

DFG-Schwerpunktprogramm 1324

„Extraktion quantifizierbarer Information aus komplexen Systemen“

n -term Approximation Rates and Besov Regularity for Elliptic PDEs on Polyhedral Domains

M. Hansen

Preprint 131



Edited by

AG Numerik/Optimierung
Fachbereich 12 - Mathematik und Informatik
Philipps-Universität Marburg
Hans-Meerwein-Str.
35032 Marburg


DFG-Schwerpunktprogramm 1324

„Extraktion quantifizierbarer Information aus komplexen Systemen“

n -term Approximation Rates and Besov Regularity for Elliptic PDEs on Polyhedral Domains

M. Hansen

Preprint 131



The consecutive numbering of the publications is determined by their chronological order.

The aim of this preprint series is to make new research rapidly available for scientific discussion. Therefore, the responsibility for the contents is solely due to the authors. The publications will be distributed by the authors.

n -term Approximation Rates and Besov Regularity for Elliptic PDEs on Polyhedral Domains.

Markus Hansen

December 7, 2012

Abstract

We investigate the Besov regularity for solutions of elliptic PDEs. This is based on regularity results in Babuska-Kondratiev spaces. Following the argument of Dahlke and DeVore, we first prove an embedding of these spaces into the scale $B_{\tau,\tau}^r(D)$ of Besov spaces with $\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{r}{d} + \frac{1}{p}$. This scale is known to be closely related to n -term approximation w.r.to wavelet systems. Ultimately this yields the rate $n^{-r/d}$ for $u \in \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \cap H_p^s(D)$ for $r < r^* \leq m$.

In order to improve this rate to $n^{-m/d}$ we leave the scale $B_{\tau,\tau}^r(D)$ and instead consider the spaces $B_{\tau,\infty}^m(D)$. We determine conditions under which the space $\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \cap H^s(D)$ is embedded into some space $B_{\tau,\infty}^m(D)$ for some $\frac{m}{d} + \frac{1}{p} > \frac{1}{\tau} \geq \frac{1}{p}$, which in turn indeed yields the desired n -term rate. As an intermediate step we also prove an extension theorem for Kondratiev spaces.

1 Introduction

Ever since the emergence of (adaptive) wavelet algorithms for the numerical computation of solutions to (elliptic) partial differential equations there was also the interest in corresponding rates for n -term approximation rates, since these may be seen as the benchmark rates the optimal algorithm (which at each step would calculate an optimal n -term approximation) would converge with.

Later on, this question was seen to be closely related to the membership in a certain scale of Besov spaces. More precisely a famous result by DeVore, Jawerth and Popov [9] characterizes certain Approximation classes for approximation with respect to $L_p(D)$ -norms as Besov spaces $B_{\tau,\tau}^r(D)$ with $\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{r}{d} + \frac{1}{p}$, where r is the rate of the best n -term approximation.

In another famous article Dahlke and DeVore [2] later used this result to determine n -term approximation rates for the solution of Poisson's equation on general Lipschitz domains. This was done by proving that the solution of $-\Delta u = f$ belongs to Besov spaces $B_{\tau,\tau}^r(D)$ for parameters $r < r^*$, where r^* depends on the Lipschitz-character of the bounded domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the dimension d and the regularity of the right-hand side f . In subsequent years this result was extended to more general elliptic operators [3], and for special domains more precise values for r^* were determined [4, 5, 8].

The purpose of this paper now is two-fold. On the one hand, we shall use the ideas of these precursors to re-prove the result for polyhedral domains in two and three space dimensions, this time based on regularity in Babuska-Kondratiev spaces. Here we manage to give a unified treatment to the different cases previously treated separately (polygonal domains in 2D, polyhedral and smooth cones in 3D, edge singularities in 3D). The outcome corresponds to the previous results, which roughly can be summarized as: If the function u admits m weak derivatives with controlled blow-up towards the boundary, then $u \in B_{\tau,\tau}^r(D)$ for every $r < m$. For the n -term approximation this implies that every such function can be approximated at rate $\frac{r}{d} < \frac{m}{d}$.

The second part of the paper then stems from investigating the limiting situation $r = m$. So far, all the previous proofs (and our version as well) fail to cover this case. However, by slightly shifting the point of view, we can close this gap: Instead, inspired by more recent results on n -term approximation for Besov spaces [7, 10], we turn our attention to Besov spaces guaranteeing the rate $n^{-m/d}$. Thus in leaving the "adaptivity scale" $B_{\tau,\tau}^r(D)$, we prove that u belongs to Besov spaces $B_{\tau,\infty}^m(D)$ for certain parameters $0 < \tau < \tau_0$, and we determine a condition under which we have $\frac{1}{\tau_0} < \frac{m}{d} + \frac{1}{p}$ (which in turn implies the mentioned rate $n^{-m/d}$ for approximation in $L_p(D)$).

2 Basic definitions and State of the art

In this section we will fix some notations corresponding to the used wavelet system, recall the definition of Besov and Babuska-Kondratiev spaces, and formulate the regularity and n -term approximation results used later on.

2.1 Wavelets

We are not interested in utmost generality pertaining to the used wavelet system. Instead, for simplicity we will stick to Daubechies' Wavelets, the generalization to compactly supported biorthogonal wavelets constituting Riesz-bases being immediate.

Let ϕ be a univariate scaling function and η the associated wavelet corresponding to Daubechies' construction, where the smoothness of ϕ and η and the number of vanishing moments for η are assumed to be sufficiently large. Let E denote the nontrivial vertices of $[0, 1]^d$, and put

$$\psi^e(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \prod_{j=1}^d \psi^{e_j}(x_j), \quad e \in E,$$

where $\psi^0 = \phi$ and $\psi^1 = \eta$. Then the set

$$\Psi' = \{\psi^e : e \in E\}$$

generates via shifts and dyadic dilates an orthonormal basis of $L_2(D)$. More precisely, denoting by $\mathcal{D} = \{I \subset \mathbb{R}^d : I = 2^{-j}([0, 1]^d + k), j \in \mathbb{Z}, k \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ the set of all dyadic cubes in \mathbb{R}^d , then

$$\{\psi_I : I \in \mathcal{D}, \psi \in \Psi'\} = \{\psi_I = 2^{jd/2} \psi(2^j \cdot -k) : j \in \mathbb{Z}, k \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \psi \in \Psi'\}$$

forms an orthonormal basis in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Denote by $Q(I)$ some dyadic cube (of minimal size) such that $\text{supp } \psi_I \subset Q(I)$ for every $\psi \in \Psi'$. Then we clearly have $Q(I) = 2^{-j}k + 2^{-j}Q$ for some dyadic cube Q . As usual \mathcal{D}^+ denotes the dyadic cubes with measure at most 1, and we put $\Lambda' = \mathcal{D}^+ \times \Psi'$. Additionally, we shall need the notation $\mathcal{D}_j = \{I \in \mathcal{D} : |I| = 2^{-jd}\}$. Then we can write every function $f \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as

$$f = P_0 f + \sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda'} \langle f, \psi_I \rangle \psi_I.$$

Therein $P_0 f$ denotes the orthogonal projector onto the closed subspace S_0 , which is the closure in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of the span of the function $\Phi(x) = \phi(x_1) \cdots \phi(x_d)$ and its integer shifts $\Phi(\cdot - k)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Later on it will be convenient to include Φ into the set of generators Ψ' together with the notation $\Phi_I := 0$ for $|I| < 1$, and $\Phi_I = \Phi(\cdot - k)$ for $I = k + [0, 1]^d$. Then we can simply write

$$f = \sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda} \langle f, \psi_I \rangle \psi_I, \quad \Lambda = \mathcal{D}^+ \times \Psi, \quad \Psi = \Psi' \cup \{\Phi\}.$$

Remark 1. If not explicitly stated otherwise convergence of wavelet expansions is always understood in $S'(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the space of tempered distributions, or in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (since all relevant spaces will be embedded into $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$).

2.2 Besov spaces

Besov space can be defined in a number of ways. Here we will need only their characterization in terms of wavelet bases as presented e.g. in [15]. For more detailed information on Besov spaces and related function spaces as well as equivalent definitions we refer to the literature, e.g. [20] and the references given there.

Let $0 < p, q < \infty$ and $r > \max(0, d(\frac{1}{p} - 1))$. Then a function $v \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ belongs to the Besov space $B_{p,q}^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if, and only if

$$\|v|B_{p,q}^r(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \|P_0 v|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| + \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{j(r+d(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}))q} \left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \mathcal{D}_j \times \Psi} |\langle v, \psi_I \rangle|^p \right)^{q/p} \right)^{1/q} < \infty.$$

For parameters $q = \infty$ we shall use the usual modification (replacing the outer sum by a supremum), i.e.

$$\|v|B_{p,\infty}^r(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \|P_0 v|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| + \sup_{j \geq 0} 2^{j(r+d(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}))q} \left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \mathcal{D}_j \times \Psi} |\langle v, \psi_I \rangle|^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

Within the scale $B_{\tau,\tau}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{\alpha}{d} + \frac{1}{2}$ due to the specific choice of τ this simplifies to

$$\|v|B_{\tau,\tau}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \|P_0 v|L_\tau(\mathbb{R}^d)\| + \left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda} |\langle v, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau \right)^{1/\tau}.$$

Additionally, we will use spaces $B_{p,q}^{r,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, characterized by the quasi-norm

$$\|v|B_{p,q}^{s,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \|P_0 v|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| + \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{j(r+\frac{d}{2}-\frac{d}{p})q} (j+1)^{\sigma q} \left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \mathcal{D}_j \times \Psi} |\langle v, \psi_I \rangle|^p \right)^{\frac{q}{p}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Therein the additional term $(j+1)^\sigma$ is of logarithmic order, hence the spaces are usually referred to as *Besov spaces of logarithmic smoothness*. In turn, these spaces are special cases of so-called *function spaces of generalized smoothness*; we refer e.g. to [16] or the survey [12].

Apart from these spaces on \mathbb{R}^d , for our main interest in boundary value problems for elliptic PDEs we also need to consider function spaces on domains. The easiest way to introduce these is via restriction, i.e.

$$B_{p,q}^s(D) = \{f \in \mathcal{D}'(D) : \exists g \in B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d), g|_D = f\}, \quad \|f|B_{p,q}^s(D)\| = \inf_{g|_D=f} \|g|B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)\|.$$

Alternative (different or equivalent) versions of this definition can be found, depending on possible additional properties for the distributions g (most often referring to their support). We refer to the monograph [21] for details and references.

The only aspect we need of these spaces is the existence of continuous linear extension operators, i.e. mappings $\mathcal{E} : B_{p,q}^s(D) \rightarrow B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, possibly depending on the parameters s, p, q and, of course, on the domain D . In this respect, Rychkov [18] gave a final answer for Lipschitz domains: There exists a universal extension operator, i.e. an operator $\mathcal{E} : B_{p,q}^s(D) \rightarrow B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ simultaneously for all parameter triples (s, p, q) . In particular, due to $B_{2,2}^s(D) = H^s(D)$ this also covers extensions of Sobolev spaces. In the sequel \mathcal{E} will always denote such an extension operator (note that particularly for the H^s -scale there are several more such extension operators, we only mention the one due to Stein [19, Chap. 3]).

2.3 Babuska-Kondratiev spaces

As mentioned in the introduction our interest stems from elliptic boundary value problems such as (2.1) below. It is nowadays classical knowledge that the regularity of the solution depends not only on the one of the coefficient a and right-hand side f , but also on the regularity/roughness of the boundary of the considered domain. While for smooth coefficients A and smooth boundary we have $u \in H^{s+2}(D)$ for $f \in H^s(D)$, it is well-known that this becomes false for more general domains. In particular, if we only assume D to be a Lipschitz domain, then it was shown in [11] that in general we only have $u \in H^s$ for all $s < 3/2$ for the solution of the Poisson equation, even for smooth right-hand side f . This behaviour is caused by singularities near the boundary.

To obtain similar shift theorems as for smooth domains, a possible approach is to adapt the function spaces. To compensate possible singularities one includes appropriate weights. For polyhedral domains,

this idea has lead to the following definition of the Babuska-Kondratiev spaces $\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)$: If the function u admits m weak derivatives, we consider the norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}^p = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \int_D |\rho(x)^{|\alpha|-a} \partial^\alpha u(x)|^p dx,$$

where $a \in \mathbb{R}$ is an additional parameter, and the weight function $\rho : D \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the smooth distance to the singular set of D . This means ρ is a smooth function, and in the vicinity of the singular set it is equal to the distance to that set. In 2D this singular set consists exactly of the vertices of the polygon, while in 3D it consists of the vertices and edges of the polyhedra. In case $p = 2$ we simply write $\mathcal{K}_a^m(D)$. Within this scale of function spaces, a regularity result for boundary value problems for elliptic PDEs can be formulated as follows, see [1] and the references given there:

Proposition 1. Let D be some bounded polyhedral domain without cracks in \mathbb{R}^d , $d = 2, 3$. Consider the problem

$$-\nabla(A(x) \cdot \nabla u(x)) = f \quad \text{in } D, \quad u|_{\partial D} = 0, \quad (2.1)$$

where $A = (a_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^d$ is symmetric and

$$a_{i,j} \in \mathcal{W}_\infty^m = \{v : D \rightarrow \mathbb{C} : \rho^{|\alpha|} \partial^\alpha v \in L_\infty(D), |\alpha| \leq m\}, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq d.$$

Let the bilinear form

$$B(v, w) = \int_D \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j}(x) \partial_i v(x) \partial_j w(x) dx$$

satisfy

$$|B(v, w)| \leq R \|v\|_{H^1(D)} \cdot \|w\|_{H^1(D)} \quad \text{and} \quad r \|v\|_{H^1(D)}^2 \leq B(v, v)$$

for some constants $0 < r \leq R < \infty$. Then there exists some $\bar{a} > 0$ such that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, any $|a| < \bar{a}$ and any $f \in \mathcal{K}_{a-1}^{m-1}(D)$ the problem (2.1) admits a uniquely determined solution $u \in \mathcal{K}_{a+1}^{m+1}(D)$, and it holds

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{a+1}^{m+1}(D)} \leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{K}_{a-1}^{m-1}(D)}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of f .

We restrict ourselves in this presentation to this simplified situation. In the literature there are further results of this type, either treating different boundary conditions, or using slightly different scales of function spaces. We particularly refer to [13, 14], where they showed that under appropriate conditions on A the result in Proposition 1 holds for all a except for countably many values.

Remark 2. We note that in the sequel we will always have the restriction $a \geq 0$. This is a natural one, since for $a < 0$ the space $\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)$ contains functions not belonging to $L_p(D)$, for example functions which behave towards a vertex singularity like ρ^α for some $-d + a < \alpha < -d$. But this kind of function is no longer locally integrable, and thus cannot be identified with a (tempered) distribution, whereas Besov spaces are defined as spaces of (tempered) distributions.

We finally shall add a comment on the possible domains D : While before and also in the sequel we will only refer to polyhedral domains, the analysis carries over without change to Lipschitz domains with polyhedral structure. Domains with polyhedral structure were seen to be a natural relaxation of polyhedra, for example replacing the flat faces of polyhedra by smooth surfaces. For precise definitions we refer to [6, 17]. As we shall see in the proofs, the only fact needed about the boundary ∂D are certain combinatorial aspects (counting the number of relevant wavelet coefficients), and these remain unchanged so long as the boundary remains Lipschitz; moreover, also Proposition 1 holds for this more general setting.

2.4 n -term approximation

The (error of the) best n -term approximation is defined as

$$\sigma_n(u, L_p(D)) = \inf_{\Gamma \subset \Lambda: \#\Gamma \leq n} \inf_{c_\gamma} \left\| u - \sum_{\gamma=(I,\psi) \in \Gamma} c_\gamma \psi_I \Big|_{L_p(D)} \right\|,$$

i.e. as the name suggests we consider the best approximation by linear combinations of the basis functions consisting of at most n terms. As shown in [9] the decay of this quantity is closely related to Besov spaces. More specifically, DeVore, Jawerth and Popov proved

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left((n+1)^{\alpha/d} \sigma_n(u, L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)) \right)^\tau \frac{1}{n+1} < \infty \iff u \in B_{\tau,\tau}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{\alpha}{d} + \frac{1}{p}.$$

However, when discussing the optimal convergence rate for adaptive algorithms this result is slightly stronger than required. We are rather interested in conditions on u that simply guarantee a certain decay rate, i.e. we only need to have

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} (n+1)^{\alpha/d} \sigma_n(u, L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)) < \infty.$$

This implies that the ‘‘adaptivity scale’’ $B_{\tau,\tau}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$ considered so far might not be the optimal choice. Moreover, this result neglects the additional knowledge that the functions of interest belong to function spaces related to the bounded domain D . In [7, 10] the rates for approximation of functions from the full scale of Besov spaces $B_{\tau,q}^s(D)$ and $B_{\tau,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ were calculated. For our purposes, we only need the following result from [7, Theorem 7]: If $s > d(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p})$ for $0 < \tau \leq p$, then

$$\sigma_n(u, L_p(D)) \lesssim n^{-s/d} \|u\|_{B_{\tau,q}^s(D)}, \quad u \in B_{\tau,q}^s(D), \quad (2.2)$$

independent of the microscopic parameter q . A similar estimate is true for approximation in the energy norm, i.e. in the norm of the space $H^1(D)$, and more generally in the norm of $W_p^1(D)$,

$$\sigma_n(u, W_p^1(D)) \lesssim n^{-(s-1)/d} \|u\|_{B_{\tau,q}^s(D)}, \quad u \in B_{\tau,q}^s(D). \quad (2.3)$$

3 Regularity in the adaptivity scale $B_{\tau,\tau}^r(D)$

As previously mentioned, we now adapt the arguments first given in [2]. The result itself is decoupled from the regularity results for elliptic PDEs, thus we formulate it as an embedding theorem.

Theorem 1. Let D be some bounded polyhedral domain in \mathbb{R}^d . Then we have a continuous embedding

$$\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \cap B_{p,p}^s(D) \hookrightarrow B_{\tau,\tau}^r(D), \quad \frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{r}{d} + \frac{1}{p}, \quad 1 < p < \infty,$$

for all $0 \leq r < \min(m, \frac{sd}{d-1})$ and $a > \frac{\delta}{d}r$. Therein δ denotes the dimension of the singular set (i.e. $\delta = 0$ if there are only vertex singularities, $\delta = 1$ if there are edge and vertex singularities etc.).

Proof. Clearly, for $r = 0$ the result is trivial, thus we always assume $r > 0$ and hence $0 < \tau < p$.

Step 1: To start with we note that since a polyhedral domain D in particular is Lipschitz we can extend every $u \in H_p^s(D)$ to some function $\tilde{u} = \mathcal{E}u \in H_p^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Consider first the term $P_0\tilde{u}$. This can be represented as

$$P_0\tilde{u} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \langle \tilde{u}, \Phi(\cdot - k) \rangle \Phi(\cdot - k).$$

Since Φ shares the same smoothness and support properties, the coefficients $\langle \tilde{u}, \Phi(\cdot - k) \rangle$ can be treated exactly like any of the coefficients $\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle$ for $|I| = 1$ in Step 2 (note that below the vanishing moments of ψ^e only become relevant for $|I| < 1$). Thus the claim can be formulated as

$$\left(\sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda} |I|^{(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2})\tau} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau \right)^{1/\tau} \leq c \max\{\|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}, \|u\|_{B_{p,p}^s(D)}\}.$$

Step 2: Now put

$$\rho_I = \inf_{x \in Q(I)} \rho(x),$$

and consider first the situation $\rho_I > 0$. We recall the following classical approximation result: For every I there exists a polynomial P_I of degree less than m , such that

$$\|\tilde{u} - P_I\|_{L_p(Q(I))} \leq c_0 |Q(I)|^{m/d} |\tilde{u}|_{W_p^m(Q(I))} \leq c_1 |I|^{m/d} |\tilde{u}|_{W_p^m(Q(I))}$$

for some constant c_1 independent of I and u . Now recall that ψ_I satisfies moment conditions of order up to m , i.e. it is orthogonal to any polynomial of degree up to $m - 1$. Thus we can estimate, using Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle| &= |\langle \tilde{u} - P_I, \psi_I \rangle| \leq \|\tilde{u} - P_I\|_{L_p(Q(I))} \cdot \|\psi_I\|_{L_{p'}(Q(I))} \leq c_1 |I|^{m/d} |\tilde{u}|_{W_p^m(Q(I))} |I|^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq c_1 |I|^{\frac{m}{d} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} \rho_I^{-m+a} \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=m} \int_{Q(I)} |\rho(x)^{m-a} \partial^\alpha \tilde{u}(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} =: c_1 |I|^{\frac{m}{d} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} \rho_I^{-m+a} \mu_I. \end{aligned}$$

Now we shall split the index set Λ : For $j \geq 0$ let $\Lambda_j \subset \Lambda$ be the set of all pairs (I, ψ) with $|I| = 2^{-jd}$, and for $k \geq 0$ let $\Lambda_{j,k} \subset \Lambda_j$ contain those (I, ψ) such that

$$k2^{-j} \leq \rho_I < (k+1)2^{-j}.$$

For $k > 0$ we additionally require $Q(I) \subset D$. Furthermore, we put $\Lambda_j^0 = \cup_{k \geq 1} \Lambda_{j,k}$. Then we find using Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} |I|^{(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2})\tau} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau &\leq c_1 \sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} (|I|^{m/d} \rho_I^{-m+a} \mu_I)^\tau \\ &\leq c_1 \left(\sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} \left(|I|^{m \frac{\tau}{d}} \rho_I^{(a-m)\tau} \right)^{\frac{p}{p-\tau}} \right)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} \left(\sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} \mu_I^p \right)^{\frac{\tau}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since there is a controlled overlap between the cubes $Q(I)$ (i.e. every $x \in \Omega$ is contained in a finite number of cubes $Q(I)$), and this number is bounded by some constant c_2^p independent of x , we can estimate the second factor

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} \mu_I^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &= \left(\sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \int_{Q(I)} |\rho(x)^{m-a} \partial^\alpha \tilde{u}(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq c_2 \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=m} \int_D |\rho(x)^{m-a} \partial^\alpha \tilde{u}(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p} \leq c_2 \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}. \end{aligned}$$

For the first factor we note that by choice of ρ we always have $\rho_I \leq 1$, hence the index k is at most 2^j for the sets $\Lambda_{j,k}$ to be non-empty, and the number of elements in each of these sets can be bounded by $c_3 k^{d-1-\delta} 2^{j\delta}$ (where c_3 depends only on D , particularly on the number and precise shape of the singular vertices, edges etc.; this estimate further uses $k \leq 2^j$). Then we find

$$\left(\sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} \left(|I|^{m \frac{\tau}{d}} \rho_I^{(a-m)\tau} \right)^{\frac{p}{p-\tau}} \right)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} \leq \left(\sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} \left(|I|^{m \frac{\tau}{d}} k^{(a-m)\tau} 2^{-j(a-m)\tau} \right)^{\frac{p}{p-\tau}} \right)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2^j} \sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_{j,k}} \left(2^{-ja\tau} k^{(a-m)\tau} \right)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} \right)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} \\
&\leq \left(c_3 2^{-ja\frac{p\tau}{p-\tau}} \sum_{k=1}^{2^j} k^{(a-m)\frac{p\tau}{p-\tau}} k^{d-1-\delta} 2^{j\delta} \right)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

For this last sum we have to distinguish three cases, according to the value of the exponent (greater, equal or less than -1). We note that

$$\begin{aligned}
(a-m)\frac{p\tau}{p-\tau} + d-1-\delta &= \frac{p\tau}{p-\tau} \left(a-m + (d-1-\delta) \left(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p} \right) \right) = \frac{p\tau}{p-\tau} \left(a-m + r \frac{d-1-\delta}{d} \right) > -1 \\
&\iff a-m + r \frac{d-1-\delta}{d} > -\frac{1}{\tau} + \frac{1}{p} = -\frac{r}{d} \iff a-m + r \frac{d-\delta}{d} > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

hence we find

$$\left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} \left(|I|^{m\frac{\tau}{d}} \rho_I^{(a-m)\tau} \right)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} \right)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} \leq c_4 2^{-ja\tau} 2^{j\delta \frac{p-\tau}{p}} \begin{cases} 2^{j(a-m)\tau + j(d-\delta)\frac{p-\tau}{p}}, & a-m + r \frac{d-\delta}{d} > 0, \\ (j+1)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}}, & a-m + r \frac{d-\delta}{d} = 0, \\ 1, & a-m + r \frac{d-\delta}{d} < 0. \end{cases}$$

Step 3: We now put $\Lambda^0 = \bigcup_{j \geq 0} \Lambda_j^0$. Summing the first line of the last estimate over all j we obtain

$$\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda^0} |I|^{(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})\tau} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau \leq c_4 \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-jm\tau} 2^{jd \frac{p-\tau}{p}} \|u\| \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \leq c_5 \|u\| \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \leq \infty$$

provided the geometric series converges, thus in the case $a-m + r \frac{d-\delta}{d} > 0$ we find the condition

$$m\tau > d \frac{p-\tau}{p} \iff m > d \frac{p-\tau}{p\tau} = d \left(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p} \right) = d \cdot \frac{r}{d} = r.$$

Similarly, in case $a-m + r \frac{d-\delta}{d} = 0$ the resulting estimate is

$$\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda^0} |I|^{(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})\tau} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau \leq c_4 \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-ja\tau} 2^{j\delta \frac{p-\tau}{p}} (j+1)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} \|u\| \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \leq c'_5 \|u\| \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \leq \infty,$$

where the series converges if, and only if

$$a\tau > \delta \frac{p-\tau}{p} \iff a > \delta \left(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p} \right) \iff a > \frac{\delta}{d} r \iff m > r \frac{d-\delta}{d} + \frac{\delta}{d} r = r,$$

which is exactly the same condition as before. Finally, in case $a-m + r \frac{d-\delta}{d} < 0$ we find

$$\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda^0} |I|^{(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})\tau} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau \leq c_4 \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-ja\tau} 2^{j\delta \frac{p-\tau}{p}} \|u\| \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \leq c''_5 \|u\| \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \leq \infty,$$

where now we obtain the condition

$$a\tau > \delta \frac{p-\tau}{p} \iff a > \delta \frac{p-\tau}{p\tau} = \delta \left(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p} \right) = \delta \cdot \frac{r}{d}.$$

Step 4: Next, we need to consider the sets $\Lambda_{j,0}$. Here the assumption $\tilde{u} \in B_{p,p}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ comes into play once more. We note that $\#\Lambda_{j,0} \leq c_7 2^{j\delta}$, thus we can estimate using Hölder's inequality

$$\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_{j,0}} |I|^{(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})\tau} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau \leq c_7^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} 2^{j\delta \frac{p-\tau}{p}} 2^{-jd(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})\tau} \left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_{j,0}} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^p \right)^{\frac{\tau}{p}}$$

$$= c_7^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} 2^{j\delta \frac{p-\tau}{p}} 2^{-js\tau} \left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_{j,0}} 2^{j(s+\frac{d}{2}-\frac{d}{p})p} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^p \right)^{\frac{\tau}{p}}.$$

Now summing over j and once more using Hölder's inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_{j,0}} |I|^{(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})\tau} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau &\leq c_7^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-js\tau} 2^{j\delta \frac{p-\tau}{p}} \left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_{j,0}} 2^{j(s+\frac{d}{2}-\frac{d}{p})p} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^p \right)^{\frac{\tau}{p}} \\ &\leq c_7^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} \left(\sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-j \frac{sp\tau}{p-\tau}} 2^{j\delta} \right)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} \left(\sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_{j,0}} 2^{j(s+\frac{d}{2}-\frac{d}{p})p} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^p \right)^{\frac{\tau}{p}} \\ &\leq c_8 \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{p,p}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}^\tau \lesssim \|u\|_{B_{p,p}^s(D)}^\tau, \end{aligned}$$

under the condition

$$\delta < \frac{sp\tau}{p-\tau} \iff \frac{s}{\delta} > \frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p} \iff r < \frac{sd}{\delta}.$$

Step 5: Finally, we need to consider those ψ_I whose support intersects ∂D . Then we can estimate similar to Step 4, with δ replaced by $d-1$. This results in the condition

$$\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda: \text{supp } \psi_I \cap \partial D \neq \emptyset} |I|^{(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})\tau} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau \leq c_9 \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{p,p}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}^\tau \lesssim \|u\|_{B_{p,p}^s(D)}^\tau \quad \text{if } r < \frac{sd}{d-1}.$$

Summarily we have proved

$$\|u\|_{B_{\tau,\tau}^r(D)} \leq \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{\tau,\tau}^r(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|u\|_{B_{p,p}^s(D)} + \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)},$$

with constants independent of u . □

Remark 3. The conditions $m > r$ and $a > \frac{\delta}{d}r$ and the cases considered in Steps 2 and 3 (depending on the sign of $a - m + r\frac{d-\delta}{d}$) are not completely independent, though it seems not clear at first glance whether there is potential for improvement.

However, we find that these steps of the argument indeed exclude parameters $r \geq m$ or $a \leq \frac{\delta}{d}r$. In detail: Assuming $r \geq m$ we either have $a - m + r\frac{d-\delta}{d} \geq 0$ which as before leads to the contradicting condition $m > r$, or we have $a - m + r\frac{d-\delta}{d} < 0$, which immediately implies

$$0 > a - m + r\frac{d-\delta}{d} \geq a - r + r\frac{d-\delta}{d} = a - \frac{\delta}{d}r,$$

thus contradicting the condition $a > \frac{\delta}{d}r$ obtained in Step 3. Thus $r < m$ indeed is necessary for our argument to work.

In a similar way, assuming $a \leq \frac{\delta}{d}r$, again we either have $a - m + r\frac{d-\delta}{d} \geq 0$, which implies

$$\frac{\delta}{d}r \geq a \geq m - r\frac{d-\delta}{d} \implies 0 \geq m - r,$$

and thus contradicts the condition obtained in Step 3, or $a - m + r\frac{d-\delta}{d} < 0$ which obviously once more gives a contradiction to Step 3. Hence we conclude $a > \frac{\delta}{d}r$ to be necessary for our argument.

Whether these restrictions are due to the chosen argument, or the result becomes false otherwise, is not clear.

Remark 4. The result remains true if D is an unbounded domain, but u is a priori known to have compact support. In particular, this refers to D being an infinite cone or some dihedral angle $D = D_\alpha = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 < \vartheta < \alpha\}$, (ρ, ϑ, z) being the cylindrical coordinates in \mathbb{R}^3 . Since Besov spaces are compatible with localization arguments (i.e. decomposing a domain by using partitions of unity, a function belongs to a Besov space on the original domain if, and only if, every piece belongs to Besov spaces corresponding to the respective subdomains), the respective localization arguments for polyhedral domains carry over to this kind of consideration for Besov regularity.

Remark 5. The above results correspond well to the ones obtained by Dahlke and Dahlke/Sickel: In case $d = 2$ every solution of $-\Delta u = f$ with $f \in H^s(D)$ can be decomposed into a regular part $u_R \in H^{s+2}(D)$ and a singular part u_S with lower Sobolev regularity, but with a special structure (a finite linear combination of special singularity functions which are known explicitly depending on the respective interior angles. In 3D such a decomposition exists only in special cases of the domain D . Dahlke investigated the Besov regularity of the singular part, which in general is significantly higher than its Sobolev regularity, and also much higher than the regularity of the regular part. For the last observation we note that for a bounded Lipschitz domain D we have $H^s(D) = B_{2,2}^s(D) \hookrightarrow B_{\tau,\tau}^r(D)$ for every $r < s$, and the result becomes false for $r = s$ (where as before $\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{r}{d} + \frac{1}{2}$). Hence, though the singular part might have a higher regularity, the Besov regularity of $u = u_R + u_S$ can in general not exceed $s + 2$. Since $f \in \mathcal{K}_{a-1}^{m-1}$ implies $u \in \mathcal{K}_{a+1}^{m+1}$ and $\mathcal{K}_m^m(D) \hookrightarrow H^m(D)$, choosing $a = m$ (whenever this choice is admissible for the regularity result in Kondratiev spaces) shows that both our and Dahlke's results yield the same Besov regularity for u .

Moreover, the estimates of Steps 3 and 4 essentially reproduce the regularity estimates for the singular functions: Away from the singularities, these functions are smooth (arbitrary high Sobolev regularity), and near the vertex/edge we have a much greater Besov-regularity (Dahlke's 2D-result corresponds to the observation that for only vertex singularities (i.e. $\delta = 0$) in Step 4 we may choose r to be arbitrarily large).

A similar observation is true for the result of Dahlke/Sickel, who investigated polyhedral cones in $d = 3$: Here we obtain exactly the same conditions on the parameters since the spaces $V_{p,\beta}^l$ used therein essentially coincide with the spaces $\mathcal{K}_{p,l-\beta}^l$.

4 Regularity result for spaces $B_{\tau,\infty}^m(D)$

We shall begin this section with reformulations of some estimates in the proof of Theorem 1, as we actually showed a little more than claimed.

Using the notations of that proof, we define an operator P_{int} on $\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)$ by defining

$$P_{\text{int}}u = \sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda^0} \langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle \psi_I. \quad (4.1)$$

Then Step 3 can be reformulated as

$$P_{\text{int}} : \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \longrightarrow B_{\tau,\tau}^r(D), \quad \|P_{\text{int}}u|B_{\tau,\tau}^r(D)\| \lesssim \|u|\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)\|. \quad (4.2)$$

With the same arguments, only replacing the summation over j by a supremum, we also find

$$P_{\text{int}} : \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \longrightarrow B_{\tau,\infty}^m(D), \quad \|P_{\text{int}}u|B_{\tau,\infty}^m(D)\| \lesssim \|u|\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)\|. \quad (4.3)$$

(observe that the condition $a - m + r\frac{d-\delta}{d} > 0$ then simply becomes $a - m\frac{\delta}{d} > 0$, which exactly is the assumption on a in case $m = r$). This observation motivated to have a closer look at the case $r = m$ and spaces $B_{\tau,\infty}^m(D)$ (for general τ , i.e. we will not require the relation $\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{m}{d} + \frac{1}{p}$).

In a similar way, we can reformulate Steps 4 and 5: Defining

$$P_{\text{bd}}u = \sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda \setminus \Lambda^0} \langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle \psi_I, \quad (4.4)$$

we so far proved

$$P_{\text{bd}} : B_{p,p}^s(D) \longrightarrow B_{\tau,\tau}^r(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \|P_{\text{bd}}u|B_{\tau,\tau}^r(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \lesssim \|\tilde{u}|B_{p,p}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \lesssim \|u|B_{p,p}^s(D)\|, \quad (4.5)$$

as long as $r < \frac{d}{d-1}s$. Also here we can be a little more precise: By summing over j without using Hölder's inequality the second time it follows

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_{j,0}} |I|^{(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})\tau} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau \right)^{\frac{p}{\tau}} \lesssim \|\tilde{u}|B_{p,p}^{\frac{(d-1)r}{d}}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p, \quad \text{thus} \quad P_{\text{bd}} : B_{p,p}^{\frac{(d-1)r}{d}}(D) \longrightarrow B_{\tau,p}^r(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

recall $\delta \frac{p-\tau}{p} = \tau \delta (\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p}) = \tau \frac{\delta}{d} r$. The second application of Hölder's inequality in Step 4 then simply corresponds to the standard embedding $B_{\tau,p}^{r+\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B_{\tau,\tau}^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\varepsilon > 0$. In other words: The boundary terms are completely covered by the assumed Besov regularity in $B_{p,p}^s(D)$ respectively Sobolev regularity in $H^s(D)$ (in case $p = 2$).

In the next theorem, we shall have a closer look at the operators P_{int} and P_{bd} , the considered function spaces being motivated by the reformulations and observations above.

Theorem 2. Let D be some bounded polyhedral domain in \mathbb{R}^d and $0 < \tau < p$, $1 < p < \infty$. Then we have

$$P_{\text{int}} : \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \longrightarrow \begin{cases} B_{\tau,\infty}^m(D), & m < a + (d-\delta)(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p}), \\ B_{\tau,\infty}^{m, -\frac{1}{\tau} + \frac{1}{p}}(D), & m = a + (d-\delta)(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p}), \\ B_{\tau,\infty}^{a+(d-\delta)(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p})}(D), & m > a + (d-\delta)(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p}), \end{cases}$$

as well as

$$P_{\text{bd}} : B_{p,q}^s(D) \longrightarrow B_{\tau,q}^{s+\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad 0 < q \leq \infty,$$

both mappings being bounded linear operators.

Proof. We only show the necessary modifications of the proof of Theorem 1.

Step 2': Using the same notations, we then find using Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau &\leq c_1 \sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} (|I|^{\frac{m}{d} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} \rho_I^{-m+a} \mu_I)^\tau \\ &\leq c_1 \left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} (|I|^{(\frac{m}{d} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})\tau} \rho_I^{(a-m)\tau})^{\frac{p}{p-\tau}} \right)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} \underbrace{\left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} \mu_I^p \right)^{\frac{\tau}{p}}}_{\lesssim \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}^\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

For the first factor we proceed as before,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} (|I|^{\frac{m}{d} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} \rho_I^{a-m})^{\frac{p\tau}{p-\tau}} \right)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} &\leq \left(c_3 2^{-j(a+\frac{d}{2}-\frac{d}{p})\frac{p\tau}{p-\tau}} \sum_{k=1}^{2^j} k^{(a-m)\frac{p\tau}{p-\tau}} k^{d-1-\delta} 2^{j\delta} \right)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} \\ &\leq c_4 2^{-j(a+\frac{d}{2}-\frac{d}{p})\tau} 2^{j\delta \frac{p-\tau}{p}} \begin{cases} 2^{j(a-m)\tau + j(d-\delta)\frac{p-\tau}{p}}, & m-a < (d-\delta)\frac{p-\tau}{p\tau}, \\ (j+1)^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}}, & m-a = (d-\delta)\frac{p-\tau}{p\tau}, \\ 1, & m-a > (d-\delta)\frac{p-\tau}{p\tau}. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Step 3': Taking the supremum over $j \geq 0$ we obtain from the first line of the last estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{j \geq 0} 2^{j(m+\frac{d}{2}-\frac{d}{p})\tau} \sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau &\leq c_4 \sup_{j \geq 0} 2^{j(m+\frac{d}{p}-\frac{d}{\tau})\tau} 2^{-jm\tau} 2^{jd\frac{p-\tau}{p}} \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}^\tau \\ &= c_4 \sup_{j \geq 0} \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}^\tau = c_4 \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}^\tau, \end{aligned}$$

without any additional condition on τ . Similarly, in case $m-a = (d-\delta)(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p})$ the resulting estimate is

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{j \geq 0} 2^{j(m+\frac{d}{2}-\frac{d}{p})\tau} (j+1)^{-\frac{p-\tau}{p\tau}\tau} \sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau &\leq c_4 \sup_{j \geq 0} 2^{j(m-a+(d-\delta)(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p}))\tau} \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}^\tau \\ &= c_4 \sup_{j \geq 0} \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}^\tau = c_4 \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}^\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, in case $m-a > (d-\delta)(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p})$ we find

$$\sup_{j \geq 0} 2^{j(a+(d-\delta)(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p})+\frac{d}{2}-\frac{d}{p})\tau} \sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_j^0} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau \leq c_4 \sup_{j \geq 0} 2^{j(a-\delta(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p}))\tau} 2^{-ja\tau} 2^{jd\frac{p-\tau}{p}\tau} \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}^\tau$$

$$= c_4 \sup_{j \geq 0} \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}^\tau = c_4 \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}^\tau < \infty.$$

Step 4': To estimate the boundary part $P_{\text{bd}}u$, as before we only need to modify the summation over $j \geq 0$:

$$\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_{j,0}} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau \leq c_7^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}} 2^{j(d-1)\frac{p-\tau}{p}} \left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_{j,0}} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^p \right)^{\frac{\tau}{p}},$$

and further for $q < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{j(s + \frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p} + d(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\tau}))q} \left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_{j,0}} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^\tau \right)^{\frac{q}{\tau}} \\ & \leq c_7^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}q} \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{j(s + \frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p} + d(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\tau}))q} 2^{j(d-1)\frac{p-\tau}{p}q} \left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_{j,0}} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^p \right)^{\frac{q}{p}} \\ & = c_7^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}q} \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{j(s + d(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}))q} \left(\sum_{(I,\psi) \in \Lambda_{j,0}} |\langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle|^p \right)^{\frac{q}{p}} \\ & \leq c_7^{\frac{p-\tau}{p}q} \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}^q \sim \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{p,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)}^q \lesssim \|u\|_{B_{p,q}^s(D)}^q, \end{aligned}$$

which proves $P_{\text{bd}}u \in B_{\tau,q}^{s + \frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The result for $q = \infty$ follows by standard modifications. \square

Corollary 1. Let $u \in \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \cap B_{p,\infty}^s(D)$ for some bounded polyhedral domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Suppose $s > \frac{d-1}{d}m$ and $a > \frac{\delta}{d}m$. Then there exists some $0 < \tau_0 \leq p$ such that

$$u \in B_{\tau,\infty}^m(D) \hookrightarrow L_p(D)$$

for all $\tau_* < \tau < \tau_0$, where $\frac{1}{\tau_*} = \frac{m}{d} + \frac{1}{p}$.

Note: While it also holds $u \in B_{\tau,\infty}^m(D)$ for $\tau \leq \tau_*$, these spaces are no longer embedded into $L_p(D)$. From the point of view of n -term approximation, the result then becomes useless (the mere knowledge of this Besov regularity no longer yields any approximation rate). We further note that we always have $H_p^s(D) \hookrightarrow B_{p,\infty}^s(D)$.

Proof. We can decompose u according to $u = P_{\text{int}}u + P_{\text{bd}}u|_D$. Then we can consider both terms separately.

First we need to have a closer look at the condition $m - a < (d - \delta)\frac{p-\tau}{p\tau}$:

$$m - a < (d - \delta)\frac{p-\tau}{p\tau} = (d - \delta)\left(\frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p}\right) < (d - \delta)\left(\frac{1}{\tau_*} - \frac{1}{p}\right) = (d - \delta)\frac{m}{d}.$$

Clearly, the inequality $m - a < (d - \delta)\frac{m}{d}$ is equivalent to the assumption $a > \frac{\delta}{d}m$. Thus for τ sufficiently close to τ_* , the required condition $m - a < (d - \delta)\frac{p-\tau}{p\tau}$ for $P_{\text{int}}u \in B_{\tau,\infty}^m(D)$ can be satisfied, and we find $\frac{1}{\tau_0} = \frac{m-a}{d-\delta} + \frac{1}{p}$ (in case $a \geq m$ we just choose $\tau_0 = p$).

Similarly $s > \frac{d-1}{d}m$ implies $s + \frac{1}{\tau_*} - \frac{1}{p} > \frac{d-1}{d}m + \frac{1}{\tau_*} - \frac{1}{p} = m$, thus for τ sufficiently close to τ_* we still have $s + \frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p} \geq m$. Hence we have $B_{\tau,\infty}^{s + \frac{1}{\tau} - \frac{1}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B_{\tau,\infty}^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which in turn yields $P_{\text{bd}}u|_D \in B_{\tau,\infty}^m(D)$. \square

5 An extension argument for Kondratiev spaces

In this section we seek to relax the required Sobolev regularity in Corollary 1. This will be done by modifying the splitting $u = P_{\text{int}}u + P_{\text{bd}}u$. In what follows we denote by $S \subset \partial D$ the singularity set of

D . Then we recall that the distance function ρ is bounded away from zero on any closed subset of \bar{D} not containing S .

As a first step, instead of P_{bd} we consider the operator \tilde{P}_{sing} ,

$$\tilde{P}_{\text{sing}}u = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda_{j,0}} \langle \tilde{u}, \psi_I \rangle \psi_I,$$

i.e. we take only those terms of wavelets touching the singular set S . Then with the same estimates leading to the properties of P_{bd} in Theorem 2 we obtain

$$\tilde{P}_{\text{sing}} : B_{p,p}^s(D) \longrightarrow B_{\tau,p}^{s+(d-\delta)(\frac{1}{\tau}-\frac{1}{p})}(D), \quad 0 < \tau < p,$$

as a bounded linear operator. Ultimately, the embedding $B_{\tau,p}^{s+(d-\delta)(\frac{1}{\tau}-\frac{1}{p})}(D) \hookrightarrow B_{\tau,\infty}^m(D)$ for some $\tau > \tau_*$ then leads to the condition $s > \frac{\delta}{d}m$.

For the other part $\tilde{P}_{\text{reg}}u = u - \tilde{P}_{\text{sing}}u$ we once more want to use the regularity of u in the Kondratiev-scale. However, inspecting the previous proofs yields that this requires modifying the index sets $\Lambda_{j,k}$ to include also those wavelets touching the boundary, and extending the corresponding estimates for wavelet coefficients. This can be done by extending the functions from $\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)$ to \mathbb{R}^d in a suitable way.

In particular, we first have to define a counterpart of the scale $\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)$ for functions on \mathbb{R}^d . We start with a function η , which is defined on \mathbb{R}^d and smooth on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus S$, and it is assumed to mimic the distance function ρ , i.e. in a (sufficiently small) neighbourhood of the singularity set S the function η shall be equivalent to the distance to S . Moreover, we suppose that η has values only in the interval $[0, 1]$. Then we put

$$\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(S) := \{u \text{ measurable} : \eta^{|\alpha|-a} \partial^\alpha u \in L_p(\mathbb{R}^d), |\alpha| \leq m\}.$$

One possible approach now consists in retracing the steps of Stein's original proof in [19] in order to determine whether his extension operator is also bounded with respect to the \mathcal{K}_a^m -norms:

Lemma 5.1. For $a < 3/2$ the extension operator \mathfrak{E} defined in [19, Section 3.2-3.3] is bounded as a mapping $\mathfrak{E} : \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(S)$.

Proof. For the most part Stein's proof carries over without change, hence we shall mostly be concerned with some necessary modifications.

The first step consists in reducing the problem to smooth functions. It is easily seen that the set $C^\infty(D)$ is dense in $\mathcal{K}_a^m(D)$ for all parameters: Given a function $u \in \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)$ we can multiply it with a smooth cut-off function, hence we may assume u to have compact support. With standard mollification arguments we see that such a function (and simultaneously its partial derivatives) can be approximated in the L_2 -sense by C^∞ -functions. Clearly this immediately extends also to approximation w.r. to the $\mathcal{K}_a^m(D)$ -norm.

Stein then shows first that the extension operator applied to a smooth function $u \in C^\infty(D)$ yields again a smooth function $\mathfrak{E}u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. It now remains to check the corresponding norm estimates. Below we shall use Stein's notation.

Step 1: Stein defined the operator \mathfrak{E} on special Lipschitz domains by

$$\mathfrak{E}(x, y) = \int_1^\infty f(x, y + \lambda \delta^*(x, y)) \psi(\lambda) d\lambda, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, y \in \mathbb{R},$$

where δ^* is a scaled version of the regularized distance to the boundary, and $\psi : [1, \infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a rapidly decaying continuous function such that $\int_1^\infty \psi(\lambda) d\lambda = 1$ and $\int_1^\infty \lambda^k \psi(\lambda) d\lambda = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, $D = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : y > \varphi(x)\}$ with $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ being Lipschitz continuous.

Now assume $y < 0$, and let x^0 be a point with $\varphi(x^0) = 0$. The scaling and further properties of δ^* ensure $2|y| \leq \delta(x^0, y) \leq c|y|$, and it follows

$$|\mathfrak{E}f(x^0, y)| \lesssim \int_1^\infty |f(x^0, y + \lambda \delta^*)| \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda^p} = \delta^* \int_{y+\delta^*}^\infty |f(x^0, s)| (s-y)^{-p} ds \lesssim |y| \int_{|y|}^\infty |f(x^0, s)| s^{-p} ds.$$

The essential step now lies in applying Hardy's inequality,

$$\int_0^\infty \left(\int_x^\infty g(y) dy \right)^q x^{r-1} dx \leq \left(\frac{q}{r} \right)^q \int_0^\infty (yg(y))^q y^{r-1} dy,$$

where g is non-negative, $q \geq 1$ and $r > 0$. This shall be applied with $g(s) = f(x^0, s)s^{-2}$; we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^0 |y|^{-pa} |\mathfrak{E}f(x^0, y)|^p dy &\lesssim \int_{-\infty}^0 |y|^{p-pa} \left(\int_{|y|}^\infty |f(x^0, s)| s^{-2} ds \right)^p dy \\ &= \int_0^\infty y^{p-pa} \left(\int_y^\infty |f(x^0, s)| s^{-2} ds \right)^p dy \\ &\lesssim \int_0^\infty (s^{-1}|f(x^0, s)|)^p s^{p-pa} ds = \int_0^\infty |f(x^0, s)|^p s^{-pa} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Therein the assumption $r > 0$ for Hardy's inequality corresponds to $a < 3/2$. We observe that in the last integral the term s^{-pa} can again be replaced by $|y|^{-pa}$. Moreover, note that with simple translation arguments, we then obtain for general $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\varphi(x)} |y - \varphi(x)|^{-pa} |\mathfrak{E}f(x, y)|^p dy \lesssim \int_{\varphi(x)}^\infty |f(x, y)|^p |y - \varphi(x)|^{-pa} dy.$$

Since $\mathfrak{E}f(x, y) = f(x, y)$ for all $y > \varphi(x)$, we can extend the integration domain on the left-hand side to \mathbb{R} . Moreover, if we extend $\delta^*(x, y)$ for $y < \varphi(x)$ as the scaled regularized distance for the special Lipschitz domain $D^c = \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus \overline{D}$, then this choice guarantees $\delta^*(x, y) \sim |y - \varphi(x)|$ for all x and y . Now integration w.r.to $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ yields the desired estimate

$$\|\delta^{-a} \mathfrak{E}f|_{L_p(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})}\| \lesssim \|\delta^{-a} f|_{L_p(D)}\|$$

for arbitrary special Lipschitz domains $D \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ with constants only depending on a and D , with δ being the (regularized) distance to ∂D .

For partial derivatives of f similar arguments can be used (as explained in [19]), and no additional restrictions on a occur. Exemplary we show it for some second-order partial derivative, w.l.o.g. $\partial_j^2 \mathfrak{E}f$. It holds

$$\partial_j \mathfrak{E}f = \int_1^\infty \partial_j f(\dots) \psi(\lambda) d\lambda + \int_1^\infty \partial_y f(\dots) \lambda \partial_j \delta^* \psi(\lambda) d\lambda$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_j^2 \mathfrak{E}f &= \int_1^\infty \partial_j^2 f(\dots) \psi(\lambda) d\lambda + 2 \int_1^\infty \partial_j \partial_y f(\dots) \lambda \partial_j \delta^* \psi(\lambda) d\lambda \\ &\quad + \int_1^\infty \partial_y^2 f(\dots) (\lambda \partial_j \delta^*)^2 \psi(\lambda) d\lambda + \int_1^\infty \partial_y^2 f(\dots) \lambda \partial_j^2 \delta^* \psi(\lambda) d\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

We first note $\partial^\alpha \delta^* \leq c_\alpha (\delta^*)^{1-|\alpha|}$ for all multiindices α and $|\psi(\lambda)| \leq A_k \lambda^{-k}$. For the first term we then find as above for $y < 0$ and $\varphi(x^0) = 0$

$$\left| \int_1^\infty \partial_j^2 f(\dots) \psi(\lambda) d\lambda \right| \leq \int_1^\infty |\partial_j^2 f(\dots) \psi(\lambda)| d\lambda \leq A_2 \int_1^\infty |\partial_j^2 f(\dots)| \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda^2} \lesssim |y| \int_{|y|}^\infty |\partial_j^2 f(x^0, s)| s^{-2} ds, \quad (5.2)$$

and similarly

$$\left| \int_1^\infty \partial_j \partial_y f(\dots) \lambda \partial_j \delta^* \psi(\lambda) d\lambda \right| \leq c_j A_3 |y| \int_1^\infty |\partial_j \partial_y f(\dots)| s^{-2} ds \quad (5.3)$$

as well as

$$\left| \int_1^\infty \partial_y^2 f(\dots) (\lambda \partial_j \delta^*)^2 \psi(\lambda) d\lambda \right| \leq c_j^2 A_4 |y| \int_1^\infty |\partial_y^2 f(\dots)| s^{-2} ds. \quad (5.4)$$

It remains the last integral in (5.1). We re-write $\partial_y f$ as

$$\partial_y f(x^0, y + \lambda\delta^*) = \partial_y f(x^0, y + \delta^*) + \int_{y+\delta^*}^{y+\lambda\delta^*} \partial_y^2 f(x^0, t) dt.$$

Due to the choice of ψ , i.e. $\int_1^\infty \lambda\psi(\lambda) d\lambda = 0$, we then have

$$\int_1^\infty \partial_y^2 f(\dots) \lambda \partial_j^2 \delta^* \psi(\lambda) d\lambda = \int_1^\infty \lambda \partial_j^2 \delta^* \psi(\lambda) \int_{y+\delta^*}^{y+\lambda\delta^*} \partial_y^2 f(x^0, t) dt d\lambda.$$

This can be estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_1^\infty \partial_y^2 f(\dots) \lambda \partial_j^2 \delta^* \psi(\lambda) d\lambda \right| &\lesssim |y|^{-1} A_4 \int_1^\infty \left(\int_{y+\delta^*}^{y+\lambda\delta^*} |\partial_y^2 f(x^0, t)| dt \right) \lambda^{-3} d\lambda \\ &= |y|^{-1} A_4 \int_{y+\delta^*}^\infty \left(\int_{\frac{t-y}{\delta^*}}^\infty \lambda^{-3} d\lambda \right) |\partial_y^2 f(x^0, t)| dt \\ &\sim |y|^{-1} \int_{y+\delta^*}^\infty (\delta^*)^2 |\partial_y^2 f(x^0, t)| \frac{dt}{(t-y)^2} \lesssim |y| \int_1^\infty |\partial_y^2 f(\dots)| s^{-2} ds. \end{aligned}$$

For the last integral as well as those in (5.2)–(5.4) we can use analogous arguments as above, we only have to replace $|y|^{-pa}$ by $|y|^{(2-a)p}$. Since the assumption $r > 0$ for Hardy's inequality now transfers to $a < 7/2$, as announced no additional restrictions on a occur.

Similarly for all other partial derivatives of $\mathfrak{E}f$: After differentiation under the integral every term can be treated separately, and for terms involving lower order derivatives of f we use Taylor expansion and the moment conditions for ψ .

Step 2: The result for special Lipschitz domains in Step 1 now can be used to derive the estimate for general Lipschitz polyhedral domains. For this we only note that the singularity set can be covered by finitely many open sets U_1, \dots, U_N such that on any of these open sets the distance to ∂D is equivalent to the distance to S . This cover of S can be extended with additional finitely many open sets U_{N+1}, \dots, U_M to an open cover of \bar{D} . On these sets U_{N+1}, \dots, U_M the distance function η shall be bounded from below. Finally, we assume that we can associate with every U_i a special Lipschitz domain D_i such that $U_i \cap D = U_i \cap D_i$. With these sets U_i and D_i in hand we are back in the situation of [19, Section 3.3], where it is described how to glue together the extension operators \mathfrak{E}_i (w.r.to the domains D_i) to finally obtain \mathfrak{E} (essentially it is a partition of unity argument for some partition adapted to the domains D_i and the neighbourhoods U_i).

The norm estimates for \mathfrak{E} carry over to our situation without change, we only note that the estimates in Step 1 due to the assumptions on the U_i exactly correspond to estimates for the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{K}_a^m(S)}$ -norm. \square

The restriction $a < 3/2$ of the above lemma is merely of technical nature. For values $a \geq 3/2$ we can easily define extension operators \mathfrak{E}_a by tracing it back to some fixed valued $a < 3/2$.

Lemma 5.2. Let ω be a smooth non-negative function with $\omega(x) = 1$ for all $x \in \bar{D}$ and $\text{supp } \omega \subset \tilde{D}$ for some arbitrary bounded domain \tilde{D} . Then the operator \mathfrak{E}_a , defined by

$$\mathfrak{E}_a u = \eta^a \omega \mathfrak{E}(\eta^{-a}|_D u),$$

is a bounded linear mapping from $\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)$ into $\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(S)$.

Proof. It is easily checked that $\mathfrak{E}_a u$ indeed defines a function on \mathbb{R}^d with $\mathfrak{E}_a u|_D = u$. We next observe

$$u \in \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \iff \rho^{-a} u \in \mathcal{K}_{p,0}^m(D).$$

This is a consequence of the assumed smoothness of ρ . Note that exactly the same reasoning applies to the spaces $\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(S)$. Then the boundedness of \mathfrak{E}_a follows from Lemma 5.1:

$$\|\eta^a \omega \mathfrak{E}(\eta^{-a}|_D u)\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(S)} \sim \|\omega \mathfrak{E}(\eta^{-a}|_D u)\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,0}^m(S)} \lesssim \|\mathfrak{E}(\eta^{-a}|_D u)\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,0}^m(S)}$$

$$\lesssim \|\eta^{-a}|_D u| \mathcal{K}_{p,0}^m(D)\| \lesssim \|u| \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)\|.$$

This proves the claim. \square

Below we shall use the notation \mathcal{E}_a , where $\mathcal{E}_a = \mathfrak{E}$ for $a < 3/2$ and $\mathcal{E}_a = \mathfrak{E}_a$ otherwise. With this definition at hand, we now put

$$P_{\text{reg}} u = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{k > 0} \sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda_{j,k}^\eta} \langle \mathcal{E}_a u, \psi_I \rangle \psi_I, \quad \Lambda_{j,k}^\eta = \{(i, \psi) \in \Lambda : 2^{-j} k \leq \eta_I < (k+1)2^{-j}\}.$$

We note that we no longer require $Q(I) \subset D$ in the definition of $\Lambda_{j,k}^\eta$. Moreover, we define

$$P_{\text{sing}} u = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda_{j,0}^\eta} \langle \mathcal{E}_a u, \psi_I \rangle \psi_I.$$

This implies

$$u = \mathcal{E}_a u|_D = P_{\text{reg}} u|_D + P_{\text{sing}} u|_D.$$

The wavelet coefficients corresponding to terms with $(I, \psi) \in \Lambda_{j,k}^\eta$ for $k > 0$ can now be estimated in exactly the same way as in the proof of Theorems 1 and 2, in particular

$$\sum_{k > 0} \sum_{(I, \psi) \in \Lambda_{j,k}^\eta} \mu_I^p \lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\eta(x)^{m-a} \partial^\alpha (\mathcal{E}_a u)(x)|^p dx \leq \|\mathcal{E}_a u| \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(S)\|^p \lesssim \|u| \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)\|^p.$$

Corresponding the singular part $P_{\text{sing}} u$ we either need to prove boundedness of \mathcal{E}_a as an extension operator on $B_{p,\infty}^s(D)$; or we use the embedding $H_p^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow B_{p,\infty}^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ together with the boundedness of \mathcal{E}_a on $H_p^s(D)$ (which in turn is easily seen once more retracing the steps of Stein's proof). Altogether, we have proved

Theorem 3. Let $u \in \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \cap H_p^s(D)$ for some bounded polyhedral domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Suppose $\min(s, a) > \frac{\delta}{d} m$. Then there exists some $0 < \tau_0 \leq p$ such that

$$u \in B_{\tau,\infty}^m(D) \hookrightarrow L_p(D)$$

for all $\tau_* < \tau < \tau_0$, where $\frac{1}{\tau_*} = \frac{m}{d} + \frac{1}{p}$.

Remark 6. We specialize the above result to the cases $d = 2$ and $d = 3$ and $p = 2$: In case $d = 2$ we always have $\delta = 0$, hence there is no restriction on the parameters except for the (almost) trivial ones $s > 0$ and $a > 0$. In particular, concerning the Sobolev regularity the trivial result $u \in H^1(D)$ whenever $f \in H^{-1}(D)$ is already sufficient.

The case $d = 3$ is a little more diverse: Except for special right-hand sides we now have $\delta = 1$, hence there is an upper bound for m , which corresponds to the limited Besov regularity of the corresponding singularity functions proved in [5].

In case of smooth cones or smooth domains except for conical points at the boundary there are analogous regularity results in weighted Sobolev spaces (see [13]), and our argument for the Besov regularity can be transferred (cf. [8]). Then we again have arbitrary Besov regularity for the singular part, and no upper bound for m .

6 Approximation rates for solutions of elliptic boundary value problems

In this final section we shall combine the embedding from Theorem 3 with the n -term approximation rates from (2.2) and (2.3).

Theorem 4. Let D be some bounded polyhedral domain in \mathbb{R}^d . Suppose $\min(s, a) > \frac{\delta}{d}m$. Then every function $u \in \mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D) \cap H_p^s(D)$ satisfies

$$\sigma_n(u; L_p(D)) \lesssim n^{-m/d} \|u\|_{B_{r,\infty}^m(D)} \lesssim n^{-m/d} \max(\|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}, \|u\|_{H_p^s(D)})$$

as well as

$$\sigma_n(u; W_p^1(D)) \lesssim n^{-(m-1)/d} \max(\|u\|_{\mathcal{K}_{p,a}^m(D)}, \|u\|_{H_p^s(D)})$$

with constants independent of u and n .

As a final step, we now assume u to be the solution of some elliptic boundary value problem.

Theorem 5. Let D be some bounded polyhedral domain without cracks in \mathbb{R}^d , and consider the problem

$$-\nabla(A(x) \cdot \nabla u(x)) = f \quad \text{in } D, \quad u|_{\partial D} = 0.$$

Under the assumptions of Proposition 1, for a right-hand side $f \in H^{m-1}(D)$ the uniquely determined solution $u \in \mathcal{K}_{a+1}^{m+1}(D)$ can be approximated at the rate

$$\sigma_n(u; H^1(D)) \lesssim n^{-m/d} \|f\|_{H^{m-1}(D)},$$

where

$$a \leq m < \min\left(\frac{d}{\delta}(a+1) - 1, \frac{d}{\delta}s_0 - 1\right).$$

Therein s_0 denotes the Sobolev-regularity of u .

Proof. We just need to check, under which conditions the assumptions of the previous theorem are fulfilled. We have $H^{m-1}(D) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{K}_{a-1}^{m-1}(D)$ whenever $a \leq m$. On the other hand, we have the restriction $\frac{\delta}{d}(m+1) < a+1$, which gives the right part of the condition on m . \square

Note that often Sobolev regularity statements are of the form: u belongs to Sobolev spaces $H^s(D)$ for all $s < s_0$, and in general $u \notin H^{s_0}(D)$. Then we still have the condition $m+1 < \frac{d}{\delta}s_0$ in the previous theorem.

Corollary 2. Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a polygon (or more generally a Lipschitz domain with polygonal structure). Let $a_{i,j} \in \mathcal{W}_\infty^m(D)$, $i, j = 1, 2$, $A = (a_{i,j})_{i,j=1,2}$, and consider the problem

$$-\nabla(A(x) \cdot \nabla u(x)) = f \quad \text{in } D, \quad u|_{\partial D} = 0, \tag{6.1}$$

for $f \in \mathcal{K}_a^m \cap H^{-1}(D)$. Then it holds

$$\sigma_n(u, H^1(D)) \lesssim n^{-m/2} \max(\|f\|_{H^{-1}(D)}, \|f\|_{\mathcal{K}_{a-1}^{m-1}(D)})$$

whenever $a > -1$ is a parameter such that (6.1) is uniquely solvable.

Thus in this situation, apart from the basic existence result in $H^1(D)$ we do not need any information about the Sobolev regularity, and similarly, also for the parameter a the only restriction is the availability of an existence result for $f \in \mathcal{K}_{a-1}^{m-1}(D)$.

Similar results hold for other types of boundary conditions, and also for bounded domains $D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary except for conical points. More general polyhedral domains in \mathbb{R}^3 require additional conditions: On the one hand we need more specific knowledge of the Sobolev-regularity of the solution, and on the other hand we need a to be large enough (which in turn might require more sophisticated existence results than Proposition 1). Nevertheless the resulting conditions improve the ones available so far by replacing the usual factor $\frac{d}{d-1}$ by $\frac{d}{\delta}$.

References

- [1] C. BAKUTA, A. MAZZUCATO, V. NISTOR, L. ZIKATANOV (2010): Interface and mixed boundary value problems on n -dimensional polyhedral domains. *Doc. Math.* **15**, 687–745.
- [2] S. DAHLKE, R. A. DEVORE (1997): Besov regularity for elliptic boundary value problems. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **22**(1-2), 1–16.
- [3] S. DAHLKE (1998): Besov regularity for second order elliptic boundary value problems with variable coefficients. *Manuscripta Math.* **95**, 59–77.
- [4] S. DAHLKE (1999): Besov regularity for elliptic boundary value problems in polygonal domains. *Appl. Math. Lett.* **12**, 31–36.
- [5] S. DAHLKE (2002): Besov regularity of edge singularities for the Poisson equation in polyhedral domains. *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.* **9**, 457–466.
- [6] M. DAUGE (1988): Elliptic boundary value problems in corner domains. Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1341**, Springer, Berlin.
- [7] S. DAHLKE, E. NOVAK, W. SICKEL (2006): Optimal approximation of elliptic problems by linear and nonlinear mappings II. *J. Complexity* **22**, 549–603.
- [8] S. DAHLKE, W. SICKEL (2009): Besov regularity for the Poisson equation in smooth and polyhedral cones. In: Sobolev spaces in mathematics II. V. Maz'ya (Ed.). *Int. Math. Ser. (N.Y.)* **9**, Springer, New York.
- [9] R. A. DEVORE, B. JAWERTH, V. POPOV (1992): Compression of wavelet decompositions. *Amer. J. Math.* **114**, 737–785.
- [10] M. HANSEN, W. SICKEL (2011): Best m -term approximation and Lizorkin-Triebel spaces. *JAT* **163**(8), 923–954.
- [11] D. JERISON, C. KENIG (1995): The inhomogeneous Dirichlet problem in Lipschitz domains. *J. Funct. Anal.* **130**, 161–219.
- [12] G. A. KALYABIN, P. I. LIZORKIN (1987): Spaces of generalized smoothness. *Math. Nachr.* **133**, 7–32.
- [13] V. A. KOZLOV, V. G. MAZ'YA, J. ROSSMANN (1997): Elliptic boundary value problems in domains with point singularities. American Mathematical Society, Rhode Island.
- [14] V. A. KOZLOV, V. G. MAZ'YA, J. ROSSMANN (2000): Spectral problems associated with corner singularities of solutions to elliptic equations. American Mathematical Society, Rhode Island.
- [15] Y. MEYER (1992): Wavelets and operators. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. **37**, Cambridge.
- [16] S. MOURA (2001): Function spaces of generalized smoothness. *Dissertationes Math.* **398**, 1–88.
- [17] A. MAZZUCATO, V. NISTOR (2010): Well posedness and regularity for the elasticity equation with mixed boundary conditions on polyhedral domains and domains with cracks. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **195**, 25–73.
- [18] V. S. RYCHKOV (1999): On restrictions and extensions of the Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces with respect to Lipschitz domains. *J. London Math. Soc.* **60**, 237–257.
- [19] E. M. STEIN (1970): Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions. Princeton Mathematical series **30**. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- [20] H. TRIEBEL (2006): Theory of Function spaces III. Birkhäuser, Basel.
- [21] H. TRIEBEL (2008): Function spaces on domains. *EMS Tracts on Mathematics* **7**. EMS Publishing House, Zürich.

Preprint Series DFG-SPP 1324

<http://www.dfg-spp1324.de>

Reports

- [1] R. Ramlau, G. Teschke, and M. Zhariy. A Compressive Landweber Iteration for Solving Ill-Posed Inverse Problems. Preprint 1, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2008.
- [2] G. Plonka. The Easy Path Wavelet Transform: A New Adaptive Wavelet Transform for Sparse Representation of Two-dimensional Data. Preprint 2, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2008.
- [3] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. Optimal Order of Convergence and (In-) Tractability of Multivariate Approximation of Smooth Functions. Preprint 3, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2008.
- [4] M. Espig, L. Grasedyck, and W. Hackbusch. Black Box Low Tensor Rank Approximation Using Fibre-Crosses. Preprint 4, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2008.
- [5] T. Bonesky, S. Dahlke, P. Maass, and T. Raasch. Adaptive Wavelet Methods and Sparsity Reconstruction for Inverse Heat Conduction Problems. Preprint 5, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2009.
- [6] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. Approximation of Infinitely Differentiable Multivariate Functions Is Intractable. Preprint 6, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2009.
- [7] J. Ma and G. Plonka. A Review of Curvelets and Recent Applications. Preprint 7, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2009.
- [8] L. Denis, D. A. Lorenz, and D. Trede. Greedy Solution of Ill-Posed Problems: Error Bounds and Exact Inversion. Preprint 8, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [9] U. Friedrich. A Two Parameter Generalization of Lions' Nonoverlapping Domain Decomposition Method for Linear Elliptic PDEs. Preprint 9, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [10] K. Bredies and D. A. Lorenz. Minimization of Non-smooth, Non-convex Functionals by Iterative Thresholding. Preprint 10, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [11] K. Bredies and D. A. Lorenz. Regularization with Non-convex Separable Constraints. Preprint 11, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

- [12] M. Döhler, S. Kunis, and D. Potts. Nonequispaced Hyperbolic Cross Fast Fourier Transform. Preprint 12, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [13] C. Bender. Dual Pricing of Multi-Exercise Options under Volume Constraints. Preprint 13, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [14] T. Müller-Gronbach and K. Ritter. Variable Subspace Sampling and Multi-level Algorithms. Preprint 14, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2009.
- [15] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and A. Iske. Optimally Sparse Image Representation by the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 15, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2009.
- [16] S. Dahlke, E. Novak, and W. Sickel. Optimal Approximation of Elliptic Problems by Linear and Nonlinear Mappings IV: Errors in L_2 and Other Norms. Preprint 16, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.
- [17] B. Jin, T. Khan, P. Maass, and M. Pidcock. Function Spaces and Optimal Currents in Impedance Tomography. Preprint 17, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.
- [18] G. Plonka and J. Ma. Curvelet-Wavelet Regularized Split Bregman Iteration for Compressed Sensing. Preprint 18, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.
- [19] G. Teschke and C. Borries. Accelerated Projected Steepest Descent Method for Nonlinear Inverse Problems with Sparsity Constraints. Preprint 19, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.
- [20] L. Grasedyck. Hierarchical Singular Value Decomposition of Tensors. Preprint 20, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.
- [21] D. Rudolf. Error Bounds for Computing the Expectation by Markov Chain Monte Carlo. Preprint 21, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.
- [22] M. Hansen and W. Sickel. Best m -term Approximation and Lizorkin-Triebel Spaces. Preprint 22, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.
- [23] F.J. Hickernell, T. Müller-Gronbach, B. Niu, and K. Ritter. Multi-level Monte Carlo Algorithms for Infinite-dimensional Integration on \mathbb{R}^N . Preprint 23, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.
- [24] S. Dereich and F. Heidenreich. A Multilevel Monte Carlo Algorithm for Lévy Driven Stochastic Differential Equations. Preprint 24, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.
- [25] S. Dahlke, M. Fornasier, and T. Raasch. Multilevel Preconditioning for Adaptive Sparse Optimization. Preprint 25, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.

- [26] S. Dereich. Multilevel Monte Carlo Algorithms for Lévy-driven SDEs with Gaussian Correction. Preprint 26, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.
- [27] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and D. Roşca. A New Hybrid Method for Image Approximation using the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 27, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2009.
- [28] O. Koch and C. Lubich. Dynamical Low-rank Approximation of Tensors. Preprint 28, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [29] E. Faou, V. Gradinaru, and C. Lubich. Computing Semi-classical Quantum Dynamics with Hagedorn Wavepackets. Preprint 29, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [30] D. Conte and C. Lubich. An Error Analysis of the Multi-configuration Time-dependent Hartree Method of Quantum Dynamics. Preprint 30, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [31] C. E. Powell and E. Ullmann. Preconditioning Stochastic Galerkin Saddle Point Problems. Preprint 31, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [32] O. G. Ernst and E. Ullmann. Stochastic Galerkin Matrices. Preprint 32, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [33] F. Lindner and R. L. Schilling. Weak Order for the Discretization of the Stochastic Heat Equation Driven by Impulsive Noise. Preprint 33, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [34] L. Kämmerer and S. Kunis. On the Stability of the Hyperbolic Cross Discrete Fourier Transform. Preprint 34, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2009.
- [35] P. Cerejeiras, M. Ferreira, U. Kähler, and G. Teschke. Inversion of the noisy Radon transform on $SO(3)$ by Gabor frames and sparse recovery principles. Preprint 35, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2010.
- [36] T. Jahnke and T. Udrescu. Solving Chemical Master Equations by Adaptive Wavelet Compression. Preprint 36, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2010.
- [37] P. Kittipoom, G. Kutyniok, and W.-Q. Lim. Irregular Shearlet Frames: Geometry and Approximation Properties. Preprint 37, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2010.
- [38] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q. Lim. Compactly Supported Shearlets are Optimally Sparse. Preprint 38, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2010.

- [39] M. Hansen and W. Sickel. Best m -Term Approximation and Tensor Products of Sobolev and Besov Spaces – the Case of Non-compact Embeddings. Preprint 39, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.
- [40] B. Niu, F.J. Hickernell, T. Müller-Gronbach, and K. Ritter. Deterministic Multi-level Algorithms for Infinite-dimensional Integration on \mathbb{R}^N . Preprint 40, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.
- [41] P. Kittipoom, G. Kutyniok, and W.-Q Lim. Construction of Compactly Supported Shearlet Frames. Preprint 41, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.
- [42] C. Bender and J. Steiner. Error Criteria for Numerical Solutions of Backward SDEs. Preprint 42, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.
- [43] L. Grasedyck. Polynomial Approximation in Hierarchical Tucker Format by Vector-Tensorization. Preprint 43, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.
- [44] M. Hansen und W. Sickel. Best m -Term Approximation and Sobolev-Besov Spaces of Dominating Mixed Smoothness - the Case of Compact Embeddings. Preprint 44, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.
- [45] P. Binev, W. Dahmen, and P. Lamby. Fast High-Dimensional Approximation with Sparse Occupancy Trees. Preprint 45, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.
- [46] J. Ballani and L. Grasedyck. A Projection Method to Solve Linear Systems in Tensor Format. Preprint 46, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.
- [47] P. Binev, A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, R. DeVore, G. Petrova, and P. Wojtaszczyk. Convergence Rates for Greedy Algorithms in Reduced Basis Methods. Preprint 47, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.
- [48] S. Kestler and K. Urban. Adaptive Wavelet Methods on Unbounded Domains. Preprint 48, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.
- [49] H. Yserentant. The Mixed Regularity of Electronic Wave Functions Multiplied by Explicit Correlation Factors. Preprint 49, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.
- [50] H. Yserentant. On the Complexity of the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. Preprint 50, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.
- [51] M. Guillemard and A. Iske. Curvature Analysis of Frequency Modulated Manifolds in Dimensionality Reduction. Preprint 51, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.
- [52] E. Herrholz and G. Teschke. Compressive Sensing Principles and Iterative Sparse Recovery for Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems. Preprint 52, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

- [53] L. Kämmerer, S. Kunis, and D. Potts. Interpolation Lattices for Hyperbolic Cross Trigonometric Polynomials. Preprint 53, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [54] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q Lim. Shearlets on Bounded Domains. Preprint 54, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [55] A. Zeiser. Wavelet Approximation in Weighted Sobolev Spaces of Mixed Order with Applications to the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. Preprint 55, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [56] G. Kutyniok, J. Lemvig, and W.-Q Lim. Compactly Supported Shearlets. Preprint 56, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [57] A. Zeiser. On the Optimality of the Inexact Inverse Iteration Coupled with Adaptive Finite Element Methods. Preprint 57, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [58] S. Jokar. Sparse Recovery and Kronecker Products. Preprint 58, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.
- [59] T. Aboiyar, E. H. Georgoulis, and A. Iske. Adaptive ADER Methods Using Kernel-Based Polyharmonic Spline WENO Reconstruction. Preprint 59, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.
- [60] O. G. Ernst, A. Mugler, H.-J. Starkloff, and E. Ullmann. On the Convergence of Generalized Polynomial Chaos Expansions. Preprint 60, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.
- [61] S. Holtz, T. Rohwedder, and R. Schneider. On Manifolds of Tensors of Fixed TT-Rank. Preprint 61, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2010.
- [62] J. Ballani, L. Grasedyck, and M. Kluge. Black Box Approximation of Tensors in Hierarchical Tucker Format. Preprint 62, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.
- [63] M. Hansen. On Tensor Products of Quasi-Banach Spaces. Preprint 63, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.
- [64] S. Dahlke, G. Steidl, and G. Teschke. Shearlet Coorbit Spaces: Compactly Supported Analyzing Shearlets, Traces and Embeddings. Preprint 64, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.
- [65] W. Hackbusch. Tensorisation of Vectors and their Efficient Convolution. Preprint 65, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.
- [66] P. A. Cioica, S. Dahlke, S. Kinzel, F. Lindner, T. Raasch, K. Ritter, and R. L. Schilling. Spatial Besov Regularity for Stochastic Partial Differential Equations on Lipschitz Domains. Preprint 66, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.

- [67] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. On the Power of Function Values for the Approximation Problem in Various Settings. Preprint 67, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.
- [68] A. Hinrichs, E. Novak, and H. Woźniakowski. The Curse of Dimensionality for Monotone and Convex Functions of Many Variables. Preprint 68, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.
- [69] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q. Lim. Image Separation Using Shearlets. Preprint 69, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.
- [70] B. Jin and P. Maass. An Analysis of Electrical Impedance Tomography with Applications to Tikhonov Regularization. Preprint 70, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [71] S. Holtz, T. Rohwedder, and R. Schneider. The Alternating Linear Scheme for Tensor Optimisation in the TT Format. Preprint 71, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [72] T. Müller-Gronbach and K. Ritter. A Local Refinement Strategy for Constructive Quantization of Scalar SDEs. Preprint 72, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [73] T. Rohwedder and R. Schneider. An Analysis for the DIIS Acceleration Method used in Quantum Chemistry Calculations. Preprint 73, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [74] C. Bender and J. Steiner. Least-Squares Monte Carlo for Backward SDEs. Preprint 74, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [75] C. Bender. Primal and Dual Pricing of Multiple Exercise Options in Continuous Time. Preprint 75, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [76] H. Harbrecht, M. Peters, and R. Schneider. On the Low-rank Approximation by the Pivoted Cholesky Decomposition. Preprint 76, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [77] P. A. Cioica, S. Dahlke, N. Döhring, S. Kinzel, F. Lindner, T. Raasch, K. Ritter, and R. L. Schilling. Adaptive Wavelet Methods for Elliptic Stochastic Partial Differential Equations. Preprint 77, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [78] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and A. Iske. Optimal Representation of Piecewise Hölder Smooth Bivariate Functions by the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 78, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

- [79] A. Mugler and H.-J. Starkloff. On Elliptic Partial Differential Equations with Random Coefficients. Preprint 79, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [80] T. Müller-Gronbach, K. Ritter, and L. Yaroslavtseva. A Derandomization of the Euler Scheme for Scalar Stochastic Differential Equations. Preprint 80, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [81] W. Dahmen, C. Huang, C. Schwab, and G. Welper. Adaptive Petrov-Galerkin methods for first order transport equations. Preprint 81, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [82] K. Grella and C. Schwab. Sparse Tensor Spherical Harmonics Approximation in Radiative Transfer. Preprint 82, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [83] D.A. Lorenz, S. Schiffler, and D. Trede. Beyond Convergence Rates: Exact Inversion With Tikhonov Regularization With Sparsity Constraints. Preprint 83, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [84] S. Dereich, M. Scheutzow, and R. Schottstedt. Constructive quantization: Approximation by empirical measures. Preprint 84, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [85] S. Dahlke and W. Sickel. On Besov Regularity of Solutions to Nonlinear Elliptic Partial Differential Equations. Preprint 85, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [86] S. Dahlke, U. Friedrich, P. Maass, T. Raasch, and R.A. Ressel. An adaptive wavelet method for parameter identification problems in parabolic partial differential equations. Preprint 86, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [87] A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, and G. Welper. Adaptivity and Variational Stabilization for Convection-Diffusion Equations. Preprint 87, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [88] T. Jahnke. On Reduced Models for the Chemical Master Equation. Preprint 88, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [89] P. Binev, W. Dahmen, R. DeVore, P. Lamby, D. Savu, and R. Sharpley. Compressed Sensing and Electron Microscopy. Preprint 89, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2011.
- [90] P. Binev, F. Blanco-Silva, D. Blom, W. Dahmen, P. Lamby, R. Sharpley, and T. Vogt. High Quality Image Formation by Nonlocal Means Applied to High-Angle Annular Dark Field Scanning Transmission Electron Microscopy (HAADF-STEM). Preprint 90, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2011.
- [91] R. A. Ressel. A Parameter Identification Problem for a Nonlinear Parabolic Differential Equation. Preprint 91, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2011.

- [92] G. Kutyniok. Data Separation by Sparse Representations. Preprint 92, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2011.
- [93] M. A. Davenport, M. F. Duarte, Y. C. Eldar, and G. Kutyniok. Introduction to Compressed Sensing. Preprint 93, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2011.
- [94] H.-C. Kreuzler and H. Yserentant. The Mixed Regularity of Electronic Wave Functions in Fractional Order and Weighted Sobolev Spaces. Preprint 94, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.
- [95] E. Ullmann, H. C. Elman, and O. G. Ernst. Efficient Iterative Solvers for Stochastic Galerkin Discretizations of Log-Transformed Random Diffusion Problems. Preprint 95, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.
- [96] S. Kunis and I. Melzer. On the Butterfly Sparse Fourier Transform. Preprint 96, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.
- [97] T. Rohwedder. The Continuous Coupled Cluster Formulation for the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. Preprint 97, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.
- [98] T. Rohwedder and R. Schneider. Error Estimates for the Coupled Cluster Method. Preprint 98, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.
- [99] P. A. Cioica and S. Dahlke. Spatial Besov Regularity for Semilinear Stochastic Partial Differential Equations on Bounded Lipschitz Domains. Preprint 99, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2011.
- [100] L. Grasedyck and W. Hackbusch. An Introduction to Hierarchical (H-) Rank and TT-Rank of Tensors with Examples. Preprint 100, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2011.
- [101] N. Chegini, S. Dahlke, U. Friedrich, and R. Stevenson. Piecewise Tensor Product Wavelet Bases by Extensions and Approximation Rates. Preprint 101, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.
- [102] S. Dahlke, P. Oswald, and T. Raasch. A Note on Quarkonial Systems and Multi-level Partition of Unity Methods. Preprint 102, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.
- [103] A. Uschmajew. Local Convergence of the Alternating Least Squares Algorithm For Canonical Tensor Approximation. Preprint 103, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.
- [104] S. Kvaal. Multiconfigurational time-dependent Hartree method for describing particle loss due to absorbing boundary conditions. Preprint 104, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.

- [105] M. Guillemard and A. Iske. On Groupoid C^* -Algebras, Persistent Homology and Time-Frequency Analysis. Preprint 105, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.
- [106] A. Hinrichs, E. Novak, and H. Woźniakowski. Discontinuous information in the worst case and randomized settings. Preprint 106, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.
- [107] M. Espig, W. Hackbusch, A. Litvinenko, H. Matthies, and E. Zander. Efficient Analysis of High Dimensional Data in Tensor Formats. Preprint 107, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.
- [108] M. Espig, W. Hackbusch, S. Handschuh, and R. Schneider. Optimization Problems in Contracted Tensor Networks. Preprint 108, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2011.
- [109] S. Dereich, T. Müller-Gronbach, and K. Ritter. On the Complexity of Computing Quadrature Formulas for SDEs. Preprint 109, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2011.
- [110] D. Belomestny. Solving optimal stopping problems by empirical dual optimization and penalization. Preprint 110, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2011.
- [111] D. Belomestny and J. Schoenmakers. Multilevel dual approach for pricing American style derivatives. Preprint 111, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2011.
- [112] T. Rohwedder and A. Uschmajew. Local convergence of alternating schemes for optimization of convex problems in the TT format. Preprint 112, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2011.
- [113] T. Görner, R. Hielscher, and S. Kunis. Efficient and accurate computation of spherical mean values at scattered center points. Preprint 113, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2011.
- [114] Y. Dong, T. Görner, and S. Kunis. An iterative reconstruction scheme for photoacoustic imaging. Preprint 114, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2011.
- [115] L. Kämmerer. Reconstructing hyperbolic cross trigonometric polynomials by sampling along generated sets. Preprint 115, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2012.
- [116] H. Chen and R. Schneider. Numerical analysis of augmented plane waves methods for full-potential electronic structure calculations. Preprint 116, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2012.
- [117] J. Ma, G. Plonka, and M.Y. Hussaini. Compressive Video Sampling with Approximate Message Passing Decoding. Preprint 117, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2012.

- [118] D. Heinen and G. Plonka. Wavelet shrinkage on paths for scattered data denoising. Preprint 118, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2012.
- [119] T. Jahnke and M. Kreim. Error bound for piecewise deterministic processes modeling stochastic reaction systems. Preprint 119, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2012.
- [120] C. Bender and J. Steiner. A-posteriori estimates for backward SDEs. Preprint 120, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2012.
- [121] M. Espig, W. Hackbusch, A. Litvinenkoy, H.G. Matthiesy, and P. Wähnert. Efficient low-rank approximation of the stochastic Galerkin matrix in tensor formats. Preprint 121, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2012.
- [122] O. Bokanowski, J. Garcke, M. Griebel, and I. Klompmaker. An adaptive sparse grid semi-Lagrangian scheme for first order Hamilton-Jacobi Bellman equations. Preprint 122, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2012.
- [123] A. Mugler and H.-J. Starkloff. On the convergence of the stochastic Galerkin method for random elliptic partial differential equations. Preprint 123, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2012.
- [124] P.A. Cioica, S. Dahlke, N. Döhring, U. Friedrich, S. Kinzel, F. Lindner, T. Raasch, K. Ritter, and R.L. Schilling. On the convergence analysis of Rothe’s method. Preprint 124, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2012.
- [125] P. Binev, A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, and R. DeVore. Classification Algorithms using Adaptive Partitioning. Preprint 125, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2012.
- [126] C. Lubich, T. Rohwedder, R. Schneider, and B. Vandereycken. Dynamical approximation of hierarchical Tucker and Tensor-Train tensors. Preprint 126, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2012.
- [127] M. Kovács, S. Larsson, and K. Urban. On Wavelet-Galerkin methods for semilinear parabolic equations with additive noise. Preprint 127, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2012.
- [128] M. Bachmayr, H. Chen, and R. Schneider. Numerical analysis of Gaussian approximations in quantum chemistry. Preprint 128, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2012.
- [129] D. Rudolf. Explicit error bounds for Markov chain Monte Carlo. Preprint 129, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2012.
- [130] P.A. Cioica, K.-H. Kim, K. Lee, and F. Lindner. On the $L_q(L_p)$ -regularity and Besov smoothness of stochastic parabolic equations on bounded Lipschitz domains. Preprint 130, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2012.

- [131] M. Hansen. n -term Approximation Rates and Besov Regularity for Elliptic PDEs on Polyhedral Domains. Preprint 131, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2012.