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In this paper, an efficient multiscale finite element method via local defect-correction technique is developed. This method is used to solve the Schrödinger eigenvalue problem with three-dimensional domain. First, this paper considers a three-dimensional bounded spherical region, which is the truncation of a three-dimensional unbounded region. Using polar coordinate transformation, we successfully transform the three-dimensional problem into a series of one-dimensional eigenvalue problems. These one-dimensional eigenvalue problems also bring singularity. Second, using local refinement technique, we establish a new multiscale finite element discretization method. The scheme can correct the defects repeatedly on the local refinement grid, which can solve the singularity problem efficiently. Finally, the error estimates of eigenvalues and eigenfunctions are also proved. Numerical examples show that our numerical method can significantly improve the accuracy of eigenvalues.

1. Introduction

As an important equation in quantum mechanics, Schrödinger eigenvalue problems have important physical background modern electronic structure computations [1, 2]. Thus, finite element methods for solving this problem become an important topic which has attracted the attention of mathematical and physical fields: a priori error estimate is discussed in [3], some posteriori error estimates and adaptive algorithms have been studied in [4–7], and, in addition, it also includes two-scale method [8–12] and the extrapolation methods [13–16].

It is worth noting that some researchers [5, 6, 17] constructed a series of efficient algorithms to solve PDE eigenvalue problems with angular singularity. For elliptic boundary value problem, Xu and Zhou [18] combined two-grid finite element discretization scheme with the local defect correction to propose a general and powerful parallel-computing technique. This technique has been used and developed by many scholars, for instance, it can be used to solve Stokes equation (see [19, 20]), Especially, Xu and Zhou [21], Dai and Zhou [22], and Bi et al. [23–25] developed this method and established local and parallel three-scale finite element discretizations for symmetric elliptic singular eigenvalue problems.

As a matter of fact, due to the influence of Coulomb potentials, the convergence order of three-dimensional numerical methods and the computational efficiency of numerical methods will further deteriorate [26]. Therefore, one of the most direct and effective methods is to transform the three-dimensional problem into one-dimensional problem. Inspired by [27–29] and others references, it is necessary to further study the high-precision numerical method for singular problems. Therefore, in this paper, we turn to discuss finite element multiscale discretization based on local defect correction. We further apply local defect-correction technique proposed by Xu and Zhou to Schrödinger eigenvalue problems, and our work has the following features. (1) We first extend local and parallel three-scale finite element discretizations for symmetric eigenvalue problems established by Dai and Zhou [22] to solve Schrödinger eigenvalue problem. (2) Based on [23], we establish a new multiscale finite element discretization method by local refinement, and this scheme repeatedly
makes defect correction on finer and finer local meshes to make up for accuracy loss caused by abrupt changes of local mesh size in three-scale scheme. (3) For the two-scale algorithms in [8, 10], we prove the local error estimates of eigenfunctions. (4) Our scheme is simple and easy to carry out, and theoretical analysis and numerical experiment verify its efficiency to solve the singular Schrödinger eigenvalue problem.

The rest of this paper is organized in the following way. In Section 2, we will briefly introduce Schrödinger eigenvalue problem and the associated dimension reduction scheme. In Section 3, we will establish the multiscale finite element method. The error estimates of eigenvalues and eigenfunctions will be studied in Section 4. Several numerical experiments are presented in Section 5 to demonstrate the accuracy and efficiency of our algorithm. Some concluding remarks are given in Section 6.

## 2. Dimension Reduction Scheme

Consider the Schrödinger eigenvalue problem:

$$\frac{1}{2} \Delta \psi + V \psi = \lambda \psi, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3,$$

(1)

$$\lim_{|x| \to \infty} \psi = 0,$$

(2)

where $V$ is the effective potential and $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Applying a truncation to an unbounded domain $\mathbb{R}^3$ to a bounded spherical domain $B^3$: $= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3: |x| < R \}$, we find

$$\frac{1}{2} \Delta \psi + V \psi = \lambda \psi, \quad \text{in } B^3,$$

(3)

$$\psi = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial B^3.$$

Using the spherical coordinate transformation [27], problems (1) and (2) are equivalent to

$$-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \psi + V \psi = \lambda \psi, \quad \text{in } B^3,$$

(4)

$$u_k(1) = 0,$$

(5)

with $\mu > 0$. According to Theorem 1 in [27], $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $b(\cdot, \cdot)$ define the inner product in $H^1_0(\Omega)$ and $L^2(\Omega)$, respectively. Let $\| \cdot \|_a$ and $\| \cdot \|_b$ be the norm induced by the inner products $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $b(\cdot, \cdot)$. Let $\| \cdot \|_a$ and $\| \cdot \|_b$.

For $D < \Omega_0 \subset \Omega$, we use $D \subset \subset \Omega_0$ to mean that $\text{dist}(\partial D \setminus \partial \Omega, \partial \Omega_0) > 0$.

Assume that $\pi_h(\Omega) = \{ \tau \}$ is a mesh of $\Omega$ with mesh-size function $h(x)$ whose value is the diameter $h_\tau$ of the element $\tau$ containing $x$, and $h(\Omega) = \max_{x \in \Omega} h(x)$ is the mesh diameter of $\pi_h(\Omega)$. We write $h(\Omega)$ as $h$ for simplicity. Let $V_h(\Omega) \subset C(\Omega)$, defined on $\pi_h(\Omega)$, be a space of piecewise polynomials, and $V_h^0(\Omega) = V_h(\Omega) \cap H^1_0(\Omega)$. Given $G \subset \Omega$, we define $\pi_h(G)$ and $V_h(G)$ to be the restriction of $\pi_h(\Omega)$ and $V_h(\Omega)$ to $G$, respectively, and

$$V_h^0(G) = \{ v \in V_h^0(\Omega): v|_{\partial G \setminus \partial \Omega} = 0 \},$$

$$V_h^0(G) = \{ v \in V_h^0(\Omega): \sup \| \nabla \Omega \subset G \}. $$

For any $G \subset \Omega$ mentioned in this paper, we assume that it aligns with $\pi_h(\Omega)$ when necessary.

In this part, $C$ denotes a positive constant independent of $h$, which may not be the same constant in different places. For simplicity, we use the symbol $x \leq y$ to mean that $x \leq C y$.

We adopt the following assumptions similar as in [18] for meshes and finite element space.

(A0) There exists $\nu \geq 1$ such that $h(\Omega)^\nu \leq h(x), \forall x \in \Omega$. 

$$\frac{1}{2} \Delta \psi + V \psi = \lambda \psi, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3,$$
(A1) There exists \( r \geq 1 \) such that, for \( w \in H^1_0(\Omega) \cap H^{1+r}(\Omega) \),
\[
\inf_{v \in V^0_h(\Omega)} \left( \|h^{-1}(w - v)\| + \|w - v\|_a \right) \leq h^r\|w\|_{1+r}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq r.
\]

(10)

(A2) Inverse Estimate. For any \( v \in V^0_h(\Omega) \),
\[
\|v\|_{1+r} \leq h^{-1}\|v\|_{0}\Omega.
\]

(A3) Superapproximation. For \( G \subset \Omega \), let \( \overline{\omega} \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}) \) with \( \text{supp} \ \overline{\omega} \Delta \Omega \subset G \). Then, for any \( w \in V^0_h(G) \), there exists \( v \in V^0_h(G) \) such that \( \|h^{-1}(\overline{\omega}w - v)\|_{a,G} \leq \|w\|_{a,G} \).

The finite element approximation of (7) is given; find \( \lambda_h \in C \) and \( u_h \in V^0_h(\Omega) \), \( \|u_h\|_a = 1 \), satisfying
\[
a(u_h, v) = \lambda_h b(u_h, v), \quad \forall v \in V^0_h(\Omega).
\]

(11)

Define the solution operator \( T : L^2_\omega(\Omega) \rightarrow H^1_\omega(\Omega) \) and \( T_h : L^2_h(\Omega) \rightarrow V^0_h(\Omega) \) as follows:
\[
a(Tg, v) = b(g, v), \quad \forall v \in H^1_\omega(\Omega),
\]

(12)

\[
a(T_h g, v) = b(g, v), \quad \forall v \in V^0_h(\Omega).
\]

(13)

Problems (7) and (11) have the equivalent operator forms (14) and (15), respectively:
\[
Tu = \lambda^{-1}u,
\]

(14)

\[
T_h u_h = \lambda h^{-1} u_h.
\]

(15)

The following regularity assumption is needed in theoretical analysis. For any \( f \in L^2_\omega(\Omega) \), \( Tf \in H^1_\omega(\Omega) \cap H^{1+r}(\Omega) \) satisfies
\[
\left\| T f \right\|_{1+r} \leq C_{\Omega} \| f \|_b.
\]

(16)

According to [30] and Section 5.5 in [31], the above assumption is reasonable.

For some \( G \subset \Omega \), we need the following local regularity assumption.

\( R(G) \): for any \( f \in L^2_\omega(G) \), there exists a \( \phi \in H^1_\omega(G) \) \( \cap H^{1+r}(G) \) satisfying
\[
a(\phi, v) = b(f, v), \quad \forall v \in H^1_\omega(G),
\]

(17)

\[
\|\phi\|_{1+r,G} \leq C_{\Omega} \| f \|_{b,G},
\]

where \( C_{\Omega} \) and \( C_{G} \) are two a priori constants.

Define the Ritz projection \( P_h : H^1_\omega(\Omega) \rightarrow V^0_h(\Omega) \) by
\[
a(u - P_h u, v) = 0, \quad \forall v \in V^0_h(\Omega).
\]

(18)

Then, \( T_h = P_h T \) (see [32]).

Let \( M(\lambda) \) be the space spanned by all generalized eigenfunctions corresponding to \( \lambda \) of \( T \), \( M_h(\lambda) \) be the space spanned by all generalized eigenfunctions corresponding to all eigenvalues of \( T_h \) that converge to \( \lambda \).

We also need the lemma as follows (see [8, 10]).

**Lemma 1.** Let \((\lambda, u)\) be an eigenpair of (7). Then, for all \( w \in H^1_0(\Omega) \), \( w \neq 0 \),
\[
a(w, w) - \lambda = \frac{a(w - u, w - u)}{b(w, w)} = \frac{b(w - u, w - u)}{b(w, w)}.
\]

(19)

The a priori error estimates of the finite element approximations (11) can be found in [3, 32].

**Lemma 2.** Assume that \( M(\lambda) \subset H^{1+s}(\Omega) \) (0 \(s\) \(<\) 1). Then,
\[
|\lambda_h - \lambda| \leq h^{2s+2r-2},
\]

(20)

and let \( u_h \in M_h(\lambda) \) with \( \|u_h\|_a = 1 \); then, there is \( u \in M(\lambda) \) such that
\[
\|u_h - u\|_a \leq h^{s+r-1},
\]

(21)

\[
\|u_h - u\|_a \leq h^{s+r-1+r}.
\]

The authors in [18, 33] studied the local behavior of finite element. The following results are given in [18].

**Lemma 3.** Suppose that \( f \in L^2_\omega(\Omega) \) and \( G \subset \subset \Omega \subset \subset \Omega_0 \subset \subset \Omega \). If \( w \in V^0_h(\Omega_0) \) satisfies
\[
a(w, v) = b(f, v), \quad \forall v \in V^0_h(\Omega_0),
\]

then
\[
\|w\|_{a,G} \leq \|w\|_{b,G} + \|f\|_{b,\Omega_0}.
\]

(23)

**Proof.** Let \( p \geq 2r - 1 \) be an integer, and let
\[
D \subset \subset \Omega_p \subset \subset \Omega_{p-1} \subset \subset \cdots \subset \subset \Omega_1 \subset \subset \Omega_0.
\]

Choose \( D_1 \subset \subset \Omega \) satisfying \( D \subset \subset D_1 \subset \subset \Omega_0 \) and \( \overline{\omega} \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}) \) such that \( \text{supp} \ \overline{\omega} \subset \subset \Omega_0 \) and \( \overline{\omega} \equiv 1 \) on \( D_1 \). Then, from (A3), there exists \( v \in V^0_h(\Omega_p) \) such that
\[
\|\overline{\omega}^2 w - v\|_{a,\Omega_p} \leq h_{\Omega_p} \|w\|_{a,\Omega_p}.
\]

(25)

so we have
\[
a(w, \overline{\omega}^2 w - v) \leq h_{\Omega_0} \|w\|_{a,\Omega_0}^2.
\]

(26)

\[
|b(f, v)| \leq \|f\|_{b,\Omega_p} \|v\|_{b,\Omega_p} \leq \|f\|_{b,\Omega_p} \left( h_{\Omega_0} \|w\|_{a,\Omega_p} + \|\overline{\omega} w\|_{a,\Omega_p} \right).
\]

(27)

Since \( v \in V^0_h(\Omega_p) \subset V^0_h(\Omega_0) \), the definition \( w \) implies
\[
a(w, \overline{\omega}^2 w) = a(w, \overline{\omega}^2 w) + b(f, v).
\]

(28)

A simple calculation shows that
\[
a(\overline{\omega} w, \overline{\omega} w) \leq a(w, \overline{\omega}^2 w) + \|w\|_{b,\Omega_0}, \quad \forall w \in H^1_\omega(\Omega).
\]

(29)

It follows from (26)–(29) that
\[ \|w\|_{a,\Omega}^2 \leq a\left(w, w^2 w + \|w\|_{b,\Omega}^2 \right) \\
= a\left(w, w^2 w - v + \|w\|_{b,\Omega}^2 + b(f,v) \right) \\
\leq h_{1,\Omega} \|w\|^2_{a,\Omega} + \|w\|^2_{b,\Omega} + \|f\|_{b,\Omega}, \\
(30) \]
and thus,
\[ \|w\|_{a,D} \leq h_{1,\Omega}^{1/2} \|w\|_{a,\Omega} + \|w\|_{b,\Omega} + \|f\|_{b,\Omega}. \]
(31)

Similarly, we can obtain
\[ \|w\|_{a,\Omega_j} \leq h_{1,\Omega_j}^{1/2} \|w\|_{a,\Omega_{j-1}} + \|w\|_{b,\Omega_0} + \|f\|_{b,\Omega_0}, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, p. \]
(32)

By using (31) and (32), we get from (A0) and (A2) and inverse estimate that
\[ \|w\|_{a,D} \leq h_{1,\Omega}^{(p+1)/2} \|w\|_{a,\Omega_0} + \|w\|_{b,\Omega_0} + \|f\|_{b,\Omega_0} \\
\leq h_{1,\Omega} \|w\|_{a,\Omega_0} + \|w\|_{b,\Omega_0} + \|f\|_{b,\Omega_0} \\
\leq \|w\|_{b,\Omega_0} + \|f\|_{b,\Omega_0}. \]
(33)

This completes the proof. \qed

**Lemma 4.** Suppose that \( G \subset \subset \Omega_0 \subset \Omega \). Then, the following estimates are valid:
\[ hT \|u - P_h u\|_{a,\Omega} + \|u - P_h u\|_{b,\Omega} \leq hT \inf_{v \in V_h^0(\Omega)} \|u - v\|_{a,\Omega}, \]
(34)
\[ \|u - P_h u\|_{a,G} \leq \inf_{v \in V_h^0(\Omega)} \|u - v\|_{a,\Omega} + hT \|u - P_h u\|_{a,G}. \]
(35)

**Proof.** By (15), we obtain
\[ \|T_h(\lambda_h u_h - \lambda u)\|_\Omega \leq \|\lambda_h u_h - \lambda u\|_\Omega. \]
(36)

By the definitions of \( T, T_h \), and \( P_h \), we deduce that
\[ \lambda T u = u, \]
\[ \lambda T_h u = P_h u. \]
(37)

Let \( P_h^{\Omega_h} \) be the finite element projection onto \( V_h^0(\Omega_0) \); then,
\[ a\left(P_h u - P_h^{\Omega_h} u, v\right) = 0, \quad \forall v \in V_h^0(\Omega_0). \]
(38)

According to Lemma 3, we have
\[ \|P_h u - P_h^{\Omega_h} u\|_{a,G} \leq \|P_h u - P_h^{\Omega_h} u\|_{b,\Omega_0}. \]
(39)

Then, by using (14) and (39), we conclude that
\[ \|u - P_h u\|_{a,G} \leq \inf_{v \in V_h^0(\Omega)} \|u - v\|_{a,\Omega_0} + \|u - P_h u\|_{b,\Omega_0} \]
\[ \leq \inf_{v \in V_h^0(\Omega)} \|u - v\|_{a,\Omega_0} + \|u - P_h u\|_{b,\Omega_0}. \]
(40)

Thus, we derive (35) from (39). \qed

### 3. Multiscale Discretizations Based on Local Defect Correction

Consider the eigenvalue problem (7) which has an isolated singular point \( t = -1 \) (e.g., see Figure 1).

Let \( \Omega \subset \subset \Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2 \subset \cdots \subset \Omega_t \subset \subset \Omega \).

(41)

Let \( \pi_{\Omega}(\Omega) \) be a shape-regular grid, which is made up of simplices, with size \( H \in (0,1) \), \( \pi_{\Omega}(\Omega) \) be a locally refined grid (from \( \pi_{\Omega}(\Omega) \)), \( \pi_t(\Omega) \) be a locally refined grid (from \( \pi_{\Omega}(\Omega_{t-1}) \)); \( h_0 = w, h_i \ll h_{i-1} \) \((i = 0, 1, \ldots, l)\) (Figure 1 shows \( \pi_{\Omega}(\Omega), \pi_{\Omega}(\Omega), \) and \( \pi_t(\Omega) \)). Let \( V^0_{\Omega}(\Omega), V^0_{\Omega}(\Omega), \) and \( V^0_{\Omega}(\Omega), \) be finite element spaces of degree less than or equal to \( r \) defined on \( \pi_{\Omega}(\Omega), \pi_{\Omega}(\Omega), \) and \( \pi_t(\Omega) \), respectively.

Based on algorithm \( B_t \) in [22], we establish the following three-scale discretization scheme.

**Scheme 1.** (three-scale discretizations based on local defect correction).

**Step 1:** solve (7) on a globally coarse grid \( \pi_{\Omega}(\Omega) \); find \( \lambda_{\Omega} \in \mathbb{R}, u_{\Omega} \in V^0_{\Omega}(\Omega) \) such that
\[ a_{\Omega}(u_{\Omega}, v) = \lambda_{\Omega} b(u_{\Omega}, v), \quad \forall v \in V^0_{\Omega}(\Omega). \]
(42)

**Step 2:** solve two linear boundary value problems on a globally mesoscopic grid \( \pi_{\Omega}(\Omega) \); find \( u^w \in V^0_{\Omega}(\Omega) \) such that
\[ a(u^w, v) = \lambda w b(u^w, v), \quad \forall v \in V^0_{\Omega}(\Omega), \]
(43)

and then, compute the Rayleigh quotient \( \lambda^w = a(u^w, u^w)/b(u^w, u^w) \).

**Step 3:** solve two linear boundary value problems on a locally fine grid \( \pi_{\Omega}(\Omega) \); find \( e^{\Omega} \in V^0_{\Omega}(\Omega) \) such that
\[ a(e^{\Omega}, v) = \lambda w b(u^w, v) - a(u^w, v), \quad \forall v \in V^0_{\Omega}(\Omega), \]
(44)

**Step 4:** set
\[ u^{\omega_{h_i}} = \begin{cases} u^w + e^{\Omega}, & \text{on } \Omega_{t-1}, \\
 u^w, & \text{in } \Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_{t-1}. \end{cases} \]
(45)

and compute the Rayleigh quotient:
\[ \lambda^{\omega_{h_i}} = \frac{a(u^{\omega_{h_i}}, u^{\omega_{h_i}})}{b(u^{\omega_{h_i}}, u^{\omega_{h_i}})}. \]
(46)

We use \( (\lambda^{\omega_{h_i}}, u^{\omega_{h_i}}) \) obtained by Scheme 1 as the approximate eigenpair of (7).
It is obvious that \((\lambda^w, u^w)\) in Scheme 1 can be viewed as approximate eigenpairs obtained by the two-grid discretization scheme in \([8, 10]\) from \(\pi_{h_1}(\Omega)\) and \(\pi_w(\Omega)\).

Using Scheme 1, abrupt changes of mesh size will appear near \(\partial\Omega_1\). Influenced by the technique on the transition layer proposed by [23], we repeatedly use the local defect-correction technique to establish the following multiscale discretization scheme.

**Scheme 2.** (multiscale discretizations based on local defect correction).

Step 1: the same as that of Step 1 of Scheme 1.
Step 2: the same as that of Step 2 of Scheme 1.
Step 3: \(u^{w_{h_1}}=u^w\) and \(\lambda^{w_{h_1}}=\lambda^w\).
Step 4: for \(i = 1, 2, \ldots, l\), execute Step 5 and Step 6.
Step 5: solve linear boundary value problems on locally fine grid \(\pi_{h_i}(\Omega_i)\); find \(e_{h_i} \in V_{h_i}^0(\Omega_i)\) such that

\[
a(e_{h_i}, v) = \lambda^{w_{h_i}} b(u^{w_{h_i}}, v) - a(u^{w_{h_i}}, v), \quad \forall v \in V_{h_i}^0(\Omega_i).
\]

Step 6: set

\[
u^{w_{h_i}} = \begin{cases} u^{w_{h_i}}, & \text{on } \Omega_i, \\ u^{w_{h_i}}, & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \Omega_i,
\end{cases}
\]

and compute

\[
\lambda^{w_{h_i}} = \frac{a(u^{w_{h_i}}, u^{w_{h_i}})}{b(u^{w_{h_i}}, u^{w_{h_i}})}
\]

We use \((\lambda^{w_{h_i}}, u^{w_{h_i}})\) obtained by Scheme 2 as the approximate eigenpair of (7).

### 4. Theoretical Analysis

Next, we shall discuss the error estimates of Schemes 1 and 2. In our analysis, we introduce an auxiliary grid \(\pi_h(\Omega)\) which is defined globally and denote the corresponding finite element space of degree \(\leq r\) by \(V_{h}^{r}(\Omega)\) \((i = 1, 2, \ldots, l)\). We also assume that \(\pi_{h_i}(\Omega)\) and \(V_{h_i}^{r}(\Omega)\) are the restrictions of \(\pi_h(\Omega)\) and a subspace of \(V_{h_i}^{r}(\Omega)\) to \(\Omega_i\), respectively, and \(V_H^0(\Omega) \subset V_w^0(\Omega) \subset V_{h_1}^0(\Omega) \subset \cdots \subset V_{h_l}^0(\Omega)\).

For \(D\) and \(\Omega_i\) stated at the beginning of Section 3, let \(G_i \subset \Omega\) and \(F \subset \Omega\) satisfy \(D \subset F \subset G_i \subset \Omega_i\) \((i = 1, 2, \ldots, l)\).

**Theorem 1.** Assume that \(M(\lambda) \in H^{r+s}(\Omega) \cap H^{r+1}(\Omega/\Gamma)\) and \((1 < r + s, 0 \leq s < 1)\), and \(H\) is properly small. Then, there exists \(u \in M(\lambda)\) such that

\[
\|\mathbf{u}^w - \mathbf{u}\|_a \leq H^{r+s-1} + u^{r+s-1},
\]

\[
\|\mathbf{u}^w - \mathbf{u}\|_b \leq H^{r+s-1} u^{r+s},
\]

\[
\|\mathbf{u}^w - \mathbf{u}\|_{a\Omega/\Gamma} \leq H^{r+s-1} + w^{r+s},
\]

and then, (51) follows. By Lemmas 2 and 4,

\[
\|\mathbf{u}^w - \mathbf{u}\|_{a\Omega/\Gamma} \leq \|\mathbf{u}_H^w - \mathbf{u}_H\|_a + \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_H\|_a
\]

and then, (52) follows. From (19), we have

\[
\lambda^w - \lambda = \frac{a(u^w - u, u^w - u)}{b(u^w, u^w)} - \lambda \frac{b(u^w - u, u^w - u)}{b(u^w, u^w)}.
\]

**Theorem 2.** Assume that \(R(\Omega_i)\) holds \((i = 1, 2, \ldots, l)\), \(u \in M(\lambda)\). Then,
Due to the inequality
\[
\|u_{w,h} - P_h u\|_{a,\Omega} + \|u - u_{w,h} - \lambda b(u, v) + \lambda b(u_{w,h} - u, v)\|_{a,\Omega}
\leq \|u_{w,h} - P_h u\|_{a,\Omega} + \|u - u_{w,h} - \lambda b(u, v) + \lambda b(u_{w,h} - u, v)\|_{a,\Omega} + \|e_h\|_{b,\Omega},
\]
we shall estimate \(\|u_{w,h} - P_h u\|_{a,\Omega}\), \(\|u_{w,h} - P_h u\|_{a,\Omega}\), and \(\|u_{w,h} - P_h u\|_{a,\Omega}\), respectively.

First, we proceed to estimate \(\|u_{w,h} - P_h u\|_{a,\Omega}\). From (18), (47), and (48), we derive
\[
a(u_{w,h} - P_h u, v) = a(u_{w,h} - P_h u, v) - a(P_h u, v)
= a\left(u_{w,h} - v, v - (u, v)\right) - \lambda b(u, v), \quad \forall v \in V_h^0(\Omega).
\]
(61)

It is obvious that
\[
\lambda^{w,h} b(u_{w,h} - v, v) - \lambda b(u, v)
= (\lambda^{w,h} - \lambda)b(u, v) + \lambda^{w,h} b(u_{w,h} - v, v), \quad \forall v \in H^1_0(\Omega),
\]
which together with (61) yields
\[
a(u_{w,h} - P_h u, v) = (\lambda^{w,h} - \lambda)b(u, v)
+ \lambda^{w,h} b(u_{w,h} - u, v), \quad \forall v \in V_h^0(\Omega).
\]
(62)

Since \((u_{w,h} - P_h u)|_{\Omega} \in V_h^0(\Omega)\) and \(V_h^0(\Omega) \subset V_h^0(\Omega)\), from the above formula and Lemma 3, we deduce that
\[
\|u_{w,h} - P_h u\|_{a,\Omega} \leq \|u_{w,h} - P_h u\|_{a,\Omega} + \|\lambda^{w,h} - \lambda\|_{a,\Omega} + \|e_h\|_{b,\Omega}.
\]
(63)

By calculation, we have
\[
\|u_{w,h} - P_h u\|_{b,\Omega} \leq \|u_{w,h} - P_h u\|_{b,\Omega} + \|e_h\|_{b,\Omega}
\leq \|u - P_h u\|_{b,\Omega} + \|u - u_{w,h} - \lambda b(u, v) + \lambda b(u_{w,h} - u, v)\|_{b,\Omega}.
\]
(64)

Substituting the above relation in (64), we obtain
\[
\|u_{w,h} - P_h u\|_{a,\Omega} \leq \|u_{w,h} - \lambda\|_{a,\Omega} + \|u_{w,h} - u\|_{b,\Omega}
+ \|u - P_h u\|_{b,\Omega} + \|e_h\|_{b,\Omega}.
\]
(65)

To estimate \(\|e_h\|_{b,\Omega}\), we use the Aubin–Nitsche duality argument. For any given \(f \in L^2(\Omega)\), consider the boundary value problem; find \(\varphi \in H^1_0(\Omega)\): \(\{ v \in H^1_0(\Omega) : v|_{\partial \Omega} = -1 = 0 \}\) such that
\[
a(\varphi, v) = b(f, v), \quad \forall v \in H^1_0(\Omega).
\]
(67)

Let \(\varphi\) be the generalized solution of (67) and \(\varphi_h\) and \(\varphi_h^{b,1}\) be finite element solutions of (67) in \(V_h^0(\Omega)\) and \(V_h^0(\Omega)\), respectively. Then,
\[
\|\varphi - \varphi_h\|_{b,\Omega} \leq h^{5/6} \|f\|_{b,\Omega},
\]
(68)

From (47) and (48), we obtain
\[
a(u_{w,h} - \varphi_h, \varphi_h) = \lambda^{w,h} b(u_{w,h} - \varphi_h, \varphi_h).
\]
(69)

Then, by the definitions of \(\varphi, \varphi_h\), and \(e_h\), we deduce that
\[
b(e_h, f) = a(e_h, \varphi) = a(e_h, \varphi_h) = a(u_{w,h} - u, \varphi_h) + a(u_{w,h} - u, \varphi_h) - a(P_h u, \varphi_h)
= a(P_h u - u, \varphi_h) + a(u_{w,h} - u, \varphi_h)
= a(P_h u - u, \varphi_h) + \lambda^{w,h} b(u_{w,h} - u, \varphi_h)
- \lambda b(u, \varphi_h)
= a(P_h u - u, \varphi_h) + \lambda^{w,h} b(u_{w,h} - u, \varphi_h)
+ \lambda^{w,h} b(u_{w,h} - u, \varphi_h)
\]
(70)

Step 2 of Scheme 2 shows that
\[
a(u_{w,h}, \varphi_h) = \lambda^{w,h} b(u_{w,h} - \varphi_h, \varphi_h),
\]
(71)

namely, for \(l = 1\),
\[
a(u_{w,h}^{b,1}, \varphi_h^{b,1}) = \lambda^{w,h} b(u_{w,h}^{b,1} - \varphi_h^{b,1}),
\]
(72)

for \(l > 1\), the above formula follows from (47) and (48). Therefore,
\[
a(P_h u - u, \varphi_h^{b,1}) = a(u - u, \varphi_h^{b,1})
= \lambda b(u, \varphi_h^{b,1}) - a(u_{w,h} - u, \varphi_h^{b,1})
\]
(73)

It is clear that
\[
\lambda^{w,h} b(u_{w,h} - u, \varphi_h^{b,1}) - \lambda b(u, \varphi_h^{b,1}) \leq \lambda^{w,h} b(u_{w,h} - u, \varphi_h^{b,1}) - \lambda b(u, \varphi_h^{b,1})
\]
(74)

Substituting the above two formulae in (70), we derive
where $f = (e_b, f)$, we obtain

$$
\|b(e_b, f)\| \leq \left( h^r H \right)_{\Omega} + \|\lambda u - \lambda w_h - u_{w_h} \|_{\Omega, 1} + \|u_{w_h} - u \|_{\Omega, 1}.
$$

(75)

Thus, we obtain

$$
\|u_{w_h} - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} \leq \|u - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|\lambda u - \lambda w_h - u_{w_h} \|_{\Omega, 1} + \|u_{w_h} - u \|_{\Omega, 1}.
$$

(76)

Substituting (76) in (66), we obtain

$$
\|u_{w_h} - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} \leq \|u - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} + h^{r-l}\|P_h u - u_{w_h}\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|\lambda u - \lambda w_h - u_{w_h} \|_{\Omega, 1} + \|u_{w_h} - u \|_{\Omega, 1}.
$$

(77)

Similarly, since $(G, D) \subset \Omega$, we deduce

$$
\|u_{w_h} - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} \leq \|u - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|\lambda u - \lambda w_h - u_{w_h} \|_{\Omega, 1} + \|u_{w_h} - u \|_{\Omega, 1}.
$$

(78)

The remainder is to analyze $\|u_{w_h} - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1}$. From (48), we see that

$$
\|u_{w_h} - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} = \|u_{w_h} - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1},
$$

(79)

which leads to

$$
\|u_{w_h} - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} \leq \|u_{w_h} - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|u_{w_h} - u_{w_h} \|_{\Omega, 1} + \|u_{w_h} - u \|_{\Omega, 1}.
$$

(80)

It follows from (7), (47), and (62) that

$$
\begin{align*}
\alpha(e_b, v) &= \lambda u - \lambda v - a(u, v) + \alpha(u, v) \\
&= \left(\lambda u - \lambda v\right) - a(u, v) - \lambda w(u, v) + a(u, v) \\
&= \left(\lambda u - \lambda v\right) - a(u, v).
\end{align*}
$$

(81)

Then, by Lemma 3, we have

$$
\|e_b\|_{\Omega, 1} \leq \|\lambda u - \lambda v\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|u_{w_h} - u\|_{\Omega, 1}.
$$

(82)

where $F \subset \Omega$ satisfies $D \subset F \subset G$. Substituting (82) in (80), we obtain

$$
\|u_{w_h} - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} \leq \|u - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|\lambda u - \lambda v\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|u_{w_h} - u\|_{\Omega, 1}.
$$

(83)

It follows from substituting (76) in the above inequality that

$$
\|u_{w_h} - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} \leq \|u - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|\lambda u - \lambda v\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|u_{w_h} - u\|_{\Omega, 1}.
$$

(84)

Combining (60), (77), (78), and (84), finally, we obtain (59).

Theorem 3. Assume that the conditions of Theorem 1 hold. Then, there exists $u \in M(\lambda)$ such that

$$
\|u_{w_h} - u\|_{\Omega, 1} \leq \|u_{w_h} - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|\lambda u - \lambda v\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|u_{w_h} - u\|_{\Omega, 1}.
$$

(85)

It follows from substituting (76) in the above inequality that

$$
\|u_{w_h} - u\|_{\Omega, 1} \leq \|u_{w_h} - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|\lambda u - \lambda v\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|u_{w_h} - u\|_{\Omega, 1}.
$$

(86)

Combining (60), (77), (78), and (84), finally, we obtain (59).

Proof. Let $u \in M(\lambda)$ such that $u - u_h$ satisfies Lemma 2. From Theorem 2, we know $l = 1$, $h_1 = H, h_2 = w$, $u_{w_h} = w, \lambda_{w_h} = \lambda_w, u_{w_h} = u_h, \lambda_{w_h} = \lambda_H$; thus, we obtain

$$
\|u_{w_h} - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} \leq \|u - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|\lambda u - \lambda v\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|u_{w_h} - u\|_{\Omega, 1}.
$$

(89)

Using Lemma 4, Theorem 1, and Lemma 2 to estimate the terms at the right-hand side of the above formula gives

$$
\|u_{w_h} - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} \leq \|u - P_h u\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|\lambda u - \lambda v\|_{\Omega, 1} + \|u_{w_h} - u\|_{\Omega, 1}.
$$

(90)

Combining (35) and (39) yields (85), (86), and (87). From (19), we have

$$
\lambda_{w_h} - \lambda = \frac{a(u_{w_h} - u, u_{w_h} - u)}{b(u_{w_h} - u, u_{w_h} - u)} - \frac{b(u_{w_h} - u, u_{w_h} - u)}{b(u_{w_h} - u, u_{w_h} - u)}.
$$

(91)
Theorem 4. Under the conditions of Theorem 1, we further assume that $R(\Omega_i)$ holds $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, l)$, and
\[
\begin{align*}
\omega^r &= \mathcal{O}(H^{rs+1-y}), \\
H_{l_i}^{rs+1} &\geq H^{rs+1-y}.
\end{align*}
\] (92)

Then, there exists $u \in M(\lambda)$ such that
\[
\begin{align*}
\|u_{w_0}^r - u\|_{a, \partial \Omega_i} &\leq H_{l_i}^{rs+1-y}, \\
\|u_{w_{0,h_1}} - u\|_{b, \partial \Omega_i} &\leq H^{rs+1-y}, \\
\|u_{w_0}^r - u\|_{a, \partial \Omega_i - \partial \Gamma} &\leq H^{rs+1-y}, \\
\lambda_{w_{0,h_1}} - \lambda &\leq H_{l_i}^{2rs+2}. 
\end{align*}
\] (93)-(96)

Proof. Let $u \in M(\lambda)$ such that $u - u_{\partial \Omega_i}$ satisfies Lemma 2. The proof of (93)–(96) is completed by induction. When $l = 1$, Scheme 2 is actually Scheme 1. Hence, from Theorems 1 and 3 and (92), we know that (93)–(96) hold for $l = 0, 1$. Suppose (93)–(96) hold for $l - 2$ and $l - 1$, i.e.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\|u_{w_{0,h_2}}^r - u\|_{a, \partial \Omega_i} &\leq H_{l_i}^{rs+1-y}, \\
\|u_{w_{0,h_2}}^r - u\|_{b, \partial \Omega_i} &\leq H^{rs+1-y}, \\
\|u_{w_{0,h_1}} - u\|_{a, \partial \Omega_i - \partial \Gamma} &\leq H^{rs+1-y}, \\
\lambda_{w_{0,h_1}} - \lambda &\leq H_{l_i}^{2rs+2}. 
\end{align*}
\] (93)-(96)

Next, we shall prove that (93)–(96) hold for $l$. Using the above formula and Lemma 4 to estimate the terms at the right-hand side of (59) gives
\[
\begin{align*}
\|u_{w_{0,h_1}} - P_{h_i}u\|_{a, \partial \Omega_i} &\leq H_{l_i}^{rs+1-y} + H_{l_i}^{r_{l+1}}(H_{l_i}^{rs+1-y} + H_{l_i}^{r_{l+1}}) + H^{rs+1-y} + H^{rs+1-y} + H^{rs+1-y} \\
&\leq H^{rs+1-y}. 
\end{align*}
\] (98)

The combination of (35), (39), and (98) yields (93), (94), and (95). From (19), we have
Table 3: $V = r$.

| DOF$_H$ | DOF$_w$ | $\lambda_H$ | $\lambda^w$ | $\lambda^{w,h_1}$ | $\lambda^{w,h_2}$ | $\lambda^{w,h_3}$ | $\lambda^{w,h_4}$ |
|---------|---------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 4       | 16      | 2.2305059   | 1.9209211   | 1.8729501      | 1.8611124      | 1.8601497      | 1.8600937      |
| 8       | 64      | 1.9785415   | 1.8584870   | 1.8564450      | 1.8559369      | 1.8558894      | 1.8558874      |
| 16      | 256     | 1.8939159   | 1.8559226   | 1.8557987      | 1.8557678      | 1.8557648      | 1.8557646      |
| 32      | 1024    | 1.8658088   | 1.8557673   | 1.8557596      | 1.8557577      | 1.8557575      | 1.8557575      |

Figure 2: Continued.
error of the finite element eigenvalues can be increased from $10^{-2}$ to $10^{-5}$. The final multiscale iteration can improve the error up to $10^{-6} - 10^{-7}$. These figures show the accuracy and effectiveness of our numerical scheme.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we developed an efficient multiscale finite element method for solving the Schrödinger eigenvalue problem with three-dimensional domain. Our scheme can correct the defects repeatedly on the local refinement grid, which can solve the singularity problem efficiently. The error estimates of eigenvalues and eigenfunctions are proved. Some numerical examples are presented to verify the effectiveness of our numerical method.
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