proof. From (4.4c) and (4.5) we conclude

$$\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi^\bullet_\varepsilon f) = \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(h^\bullet) \leq \frac{2}{\ell_\varepsilon^2} \sum_{p\in I_\varepsilon} |a_p^0|^2 \leq 2\ell_\varepsilon^{-1} C'_m(\varepsilon,\eta)^2 \|f\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta,g)}.$$

Moreover, from (4.4d) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi^\perp_\varepsilon f) = \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(h^\perp) &\leq \sum_{p\in I_\varepsilon} \sum_{\mu\in \mathrm{M}\setminus\{0\}} \Big(\frac{\mu+1}{\varepsilon\ell_\varepsilon} + \frac{2}{\ell_\varepsilon^2}\Big)|a_p^\mu|^2 \\
&= \sum_{p\in I_\varepsilon} \sum_{\mu\in \mathrm{M}\setminus\{0\}} \Big(\frac{1+1/\mu}{\varepsilon\ell_\varepsilon} + \frac{2}{\mu\ell_\varepsilon^2}\Big)\mu|a_p^\mu|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{p\in I_\varepsilon} 2\Big(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\ell_\varepsilon}\Big) \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon\ell_\varepsilon} \sum_{\mu\in \mathrm{M}\setminus\{0\}} \mu|a_p^\mu|^2
\end{aligned}$$

as $\mu \geq \mu_1 = \sqrt{m-1} \geq 1$ for $\mu \in \mathrm{M}\setminus\{0\}$ in the second inequality. In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\varepsilon\ell_\varepsilon} \sum_{\mu\in\mathrm{M}} \mu|a_p^\mu|^2 = \frac{1}{\varepsilon\ell_\varepsilon} \|\Delta_{\mathbb{S}}^{1/4} h_p(0,\cdot)\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} &= \varepsilon^{m-2} \|\Delta_{\mathbb{S}}^{1/4} f_p(\varepsilon,\cdot)\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} \\
&= \|\Delta_{\varepsilon\mathbb{S}}^{1/4} f_p(\varepsilon,\cdot)\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\partial B_\varepsilon(p),\iota_\varepsilon^* g_{\mathrm{eucl}})} \\
&\leq (m-1)^{1/2} \|df\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_\varepsilon(p),g_{\mathrm{eucl}})} \\
&\leq (m-1)^{1/2} K^{(m+2)/2} \|df\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_\varepsilon(p),g)}
\end{aligned}$$

for $p \in I_\varepsilon^-$, using the spectral decomposition of $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}}$ for the first, (4.1) for the second, the scaling behaviour for the third equality, Lemma A.14 for the second last and Corollary B.6 for the last step. A similar argument holds for $p \in I_\varepsilon^+$. Finally, we apply Propositions 2.2 and 2.5 and obtain

$$\|df\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_\varepsilon,g)} \leq C_m(\varepsilon,\eta) \|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^2(B_\eta,g)}.$$ □

4.7. Corollary. *Let $\varepsilon, \eta = \eta_\varepsilon \in (0, r_0)$ such that $0 < \varepsilon < \eta_\varepsilon/2$ then we have*

$$\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi_\varepsilon f) \leq (\delta'_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon})^2 \|f\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^2(B_\eta,g)}$$

for $f \in \mathsf{H}^2(B_\eta)$, where

$$\delta'_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} := \max\{\delta^\bullet_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}, \delta^\perp_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}\}$$

Proof. The claim follows from

$$\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi_\varepsilon f) = \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi^\bullet_\varepsilon f) + \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi^\perp_\varepsilon f)$$

and Proposition 4.6. □

4.8. Lemma. *We have*

$$\|h - \Phi_\varepsilon u\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} \leq \frac{\ell_\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2}\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(h) \leq \frac{\ell_\varepsilon^2}{\pi^2}\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon(U)$$

for all $U = (u, h) \in \operatorname{dom}\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$.

Proof. We have $h_0 := h - \Phi_\varepsilon u \in \mathring{\mathsf{H}}^1(C) = \{\, g \in \mathsf{H}^1(C) \mid g\restriction_{\partial C} = 0 \,\}$, i.e., h_0 fulfils Dirichlet conditions on ∂C. From the min-max principle we obtain $\lambda_1^{\mathrm{D}}\|h_0\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} \leq \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(h_0)$, where $\lambda_1^{\mathrm{D}} = \pi^2/\ell_\varepsilon^2$ is the smallest Dirichlet eigenvalue on C_ε. Moreover, we have

$$\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(h_0) \leq \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(h_0) + \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi_\varepsilon u) = \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(h)$$

and the result follows. □

4.9. Lemma. *We have*

$$\|h\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} \leq \delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon}\|U\|_{\mathscr{H}^1_\varepsilon}$$

for all $U = (u, h) \in \operatorname{dom}\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$, where

$$\delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon} := \frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{\pi} + \delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} = \frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{\pi} + \big((\ell_\varepsilon + \varepsilon)\big)^{1/2} C'_m(\varepsilon, \eta).$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\|h\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} &\leq \|h - \Phi_\varepsilon u\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} + \|\Phi_\varepsilon u\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} \\ &\leq \frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{\pi}\sqrt{\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(h)} + \delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}\|u\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(X_\varepsilon,g)} \leq \delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon}\|U\|_{\mathscr{H}^1_\varepsilon}\end{aligned}$$

using Lemma 4.8 and Corollary 4.5. □

4.10. Remark (Relation between and order of the estimates)**.** For completeness, we also define

$$\delta_{\mathrm{ball},\varepsilon} := C_m(\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) = N^{1/2}K^{(m+1)/2}C^{\mathrm{eucl}}_m(\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) = \mathrm{O}\Big(\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta_\varepsilon^m} + \varepsilon^2[-\log\varepsilon]_2\Big)^{1/2}\Big), \qquad (4.6)$$

the non-concentrating constant for a ball of radius ε inside a ball of radius ε_ε (see Proposition 2.5). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} &= \mathrm{O}\Big(\Big(\Big(\frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}+1\Big)\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta_\varepsilon^m}+\varepsilon^2[-\log\varepsilon]_2\Big)\Big)^{1/2}\Big),\\
\delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon} &= \mathrm{O}\Big(\ell_\varepsilon+\Big(\Big(\frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}+1\Big)\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta_\varepsilon^m}+\varepsilon^2[-\log\varepsilon]_2\Big)\Big)^{1/2}\Big),\\
\delta^\perp_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} &= \mathrm{O}\Big(\Big(\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{\ell_\varepsilon}+1\Big)\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta_\varepsilon^m}+\varepsilon^2[-\log\varepsilon]_2\Big)\Big)^{1/2}\Big),\\
\delta^\bullet_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} &= \mathrm{O}\Big(\Big(\frac{1}{\varepsilon\ell_\varepsilon}\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta_\varepsilon^m}+\varepsilon^2[-\log\varepsilon]_2\Big)\Big)^{1/2}\Big),\\
\delta'_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} &= \mathrm{O}\Big(\Big(\frac{1}{\varepsilon\ell_\varepsilon}\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta_\varepsilon^m}+\varepsilon^2[-\log\varepsilon]_2\Big)\Big)^{1/2}\Big),\\
\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon} &= \mathrm{O}\Big(\Big(\frac{\eta_\varepsilon^m}{\varepsilon^{m-2}}\Big(\frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}+\Big[\log\frac{\eta_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big]_2\Big)\Big)^{1/2}\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

(see Remark A.13 for the order of $\varepsilon C'_m(\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon)$ and $C_m(\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon)$; for the definition of $\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon}$, see also Lemma 6.2).

Note that $\ell_\varepsilon/\varepsilon$ can be seen as a sort of "resistance" along a handle, so handles with very slowly (longitudinally) shrinking length (compared to their radius) are somehow "punished" in $\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon}$; the ratio radius per uniform cover distance then has to compensate such handles in the fading case.

We have the following relations between the convergences:



In some sense, the energy of the transversally constant part of the harmonic extension on the handle given by $\delta^\bullet_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}$ gives the worst estimate (as well es the entire part of the harmonic extension given by $\delta'_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}$).

If we have $\eta_\varepsilon = r_0\varepsilon^\alpha$ for some $\alpha\in[0,1)$ and $\ell_\varepsilon=\varepsilon^\lambda$ for $\lambda>0$, then the estimates on the convergence speed have order

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{\mathrm{ball},\varepsilon} &= \mathrm{O}\big(\varepsilon^{\min\{m(1-\alpha),2\}/2}\big),\\
\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} &= \mathrm{O}\big(\varepsilon^{(\min\{\lambda-1,0\}+\min\{m(1-\alpha),2\})/2}\big),\\
\delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon} &= \mathrm{O}\big(\varepsilon^{(\min\{\lambda,\min\{\lambda-1,0\}+\min\{m(1-\alpha),2\}\})/2}\big),\\
\delta^\perp_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} &= \mathrm{O}\big(\varepsilon^{(\min\{1-\lambda,0\}+\min\{m(1-\alpha),2\})/2}\big),\\
\delta^\bullet_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} &= \mathrm{O}\big(\varepsilon^{(-\lambda-1+\min\{m(1-\alpha),2\})/2}\big),\\
\delta'_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} &= \mathrm{O}\big(\varepsilon^{-\lambda-1+\min\{m(1-\alpha),2\})/2}\big),\\
\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon} &= \mathrm{O}\big(\varepsilon^{-\lambda-1+\min\{m(1-\alpha),2\})/2}\big).
\end{aligned}$$

We illustrate the parameter range in the (α,λ)-plane in Figures 9–10, being slightly more precise than in the general convergence scheme above.



FIGURE 9. The range of the parameters α and λ for the various constants. Darkest grey: *Second left:* $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{(\lambda+1)/2})$, *middle:* $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{\lambda})$, *second right:* $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{(3-\lambda)/2})$, *right:* $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{(1-\lambda)/2})$. Second darkest grey: *Left, second left, middle and second right:* $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon)$. Second lightest grey: *Second left and middle:* $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{(\lambda+(m-1)-\alpha m)/2})$, *second right:* $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{1-\lambda+(1-\alpha)m)/2})$, *right:* $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{(-\lambda+(m-1)-\alpha m)/2})$. Lightest grey: *Left, second left, middle and second right:* $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{m(1-\alpha)/2})$.



FIGURE 10. The range of the parameters α and λ where $\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon}$ (appearing in Lemma 6.2) converges. The light grey (infinite) rectangle $ABEF$ is of order $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{(m\alpha-(m-2))/2})$; the dark grey polygon $C(1,0)BE$ is of order $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{(\lambda+m\alpha-(m-1))/2})$.

5. Proofs of the main theorems

5.1. Proof of Theorem 3.1 (fading handles I)

The goal is to define transplantation operators which satisfy the hypotheses of Definition C.1.

The spaces are

$$\mathscr{H} := \mathscr{H}_0 = \mathsf{L}_2(X, g), \qquad \widetilde{\mathscr{H}} := \mathscr{H}_\varepsilon = \mathsf{L}_2(X_\varepsilon, g) \oplus \mathsf{L}_2(C, g_{\mathrm{can}}) \cong \mathsf{L}_2(M_\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon),$$
$$\mathscr{H}^1 := \mathscr{H}^1_0 = \mathsf{H}^1(X, g), \qquad \widetilde{\mathscr{H}}^1 := \mathscr{H}^1_\varepsilon = \operatorname{dom} \mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon.$$

An element $U \in \mathscr{H}_\varepsilon$ is written $U = (u, h)$ with $u = U\restriction_{X_\varepsilon}$ and $h \in \mathsf{L}_2(C, g_{\mathrm{can}})$.

In this first approach use some the calculations already done in [AP21] for Dirichlet obstacles.

We define the transplantation operators as follows

$$\begin{aligned} J_\varepsilon &\colon \mathscr{H}_0 \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}_\varepsilon, & f &\mapsto (f\restriction_{X_\varepsilon}, 0),\\ J^1_\varepsilon &\colon \mathscr{H}^1_0 \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}^1_\varepsilon, & f &\mapsto (\chi_\varepsilon f, 0),\\ J'_\varepsilon &\colon \mathscr{H}_\varepsilon \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}_0, & U = (u,h) &\mapsto \bar{u},\\ J'^1_\varepsilon &\colon \mathscr{H}^1_\varepsilon \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}^1_0, & U = (u,h) &\mapsto E_\varepsilon u, \end{aligned}$$

where χ_ε is the cut-off function already defined in [AP21, Section 5.2], where $\bar{u}$ is the extension of $u \in \mathsf{L}_2(X_\varepsilon, g)$ by 0 onto $\mathsf{L}_2(B_\varepsilon, g)$, and where

$$E_\varepsilon \colon \mathsf{H}^1(X_\varepsilon, g) \longrightarrow \mathsf{H}^1(X, g) \tag{5.1}$$

is the harmonic extension operator with respect to the Euclidean metric $g_{\mathrm{eucl},p}$ near each ball $B_\varepsilon(p)$ (cf. (B.2)), i.e., $E_\varepsilon u$ is harmonic on B_ε (for $g_{\mathrm{eucl}.p}$). We have shown in [AP21, Prop. 4.6] that there is a constant $C_{\mathrm{ext}} \geq 1$ such that E_ε as operator in (5.1) is bounded by C_{ext} for all $\varepsilon \in (0, r_0)$.

Moreover, $\chi_\varepsilon \colon X \longrightarrow [0,1]$ is in $\mathsf{H}^1(X,g)$, has support in X_ε, it is 0 on B_ε and 1 outside $B_{\varepsilon^+} = \bigcup_{p \in I^+_\varepsilon} B_{\varepsilon^+}(p)$, and on $B_{\varepsilon^+} \setminus B_\varepsilon$, it is the harmonic extension, where $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon^+ < \eta_\varepsilon/4$. In particular, the support of $\mathbb{1}_X - \chi_\varepsilon$ is B_{ε^+}. This cut-off function has been used in [AP21, Thm. 5.6], where we have set $\varepsilon^+ \coloneqq (\zeta_\varepsilon \eta_\varepsilon)^{1/2}$. In the notation of [AP21, Thm. 5.6] and by our assumption, we have $\omega_\varepsilon \coloneqq \zeta_\varepsilon/\eta_\varepsilon \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. The complicated formula for ζ_ε comes from an application of a Sobolev embedding theorem, cf. [AP21, Lem. 5.4 and Prp. 5.5].

Let us now check the conditions of Definition C.1:

Proof of Theorem 3.1. First, we have $J'_\varepsilon = J^*_\varepsilon$ and $\|J_\varepsilon\| = \|J'_\varepsilon\| = 1$. Moreover, $J'_\varepsilon J_\varepsilon f = \mathbb{1}_{X_\varepsilon} f$ and hence $J_\varepsilon J'_\varepsilon J_\varepsilon f = (f\restriction_{X_\varepsilon}, 0) = J_\varepsilon f$, hence J_ε is a partial isometry. Second,

$$\|f - J'_\varepsilon J_\varepsilon f\|_{\mathscr{H}_0} = \|f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_\varepsilon, g)} \leq C_m(\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) \|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(X,g)}$$

for $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(X,g)$ by Proposition 2.5. In addition,

$$\|U - J_\varepsilon J'_\varepsilon U\|_{\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon} = \|h\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(C, g_{\mathrm{can}})} \leq \delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon} \|U\|_{\mathscr{H}^1_\varepsilon}$$

for $U \in \mathscr{H}^1_\varepsilon$ by Lemma 4.9. Next, we have

$$\|(J_\varepsilon - J^1_\varepsilon) f\|_{\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon} = \|(1 - \chi_\varepsilon) f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(X_\varepsilon, g)} \leq \|f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_{\varepsilon^+}, g)} \leq C_m(\varepsilon^+, \eta_\varepsilon) \|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(X,g)}$$

for $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(X,g)$ again by Proposition 2.5. Note that $\varepsilon^+ > \varepsilon$ and that $C_m(\cdot, \eta)$ is monotonely increasing, hence $C_m(\varepsilon^+, \eta_\varepsilon)$ dominates $C_m(\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon)$. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(J'_\varepsilon - J'^1_\varepsilon) U\|_{\mathscr{H}_0} = \|E_\varepsilon u\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_\varepsilon, g)} &\leq C_m(\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) \|E_\varepsilon u\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(X,g)} \\ &\leq C_{\mathrm{ext}} C_m(\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) \|U\|_{\mathscr{H}^1_\varepsilon} \end{aligned}$$

for $U = (u,h) \in \mathscr{H}^1_\varepsilon$ again by Proposition 2.5 and the ε-independent norm bound on the extension operator in (5.1).

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon(J^1_\varepsilon f, U) - \mathfrak{d}_0(f, J'^1_\varepsilon U) &= \int_{X_\varepsilon} \langle d(\chi_\varepsilon f), du \rangle \,\mathrm{d}g - \int_X \langle df, d(E_\varepsilon u) \rangle \,\mathrm{d}g \\ &= \int_{X_\varepsilon} \big\langle d\big((\chi_\varepsilon - 1) f\big), du \big\rangle \,\mathrm{d}g - \int_{B_\varepsilon} \langle df, d(E_\varepsilon u) \rangle \,\mathrm{d}g. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

For the second term in (5.2), the non-concentrating property Proposition 2.5 gives via Proposition 2.2 the estimate

$$\|df\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_\varepsilon, g)} \leq C_m(\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) \|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^2(X,g)} \leq C_{\mathrm{ell.reg}} C_m(\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) \|(\Delta_{(X,g)} + 1) f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(X,g)},$$

using also Proposition B.2. Moreover, we have

$$\|d(E_\varepsilon u)\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_\varepsilon, g)} \leq \|d(E_\varepsilon u)\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(X_\varepsilon, g)} \leq C_{\mathrm{ext}} \|U\|_{\mathscr{H}^1_\varepsilon}$$

For the first term in (5.2), we do the same calculus as in [AP21, Sec. 5.2 and Thm. 5.6] and obtain (with the same notation)

$$\begin{aligned}\|d((\chi_\varepsilon-1)f)\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_{\varepsilon^+},g)} &\le \|(\chi_\varepsilon-1)df)\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_{\varepsilon^+},g)} + \|fd\chi_\varepsilon\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_{\varepsilon^+},g)}\\ &\le (C_m(\varepsilon^+,\eta_\varepsilon)+\delta_\varepsilon^+)\|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^2(X,g)}\\ &\le C_{\mathrm{ell.reg}}(C_m(\varepsilon^+,\eta_\varepsilon)+\delta_\varepsilon^+)\|(\Delta_{(X,g)}+1)f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(X,g)},\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_\varepsilon^+ = \mathrm{O}(\omega_\varepsilon^{\gamma_m})$ with $\gamma_m = 1/(2(1-\alpha_m))$ $(m \ge 3)$, i.e., $\gamma_m = 1$ for $m \ge 5$, $\gamma_m \in (1/2,1)$ for $m=4$, $\gamma_m = 3/4$ for $m=3$; and we set $\gamma_m = 1/2$ for $m=2$. Note that $C_m(\varepsilon^+,\eta_\varepsilon) = \mathrm{O}(\omega_\varepsilon^{m/4} + \omega_\varepsilon^{1/2}\eta_\varepsilon[-\log(\omega_\varepsilon^{1/2}\eta_\varepsilon)]_2^{1/2})$, and as $\gamma_m \le m/4$, the dominant power of ω_ε is $\omega_\varepsilon^{\gamma_\varepsilon}$. As $\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} = \mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{(m-1-m\alpha_m)/2}\omega_\varepsilon^{m/2})$ for $m \ge 3$ (see (3.1), note that $\varepsilon/\omega_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{1-\alpha_m}\eta_\varepsilon \to 0$, so the first term in (3.1) is dominant) and $\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} = \mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{1/2}|\log\varepsilon|^{1/2}\omega_\varepsilon)$ for $m=2$, we conclude that $\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}$ is not dominant against δ_ε^+ and $C_m(\varepsilon^+,\eta_\varepsilon)$; only $\mathrm{O}(\ell_\varepsilon)$ remains from $\delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon}$ (see also Remark 4.10). In particular, the leading term is given by

$$\delta_\varepsilon = \mathrm{O}\big(\ell_\varepsilon + \omega_\varepsilon^{\gamma_m} + \omega_\varepsilon^{1/2}\eta_\varepsilon[-\log(\omega_\varepsilon^{1/2}\eta_\varepsilon)]_2^{1/2}\big). \tag{5.3}$$

and we have proven Theorem 3.1. □

Proof of Corollary 3.2. It remains to show the estimates on the convergence speed. We have $\omega_\varepsilon = \mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{\alpha_m-\alpha})$ and $\varepsilon^+ = \omega_\varepsilon^{1/2}\eta_\varepsilon = \mathrm{O}(\varepsilon^{(\alpha_m+\alpha)/2)})$, so that

$$\delta_\varepsilon = \mathrm{O}\big(\varepsilon^{\min\{\lambda,(\alpha_m-\alpha)\gamma_m,(\alpha_m+\alpha)/2\}}\big)$$

for $m \ge 3$ and $\omega_\varepsilon = |\log\varepsilon|^{-(1/2-\alpha)}$ for $m=2$. Note that $\ell_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\lambda$ is not dominant here. □

5.2. Proof of Theorem 3.4 (fading handles II)

We give here an alternative proof for fading handles, i.e., we avoid the complicated control result [AP21, Lemma 5.4] related to the use of a cut-off function χ_ε. Instead, we use the harmonic extension $\Phi_\varepsilon f$ onto the handles defined in Definition 4.1.

The transplantation operators are the same as in Subsection 5.1, except J_ε^1 which here is given by

$$J_\varepsilon^1 \colon \mathscr{H}_0^1 \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}_\varepsilon^1, \qquad f \mapsto (f\restriction_{X_\varepsilon}, \Phi_\varepsilon f)$$

where the harmonic extension $\Phi_\varepsilon f$ onto the handles is defined in Definition 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Again, J_ε is a partial isometry, and the estimates are the same as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, except for the following: We have

$$\|(J_\varepsilon - J_\varepsilon^1)f\|_{\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon} = \|\Phi_\varepsilon f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} \le \delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}\|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(X,g)}$$

for $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(X,g)$ by Corollary 4.5. Moreover,

$$\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon(J_\varepsilon^1 f, U) - \mathfrak{d}_0(f, J_\varepsilon'^1 U) = \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi_\varepsilon f, h) - \int_{B_\varepsilon}\langle df, d(E_\varepsilon u)\rangle\,\mathrm{d}g$$

for $f \in \mathscr{H}_0^1 = \mathsf{H}^1(X,g)$ and $U = (u,h) \in \mathscr{H}_\varepsilon^1 = \operatorname{dom}\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon$. The second term can be controlled as before with contribution $C_{\mathrm{ext}}C_{\mathrm{ell.reg}}C_m(\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon)$ to the final convergence speed. For the first term, note that

$$|\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi_\varepsilon f, h)| \le \sqrt{\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi_\varepsilon f)}\sqrt{\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(h)} \le \delta'_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}\|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^2(B_\eta\setminus B_\varepsilon,g)}\|U\|_{\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon^1}$$

for $f \in \mathsf{H}^2(X,g)$ by Corollary 4.7.

In particular, the entire estimate on the convergence speed is given by

$$\delta_\varepsilon := C_{\mathrm{ell.reg}}\max\Big\{\delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon}, \delta'_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} + C_{\mathrm{ext}}C_m(\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon)\Big\} \tag{5.4}$$

using also Proposition B.2 and $\delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon} \le \ell_\varepsilon/\pi + \delta'_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}$ (see Remark 4.10). The leading term in (5.4) is the second one, together with $\mathrm{O}(\ell_\varepsilon)$, see Remark 4.10. □

6. Adhering handles: some more tools and proof

6.1. A symmetrisation operator and related estimates

We prove here the possibility of making a bridge ("wormhole") between two isometric parts $\Omega^\pm$ of X by short *non-fading handles* (see also Figure 5).

Let $\chi_\varepsilon\colon X \longrightarrow [0,1]$ be the cut-off function defined already in [AP21, Eq. (6.6)] with

$$\chi_\varepsilon(x) = \widetilde{\chi}\Big(\frac{d(x,\Omega)}{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}\Big).$$

Here, $\widetilde{\chi}\colon \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow [0,1]$ is a smooth function with $\|\widetilde{\chi}'\|_\infty \le 2$, $\widetilde{\chi}(s) = 0$ for $s \le 0$ and $\widetilde{\chi}(s) = 1$ for $s \ge 1$ and $\widetilde{\chi}(s) \in (0,1)$ for $s \in (0,1)$. As a consequence,

$$\operatorname{supp}(1-\chi_\varepsilon) = \overline{\Omega}_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}.$$

We also need the so-called *symmetrisation* of a function $f \in \mathsf{L}_2(X,g)$: We define

$$S\colon \mathsf{L}_2(X,g) \longrightarrow \mathsf{L}_2(X,g), \qquad (Sf)(x) := \begin{cases} f(x), & x \in X \setminus \Omega_{r_1}, \\ \frac{1}{2}(f(x) + f(\varphi(x)), & x \in \Omega^-_{r_1}, \\ \frac{1}{2}(f(\varphi^{-1}(x)) + f(x), & x \in \Omega^+_{r_1}. \end{cases}$$

We call $f\colon X \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ *(S-)symmetric* if $Sf = f$ and *(S-)anti-symmetric* if $Sf = 0$. Note that $\Gamma Sf = 0$ if $f \in \mathsf{L}_2(X,g)$ or $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(X,g)$ (cf. (3.6)). We note the following simple



FIGURE 11. The symmetrisation operator S changing f on $\Omega_{r_1} = \Omega^+_{r_1} \cup \Omega^-_{r_1}$ (fat grey and black line, in grey: $\Omega = \Omega^+ \cup \Omega^-$); shaded in grey in the diagram. Here, the diagram is plotted for $x \in X$ along the dotted line of Figure 5. *full line:* the original function f. *Dotted:* The symmetrised function Sf (only changed on Ω_{r_1}). *Dashed:* The anti-symmetric part $f - Sf$ of f. *Dotted-dashed:* The function f copied from the other isometric set.

observation (as φ is an isometry from $\Omega^-_{r_1}$ onto $\Omega^+_{r_1}$ and $B^\pm_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{p \in I^\pm_\varepsilon} B_\varepsilon(p) \subset \Omega^\pm$ for the last assertion):

6.1. Lemma (properties of the symmetrisation)**.**

(i) *S is idempotent and self-adjoint (i.e., an orthogonal projection). In particular, Sf is symmetric and $f - Sf = \Gamma f/2$ is anti-symmetric on Ω_{r_1}; any $f \in \mathsf{L}_2(X,g)$ has the unique decomposition $f = Sf + (f - Sf)$ into its symmetric and anti-symmetric part.*

(ii) *If f_1 is symmetric and f_2 is anti-symmetric, then*

$$\langle f_1, f_2\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega',g)} = 0 \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \langle df_1, df_2\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega',g)} = 0$$

for any symmetric $\Omega' \subset \Omega_{r_1}$ (i.e., $\varphi(\Omega') = \Omega'$) and $f_1, f_2 \in \mathsf{L}_2(\Omega',g)$ resp. $f_1, f_2 \in \mathsf{H}^1(\Omega',g)$.

(iii) *We have*

$$\|Sf\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega',g)} \le \|f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega',g)}, \quad \|d(Sf)\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega',g)} \le \|df\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega',g)},$$
$$\|f - Sf\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega',g)} \le \|f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega',g)} \quad \textit{and} \quad \|d(f - Sf)\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega',g)} \le \|df\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega',g)}$$

for $f \in \mathsf{L}_2(\Omega', g)$ resp. $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(\Omega', g)$ and any open set $\Omega' \subset \Omega_{r_1}$.

(iv) *We have $SE_\varepsilon u = E_\varepsilon S\bar{u}$ for $u \in \mathsf{H}^1(X_\varepsilon, g)$.*



FIGURE 12. The identification operators J'_ε and J'^1_ε and its ingredients: $\bar{u}$ (full line) is the extension by 0 onto B_ε; $SE_\varepsilon u$ (dotted and thick line) is the symmetrisation of the harmonic extension of u and $(1-\chi_\varepsilon)SE_\varepsilon u$ (dashed) is the smoothed function symmetric on Ω using the cut-off function $1-\chi_\varepsilon$ with support in $\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}$.

Before proving Theorem 3.13, we need some more lemmas:

First, we need an estimate on anti-symmetric functions. The parameter range where $\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon} \to 0$ is shown in Figure 10.

6.2. Lemma (estimate on anti-symmetric functions)**.** *We have*

$$\|u - Su\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_{\eta_\varepsilon} \setminus B_\varepsilon)} \le \delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon} \|U\|_{\mathscr{H}^1_\varepsilon}$$

for $U = (u, h) \in \mathscr{H}^1_\varepsilon$, where

$$\delta^2_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon} \coloneqq \frac{NK^{m/2}}{m} \cdot \frac{\eta_\varepsilon^m}{\varepsilon^{m-2}} \cdot \max\Big\{\frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}, 4\Big[\log\frac{\eta_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big]_2\Big\}. \tag{6.1}$$

Proof. Let $p \in I^-_\varepsilon$ and (ε, θ) be the polar coordinates of $x \in \partial B_\varepsilon(p)$.Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}(u - S\bar{u})_p(\varepsilon,\theta) = (u - S\bar{u})(x) &= \frac{1}{2}\big(u(x) - u(\varphi(x)\big) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\big(u_p(\varepsilon,\theta) - u_{\bar{p}}(\varepsilon,\theta)\big) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon^{m-1}\ell_\varepsilon)^{-1/2}(h_p(1,\theta) - h_p(0,\theta)) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon^{m-1}\ell_\varepsilon)^{-1/2}\int_0^1 \partial_1 h_p(s,\theta)\,\mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned}$$

due to the coupling condition (2.4a) for the third equality. In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{m-1}} |(u - S\bar{u})_p(\varepsilon,\theta)|^2\,\mathrm{d}\theta &\le \frac{1}{4\varepsilon^{m-1}\ell_\varepsilon}\int_0^1\int_{\mathbb{S}^{m-1}} |\partial_1 h_p(s,\theta)|^2\,\mathrm{d}\theta\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le \frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{4\varepsilon^{m-1}}\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon(p)}(h_p)\end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

due to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (2.4b).

As $(u - S\bar{u})(\cdot, \theta)$ is weakly differentiable on $\Omega_{\eta_\varepsilon} \subset \Omega_{r_1}$, we have for $r \in [\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon)$

$$(u - S\bar{u})_p(r, \theta) = (u - S\bar{u})_p(\varepsilon, \theta) + \int_\varepsilon^r \partial_1 (u - S\bar{u})_p(s, \theta)\, \mathrm{d}s$$

Using the Cauchy-Young inequality and Fubini we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p)\setminus B_\varepsilon(p)} |u - S\bar{u}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}g_{\mathrm{eucl}} &= \int_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{m-1}} |(u - S\bar{u})_p(r, \theta)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\theta\, r^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}r \\ &\le 2\int_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{m-1}} |(u - S\bar{u})_p(\varepsilon, \theta)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\theta\, r^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}r \\ &\qquad + 2\int_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{m-1}} \Big| \int_\varepsilon^r \partial_1 (u - S\bar{u})_p(s, \theta)\,\mathrm{d}s \Big|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\theta\, r^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}r.\end{aligned}$$

For the first term in the last estimate, we use (6.2) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}2\int_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{m-1}} |(u - S\bar{u})_p(\varepsilon, \theta)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\theta\, r^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}r &= \frac{2}{m}\big(\eta_\varepsilon^m - \varepsilon^m\big) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{m-1}} |(u - S\bar{u})_p(\varepsilon, \theta)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\theta \\ &\le \frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{2m\varepsilon^{m-1}}\big(\eta_\varepsilon^m - \varepsilon^m\big)\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon(p)}(h_p) \\ &\le \frac{\ell_\varepsilon}{2m} \cdot \frac{\eta_\varepsilon^m}{\varepsilon^{m-1}} \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon(p)}(h_p).\end{aligned}$$

Using Corollary B.6 on the annulus $B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p) \setminus B_\varepsilon(p)$ (hence the factor $K^{m/2}$), summing over $p \in I_\varepsilon = I_\varepsilon^- \cup I_\varepsilon^+$ (hence the factor 2) and using that I_ε has η_ε-cover number N (hence the factor N), we obtain the first term in the maximum in (6.1).

For the second term, we use again Cauchy-Schwarz and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{m-1}} \Big| \int_\varepsilon^r \partial_1 (u - S\bar{u})_p(s, \theta)\,\mathrm{d}s \Big|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\theta\, r^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}r \\ &\qquad \le \int_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon} \int_\varepsilon^r s^{1-m}\,\mathrm{d}s\, r^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}r \cdot \int_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{m-1}} |\partial_1 (u - S\bar{u})_p(s, \theta)|^2 s^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}\theta\end{aligned}$$

(this calculation gives also the techniques for a proof "à la main" of [AP21, Proposition 6.7]). The last integral can be estimated by

$$K^{m/2} \|\partial_1 (u - S\bar{u})\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p)\setminus B_\varepsilon(p))} \le 2K^{m/2}\big(\|du\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(p)\setminus B_\varepsilon(p))} + \|du\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_{\eta_\varepsilon}(\bar{p})\setminus B_\varepsilon(\bar{p}))}\big)$$

using Corollary B.6 on an annulus (hence the factor $K^{m/2}$). Moreover, for the first integral, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon} \int_\varepsilon^r s^{1-m}\,\mathrm{d}s r^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}r &= \int_\varepsilon^{\eta_\varepsilon} (h_m(r) - h_m(\varepsilon)) r^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}r \\ &= \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{m-2}\Big(\dfrac{1}{m} \cdot \Big(\dfrac{\eta_\varepsilon^m}{\varepsilon^{m-2}} - \varepsilon^2\Big) - \dfrac{1}{2} \cdot (\eta_\varepsilon^2 - \varepsilon^2)\Big), & m \ge 3 \\ \dfrac{\eta_\varepsilon^2}{2}\Big(\log\Big(\dfrac{\eta_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big) - \dfrac{1}{2}\Big) + \dfrac{1}{4}\varepsilon^2, & m = 2 \end{cases} \\ &\le \frac{1}{m}\Big[\log \frac{\eta_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}\Big]_2 \frac{\eta_\varepsilon^m}{\varepsilon^{m-2}},\end{aligned}$$

where $h_m(s) = s^{2-m}/(2-m)$ for $m \ge 3$ and $h_2(s) = \log s$, provided $\varepsilon \le \eta_\varepsilon/2$. We conclude using that I_ε has η_ε-cover number N. □

As in [AP21, Lem. A.3] we conclude from Assumption 3.11 the following estimate:

6.3. Lemma (general estimate on tubular neighbourhood)**.** *There is a constant C_{nbhd} depending only on r_0 and $\partial\Omega$ such that*

$$\|f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}\setminus\Omega)} \le C_{\mathrm{nbhd}} \sqrt{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} \|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(\Omega_{r_1}\setminus\Omega)}$$

for $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(\Omega_{r_1} \setminus \Omega)$.

Proof. A proof is indicated in [AP21, Lemma A.3] using the almost product structure of the tubular neighbourhood $\Omega_{r_1} \setminus \Omega$ as in the proof of the previous lemma. □

In the sense of Definition 2.1, $(\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} \setminus \Omega, \Omega_{r_1} \setminus \Omega)$ is $C_{\mathrm{nbhd}}\sqrt{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}$-non-concentrating, and hence we can also apply Proposition 2.2. The estimate in Lemma 6.3 cannot be improved: if $\partial\Omega$ is compact and f has constant value 1, then $\|f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}\setminus\Omega)} = \sqrt{\mathrm{vol}(\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} \setminus \Omega)}$ and this term is of order $\sqrt{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}$.

6.2. Proof of Theorem 3.13 (adhering handles)

We now define the following transplantation operators

$$\begin{aligned} J_\varepsilon &\colon \mathscr{H}_0 \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}_\varepsilon, & f &\mapsto (f\restriction_{X_\varepsilon}, 0),\\ J_\varepsilon^1 &\colon \mathscr{H}_0^1 \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}_\varepsilon^1, & f &\mapsto (f\restriction_{X_\varepsilon}, \Phi_\varepsilon f)\\ J_\varepsilon' &\colon \mathscr{H}_\varepsilon \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}_0, & U = (u,h) &\mapsto \mathbb{1}_{X\setminus\Omega} u + \mathbb{1}_\Omega S\bar{u},\\ J_\varepsilon'^1 &\colon \mathscr{H}_\varepsilon^1 \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}_0^1, & U = (u,h) &\mapsto \chi_\varepsilon u + (1-\chi_\varepsilon) S E_\varepsilon u \end{aligned}$$

(see (3.5) for the definition of $\mathscr{H}_0$ and $\mathscr{H}_0^1$), where[3] (as before) $\bar{u}$ is the extension of $u \in \mathsf{L}_2(X_\varepsilon, g)$ onto $\mathsf{L}_2(X, g)$ by 0, and $E_\varepsilon u$ is the harmonic extension, cf. (5.1). Note that $J_\varepsilon' U \in \mathscr{H}_0$ and $J_\varepsilon'^1 U \in \mathscr{H}_0^1$ as $J_\varepsilon' U\restriction_\Omega = S\bar{u}\restriction_\Omega$ and similarly $J_\varepsilon'^1 U\restriction_\Omega = S E_\varepsilon u\restriction_\Omega$ are both symmetric on Ω (see also Figure 12). Moreover, $(1-\chi_\varepsilon)SE_\varepsilon u \in \mathsf{H}^1(X,g)$ as $1-\chi_\varepsilon$ is smooth and 0, where $S\bar{u}$ has a jump, namely at $\partial\Omega_{r_1}$.

Let us now prove Theorem 3.13 by checking the conditions of Definition C.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.13. Let $f \in \mathscr{H}_0^1$ and $U = (u,h) \in \mathscr{H}_\varepsilon^1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle J_\varepsilon f, U\rangle_{\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon} &= \langle f, u\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(X\setminus\Omega,g)} + \langle Sf, u\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega\setminus B_\varepsilon,g)}\\ &= \langle f, u\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(X\setminus\Omega,g)} + \langle f, Su\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega\setminus B_\varepsilon,g)}\\ &= \langle f, u\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(X\setminus\Omega,g)} + \langle f, S\bar{u}\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega,g)}\\ &= \langle f, J_\varepsilon' U\rangle_{\mathscr{H}_0} \end{aligned}$$

as $Sf = f$ on Ω for the first equation, the selfadjointness of S for the second equation and that $\bar{u} = 0$ on B_ε for the third. In particular, $J_\varepsilon' = J_\varepsilon^*$ and one easily sees $\|J_\varepsilon\| = \|J_\varepsilon'\| = 1$. Moreover, we have

$$f - J_\varepsilon' J_\varepsilon f = f - \mathbb{1}_{X\setminus\Omega} f - \mathbb{1}_{\Omega\setminus B_\varepsilon} Sf = f - \mathbb{1}_{X_\varepsilon} f = \mathbb{1}_{B_\varepsilon} f$$

as $Sf = f$ and therefore $J_\varepsilon f - J_\varepsilon J_\varepsilon' J_\varepsilon f = 0$, i.e., $J_\varepsilon = J_\varepsilon J_\varepsilon^* J_\varepsilon$ and J_ε is a partial isometry; and

$$\|f - J_\varepsilon' J_\varepsilon f\|_{\mathscr{H}_0} = \|f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_\varepsilon,g)} \le C_m(\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon)\|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_{\eta_\varepsilon},g)}. \tag{6.3a}$$

We also have $U - J_\varepsilon J_\varepsilon' U = (\mathbb{1}_{\Omega\setminus B_\varepsilon}(u - Su), h)$ for $U = (u,h) \in \mathscr{H}_\varepsilon^1$, and therefore

$$\|U - J_\varepsilon J_\varepsilon' U\|_{\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon} \le \big(\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon}^2 + \delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon}^2\big)^{1/2}\|U\|_{\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon^1} \le \big(\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon} + \delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon}\big)\|U\|_{\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon^1} \tag{6.3b}$$

applying Lemma 6.2 for the first component (note that $\Omega\setminus B_\varepsilon \subset B_{\eta_\varepsilon}\setminus B_\varepsilon$) and Lemma 4.9 for the second component. Moreover,

$$\|(J_\varepsilon^1 - J_\varepsilon)f\|_{\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon} = \|\Phi_\varepsilon f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(C,g_{\mathrm{can}})} \le \delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}\|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_{\eta_\varepsilon}\setminus B_\varepsilon,g)} \tag{6.3c}$$

by Corollary 4.5. Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(J_\varepsilon'^1 - J_\varepsilon')U\|_{\mathscr{H}_0}^2 &= \|(1-\chi_\varepsilon)(u-Su)\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}\setminus\Omega,g)}^2 + \|E_\varepsilon u\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_\varepsilon,g)}^2\\ &\le \|u - Su\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_{\eta_\varepsilon}\setminus B_\varepsilon,g)}^2 + C_m(\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon)^2\|E_\varepsilon u\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_{\eta_\varepsilon},g)}^2\\ &\le \big(\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon}^2 + C_m(\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon)^2 C_{\mathrm{ext}}^2\big)\|U\|_{\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon^1}^2\\ &\le \big(\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon} + C_m(\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon)C_{\mathrm{ext}}\big)^2\|U\|_{\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon^1}^2 \end{aligned} \tag{6.3d}$$

[3] We write a bit pedantic $S\bar{u}$ as S needs a function defined on X, and not only on X_ε.

using again $\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} \setminus \Omega \subset B_{\eta_\varepsilon} \setminus B_\varepsilon$ and Proposition 2.5 for the first estimate, and Lemma 6.2 and (5.1) for the second.

Finally, for the quadratic forms, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon(J_\varepsilon^1 f, U) - \mathfrak{d}_0(f, J_\varepsilon'^1 U) &= \int_{X_\varepsilon} \big\langle df, d\big((1-\chi_\varepsilon)(u - S\bar{u})\big)\big\rangle \,\mathrm{d}g + \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi_\varepsilon f, h) \\ &\qquad - \int_{B_\varepsilon} \langle df, d(E_\varepsilon S\bar{u})\rangle \,\mathrm{d}g \\ &= \int_{\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}\setminus\Omega} \big\langle df, d\big((1-\chi_\varepsilon)(u - S\bar{u})\big)\big\rangle \,\mathrm{d}g + \mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi_\varepsilon^\perp f, h) \\ &\qquad - \int_{B_\varepsilon} \langle df, d(E_\varepsilon S\bar{u})\rangle \,\mathrm{d}g \end{aligned} \tag{6.3e}$$

using $E_\varepsilon u\restriction_{X_\varepsilon} = u$ and Lemma 6.1 (iv) for the first equality. For the second equality, note that $\operatorname{supp}(1-\chi_\varepsilon) = \Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}$. Moreover, χ_ε is symmetric and f symmetric (but only) on Ω, and hence $(1-\chi_\varepsilon)(u - S\bar{u})$ is anti-symmetric, and the integral over $\Omega' = \Omega \setminus B_\varepsilon$ vanishes according to Lemma 6.1 (ii). Finally, for the second term note that $\Phi_\varepsilon f = \Phi_\varepsilon^\bullet f + \Phi_\varepsilon^\perp f$ and $\Phi_\varepsilon^\bullet f$ is constant on the handles as f is symmetric, hence $\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi_\varepsilon^\bullet f, h) = 0$.

For the first summand in (6.3e) we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\int_{\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}\setminus\Omega} \big\langle df, d\big((1-\chi_\varepsilon)(u - S\bar{u})\big)\big\rangle \,\mathrm{d}g\Big|^2 \\ &\qquad \le 2\int_{\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}\setminus\Omega} |df|^2 \,\mathrm{d}g \cdot \Big(\frac{2}{\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2}\|u - S\bar{u}\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}\setminus\Omega,g)} + \|d(u - S\bar{u})\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\Omega_{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}\setminus\Omega,g)}\Big) \\ &\qquad \le 2(C_{\mathrm{nbhd}})^2\bigg(\frac{2\delta^2_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon}}{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} + \widetilde{\varepsilon}\bigg)\|f\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^2(\Omega_{r_0}\setminus\Omega,g)}\|U\|^2_{\mathscr{H}^1}\end{aligned} \tag{6.3f}$$

using Lemma 6.3 together with Proposition 2.2 for the first factor, and Lemma 6.2 resp. $\|d(u - S\bar{u})\| \le \|du\| \le \|U\|_{\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon^1}$ from Lemma 6.1 (iii) for the second.

To control the second summand in (6.3e) we apply Proposition 4.6, i.e., we have

$$\big|\mathfrak{d}_{C_\varepsilon}(\Phi_\varepsilon^\perp f, h)\big| \le \delta^\perp_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}\|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^2(X,g)}\|U\|_{\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon^1}. \tag{6.3g}$$

For the third summand in (6.3e), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_{B_\varepsilon} \langle df, d(E_\varepsilon S\bar{u})\rangle \,\mathrm{d}g\Big| &\le C_{\mathrm{ext}}\|df\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_\varepsilon,g)}\|u\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(X_\varepsilon,g)} \\ &\le C_{\mathrm{ext}}C_m(\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon)\|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^2(B_{\eta_\varepsilon},g)}\|u\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(X_\varepsilon,g)}\end{aligned} \tag{6.3h}$$

using the uniform bound on the extension operator (5.1) and Propositions 2.5 and 2.2. Finally, we pass to the graph norm

$$\|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^2(B_{\eta_\varepsilon},g)} \le C_{\mathrm{ell.reg}}\|(\Delta_0 + 1)f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(X,g)} \tag{6.3i}$$

using Proposition B.2, where Δ_0 is the operator associated with $\mathfrak{d}_0$. Note that $\operatorname{dom}\Delta_0$ is a subset of the domain of the entire Laplacian on X, hence Proposition B.2 can also be applied in this situation.

In summary, from (6.3a)–(6.3d) and (6.3f)–(6.3i) we conclude that Definition C.1 can be satisfied with

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\varepsilon = \max\Big\{&C_m(\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon), \delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon} + \delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon}, \delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon}, \delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon} + C_{\mathrm{ext}}C_m(\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon), \\ &C_{\mathrm{ell.reg}}\bigg(\Big(\sqrt{2}C_{\mathrm{nbhd}}\bigg(\frac{2\delta^2_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon}}{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} + \widetilde{\varepsilon}\bigg)^{1/2} + \delta^\perp_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} + C_{\mathrm{ext}}C_m(\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon)\Big)\bigg)\Big\} \\ = \mathrm{O}\Big(&\frac{\delta_{\mathrm{antisym},\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}} + \sqrt{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}\Big) + \mathrm{O}\Big(C_m(\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon)\Big) + \mathrm{O}(\delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon}) + \mathrm{O}(\delta^\perp_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon})\end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

using $\delta_{\mathrm{harm},\varepsilon} \le \delta_{\mathrm{handle},\varepsilon}$. □

Appendix A. Some estimates on Euclidean balls, annuli and spheres

We prove here the non-concentrating property needed in Proposition 2.5 for pairs of Euclidean balls in dependence of their radii. We actually calculate the optimal constant. Some results follow from the abstract theory of Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps and boundary pairs (see e.g. [P16]). For the convenience of the reader, we give proofs without referring to the abstract theory. Note that a simple scaling argument as in Lemma A.14 does only lead to the worse estimate (2.3), see Remark 2.6.

For $r > 0$, denote by B_r the open ball around 0 in $\mathbb{R}^m$, together with the Euclidean metric g_{eucl}. For short, we also write B_r for the Riemannian manifold (B_r, g_{eucl}), and similarly for other subsets of $\mathbb{R}^m$. Moreover, denote by $\iota_r \colon \partial B_r \hookrightarrow B_r$ the natural embedding, and by $\iota_r^* g_{\mathrm{eucl}}$ the induced metric on ∂B_r: the standard metric on a sphere of radius $r > 0$. We denote by ∂B_r also the Riemannian manifold $(\partial B_r, \iota_r^* g_{\mathrm{eucl}})$, i.e., the standard $(m-1)$-dimensional sphere of radius $r > 0$.

For the non-concentrating property Definition 2.1, we actually need the estimate

$$\|f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_\varepsilon)} \leq C(B_\varepsilon, B_\eta) \|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta)} \tag{A.1}$$

for all $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta)$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \eta$. Here, the optimal constant is

$$C(A, B) := \sup_{f \in \mathsf{H}^1(B)} \frac{\|f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(A)}}{\|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(B)}} \tag{A.2}$$

for reasonable subsets A, B of a Riemannian manifold with $A \subset B$.

The aim of this section is to give an asymptotic expansion of the optimal constant of the non-concentrating property for $A = B_\varepsilon$ and $B = B_\eta$. For a comment on the previous result of [AP21, Lem. 3.10], we refer to Remark 2.6.

We also need the Sobolev trace estimate

$$\|f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(Y)} \leq C'(Y, X) \|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(X)} \tag{A.3}$$

for all $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(X)$, where $Y \subset X$ is a hypersurface (with its natural measure) in a Riemannian manifold (X, g). The optimal constant is here

$$C'(Y, X) := \sup_{f \in \mathsf{H}^1(X)} Q'(u; Y, X) \quad \text{with} \quad Q'(u; Y, X) := \frac{\|u\restriction_Y\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(Y)}}{\|u\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(X)}}. \tag{A.4}$$

From [P16, Thm. 2.7 (ii)] we know that $C'(Y, X)^2 = 1/\inf \sigma(\Lambda_{Y,X})$, where $\Lambda_{Y,X}$ is the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator (at the spectral value -1) on X with boundary space Y and with Neumann boundary conditions on $\partial X \setminus Y$ (if not empty), i.e., $\Lambda_{Y,X}\varphi = \mathrm{d_n}\widetilde{u}$ for a suitable function $\varphi \colon Y \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, where $\mathrm{d_n}\widetilde{u}$ is the normal (outwards) derivative[4] of $\widetilde{u}$ on Y and $\widetilde{u} \in \mathsf{H}^1(X)$ is the weak solution of $(\Delta + 1)\widetilde{u}$ with $\widetilde{u}\restriction_Y = \varphi$ and $\mathrm{d_n}\widetilde{u} = 0$ on $\partial X \setminus Y$ (also called the *harmonic extension (at the spectral value -1)*), i.e.,

$$\forall v \in \mathsf{H}^1(X), v\restriction_Y = 0 \colon \ \langle \widetilde{u}, v \rangle_{\mathsf{H}^1(X)} = \int_X \big(\langle d\widetilde{u}, dv \rangle + \widetilde{u}\overline{v} \big) \, \mathrm{d}g = 0. \tag{A.5}$$

The following relation between the optimal constants for balls holds:

A.1. Lemma. *We have*

$$C(B_\varepsilon, B_\eta)^2 = \int_0^\varepsilon C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta)^2 \, \mathrm{d}r.$$

[4] If Y lies on both sides of X, then we take the sum of the two normal outwards derivatives of each side.

Proof. Using $\|f\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_\varepsilon)} = \int_0^\varepsilon \|f\restriction_{\partial B_r}\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\partial B_r)}\,\mathrm{d}r$ we obtain

$$C(B_\varepsilon, B_\eta)^2 = \sup_{f\in\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta)} \int_0^\varepsilon \frac{\|f\restriction_{\partial B_r}\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\partial B_r)}}{\|f\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta)}}\,\mathrm{d}r = \int_0^\varepsilon \Big(\sup_{f\in\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta)} \frac{\|f\restriction_{\partial B_r}\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\partial B_r)}}{\|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta)}}\Big)^2\,\mathrm{d}r,$$

where the interchange of the supremum and the integral is allowed to the monotonicity of the integral, the square function on positive numbers and the monotone convergence theorem. □

A.2. Lemma (estimate on spherical shells against an annulus)**.** *We have*

$$C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta \setminus B_r)^2 = -\frac{1}{f'_{0,r,\eta}(r)}, \tag{A.6}$$

where $f = f_{0,r,\eta}$ is the solution of

$$-\frac{1}{s^{m-1}}\big(s^{m-1}f'(s)\big)' + f(s) = 0 \tag{A.7}$$

on $r \le s \le \eta$ with boundary conditions $f(r) = 1$ and $f'(\eta) = 0$.

Proof. We have seen above that the optimal constant $C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta \setminus B_r)^2$ is given by the inverse of the infimum of $\sigma(\Lambda_{\partial B_r, B_\eta\setminus B_r})$. Moreover, this infimum is given by the radially symmetric part, i.e., by $-f'(r)$. For convenience of the reader, we give a proof of (A.6) here:

The inequality "$\ge$" is easily seen by calculating $Q'_m(\widetilde{f}; r, \eta) := Q'(\widetilde{f}; \partial B_r, B_\eta \setminus B_r)$ for $\widetilde{f}(s,\theta) = f(s)$ in polar coordinates $(s,\theta) \in (r,\eta)\times\mathbb{S}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widetilde{f}\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta\setminus B_r)} &= \omega'_m \int_r^\eta \Big((f'(s))^2 + (f(s))^2 s^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}s \\
&= \omega'_m \int_r^\eta \Big(-\frac{1}{s^{m-1}}\big(s^{m-1}f'(s)\big)' + f(s)\Big) f(s) s^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}s + \omega'_m \Big[f'(s)f(s)s^{m-1}\Big]_r^\eta \\
&= -\omega'_m r^{m-1} f'(r),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\omega'_m = \operatorname{vol}_{m-1}\mathbb{S}$, as f fulfils the differential equation (A.7), $f'(\eta) = 0$ and $f(r) = 1$. Moreover, $\|\widetilde{f}\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\partial B_r)} = \omega'_m r^{m-1}$, hence we have the desired inequality by definition of the supremum.

For "$\le$" we argue as follows: First, we can calculate the supremum in two steps as

$$C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta \setminus B_r) = \sup_{\varphi\in\mathscr{G}^{1/2},\, u\in\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta\setminus B_r)\atop u\restriction_{\partial B_r}=\varphi} \sup Q'_m(u; r, \eta),$$

where $\mathscr{G}^{1/2} = \{\, u\restriction_{\partial B_r} \mid u \in \mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta \setminus B_r)\,\}$ and $Q'_m(u; r, \eta) = Q(u; \partial B_r, B_\eta \setminus B_r)$. Now, the second supremum is maximised for the (unique) harmonic extension $\widetilde{u}$ (at the spectral value -1) with boundary data φ (see (A.5) with $X = B_\eta \setminus B_r$ and $Y = \partial B_r$). Then $v = u - \widetilde{u}$ fulfils $v\restriction_{\partial B_r} = 0$, hence v and $\widetilde{u}$ are orthogonal in $\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta \setminus B_r)$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta\setminus B_r)} = \|\widetilde{u} + v\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta\setminus B_r)} &= \|\widetilde{u}\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta\setminus B_r)} + \|v\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta\setminus B_r)} \\
&\ge \|\widetilde{u}\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta\setminus B_r)}.
\end{aligned}$$

As $\widetilde{u}\restriction_{\partial B_r} = u\restriction_{\partial B_r}$, we then have $Q'_m(u, r, \eta) \le Q'_m(\widetilde{u}, r, \eta)$, hence

$$C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta \setminus B_r) \le \sup_{\varphi\in\mathscr{G}^{1/2}} Q'_m(\widetilde{u}, r, \eta) = \sup_{\varphi\in\mathscr{G}^{1/2}} \frac{\|\varphi\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\partial B_r)}}{\|S\varphi\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta\setminus B_r)}},$$

where $S\varphi := \widetilde{u}$.

Now, $\|S\varphi\|^2_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_\eta\setminus B_r)}$ is the (non-negative) quadratic form of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator Λ (at -1), hence we look at the infimum of the spectrum of this operator.

A separation of variables ansatz (decomposing $\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S}) = \bigoplus_{\mu\in \mathrm{M}} \mathbb{C}\varphi_\mu$, where φ_μ are the eigenvectors of $\mathbb{S}$ and M is a multiset , i.e., it counts multiplicities) gives

$$\Lambda = \bigoplus_{\mu\in \mathrm{M}} \Lambda_\mu, \tag{A.8a}$$

and Λ_μ is the multiplication operator with a non-negative real number. By partial integration as before, it can be seen that its value is

$$-f'(r) = \int_r^\eta \Big(|f'(s)|^2 + \frac{\mu}{s^2}|f(s)|^2 + |f(s)|^2\Big) s^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}s, \tag{A.8b}$$

where $f = f_{\mu,r,\eta}$ is the unique solution of

$$-\frac{1}{s^{m-1}}\big(s^{m-1}f'(s)\big)' + \Big(\frac{\mu}{s^2}+1\Big)f(s) = 0, \quad f(r) = 1, \quad f'(\eta) = 0. \tag{A.8c}$$

As $-f'_{0,r,\eta}(r) \le -f'_{\mu,r,\eta}$ for any $\mu \in \mathrm{M}$ by (A.8b), we see that the radially symmetric part $f_{0,r,\eta} = f_{r,\eta}$ ($\mu = 0$) actually gives the infimum of the spectrum of Λ. □

Similarly, we see:

A.3. Lemma (estimate on spherical shells against a ball)**.** *We have*

$$C'(\partial B_r, B_r)^2 = \frac{1}{g'_r(r)}, \tag{A.9}$$

where $g = g_r$ is the solution of the ODE (A.7) *on $0 < s \le r$ with boundary conditions*

$$g(r) = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \int_0^r (|g(s)|^2 + |g'(s)|^2) s^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}s < \infty \tag{A.10}$$

(the latter is a condition at 0).

Finally, we calculate the optimal constant needed in Lemma A.1

A.4. Lemma (estimate on spherical shells in a larger ball)**.** *We have*

$$C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta)^2 = \big(-f_{0,r,\eta}(r) + g'_r(r)\big)^{-1} = \Big(\frac{1}{C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta \setminus B_r)^2} + \frac{1}{C'(\partial B_r, B_r)^2}\Big)^{-1}, \tag{A.11}$$

where $f_{0,r,\eta}$ and g_r are the solutions of Lemma A.2 and Lemma A.3.

A.5. Remark. Here, we consider ∂B_r as "boundary" of B_η. Using again the theory of boundary pairs (as in [P16]) one can see that the optimal constant is again given by

$$C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta)^2 = \frac{1}{\inf \sigma(\Lambda_{\partial B_r, B_\eta})},$$

where $\Lambda_{\partial_r B, B_\eta}$ is the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator (always at the spectral value -1) of the coupled problem $B_\eta = B_r \cup (B_\eta \setminus B_r)$. It can be seen (see e.g. [P16, Prp. 5.3]) that

$$\Lambda_{\partial B_r, B_\eta} = \Lambda_{\partial B_r, B_r} + \Lambda_{\partial B_r, B_\eta \setminus B_r},$$

where $\Lambda_{\partial B_r, B_r}$ is the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator of the ball of radius r and boundary ∂B_r and $\Lambda_{\partial B_r, B_\eta\setminus B_r}$ is the operator Λ in (A.8a) in the proof of Lemma A.2. We have

$$\inf \sigma(\Lambda_{\partial B_r, B_\eta}) = \inf \sigma(\Lambda_{\partial B_r, B_r}) + \inf \sigma(\Lambda_{\partial B_r, B_\eta\setminus B_r}) = g'_r(r) - f'_{0,r,\eta}(r)$$

given both by the radially symmetric part (argument as in the proof of Lemma A.2).

We now calculate the asymptotic expansion of the optimal constant:

A.6. Proposition. *We have*

$$C'^{\mathrm{eucl}}_m(r,\eta)^2 := C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta)^2 = \frac{m r^{m-1}}{\eta^m} + h_m(r) + R'_m(r,\eta), \tag{A.12}$$

where γ is Euler's constant and $0.115 < \log 2 - \gamma < 0.116$,

$$h_m(r) := \begin{cases} (\log 2 - \gamma - \log r) r, & m = 2, \\ \dfrac{r}{m-2}, & m \ge 3. \end{cases} \tag{A.13}$$

Moreover, there are constants $c'_m > 0$ and $\eta_m \in (0,1]$ depending only on m such that

$$|R'_m(r,\eta)| \le c'_m\Big(\frac{r^{m-1}}{\eta^m}\cdot[-\log\eta]_2\eta^2 + r^2\Big)$$

holds for all $0 < r < \eta < \eta_m$. Finally, the function $C'^{\mathrm{eucl}}_m(\cdot,\eta)$ is monotonely increasing for all such η.

We prove the proposition in several lemmas.

A.7. Lemma. *We have*

$$C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta \setminus B_r)^2 = \frac{I_\nu(r)K_{\nu+1}(\eta) + K_\nu(r)I_{\nu+1}(\eta)}{K_{\nu+1}(r)I_{\nu+1}(\eta) - I_{\nu+1}(r)K_{\nu+1}(\eta)}, \quad \text{where} \quad \nu = \frac{m-2}{2}$$

and where I_ν resp. K_ν are the modified Bessel functions of first resp. second kind.

Proof. In order to calculate the solution $f = f_{0,r,\eta}$ of the ODE (A.7), note that f is a linear combination of

$$\varphi_\nu(s) = s^{-\nu}I_\nu(s) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \psi_\nu(s) = s^{-\nu}K_\nu(s); \tag{A.14}$$

this can be seen using

$$\varphi'_\nu(s) = s^{-\nu}I_{\nu+1}(s), \qquad \psi'_\nu(s) = -s^{-\nu}K_{\nu+1}(s), \tag{A.15a}$$

$$(s^\nu I_\nu(s))' = s^\nu I_{\nu-1}(s), \qquad (s^\nu K_\nu(s))' = -s^\nu K_{\nu-1}(s) \tag{A.15b}$$

(see e.g. [AS64, 9.6.27–28]). A straightforward calculation using the boundary conditions give

$$f'_{r,\eta}(r) = \frac{\varphi'_\nu(r)\psi'_\nu(\eta) - \psi'_\nu(r)\varphi'_\nu(\eta)}{\varphi_\nu(r)\psi'_\nu(\eta) - \psi_\nu(r)\varphi'_\nu(\eta)} = \frac{-I_{\nu+1}(r)K_{\nu+1}(\eta) + K_{\nu+1}(r)I_{\nu+1}(\eta)}{-I_\nu(r)K_{\nu+1}(\eta) - K_\nu(r)I_{\nu+1}(\eta)}.$$

The expression for $C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta \setminus B_r)$ in terms of modified Bessel functions follows again from (A.15a). □

A.8. Lemma. *We have*

$$C'(\partial B_r, B_r)^2 = \frac{I_\nu(r)}{I_{\nu+1}(r)}.$$

Proof. The solution $g = g_r$ is again a linear combination of φ_ν and ψ_ν (see (A.14)). But only φ_ν fulfils the integrability condition in (A.10), so together with the first condition $g_r(r) = 1$ we obtain

$$g_r(s) = \frac{\varphi_\nu(s)}{\varphi_\nu(r)}, \qquad \text{hence} \qquad g'_r(r) = \frac{\varphi'_\nu(r)}{\varphi_\nu(r)} = \frac{I_{\nu+1}(r)}{I_\nu(r)},$$

where the latter equality follows as before by (A.15a)). □

A.9. Lemma. *We have*

$$C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta)^2 = \frac{\dfrac{IK^+_\nu(r)}{IK_{\nu+1}(\eta)} + KK^+_\nu(r)}{1 + \dfrac{IK_{\nu+1}(r)}{IK_\nu(r)}}, \tag{A.16}$$

where

$$IK_\nu(r) := \frac{I_\nu(r)}{K_\nu(r)}, \quad IK^+_\nu(r) := \frac{I_\nu(r)}{K_{\nu+1}(r)} \quad \text{and} \quad KK^+_\nu(r) = \frac{K_\nu(r)}{K_{\nu+1}(r)}$$

Proof. We first rewrite the expression for $C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta \setminus B_r)$ of Lemma A.7 in terms of the above defined functions as

$$C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta \setminus B_r)^2 = \frac{\dfrac{IK_\nu^+(r)}{IK_{\nu+1}(\eta)} + KK_\nu^+(r)}{1 - \dfrac{IK_{\nu+1}(r)}{IK_{\nu+1}(\eta)}}.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta)^{-2} &= C'(\partial B_r, B_\eta \setminus B_r)^{-2} + C'(\partial B_r, B_r)^{-2} \\ &= \frac{1 - \dfrac{IK_{\nu+1}(r)}{IK_{\nu+1}(\eta)} + \dfrac{I_{\nu+1}(r)}{I_\nu(r)}\Big(\dfrac{IK_\nu^+(r)}{IK_{\nu+1}(\eta)} + KK_\nu^+(r)\Big)}{\dfrac{IK_\nu^+(r)}{IK_{\nu+1}(\eta)} + KK_\nu^+(r)} \\ &= \frac{1 + \dfrac{IK_{\nu+1}(r)}{IK_\nu(r)}}{\dfrac{IK_\nu^+(r)}{IK_{\nu+1}(\eta)} + KK_\nu^+(r)} \end{aligned}$$

as

$$\frac{I_{\nu+1}(r)}{I_\nu(r)} \cdot IK_\nu^+(r) = IK_{\nu+1}(r) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{I_{\nu+1}(r)}{I_\nu(r)} \cdot KK_\nu^+(r) = \frac{IK_{\nu+1}(r)}{IK_\nu(r)}. \qquad \square$$

A.10. Lemma. *There are constants $c_{k,m}$ ($k = 1, 2, 3, 4$) and $a_{m-1}, b_m > 0$ such that for all $0 < r < \eta < 1$, we have:*

$$|IK_\nu^+(r) - a_{m-1} r^{m-1}| \le c_{1,m} r^{m-1} \cdot r^2 [-\log r]_2$$

and

$$|IK_{\nu+1}(r) - b_m r^m| \le c_{2,m} r^m \cdot r^2 [-\log r]_2,$$

where the term $[\dots]_2$ appears only if $m = 2$; in this case we restrict to $r \le \mathrm{e}^{-1/2}$ in order to keep $r^2(-\log r)$ monotonely increasing. We also have $a_{m-1}/b_m = m$. Moreover,

$$|KK_\nu^+(r) - h_m(r)| \le c_{3,m} r^2$$

and

$$0 \le \frac{IK_{\nu+1}(r)}{IK_\nu(r)} \quad \text{and} \quad \Big|\frac{IK_{\nu+1}(r)}{IK_\nu(r)} - \frac{r h_m(r)}{2}\Big| \le c_{4,m} r^3. \tag{A.17}$$

Moreover, IK_ν^+, IK_ν and KK_ν^+ are monotonely increasing.

Proof. The claims can be seen using a symbolic computation system. For the monotonicity, we only give a formal proof for KK_ν^+: We have

$$KK_\nu^+(r) = \frac{K_\nu(r)}{K_{\nu+1}(r)} = \frac{\int_0^\infty \mathrm{e}^{-r\cosh t} \cosh(\nu t)\,\mathrm{d}t}{\int_0^\infty \mathrm{e}^{-r\cosh t} \cosh((\nu+1)t)\,\mathrm{d}t}.$$

We use [Qi22, Lem. 9]: if $t \mapsto \partial_r W(t,r)/W(t,r)$ and $t \mapsto U(t)/V(t)$ are monotonely decreasing on $[0,\infty)$ then $t \mapsto \int_0^\infty U(t)W(t,r)\,\mathrm{d}t / \int_0^\infty V(t)W(t,r)\,\mathrm{d}t$ is monotonely increasing; we apply it with $U(t) = \cosh(\nu t)$, $V(t) = \cosh((\nu+1)t)$ and $W(t,r) = \mathrm{e}^{-r\cosh t}$; note that $\partial_r W(t,r)/W(t,r) = -\cosh t$ in decreasing and $(U/V)'(t) = -t\sinh t/\cosh((\nu+1)t)^2 \le 0$ for $t \in [0,\infty)$. $\square$

A.11. Corollary. *There is $c_{5,m} > 0$ and $\eta_m \in (0,1)$ depending only on m such that*

$$\Big|\frac{IK_\nu^+(r)}{IK_{\nu+1}(\eta)} - \frac{m r^{m-1}}{\eta^m}\Big| \le \frac{r^{m-1}}{\eta^m} \cdot c_{5,m} \eta^2 [-\log \eta]_2$$

for $0 < \eta < \eta_m$.

Proof. We have

$$\Big|\frac{a+u}{b+v}-\frac{a}{b}\Big| \le \frac{a}{b}\cdot 2\Big(\frac{|u|}{a}+\frac{|v|}{b}\Big)$$

provided $a,b>0$ and $|v|<b/2$. Applying this estimate with $a=a_{m-1}r^{m-1}$ and $b=b_m\eta^m$, we conclude from Lemma A.10 that

$$\Big|\frac{IK_\nu^+(r)}{IK_{\nu+1}(\eta)}-\frac{mr^{m-1}}{\eta^m}\Big| \le \frac{mr^{m-1}}{\eta^m}\cdot 2\big(c_{1,m}r^2[-\log r]_2+c_{2,m}\eta^2[-\log\eta]_2\big)$$

provided $|c_{2,m}\eta^2[-\log\eta]_2|<b_m/2$; the latter condition is fulfilled for some $\eta<\eta_m$ and η_m small enough. If $m=2$, we also have to ensure that $\eta_m\le \mathrm{e}^{-1/2}$ in order that $r\mapsto r^2(-\log r)$ is monotonely increasing. The estimate is therefore fulfilled with $c_{5,m}=2m(c_{1,m}+c_{2,m})$. □

Proof of Proposition A.6. The proof follows now from Lemma A.4, and Lemmata A.9–A.11 with $c'_m=\max\{c_{5,m}c_{3,m}\}$. Note that we estimate the denominator of (A.16) by 1 from above using (A.17). We do not formally prove the monotonicity, as we only need it for the leading terms. Nevertheless, function plots of the expression in Lemma A.9 suggest that $C'_m(\cdot,\eta)$ is monotonely increasing. □

As a consequence, we have:

A.12. Corollary (estimate on small balls). *Let ε and η be positive real numbers such that $0<\varepsilon<\eta$. Then the optimal constant in (2.3) can be estimated by*

$$C_m^{\mathrm{eucl}}(\varepsilon,\eta)^2 = C(B_\varepsilon,B_\eta)^2 = \frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta^m}+H_m(\varepsilon)+R_m(r,\varepsilon), \tag{A.18}$$

where

$$H_m(\varepsilon):=\int_0^\varepsilon h_m(r)\,\mathrm{d}r = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\varepsilon^2}{2}(2+\log 2-\gamma-\log\varepsilon), & m=2,\\ = \dfrac{\varepsilon^2}{2(m-2)}, & m\ge 3.\end{cases}$$

Moreover, we have depending only on m such that

$$|R_m(\varepsilon,\eta)| \le c'_m\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta^m}\cdot\eta^2[-\log\eta]_2+\frac{\varepsilon^3}{3}\Big)$$

for all $0<r<\eta<\eta_m$, where $c'_m,\eta'_m>0$ are the constants from Proposition A.6. Finally, the function $C_m(\cdot,\eta)$ is monotonely increasing for all such η.

Proof. The claims follow from Proposition A.6 and Lemma A.1. The monotonicity of $C_m(\cdot,\eta)$ is clear from the integral formula and the fact that the integrand $C'_m(\cdot,\eta)$ is non-negative. □

A.13. Remark. Note that

$$C_m^{\mathrm{eucl}}(\varepsilon,\eta)=\mathrm{O}\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^m}{\eta^m}+[-\log\varepsilon]_2\varepsilon^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big) \text{ and } C_m'^{\mathrm{eucl}}(\varepsilon,\eta)=\mathrm{O}\Big(\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^{m-1}}{\eta^m}+[-\log\varepsilon]_2\varepsilon\Big)^{1/2}\Big),$$

hence $C_m^{\mathrm{eucl}}(\varepsilon,\eta)$ and $\varepsilon^{1/2}C_m'^{\mathrm{eucl}}(\varepsilon,\eta)$ are of same order. The manifold constants $C_m(\varepsilon,\eta)$ and $C'_m(\varepsilon,\eta)$ are also of the same order as they additionally contain only a constant $K\ge 1$ describing the deviation of the ball on the manifold from the Euclidean one, see Proposition 2.5 and Proposition B.3, and the cover number N, see (2.1).

We need the following estimate on $\partial B_r=r\mathbb{S}$:

A.14. Lemma (estimate on fourth root of the Laplacian on the sphere). *We have*

$$\|\Delta_{r\mathbb{S}}^{1/4}f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\partial B_r)} \le (m-1)^{1/4}\|df\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_r)}$$

for all $f\in\mathsf{H}^1(B_r)$ and any $r>0$.

Proof. We argue in four steps:

(1) By a scaling argument we see that it is sufficient to prove the inequality for $r = 1$: Indeed,

$$\|\Delta_{r\mathbb{S}}^{1/4} f\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\partial B_r)} = r^{m-2}\|\Delta_{\mathbb{S}}^{1/4} f\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\partial B_1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|df\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(rB_1)} = r^{m-2}\|df\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_1)}.$$

(2) Let $\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}$ be the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator (at the spectral value 0) on B_1 with boundary $\mathbb{S} = \partial B_1$.

From the definition of $\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}$ (see also the theory of boundary pairs e.g. in [P16, Sec. 2.4]), one has

$$\|\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}^{1/2}\varphi\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} = \|dh\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_1)},$$

where $h \in \mathsf{H}^1(B_1)$ is the harmonic extension of φ, i.e., h reaches the minimum of

$$\inf\big\{\, \|df\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_1)} \,\big|\, f \in \mathsf{H}^1(B_1), f\restriction_{\partial B_1} = \varphi \,\big\},$$

hence $\|dh\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_1)} \le \|df\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_1)}$ for all $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(B_1)$ with $f\restriction_{\partial B_1} = \varphi$:

Indeed if h (resp. φ) is smooth enough, we have $\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}\varphi = \partial_{\mathrm{n}} h$, where $\partial_{\mathrm{n}} h$ is the normal outwards derivative of h on ∂B_1. Green's formula gives (last equality)

$$\|\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}^{1/2}\varphi\|^2 = \langle \Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}\varphi, \varphi\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} = \int_{\mathbb{S}} \partial_{\mathrm{n}} h\overline{h} = \|dh\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_1)}.$$

Thus, for any $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(B_1)$, we has

$$\|\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}^{1/2}(f\restriction_{\mathbb{S}})\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} \le \|df\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_1)}. \tag{A.19}$$

(3) The Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator $\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}$ (at the spectral value 0) and the Laplacian $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}}$ on the sphere are related by the formula

$$\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}} = \sqrt{\Delta_{\mathbb{S}} + \nu^2} - \nu, \quad \text{where} \qquad \nu = \frac{m-2}{2}:$$

Indeed, the expression of Δ_{B_1} in polar coordinates is

$$\Delta_{B_1} = -\partial_r^2 - \frac{m-1}{r}\partial_r + \frac{1}{r^2}\Delta_{\mathbb{S}}.$$

If $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}}\varphi = \mu^2\varphi$ then the harmonic extension of φ on the ball is given by $h(r,\theta) = r^\lambda\varphi(\theta)$, where λ is a solution of

$$-\lambda(\lambda-1) - (m-1)\lambda + \mu^2 = -\lambda^2 - (m-2)\lambda + \mu^2 = 0$$

this gives $\lambda = \sqrt{\mu^2+\nu^2} - \nu > 0$ (the other solution $-\sqrt{\mu^2+\nu^2} - \nu < 0$ leads to a solution with singularity at $r = 0$, hence is not smooth on B_1). Moreover, $\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}\varphi = \partial_{\mathrm{n}} h = \partial_r h = \lambda\varphi$. Decomposing φ with respect to the eigenfunctions of $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}}$ gives the formula.

(4) The lowest eigenvalue of $\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}$ is 0 (constant eigenfunction); moreover, the first non-zero eigenvalue λ_1 fulfils $\lambda_1 = \sqrt{\mu_1^2+\nu^2} - \nu$ (by the previous operator equality; note that $\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}$ and $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}}$ are self-adjoint). As the first non-zero eigenvalue of $\mathbb{S}$ is $\mu_1^2 = m-1$, we obtain $\lambda_1 = 1$. In particular, we obtain the operator inequality $\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}} = \lambda_1\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}} \le \Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}^2$.

Moreover, the operator equation from step (3) gives $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}} = (\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}+\nu)^2 - \nu^2 = (\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}+2\nu)\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}$, hence we obtain the operator inequality

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{S}} = \Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}(\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}} + 2\nu) \le (1+2\nu)\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}^2 = (m-1)\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}^2.$$

As both operators commute, we can also use the spectral calculus and take the square root of the above inequality. Hence, for any $f \in \mathsf{H}^1(B_1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta_{\mathbb{S}}^{1/4}(f\restriction_{\partial B_1})\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} &= \langle \Delta_{\mathbb{S}}^{1/2}(f\restriction_{\partial B_1}), f\restriction_{\partial B_1}\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} \\
&\le \sqrt{m-1}\, \langle \Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}(f\restriction_{\partial B_1}), f\restriction_{\partial B_1}\rangle_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} \\
&= \sqrt{m-1}\, \|\Lambda_{\mathbb{S}}^{1/2} f\restriction_{\partial B_1}\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(\mathbb{S})} \\
&\le \sqrt{m-1}\, \|df\|^2_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_1)},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (A.19) from step (2) for the last inequality. □

Appendix B. Sobolev spaces on manifolds of bounded geometry and harmonic charts

The Levi-Civita connection ∇ extends to tensors on the manifold and permits to define the *k-th Sobolev space* $\mathsf{H}^k_p(X,g)$: we say that the function u has a *k-th weak derivative* if there exists a measurable section $v \in \mathsf{L}_{1,\mathrm{loc}}(X,(T^*X)^{\otimes k})$ such that for all $\varphi \in \mathsf{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{c}}(X,(T^*X)^{\otimes k})$ (smooth section with compact support)

$$\int_X u \cdot (\nabla^k)^* \varphi \,\mathrm{d}g = \int_X (v \cdot \varphi)\,\mathrm{d}g.$$

Note that v is uniquely determined by u and denoted by $\nabla^k u$. We set

$$\mathsf{H}^k_p(X,g) \coloneqq \big\{\, u \in \mathsf{L}_p(X,g) \,\big|\, \forall j \in \{1,\dots,k\}\ \exists \nabla^j u \in \mathsf{L}_p(X,g) \,\big\}$$

with norm given by

$$\|u\|^p_{\mathsf{H}^k_p(X,g)} \coloneqq \sum_{j=0}^{k} \|\nabla^j u\|^p_{\mathsf{L}_p(T^*X^{\otimes j},g)}$$

for $p \geq 1$, and $\mathsf{H}^k(X,g) \coloneqq \mathsf{H}^k_2(X,g)$. Obviously, the space $\mathsf{H}^1(X,g)$ agrees with the domain of the energy form defined in Subsection 2.1 as the corresponding norms agree. For higher orders, the equivalence of Sobolev spaces and Laplacian-Sobolev spaces on non-compact manifolds is not guaranteed without further assumptions:

B.1. Definition (manifold of bounded geometry)**.** We say that a complete Riemannian manifold (X,g) has *bounded geometry* if the injectivity radius is uniformly bounded from below by some constant $\iota_0 > 0$ and if the Ricci tensor Ric is uniformly bounded from below by some constant $\kappa_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{Ric}_x \geq \kappa_0 g_x \qquad \text{for all } x \in X$$

as symmetric 2-tensors.

We will not need assumptions on *derivatives* of the curvature tensor (i.e., bounded geometry of higher order) in this article; from the next result, we only need the explicit constant $C_{\mathrm{ell.reg}}$ in the upper bound; for a proof we refer to [He96, Prp. 2.10] or [AP21, Prp. 3.3]:

B.2. Proposition (equivalence of second order Sobolev norms)**.** *Suppose that (X,g) is a complete manifold with bounded geometry, then the set of smooth functions with compact support is dense in the Sobolev space $\mathsf{H}^2(X,g)$ and the norms of $\mathsf{H}^2(X,g)$ and $\mathsf{H}^2(\Delta_{(X,g)})$ are equivalent, i.e., there are constants $C_{\mathrm{ell.reg}} \geq c_{\mathrm{ell.reg}} > 0$ such that*

$$c_{\mathrm{ell.reg}} \|(\Delta_{(X,g)} + 1)f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(X,g)} \leq \|f\|_{\mathsf{H}^2(X,g)} \leq C_{\mathrm{ell.reg}} \|(\Delta_{(X,g)} + 1)f\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(X,g)}$$

for all $f \in \mathsf{H}^2(X,g)$, where $C_{\mathrm{ell.reg}} = 2 + \max\{0, -\kappa_0\}$ depends only on a lower bound κ_0 of the Ricci curvature.

In particular, if the manifold has bounded geometry, we conclude the equality of the spaces $\mathsf{H}^2(X,g)$ and $\mathsf{H}^2(\Delta_{(X,g)})$ and equivalence of their norms.

In the following, we need the (open) geodesic ball of radius $r > 0$ around $p \in X$ denoted by

$$B_r(p) \coloneqq \{\, x \in X \,|\, d_g(x,p) < r \,\},$$

where d_g is the metric (distance function) induced by the Riemannian metric g on X. Recall that a chart $\varphi = (y^1,\dots,y^m)\colon U \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ for an open subset $U \subset X$ is called *harmonic* if each coordinate function y^j is harmonic, i.e., if $\Delta_{(U,g)} y^j = 0$.

B.3. Proposition ([He96, Th. 1.3]). *Assume that (X, g) is complete and has bounded geometry (with constants $\kappa_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\iota_0 > 0$). Then for all $a \in (0,1)$ there exist $r_0 > 0$, $K \geq 1$ and $k > 0$ depending only on κ_0, ι_0 and a, such that around any point $p \in X$ there exist harmonic charts $\varphi_p = (y^1, \dots, y^m)$ defined on $\overline{B_{r_0}(p)}$, and in these charts we have $g_{ij}(p) = \delta_{ij}$ and*[5]

$$|g_{ij}(x) - g_{ij}(x')| \leq k\, d_g(x,x')^a, \tag{B.1a}$$

$$K^{-1}\delta_{ij} \leq g_{ij} \leq K\, \delta_{ij} \tag{B.1b}$$

for all $x, x' \in B_{r_0}(p)$.

B.4. Remarks.

(i) The supremum of all radii r_0 such that Proposition B.3 holds will be called *harmonic radius* in the following. We refer to [He96, HPW14] and references therein for more details. We assume $r_0 \leq 1$ here, as it simplifies some estimates later on.

(ii) Estimate (B.1b) (and its Corollaries B.5 and B.6 below) means that the manifold has bounded geometry in the sense of Grigor'yan [Gr09, Ex. 11.12]: there exist $\eta > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that at each point $p \in X$ there exists a diffeomorphism between the geodesic ball of radius η around p and the Euclidean ball of radius η in $\mathbb{R}^m$ and this diffeomorphism changes the metric and the measure at most by a factor C. In particular, this property implies a lower bound of the injectivity radius.

Denote by $g_{\mathrm{eucl},p}$ the Euclidean metric in the harmonic chart φ_p defined in the geodesic ball $B \coloneqq B_{r_0}(p)$, i.e.,

$$g_{\mathrm{eucl},p}(x)(\partial_{y_i}, \partial_{y_j}) = \delta_{ij} \tag{B.2}$$

for $x \in B$. Moreover, let $x \mapsto A_{\mathrm{eucl},p}(x)\colon T_xB \longrightarrow T_xB$ $(x \in B)$ be defined via

$$g_{\mathrm{eucl},p}(x)(\xi,\xi) = g(x)\big(A_{\mathrm{eucl},p}(x)\xi, \xi\big).$$

i.e., the endomorphism $A_{\mathrm{eucl},p}$ measures how far the Euclidean metric on B is from the original one. If the dependence of $g_{\mathrm{eucl},p}$ and $A_{\mathrm{eucl},p}$ on $p \in X$ is clear, we also write g_{eucl} and A_{eucl}. Estimate (B.1a) now reads as:

B.5. Corollary. *For $\varepsilon \in (0, r_0)$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_{\mathrm{eucl}} - \mathrm{id}_{TB}\|_{\mathsf{C}(B_\varepsilon(p))} &\coloneqq \sup_{x \in B_\varepsilon(p)} \|A_{\mathrm{eucl}}(x) - \mathrm{id}_{T_xB}\|_{\mathsf{L}(T_xB, g_x)} \\ &= \sup_{x \in B_\varepsilon(p)} \|E_m - G(x)\|_{\mathsf{L}(\mathbb{R}^m)} \leq mk\varepsilon^a,\end{aligned}$$

where k and a are as in Proposition B.3, $\|B\|_{\mathsf{L}(\mathbb{R}^m)}$ is the operator norm of $B\colon \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ with its standard Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^m$, E_m is the $(m \times m)$-unit matrix and $G(x) = (g_{ij}(x))_{i,j=1,\dots,m}$.

Proof. From (B.1a) we conclude

$$-k\varepsilon^a \leq g_{ij}(p) - g_{ij}(x) \leq k\varepsilon^a$$

for $x \in B_\varepsilon(p)$. Moreover, $g_{ij}(p) = \delta_{ij}$, hence $\|E_m - G(x)\|_\infty \leq k\varepsilon^a$ where E_m is the $(m \times m)$-unit matrix and $G(x) = (g_{ij}(x))_{i,j}$ the matrix representation of $g(x)$ and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is the component-wise maximum norm. Moreover, $\|E_m - G(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m} \leq m\|E_m - G(x)\|_\infty$. Passing to an orthonormal basis of (T_xB, g_x) we see that

$$\|E_n - G(x)\|_{\mathsf{L}(\mathbb{R}^m)} = \|A_{\mathrm{eucl}}(x) - \mathrm{id}_{T_xB}\|_{\mathsf{L}(T_xB, g_x)}. \qquad \square$$

Using Proposition B.3 we can compare the metric on a ball with the Euclidean one:

[5] When stressing the dependence of g_x on $x \in X$, we also write $g(x)$ or $g_{ij}(x)$ and similarly for related objects.

B.6. Corollary. *Let $p \in X$, $r \in (0, r_0)$ and $B_r := B_r(p)$, then we have the following norm estimates*

$$\begin{aligned} K^{-m/4}\|\varphi\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\partial B_r, \iota_r^* g_{\mathrm{eucl}})} &\le \|\varphi\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\partial B_r, \iota_r^* g)} \le K^{m/4}\|\varphi\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(\partial B_r, \iota_r^* g_{\mathrm{eucl}})} \\ K^{-m/4}\|u\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_r, g_{\mathrm{eucl}})} &\le \|u\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_r, g)} \le K^{m/4}\|u\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(B_r, g_{\mathrm{eucl}})}, \\ K^{-(m+2)/4}\|du\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(T^*B_r, g_{\mathrm{eucl}})} &\le \|du\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(T^*B_r, g)} \le K^{(m+2)/4}\|du\|_{\mathsf{L}_2(T^*B_r, g_{\mathrm{eucl}})}, \\ K^{-(m+2)/4}\|u\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_r, g_{\mathrm{eucl}})} &\le \|u\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_r, g)} \le K^{(m+2)/4}\|u\|_{\mathsf{H}^1(B_r, g_{\mathrm{eucl}})} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathsf{L}_2(\partial B_r, \iota_r^* g)$, $u \in \mathsf{L}_2(B_r, g)$ resp. $u \in \mathsf{H}^1(B_r, g)$. Here $\iota_r \colon \partial B_r \hookrightarrow B_r$ denotes the natural embedding, and $\iota_r^* g$ resp. $\iota_r^* g_{\mathrm{eucl}}$ the induced metric on ∂B_r.

Proof. Let $(r, \theta) \in (0, r_0) \times \mathbb{S}$ be polar coordinates around $p \in X$, then we can write $g = \mathrm{d}r^2 + \iota_r^* g$. Moreover, we have $g_{\mathrm{eucl}} = \mathrm{d}r^2 + \iota_r^* g_{\mathrm{eucl}}$ and $\iota_r^* g_{\mathrm{eucl}} = r^2 g_{\mathbb{S}}$ is the (scaled) standard metric on $\mathbb{S}$. From (B.1b) we conclude

$$K^{-m/2} r^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}g_{\mathbb{S}} = K^{-m/2}\,\mathrm{d}(\iota_r^* g_{\mathrm{eucl}}) \le \mathrm{d}(\iota_r^* g) \le K^{m/2}\,\mathrm{d}(\iota_r^* g_{\mathrm{eucl}}) = K^{m/2} r^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}g_{\mathbb{S}} \quad \text{and}$$

$$K^{-m/2}\,\mathrm{d}g_{\mathrm{eucl}} = K^{-m/2} r^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}r\,\mathrm{d}g_{\mathbb{S}} \le \mathrm{d}g \le K^{m/2} r^{m-1}\,\mathrm{d}r\,\mathrm{d}g_{\mathbb{S}} = K^{m/2}\,\mathrm{d}g_{\mathrm{eucl}}$$

for the $(m-1)$- resp. m-dimensional volume measure and

$$K^{-1}|\xi|^2_{g_{\mathrm{eucl}}} \le |\xi|^2_{g_x} \le K|\xi|^2_{g_{\mathrm{eucl}}}$$

for the squared norm on the cotangent bundle. The claimed estimates follow now from the definition of the norms. □

Appendix C. Norm convergence of operators on varying Hilbert spaces

We briefly define here the concept of *quasi-unitary equivalence*, which gives a notion of "distance" between two closed non-negative quadratic forms. For more details, we refer to [KhP18, AP21] or the monograph [P12]. Moreover, we define a general framework which assures a *generalised norm resolvent convergence* for operators Δ_ε converging to Δ_0 as $\varepsilon \to 0$. For a comparison of this concept and a similar one introduced by Weidmann [W00, Sec. 9.3], we refer to [PZ22] and [PZ24]. Here, each operator Δ_ε acts in a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon \ge 0$; and the Hilbert spaces are allowed to depend on ε. In typical applications, the Hilbert spaces $\mathscr{H}_\varepsilon$ are of the form $\mathsf{L}_2(X_\varepsilon)$ for some metric measure space X_ε which is considered as a perturbation of a "limit" metric measure space X_0; and typically, there is a topological transition between $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varepsilon = 0$.

In order to define the convergence, we define a sort of "distance" $\delta = \delta_\varepsilon$ between $\widetilde{\Delta} := \Delta_\varepsilon$ and $\Delta := \Delta_0$, in the sense that if $\delta_\varepsilon \to 0$ then Δ_ε converges to Δ_0 in the above-mentioned generalised norm resolvent sense.

Let $\mathscr{H}$ and $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$ be two separable Hilbert spaces. We say that $(\mathfrak{d}, \mathscr{H}^1)$ is an *energy form in $\mathscr{H}$* if $\mathfrak{d}$ is a closed, non-negative quadratic form in $\mathscr{H}$ with domain $\mathscr{H}^1$, i.e., if $\mathfrak{d}(f) := \mathfrak{d}(f, f) \ge 0$ for some sesquilinear form $\mathfrak{d} \colon \mathscr{H}^1 \times \mathscr{H}^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, denoted by the same symbol, with $\mathscr{H}^1 =: \operatorname{dom}\mathfrak{d}$ endowed with the norm defined by

$$\|f\|_1^2 := \|f\|_{\mathscr{H}^1}^2 := \|f\|_{\mathscr{H}}^2 + \mathfrak{d}(f), \tag{C.1}$$

so $\mathscr{H}^1$ is itself a Hilbert space and a dense set in $\mathscr{H}$. We call the corresponding non-negative, self-adjoint operator by Δ (see e.g. [K66, Sec. VI.2]) the *energy operator* associated with $(\mathfrak{d}, \mathscr{H}^1)$. Similarly, let $(\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}, \widetilde{\mathscr{H}^1})$ be an energy form in $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$ with energy operator $\widetilde{\Delta}$.

Associated with an energy operator Δ, we can define a natural *scale of Hilbert spaces* $\mathscr{H}^k$ defined via the *abstract Sobolev norms*

$$\|f\|_{\mathscr{H}^k} := \|f\|_k := \|(\Delta + 1)^{k/2} f\|.$$

Here, we only need the cases $k \in \{0,1,2\}$. In particular, $\mathscr{H}^0 = \mathscr{H}$, $\mathscr{H}^1 = \operatorname{dom}\mathfrak{d}$ and the norms $\|f\|_{\mathscr{H}^1} = \|f\|_1$ agree (the latter in the sense of (C.1)). Finally, $\mathscr{H}^2 = \operatorname{dom}\Delta$ and $\|f\|_{\mathscr{H}^2}$ is equivalent with the graph norm of Δ (see [P12, Sec. 3.2] for details). Similarly, we denote by $\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}^k$ the scale of Hilbert spaces associated with $\widetilde{\Delta}$.

We denote by $\sigma(\Delta)$ the spectrum of the energy operator and by $R = (\Delta+1)^{-1}$ its resolvent in -1; we use similar notations for $\widetilde{\Delta}$.

We now need a pair of so-called *identification* or *transplantation operators* acting on the Hilbert spaces and also a pair of identification operators acting on the form domains. Note that our definition is slightly more general than the ones in [P12, Secs. 4.1, 4.2 and 4.4]. The new point here is that we allow the (somehow "smoothing") resolvent power of order $k/2$ on the right hand side in (C.2d) also for $k > 0$.

C.1. Definition (quasi-unitary equivalence of forms)**.** Let $\delta \geq 0$, and let $J\colon \mathscr{H} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{H}}$ and $J'\colon \widetilde{\mathscr{H}} \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}$ be linear bounded operators. Moreover, let $J^1\colon \mathscr{H}^1 \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathscr{H}}^1$ and $J'^1\colon \widetilde{\mathscr{H}}^1 \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}^1$ be linear bounded operators on the energy form domains.

(i) We say that J is *δ-quasi-unitary* with *δ-quasi-adjoint* J' if

$$\|Jf\| \leq (1+\delta)\|f\|, \quad \big|\langle Jf,u\rangle - \langle f,J'u\rangle\big| \leq \delta\|f\|\|u\| \qquad (f\in\mathscr{H}, u\in\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}), \tag{C.2a}$$

$$\|f - J'Jf\| \leq \delta\|f\|_1, \quad \|u - JJ'u\| \leq \delta\|u\|_1 \qquad (f\in\mathscr{H}^1, u\in\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}^1). \tag{C.2b}$$

(ii) We say that J^1 and J'^1 are *δ-compatible* with the identification operators J and J' if

$$\|J^1f - Jf\| \leq \delta\|f\|_1, \quad \|J'^1u - J'u\| \leq \delta\|u\|_1 \qquad (f\in\mathscr{H}^1, u\in\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}^1). \tag{C.2c}$$

(iii) We say that the energy forms $\mathfrak{d}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}$ are *δ-close (of order 2)* if

$$\big|\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}(J^1f,u) - \mathfrak{d}(f,J'^1u)\big| \leq \delta\|f\|_2\|u\|_1 \qquad (f\in\mathscr{H}^2, u\in\widetilde{\mathscr{H}}^1). \tag{C.2d}$$

(iv) We say that $\mathfrak{d}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}$ (or sometimes that Δ and $\widetilde{\Delta}$) are *δ-quasi unitarily equivalent (of order 2)*, if (C.2a)–(C.2d) are fulfilled, i.e.,

- if there exists identification operators J and J' such that J is δ-quasi unitary with δ-adjoint J' (i.e., (C.2a)–(C.2b) hold);
- if there exists identification operators J^1 and J'^1 which are δ-compatible with J and J' (i.e., (C.2c) holds);
- and if $\mathfrak{d}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}$ are δ-close (of order k) (i.e., (C.2d) holds).

C.2. Remark. There is an asymmetry in the order in (C.2d), namely f appears in the *graph norm* $\|f\|_2$ on the right hand side, while u appears only in the *quadratic form norm* $\|u\|_1$; for a discussion of this point we refer to [AP21, Rem. 2.7]; moreover we believe that — similarly as in [AP21, Rem. 4.4] — an estimate as in (C.2d) with $\|f\|_2$ replaced by the quadratic form norm $\|f\|_1$ would not be enough. Nevertheless, higher orders $\|f\|_k$ for $k \geq 3$ are possible, but then estimate (C.3a) in the next proposition is only true with $JR - \widetilde{R}J$ replaced by $(JR - \widetilde{R}J)R^{k-2}$.

The property of quasi-unitary equivalence for quadratic forms give convergence of the related operators:

C.3. Proposition (resolvent estimate, cf. [AP21, Prps. 2.2 and 2.5])**.** *Let $\mathfrak{d}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{d}}$ be δ-quasi unitarily equivalent (of order 2), then the following holds true:*

$$\big\|JR - \widetilde{R}J\big\| \leq 7\delta \qquad \textit{and} \tag{C.3a}$$

$$\big\|(\widetilde{\Delta}+1)^{1/2}\big(J^1R - \widetilde{R}J\big)\big\| \leq 6\delta. \tag{C.3b}$$

One can define a slightly different version of quasi-unitary equivalence (see [PZ24, Sec. 5]). If the identification operator J is a partial isometry (an equivalent characterisation is $JJ^*J = J$, see [PZ22, Lem. 2.1]), then our definition Definition C.1 implies

the new one. We now use the unitary equivalence concept to define convergence and conclude:

C.4. Theorem (spectral convergence)**.** *Assume that $(\mathfrak{d}_n)_n$ is a sequence of energy forms such that each $\mathfrak{d}_n$ is δ_n-quasi unitarily equivalent with partial isometric identification operators, then*

$$d_{\mathrm{Hausd}}(\sigma_\bullet((\Delta_n+1)^{-1}), \sigma_\bullet((\Delta+1)^{-1}) \leq 7\sqrt{3}\cdot\delta_n \tag{C.4}$$

Here, d_{Hausd} is the Hausdorff distance of two sets, $\sigma_\bullet(\Delta)$ stands for the entire spectrum or the essential spectrum of Δ and similarly for Δ_n.

If $\lambda \in \sigma_{\mathrm{disc}}(\Delta)$ is an eigenvalue of multiplicity $\mu > 0$, then there exist μ eigenvalues (not necessarily all distinct) $\lambda_{n,j}$, $j = 1 \dots \mu$, such that $\lambda_{n,j} \to \lambda$ as $n \to \infty$. (with convergence speed δ_n as above). In particular, if $\mu = 1$ and if $\psi \in \mathscr{H}$ is the corresponding normalised eigenvector, then there exists a sequence of normalised eigenvectors ψ_n of Δ_n such that

$$\|J\psi - \psi_n\| \leq c\delta_n, \quad \|J'\psi_n - \psi\| \leq c'\delta_n, \quad \|J^1\psi - \psi_n\|_1 \leq c_1'\delta_n. \tag{C.5}$$

where c,c' and $c_1' > 0$ are universal constants depending only on λ and the distance of λ from the remaining spectrum of Δ.

Proof. Is is shown in [PZ22, Thm. 2.12, Thm. 3.9] that quasi-unitary equivalence as in Definition C.1 implies a generalised resolvent convergence defined by Weidmann [W00, Sec. 9.3]. If the identification operator J is a partial isometry, then the convergence speed is the same, and one has a slightly stronger version of quasi-unitary equivalence (see [PZ24, Sec. 5]). Using now [PZ24, Thm. F] we conclude that the Hausdorff distance of the resolvent spectra can be estimated by $\sqrt{3}$ times the resolvent difference (C.3a) (see [PZ24, Thm. C]). The energy norm estimate on eigenfunctions in (C.5) follows from [PS18, Thm. 2.6] □

References

[A87] C. Anné, *Spectre du Laplacien et écrasement d'anses*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Super., IV. Sér. **20** (1987), 271–280.

[AC95] C. Anné and B. Colbois, *Spectre du Laplacien agissant sur les p-formes différentielles et écrasement d'anses*, Math. Ann. **303** (1995), 545–573.

[AP20] C. Anné and O. Post, *Norm convergence of the resolvent for wild perturbations*, Analysis and geometry on graphs and manifolds. Selected papers of the conference, University of Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany, July 31 – August 4, 2017, Cambridge University Press, 2020, pp. 66–75.

[AP21] ———, *Wildly perturbed manifolds: norm resolvent and spectral convergence*, J. Spectr. Theory **11** (2021), 229–279.

[AS64] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables*, National Bureau of Standards Applied Mathematics Series, No. 55, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1964, For sale by the Superintendent of Documents.

[BdMCK97] L. Boutet de Monvel, I. D. Chueshov, and E. Y. Khruslov, *Homogenization of attractors for semilinear parabolic equations on manifolds with complicated microstructure*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **172** (1997), 297–322.

[BdMK95] L. Boutet de Monvel and E. Khruslov, *Homogenization of harmonic vector fields on Riemannian manifolds with complicated microstructure*, Composite media and homogenization theory. Proceedings of the second workshop held in Trieste 1993, September 20 – October 1, 1995, pp. 203—215.

[BdMK97] L. Boutet de Monvel and E. Y. Khruslov, *Averaging of a diffusion equation on Riemannian manifolds of complex microstructure*, Tr. Mosk. Mat. Obs. **58** (1997), 158–186.

[BdMK98] L. Boutet de Monvel and E. Khruslov, *Homogenization of harmonic vector fields on Riemannian manifolds with complicated microstructure*, Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **1** (1998), 1–22.

[CF81] I. Chavel and E. A. Feldman, *Spectra of manifolds with small handles*, Comment. Math. Helv. **56** (1981), 83–102.

[ChDR18] K. Cherednichenko, P. Dondl, and F. Rösler, *Norm-resolvent convergence in perforated domains*, Asymptot. Anal. **110** (2018), 163–184.

[DMGM01] G. Dal Maso, R. Gulliver, and U. Mosco, *Asymptotic spectrum of manifolds of increasing topological type*, Preprint: SISSA 78/2001/M (2001).

[Gr09] A. Grigor'yan, *Heat kernel and analysis on manifolds*, AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 47, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; International Press, Boston, MA, 2009.

[He96] E. Hebey, *Sobolev spaces on Riemannian manifolds*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Vol. 1635, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.

[HPW14] R. Hempel, O. Post, and R. Weder, *On open scattering channels for manifolds with ends*, J. Funct. Anal. **266** (2014), 5526–5583.

[K66] T. Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1966.

[KhSt08] A. Khrabustovskyi and H. Stephan, *Positivity and time behavior of a linear reaction-diffusion system, non-local in space and time*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **31** (2008), 1809–1834.

[Kh08] A. Khrabustovskyi, *Asymptotic behaviour of spectrum of Laplace-Beltrami operator on Riemannian manifolds with complex microstructure*, Appl. Anal. **87** (2008), 1357–1372.

[Kh09] A. Khrabustovskyi, *On the spectrum of Riemannian manifolds with attached thin handles*, Zh. Mat. Fiz. Anal. Geom. **5** (2009), 145–169, 214.

[Kh13] A. Khrabustovskyi, *Homogenization of the spectral problem on the Riemannian manifold consisting of two domains connected by many tubes*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **143** (2013), 1255–1289.

[KhP18] A. Khrabustovskyi and O. Post, *Operator estimates for the crushed ice problem*, Asymptot. Anal. **110** (2018), 137–161.

[LlP08] F. Lledó and O. Post, *Existence of spectral gaps, covering manifolds and residually finite groups*, Rev. Math. Phys. **20** (2008), 199–231.

[MKh06] V. A. Marchenko and E. Y. Khruslov, *Homogenization of partial differential equations*, Progress in Mathematical Physics, vol. 46, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2006, Translated from the 2005 Russian original by M. Goncharenko and D. Shepelsky.

[N98] L. Notarantonio, *Spectrum of compact manifolds with high genus*, arXiv:math/9804094 (1998).

[P03a] ———, *Periodic manifolds with spectral gaps*, J. Diff. Equations **187** (2003), 23–45.

[P03b] O. Post, *Eigenvalues in spectral gaps of a perturbed periodic manifold*, Mathematische Nachrichten **261–262** (2003), 141–162.

[P06] O. Post, *Spectral convergence of quasi-one-dimensional spaces*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **7** (2006), 933–973.

[P12] ———, *Spectral analysis on graph-like spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 2039, Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.

[P16] ———, *Boundary pairs associated with quadratic forms*, Math. Nachr. **289** (2016), 1052–1099.

[PS18] O. Post and J. Simmer, *Approximation of fractals by discrete graphs: norm resolvent and spectral convergence*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **90** (2018), 90:68.

[PS19] ———, *Quasi-unitary equivalence and generalized norm resolvent convergence*, Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl. **64** (2019), 373–391.

[PZ22] O. Post and S. Zimmer, *Generalised norm resolvent convergence: comparison of different concepts*, J. Spectr. Theory **12** (2022), 1459–1506.

[PZ24] ———, *Distances between operators acting on different Hilbert spaces*, arXiv:2412.13165 (2024).

[Qi22] F. Qi, *Decreasing properties of two ratios defined by three and four polygamma functions*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **360** (2022), 89–101.

[RT75] J. Rauch and M. Taylor, *Potential and scattering theory on wildly perturbed domains*, J. Funct. Anal. **18** (1975), 27–59.

[Sh01] M. A. Shubin, *Pseudodifferential operators and spectral theory*, second ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001, Translated from the 1978 Russian original by Stig I. Andersson.

[W00] J. Weidmann, *Lineare Operatoren in Hilberträumen. Teil 1*, Mathematische Leitfäden., B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart, 2000, Grundlagen.

[Wh62] J. A. Wheeler, *Geometrodynamics*, Topics of Modern Physics, vol. I, Academic Press, London, 1962.