

Quasi-Monte Carlo methods for uncertainty quantification of wave propagation and scattering problems modelled by the Helmholtz equation

Ivan G. Graham*, Frances Y. Kuo†, Dirk Nuyens‡, Ian H. Sloan§, Euan A. Spence¶

February 2025

Abstract

We analyse and implement a quasi-Monte Carlo (QMC) finite element method (FEM) for the forward problem of uncertainty quantification (UQ) for the Helmholtz equation with random coefficients, both in the second-order and zero-order terms of the equation, thus modelling wave scattering in random media. The problem is formulated on the infinite propagation domain, after scattering by the heterogeneity, and also (possibly) a bounded impenetrable scatterer. The spatial discretization scheme includes truncation to a bounded domain via a perfectly matched layer (PML) technique and then FEM approximation. A special case is the problem of an incident plane wave being scattered by a bounded sound-soft impenetrable obstacle surrounded by a random heterogeneous medium, or more simply, just scattering by the random medium. The random coefficients are assumed to be affine separable expansions with infinitely many independent uniformly distributed and bounded random parameters. As quantities of interest for the UQ, we consider the expectation of general linear functionals of the solution, with a special case being the far-field pattern of the scattered field. The numerical method consists of (a) dimension truncation in parameter space; (b) application of an adapted QMC method to compute expected values and (c) computation of samples of the PDE solution via PML truncation and FEM approximation. Our error estimates are explicit in s (the dimension truncation parameter), N (the number of QMC points), h (the FEM grid size) and (most importantly), k (the Helmholtz wavenumber). The method is also exponentially accurate with respect to the PML truncation radius. Illustrative numerical experiments are given.

Keywords: Quasi-Monte Carlo methods, uncertainty quantification, wave propagation, wave scattering, Helmholtz equation, perfectly matched layer, far-field pattern

MSC2020 Subject Classification: 60G60, 65D30, 65D32, 65N30, 35Q86

1 Introduction

1.1 Informal statement of the exterior Dirichlet problem for the Helmholtz equation and the UQ algorithm

In this paper we study the uncertainty quantification of problems governed by an exterior Dirichlet problem for the Helmholtz equation, posed in the infinite region $D_+ := \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{D}$ where $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \{2, 3\}$, is a bounded domain (which may be empty). When $D \neq \emptyset$ we impose a homogeneous Dirichlet condition on its boundary ∂D . Thus the general form of the problem is to find $u : D_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\nabla \cdot (A \nabla u) + k^2 n u = -f \quad \text{in } D_+, \tag{1.1}$$

$$u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial D, \tag{1.2}$$

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Bath, United Kingdom. Email: i.g.graham@bath.ac.uk

†School of Mathematics and Statistics, UNSW Sydney, Australia. Email: f.kuo@unsw.edu.au

‡Department of Computer Science, KU Leuven, Belgium. Email: dirk.nuyens@kuleuven.be

§School of Mathematics and Statistics, UNSW Sydney, Australia. Email: i.sloan@unsw.edu.au

¶Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Bath, United Kingdom. Email: e.a.spence@bath.ac.uk




Figure 1: The domain D_{R_0} is the (open) shaded region inside the ball B_{R_0} , excluding the closure of the obstacle D . The supports of $A - I$ and $n - 1$ are in D_{R_0} . The support of the source term f is in $\overline{D_{R_0}}$. The quantity of interest G will be a linear functional on D_R for $R \geq R_0$.

where A is a positive-definite matrix-valued function, n is a positive scalar-valued function, f is a forcing term, and $k > 0$ is the Helmholtz wavenumber. We also require u to satisfy the Sommerfeld radiation condition,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}(\mathbf{x}) - ik u(\mathbf{x}) = o\left(\frac{1}{r^{(d-1)/2}}\right) \quad (1.3)$$

as $r := |\mathbf{x}|_2 \rightarrow \infty$ (uniformly in $\hat{\mathbf{x}} := \mathbf{x}/r$), thus ensuring that the asymptotic solution is an outgoing spherical wave, and making the solution unique. The cost of solving the Helmholtz equation numerically increases as k increases; we therefore pay particular attention to how our method and error depend on k .

In this paper the coefficients A and n are heterogeneous (with the random case being of most interest), but we always assume that f has bounded support and that the problem is homogeneous in the far field.

Such problems arise widely in applications. The propagation of acoustic waves in a homogeneous medium is often modelled by (1.1) with $A = I$ and $n = c^{-2}$, where c is the sound speed, and k is the angular frequency of the excitation, also called the wavenumber, see, e.g., [15, Chapter 8].

In seismology, problem (1.1)–(1.3) arises when elastic waves are computed using the ‘acoustic approximation’, in which case $A = \rho^{-1}I$ and $n = \rho^{-1}c_p^{-2}$, where ρ is the density and c_p is the speed of longitudinal waves (also called P -waves) in the medium, see, e.g., [57]. In ‘full waveform inversion’ the fields n and possibly A are to be recovered in an inverse problem, requiring many solves of the above problem, and, for each solve, f is given by a point source.

For any radius $R > 0$, we define the open ball

$$B_R := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\mathbf{x}|_2 < R\}, \quad \text{and the domain } D_R := B_R \setminus \overline{D}. \quad (1.4)$$

Since the obstacle D is bounded, the region D_R is non-empty for a large enough R .

We assume throughout that the supports of $A - I$ and $n - 1$ are bounded. Thus we can choose a radius $R_0 > 0$ such that these supports, and the closure of the obstacle \overline{D} , are all contained inside the ball B_{R_0} and are sufficiently far from its boundary ∂B_{R_0} . Thus we have $A \equiv I$ and $n \equiv 1$ outside B_{R_0} . (Assumption 2.1 and Definition 2.4 below give a more precise statement of the problem, including regularity requirements.) See Figure 1 for an illustration.

Random coefficients and the UQ problem. While there is a further brief discussion in §2.1 of the deterministic version of (1.1)–(1.3), we mainly study the random case, in which the coefficients A

and n are taken to be random fields with the infinite affine expansions

$$A(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = A_0(\mathbf{x}) + \xi_A \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j \Psi_j(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in D_+, \mathbf{y} \in U, \quad (1.5)$$

$$n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = n_0(\mathbf{x}) + \xi_n \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j \psi_j(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in D_+, \mathbf{y} \in U, \quad (1.6)$$

where $U := [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots)$ is an infinite sequence of independent uniformly distributed random parameters $y_j \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$, while ξ_A, ξ_n are nonnegative scaling parameters. In §2.3, conditions are given to ensure that the infinite expansions in (1.5) and (1.6) are absolutely convergent.

With this formulation, the fields A and n can be either correlated or not. To model two fields that are not correlated, it suffices to set $\Psi_{2j-1} \equiv 0$ and $\psi_{2j} \equiv 0$, for all $j \geq 1$. On the other hand, if there exists a $j \geq 1$ such that $\Psi_j \not\equiv 0$ and $\psi_j \not\equiv 0$, then A and n will be correlated. In any case the functions Ψ_j that are nonzero are assumed to be linearly independent and known, and likewise the nonzero functions ψ_j .

The output solution $u(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ depends on the spatial variable $\mathbf{x} \in D_+$, as well as the random parameters $\mathbf{y} \in U$, and the UQ problem that we study is to efficiently compute (and give error estimates for) approximations of the expected value of $Gu(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$, where G is some linear functional acting with respect to the spatial variable \mathbf{x} in $D_R = B_R \setminus \overline{D}$ with $R \geq R_0$. The expected value of any function $\Theta : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is expressed as an integral,

$$\mathbb{E}[\Theta] := \int_U \Theta(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \int_{U_s} \Theta(y_1, \dots, y_s, 0, 0, \dots) dy_1 \cdots dy_s, \quad (1.7)$$

when this limit exists, where $U_s := [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^s$.

The algorithm. We start by truncating the affine expansions (1.5) and (1.6) to s terms, yielding approximations to A and n that depend only on $\mathbf{y}_s := (y_1, \dots, y_s)$, and then denote the corresponding approximate solution of (1.1)–(1.3) by

$$u_s(\cdot, \mathbf{y}_s) := u(\cdot, (\mathbf{y}_s, \mathbf{0})). \quad (1.8)$$

Taking the expectation of this yields a first (theoretical) approximation

$$\mathbb{E}[Gu] \approx \mathbb{E}[Gu_s]. \quad (1.9)$$

To attack the s -dimensional integral arising in the computation of the expectation in (1.9), we will consider a family of first order quasi-Monte Carlo (QMC) quadrature rules known as “randomly shifted lattice rules”, as well as a family of higher order QMC rules known as “interlaced polynomial lattice rules”. In the case of randomly shifted lattice rules, we construct N suitable lattice points in the s -dimensional unit cube $[0, 1]^s$ with specially chosen generating vector $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{N}^s$ and a uniformly-distributed random shift $\Delta \in [0, 1]^s$ (cf., [18]). The entire pointset is then translated into the cube $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^s$. The estimate of $\mathbb{E}[Gu_s]$ is then the (equal-weight) average of the values of Gu_s at these N shifted points in U_s , which we denote by $Q_{s,N,\Delta}(Gu_s)$. Full details of the QMC algorithm are in §5. In general N may need to increase with increasing s or increasing k .

Finally, to make this practical, we employ a finite element method (FEM) to approximate each sample u_s (for $\mathbf{y}_s \in U_s$) by a spatially discrete approximation denoted $u_{s,\text{PML},h}$, where h denotes mesh diameter and PML indicates that we employ a perfectly matched layer (PML) technique to approximate the PDE over the infinite domain D_+ by an accurate approximation on a finite domain; details are given in §6. This yields the practical approximation of the required expected value, which is denoted $Q_{s,N,\Delta}(Gu_{s,\text{PML},h})$.

To measure errors we need appropriate function spaces.

Notation 1.1 (Sobolev spaces and dual spaces) *Throughout the paper, for any bounded domain Ω and any $r \geq 0$, $H^r(\Omega)$ denotes the usual Sobolev space of order $r \geq 0$, with $H^0(\Omega) = L^2(\Omega)$ and*

$H^r(\Omega)'$ denoting the dual space of $H^r(\Omega)$ (i.e., the space of all bounded linear functional on $H^r(\Omega)$). Standard norms on $H^r(\Omega)$ and $H^r(\Omega)'$ are denoted $\|\cdot\|_{H^r(\Omega)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H^r(\Omega)'}$. To be precise, the scales $H^r(\Omega)$ and $H^r(\Omega)'$ with varying r are interpolation spaces [7, §14.2.3], [4, §4.5].

In the special case $r = 1$, the standard norm is $\|v\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 := \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$, but we also make extensive use of the k -weighted $H^1(\Omega)$ norm, defined for $k > 0$ by

$$\|v\|_{H_k^1(\Omega)}^2 := \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + k^2 \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \quad (1.10)$$

We also use the space $H_0^1(\Omega) := \{v \in H^1(\Omega) : v = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$ equipped with the norm (1.10).

Although the solution u of problem (1.1)–(1.3) is defined on all of D_+ , we will typically be concerned with its restriction to the domain D_R for some $R \geq R_0$, see (1.4) and Figure 1. In this context, we write $u \in H_{0,D}^1(D_R)$ to indicate that u has vanishing trace on ∂D (see (2.4)).

1.2 The main results of the paper

In this introductory subsection we restrict ourselves to an illustration of the main results, with pointers to the full details given later. A key assumption used throughout this paper (and in many other papers about UQ of PDEs, see e.g., [12]) is that the expansions (1.5) and (1.6) converge quickly enough. The speed of convergence is controlled by a “summability exponent” $p \in (0, 1)$, see (2.14) below, with a smaller value of p corresponding to a faster convergence of (1.5) and (1.6).

In our error analysis, we also impose conditions on the coefficients A, n , and obstacle D to ensure good (i.e., nontrapping) behaviour of the Helmholtz solution operator (see Definition 2.6 below). Although we do not impose all of these conditions in our numerical experiments, we do not observe any “bad” behaviour of the Helmholtz solution operator. This is because such bad behaviour is very specific to particular values of k and particular data, and so it is rare that one actually sees this behaviour in practice; see the discussion in §1.4.

In this illustration we restrict ourselves to the case when $G \in L^2(D_R)'$, although bounded linear functionals on $H^r(D_R)$ for any $r \in [0, 1]$ are also treated in the detailed theorems. We restrict our illustration here to randomly shifted lattice rules, while the theory of interlaced polynomial lattice rules is also considered in §5.

Our overall error estimate for the root-mean-square error has the following form:

$$\left(\mathbb{E}_\Delta \left[|\mathbb{E}[Gu] - Q_{s,N,\Delta}(Gu_{s,\text{PML},h})|^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{2} (E^{\text{trunc}} + E^{\text{QMC}} + E^{\text{FEM}}), \quad (1.11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E^{\text{trunc}} &:= |\mathbb{E}[G(u - u_s)]|, \\ E^{\text{QMC}} &:= \left(\mathbb{E}_\Delta \left[|\mathbb{E}[Gu_s] - Q_{s,N,\Delta}(Gu_s)|^2 \right] \right)^{1/2}, \\ E^{\text{FEM}} &:= \sup_{\mathbf{y}_s \in U_s} |G(u_s - u_{s,\text{PML},h})(\mathbf{y}_s)|. \end{aligned} \quad (1.12)$$

Our illustration includes the case when the linear functional G is the far-field pattern of the scattered wave produced when a plane wave is incident on a heterogeneous medium, with or without an impenetrable obstacle.

In the analysis we use the notation

$$\xi := \xi_A + \xi_n, \quad (1.13)$$

where ξ_A, ξ_n are the scaling parameters in (1.5), (1.6), and we shall see below that $k R \xi$ is an important critical parameter in the error estimates.

Throughout the paper, for two expressions A and B , we write $A \lesssim B$ to mean $A \leq cB$ where c is a constant independent of k, R, ξ, N, h and s , and we write $A \sim B$ to mean $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$.

Dimension truncation. The detailed estimate for the dimension truncation error is given in Theorem 4.1. In our case, assuming that $G \in L^2(D_R)'$ for some $R \geq R_0$, the estimate with the fastest decay with respect to s is

$$E^{\text{trunc}} \lesssim R k^{-1} c(k R \xi) s^{-2/p+1} \|f\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})} \|G\|_{L^2(D_R)'},$$

although here c is a function that grows rapidly with respect to its argument. In the case when k is large the estimate

$$E^{\text{trunc}} \lesssim R^2 \xi s^{-1/p+1} \|f\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})} \|G\|_{L^2(D_R)'}$$

is available, providing a slower decay rate with respect to s but independent of $k \rightarrow \infty$.

QMC error. The QMC error is analyzed in Theorem 5.1. Given any linear functional $G \in L^2(D_R)'$ for some $R \geq R_0$, we show that randomly shifted lattice rules can be constructed to achieve

$$E^{\text{QMC}} \leq R k^{-1} C(s, k, R, \xi, \delta) N^{-1+\delta} \|f\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})} \|G\|_{L^2(D_R)'}, \quad \text{if } p \leq 2/3,$$

where the constant $C(s, k, R, \xi, \delta)$ grows unboundedly as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Moreover: (i) if k is bounded, then $C(s, k, R, \xi, \delta)$ is bounded independently of s ; (ii) if s is fixed and k grows, then, with C_{stab} denoting the stability constant for the boundary value problem (1.1)–(1.3) written in variational form (see Corollary 2.13), we have $C(s, k, R, \xi, \delta) \sim (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^s$, which grows quickly with increasing dimension unless

$$\xi \leq \frac{1}{C_{\text{stab}} k R}, \quad (1.14)$$

in which case the magnitude of the random perturbation dies away as $k \rightarrow \infty$. A higher order convergence rate $N^{-1/p}$ can be achieved using interlaced polynomial lattice rules.

FEM error. The PML truncation and FEM approximation of the problem are described in §6. Given any linear functional $G \in L^2(D_R)'$ for some $R \geq R_0$, the PML truncation should be performed in a spherical annulus $B_{R_2} \setminus B_{R_1}$ with $R_2 > R_1 > R$. We approximate the truncated problem using H^1 -conforming Lagrange (in the sense of [10, p.95]) finite elements of degree $m \geq 1$. Then, assuming that all the data A , n and ∂D are sufficiently smooth, and provided the mesh-resolution condition

$$(hk)^{2m} k \quad \text{sufficiently small} \quad (1.15)$$

is satisfied, the dimension-truncated and PML-truncated problem has a unique FEM solution $u_{s,\text{PML},h}$. Our estimate of E^{FEM} then takes the form (see Corollary 6.15)

$$E^{\text{FEM}} \lesssim k^{-1} \left(\exp(-C_{\text{PML}} k) + ((hk)^{m+1} + (hk)^{2m} k) \right) \|f\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})} \|G\|_{L^2(D_R)'}, \quad (1.16)$$

where both the hidden positive constant and the explicit positive constant C_{PML} depend on the PML parameters but not on h, s or k .

For the particular case when G is the far-field pattern of the scattered field in a plane-wave soundsoft scattering problem (see §2.2 and §7), then the estimate of E^{FEM} takes the form (Theorem 7.4)

$$E^{\text{FEM}} \lesssim c(d, k) k \left(\exp(-C_{\text{PML}} k) + ((hk)^{m+1} + (hk)^{2m} k) \right), \quad (1.17)$$

where $c(d, k)$ is independent of k when $d = 3$ and decays with $\mathcal{O}(k^{-1/2})$ when $d = 2$.

1.3 Discussion of the main results in the context of the literature

While there have been many papers analysing the application of QMC to PDE problems, much of this has dealt with coercive PDEs, thus not applicable to high-frequency Helmholtz. However we want to mention here three recent papers on the k -explicit UQ of the Helmholtz equation: [29], [38], [59].

- Reference [29] considers the Helmholtz equation (1.1) with variable coefficients A and n , and an impedance boundary condition. The novelties of the present paper relative to [29] are that (i) we do not study impedance boundary conditions (which give k -independent errors when approximating the radiation condition (1.3) for high-frequency waves [25]) but instead study PML truncation (which gives exponentially-small errors in approximating (1.3)); (ii) we consider the physically-relevant quantity of the far-field pattern and give detailed numerical experiments; and (iii) the finite element error estimates in [29] are not k -explicit (see [30]), while here we give fully k -explicit error estimates for all approximations.
- Reference [38] gives k -explicit theory for shape UQ (different from the setting in this paper) for the Helmholtz transmission problem. The novelties of the present paper relative to [38] are that (i) we have randomness in the highest-order term of the PDE ([38] only has randomness in lowest-order term); and (ii) we give numerical experiments supporting the theory (while [38] is theory only).
- While reference [59] presents UQ methods with error independent of k (or even improving as $k \rightarrow \infty$) for a high random-dimensional Helmholtz problem (using its connection to oscillatory multivariate integration), the results in [59] are restricted to the case of 1 space dimension, whereas the analysis in the present paper holds in general space dimension.

Thus the present paper is the first to give an analysis of all sources of error explicitly in the (possibly large) parameter k for random Helmholtz problems arising in wave scattering with both A and n random, and the first to apply this to practical scattering problems posed on an infinite domain.

Finally we mention that in [29] the stochastic perturbation of n was constrained to decay with $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ (and this condition can play a role in our analysis – see (1.14) above). A condition similar to (1.14) (there called “weakly stochastic”) played a prominent rôle in the analysis of the ‘multimodes’ algorithm discussed in [22], see also [23]. There is some numerical evidence that (1.14) is actually necessary to keep the QMC error bounded when ξ and s are fixed but k grows: a numerical experiment in [54, §4.6.3] found that the number of QMC points N needed to keep the error bounded below a constant increases quickly (apparently exponentially) with k , although only a moderate range of k was tested.

1.4 The difficulty caused by trapping/nontrapping

In this paper we have to deal with the fact that the k -dependence of the Helmholtz solution operator depends in a complicated, nonlinear way on the coefficients A, n , and the impenetrable obstacle D . Indeed, if A, n and D support trapped rays, then for certain data f (with $\|f\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})} = 1$) and a certain unbounded sequence of wavenumbers, the norm of the solution to (1.1)–(1.3) grows exponentially. However, if A, n , and D are such that no rays are trapped (i.e., the problem is nontrapping), then the solution to (1.1)–(1.3) is bounded uniformly in k (in a suitable k -weighted norm); see Lemma 2.7(i) below.

The theory in this paper is restricted to a certain class of A and n and star-shaped D , for which bounds on the Helmholtz solution operator that are explicit in both k and the coefficients A and n are available from [35]. The coefficients A and n in this class satisfy pointwise bounds on the fields and their derivatives; see Definition 2.6 below. It is important to emphasise that, because the properties of trapping/nontrapping depend on the *global* properties of A, n , and D *in combination*, any pointwise conditions imposed on A and n that ensure nontrapping (such as in Definition 2.6) are, *by construction*, sufficient but not necessary. As mentioned above, the bad behaviour due to trapping is very specific to both the value of k (see [46]) and the particular data; however, establishing rigorous convergence results about QMC methods applied to the Helmholtz equation with “generic” coefficients, data, and wavenumbers seems currently out of reach.

2 The Exterior Dirichlet Problem (EDP)

In this section we define our model wave scattering problem and give the basic theory for its solution. The model problem involves scattering both by the assumed heterogeneity of the medium (characterised by variable coefficients A and n) and also (possibly) by an impenetrable obstacle D . Later we focus on the plane-wave scattering problem, where the scattering is initiated by an incident plane wave u^I .

The following assumption holds throughout the paper.

Assumption 2.1 (The domain and the source term) *For $d \in \{2, 3\}$, let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded (possibly empty) Lipschitz domain such that its open complement $D_+ := \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{D}$ is connected (and so the scattering problem in D_+ makes sense), and denote its boundary as usual by ∂D . Moreover, let B_{R_0} be an open ball of radius $R_0 > 0$ that contains \overline{D} and also contains the supports of $A - I$ and $n - 1$, and let $D_{R_0} := B_{R_0} \setminus \overline{D}$. Furthermore, let the support of f be in $\overline{D_{R_0}}$ and let $f \in L^2(D_{R_0})$. (Throughout, the support of a function is defined as the closure of the set of points at which the function has non-zero value.)*

Notation 2.2 *Let $|\cdot|_2$ denote both the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{C}^d and the induced matrix norm (i.e., the spectral norm) on $d \times d$ matrices. With Ω an arbitrary bounded Lipschitz domain, let $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ and $\|v\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} := \max(\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \|\nabla v(\cdot)|_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})$ be the standard L^∞ and $W^{1,\infty}$ norms on scalar-valued functions on Ω . We extend these definitions to real symmetric matrix-valued functions A on Ω by*

$$\|A\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = \|\sigma_{\max}(A)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|A\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} = \|\sigma_{\max}(A)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)},$$

where A is a real symmetric $d \times d$ matrix, and $\sigma_{\max}(A)$ is its maximum singular value.

2.1 The deterministic problem

We first describe the deterministic setting, with the random case described in §2.3.

Assumption 2.3 (The coefficients of the PDE) *The function $n \in W^{1,\infty}(D_+)$ is real-valued, and for almost all $\mathbf{x} \in D_+$ there exist $n_{\min}, n_{\max} > 0$ such that*

$$n_{\min} \leq n(\mathbf{x}) \leq n_{\max}. \tag{2.1}$$

Moreover, $A \in W^{1,\infty}(D_+)$ and for almost all $\mathbf{x} \in D_+$, $A(\mathbf{x})$ is real symmetric and there exist $A_{\min}, A_{\max} > 0$ such that

$$A_{\min}|\zeta|_2^2 \leq (A(\mathbf{x})\zeta) \cdot \zeta \leq A_{\max}|\zeta|_2^2 \quad \text{for all } \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.2}$$

We now define the exterior Dirichlet problem from the introduction in a more precise way.

Definition 2.4 (The exterior Dirichlet Problem (EDP)) *Given D , A , n , and R_0 satisfying Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3, wavenumber $k > 0$, and data $f \in L^2(D_{R_0})$, we say that a function $u : D_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a solution of the exterior Dirichlet problem if, for every $R \geq R_0$, the restriction of u to the domain $D_R = B_R \setminus \overline{D}$ satisfies $u|_{D_R} \in H^1(D_R)$, and also u satisfies the PDE (1.1) (in the standard weak sense, i.e., under testing with C^∞ functions with compact support; see, e.g., [35, p.2874]), as well as the boundary condition (1.2), and the radiation condition (1.3).*

Requiring $u|_{D_R} \in H^1(D_R)$ to satisfy (1.2) is legitimate here, since the trace of u on ∂D is a well-defined function. Moreover, requiring (1.3) is also legitimate, since, although $u|_{D_R}$ is only *a priori* in $H^1(D_R)$ for every $R \geq R_0$, interior regularity results for elliptic PDEs imply that u is C^∞ outside B_{R_0} .

To obtain the variational formulation of the EDP we first introduce the following Exterior Dirichlet to Neumann map. Using this, we formulate the EDP on a bounded domain D_R for any $R \geq R_0$, in the variational form.

Definition 2.5 (Exterior Dirichlet-to-Neumann map DtN_k on ∂B_R) Let D , A , n and R_0 satisfy Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3. For any $R \geq R_0$ and $g \in H^{1/2}(\partial B_R)$, let v be the solution of $(\Delta + k^2)v = 0$ in the infinite domain exterior to B_R , with v also satisfying the Dirichlet condition $v = g$ on ∂B_R , as well as the Sommerfeld radiation condition (1.3). Then $\text{DtN}_k g \in H^{-1/2}(\partial B_R)$ is defined to be the Neumann trace (with outward-pointing normal) of v (recall that the Neumann trace equals the outward-facing normal derivative, provided that the function has sufficient regularity).

Note that although DtN_k depends on both k and R , our notation only reflects its k -dependence.

Variational form of (1.1)–(1.3). Green’s identity (see, e.g., [50, Lemma 4.3]) implies that the restriction $u_R := u|_{D_R}$ of the solution of the EDP to D_R for any $R \geq R_0$ is also the solution of the variational problem:

$$\text{find } u_R \in H_{0,D}^1(D_R) \text{ such that } a_k(u_R, v) = F(v) \text{ for all } v \in H_{0,D}^1(D_R) \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$H_{0,D}^1(D_R) := \{v \in H^1(D_R) : v = 0 \text{ on } \partial D\}, \quad (2.4)$$

$$a_k(w, v) := \int_{D_R} ((A\nabla w) \cdot \nabla \bar{v} - k^2 n w \bar{v}) - \int_{\partial B_R} \text{DtN}_k(w|_{\partial B_R}) \bar{v} \quad \text{and} \quad F(v) = \int_{D_R} f \bar{v}. \quad (2.5)$$

Note that the DtN_k operator plays a theoretical rôle, providing us with the variational form (2.3) – (2.5). It is not computed explicitly, but later we compute approximations of (2.3) by approximating DtN_k using a perfectly-matched layer; see §6 below.

Under the conditions of Definition 2.4, the EDP has a unique solution u and $\|u\|_{H_k^1(D_R)}$ is finite for all $R \geq R_0$ (see [35, Theorem 2.5]). Moreover the variational form (2.3)–(2.5) also has a unique solution $u_R \in H_{0,D}^1(D_R)$, with $\|u\|_{H_k^1(D_R)}$ also finite, and so u_R coincides with the restriction of u to D_R . Hence bounds on the solution of the variational form imply bounds on the solution to the EDP.

However the variational form permits the inclusion of more general functionals F in (2.3) than the special F appearing in (2.5). Indeed, any $F \in H_{0,D}^1(D_R)'$ (the dual of $H_{0,D}^1(D_R)$) is allowed in (2.3). Such more-general right-hand sides are needed in some of our arguments see, for example (3.5) and (3.6).

Bounds on the solution of the EDP explicit in k , A , and n . The k -dependence of the bounds on the solution of the EDP in terms of the data depends crucially on whether or not A , n , and D allow trapped rays. In the nontrapping case, the solution operator is bounded uniformly in k (in suitable norms), whereas in the trapping case the solution operator can grow exponentially in k ; see the reviews in [52, Section 6], [35, Section 1], [46, §1] and the references therein.

We now discuss conditions on A and n such that *both* the problem is nontrapping (recall the discussion in §1.2) and that we know explicitly how the constants in the bounds on the solution of the EDP in terms of the data depend on A and n ; this latter condition is important when we consider random coefficients in the next subsection.

Definition 2.6 (A particular class of nontrapping D , A , and n) Let D , A , and n satisfy Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3. Furthermore let D be star-shaped with respect to the origin. Then, given $\mu_A, \mu_n > 0$ we say that $A \in \text{NT}_{\text{mat}}(\mu_A)$ and $n \in \text{NT}_{\text{scal}}(\mu_n)$ if

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta^\top (A(\mathbf{x}) - (\mathbf{x} \cdot \nabla) A(\mathbf{x})) \zeta &\geq \mu_A, \quad \text{for all } \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ with } |\zeta|_2 = 1, \quad \text{and} \\ n(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{x} \cdot \nabla n(\mathbf{x}) &\geq \mu_n \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

for almost every $\mathbf{x} \in D_+$.

The relationship between Definition 2.6 and the definition of nontrapping in terms of rays is explained in [35, §7]. Under the condition (2.6), [35] gives results that show explicitly how the constant in the bound of the solution of the EDP in terms of the data f depends on μ_A, μ_n . The more recent results in [28] generalise those in [35], but require more smoothness of A, n , and ∂D than assumed here. We now state these results applied to the particular situation of $D, \partial D, A$, and n satisfying Definition 2.6.

Lemma 2.7 (Bounds on the solution of the EDP) *Let D, A, n , and R_0 be as in Definition 2.6. Given $k_0 > 0$ let*

$$C_1 := 2 \sqrt{\frac{1}{\mu_A} + \frac{1}{\mu_n} \left(1 + \frac{d-1}{2k_0 R_0}\right)^2}.$$

Then, for all $k \geq k_0$ and $R \geq R_0$, the following estimates hold.

(i) *Given $f \in L^2(D_{R_0})$, the solution of the EDP of Definition 2.4 satisfies*

$$\|u\|_{H_k^1(D_R)} \leq \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{\min\{\mu_A, \mu_n\}}} R \|f\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})}, \quad (2.7)$$

(ii) *Given $F \in H_{0,D}^1(D_R)'$, the solution of the variational problem (2.3) satisfies*

$$\|u\|_{H_k^1(D_R)} \leq \frac{1}{\min\{A_{\min}, n_{\min}\}} \left(\frac{1}{k_0 R_0} + 2 \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{\min\{\mu_A, \mu_n\}}} n_{\max} \right) k R \|F\|_{H_k^1(D_R)'}, \quad (2.8)$$

where $\|F\|_{H_k^1(D_R)'}$ denotes the norm of the functional F with respect to the H_k^1 norm on D_R .

Proof. Part (i) is [35, Theorem 2.5] and Part (ii) is [35, Corollary 2.16]. \square

2.2 The plane-wave sound-soft scattering problem

An important scattering problem in applications is the plane-wave sound-soft scattering problem.

Definition 2.8 (Plane-wave sound-soft scattering problem) *Given D, A, n , and R_0 satisfying Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3, wavenumber $k > 0$, and unit vector $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|\alpha|_2 = 1$, let*

$$u^I(\mathbf{x}) := \exp(i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x} \cdot \alpha), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (2.9)$$

be an incident plane wave in the direction α . The total field $u^T : D_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is the solution of the plane-wave sound-soft scattering problem if, for every $R \geq R_0$, the restriction of u^T on D_R satisfies $u^T|_{D_R} \in H^1(D_R)$, and u^T satisfies

$$\nabla \cdot (A \nabla u^T) + k^2 n u^T = 0 \quad \text{in } D_+, \quad u^T = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial D. \quad (2.10)$$

In addition, the scattered field $u^S := u^T - u^I|_{D_+}$ satisfies $u^S|_{D_R} \in H^1(D_R)$ for every $R \geq R_0$ and it satisfies the Sommerfeld radiation condition (1.3) (with u replaced by u^S).

A natural object of interest for the plane-wave sound-soft scattering problem is the far-field pattern of the scattered field u^S defined by

$$u_\infty^S(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) := \lim_{|\mathbf{x}|_2 \rightarrow \infty} \left(u^S(\hat{\mathbf{x}} |\mathbf{x}|_2) \exp(-ik|\mathbf{x}|_2) |\mathbf{x}|_2^{(d-1)/2} \right). \quad (2.11)$$

We will return to this in §7.

2.3 The random problem

We now study uncertainty quantification for the EDP with random coefficients in the stochastic domain $U := [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{\mathbb{N}} = \{\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, y_3, \dots) : y_j \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]\}$. The coefficients are required to satisfy the following assumptions.

Assumption 2.9 (Random coefficients) *The coefficients $A(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ are given by the affine series (1.5) and (1.6) under the following conditions.*

- The mean fields A_0, n_0 satisfy Assumption 2.3 with lower and upper bounds (analogous to (2.1) and (2.2)), denoted $A_{0,\min}, A_{0,\max}, n_{0,\min}, n_{0,\max}$.

- The obstacle D and the mean fields A_0, n_0 satisfy the nontrapping condition in Definition 2.6, i.e., D is star-shaped with respect to the origin, and there exist μ_A, μ_n such that $A_0 \in \text{NT}_{\text{mat}}(\mu_A)$ and $n_0 \in \text{NT}_{\text{scal}}(\mu_n)$.
- The supports of $A_0 - I, n_0 - 1, \Psi_j$ and ψ_j for all $j \geq 1$ are all compactly contained in B_{R_0} .
- The scaling parameters are nonnegative: $\xi_A \geq 0$ and $\xi_n \geq 0$.
- The fluctuations $\Psi_j \in W^{1,\infty}(D_{R_0})$ are real symmetric matrices with (recalling Notation 2.2), $\|\Psi_1\|_{L^\infty(D_{R_0})} = 1$ and

$$\xi_A \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|\Psi_j\|_{L^\infty(D_{R_0})} \leq A_{0,\min} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|\Psi_j\|_{W^{1,\infty}(D_{R_0})} < \infty. \quad (2.12)$$

- The fluctuations $\psi_j \in W^{1,\infty}(D_{R_0})$ satisfy $\|\psi_1\|_{L^\infty(D_{R_0})} = 1$,

$$\xi_n \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|\psi_j\|_{L^\infty(D_{R_0})} \leq n_{0,\min} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|\psi_j\|_{W^{1,\infty}(D_{R_0})} < \infty. \quad (2.13)$$

- There exists a summability exponent $p \in (0, 1)$ for the sequence $\mathbf{b} = (b_j)_{j \geq 1}$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_j^p < \infty, \quad \text{where } b_j := \max(\|\psi_j\|_{L^\infty(D_{R_0})}, \|\Psi_j\|_{L^\infty(D_{R_0})}). \quad (2.14)$$

The following lemma is an immediate consequence of Assumption 2.9 and the triangle inequality.

Lemma 2.10 *Under Assumption 2.9, $A(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ and $n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ defined by (1.5) and (1.6) satisfy Assumption 2.3 uniformly in $\mathbf{y} \in U$, with*

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\min} &:= \frac{A_{0,\min}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad A_{\max} := A_{0,\max} + \frac{A_{0,\min}}{2}, \\ n_{\min} &:= \frac{n_{0,\min}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad n_{\max} := n_{0,\max} + \frac{n_{0,\min}}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.11 *Only the first estimates in (2.12) and (2.13) are needed to prove Lemma 2.10. The second estimates were used in [55, Appendix C] to prove that A and n are measurable. Under Assumption 2.9, existence and uniqueness of the solution of the EDP of Definition 2.4 is proved in [56, Theorem 1.4, §1.2, Remark 1.12].*

We now impose conditions on $A - A_0$ and $n - n_0$ so that the coefficients A and n belong to the class of coefficients in Definition 2.6, and are thus nontrapping for all realisations of $\mathbf{y} \in U$. As in §1.2, we emphasise that, because the properties of trapping/nontrapping depend on the global properties of A, n , and D in combination, any pointwise conditions imposed on A and n that ensure nontrapping (such as in Definition 2.6) will be sufficient but not necessary.

Assumption 2.12 (Conditions on the fluctuations ensuring nontrapping) *Suppose that Assumption 2.9 holds. Then assume further that*

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_A \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\mathbf{x} \in D_{R_0}} |\Psi_j(\mathbf{x}) - (\mathbf{x} \cdot \nabla) \Psi_j(\mathbf{x})|_2 &\leq \mu_A, \quad \text{and} \\ \xi_n \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\mathbf{x} \in D_{R_0}} |\psi_j(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{x} \cdot \nabla \psi_j(\mathbf{x})| &\leq \mu_n, \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

where μ_A, μ_n are as given in Assumption 2.9.

The fact that the corresponding EDP is nontrapping is guaranteed by the following corollary, whose proof follows from Lemma 2.7, Definition 2.6 and the triangle inequality. To simplify the statement, we first replace the constant in (2.7) by the larger constant in (2.8).

Corollary 2.13 *Let D , A , n , and R_0 satisfy Assumptions 2.1, 2.9 and 2.12, and let $k_0 > 0$. Then we have $A \in \text{NT}_{\text{mat}}(\mu_A/2)$ and $n \in \text{NT}_{\text{scal}}(\mu_n/2)$ for all $\mathbf{y} \in U$. Consequently, the bounds (2.7) and (2.8) (with μ_A , μ_n replaced by $\mu_A/2$, $\mu_n/2$) hold for the solution $u = u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ of the EDP with random coefficients $A(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$, $n(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$.*

In particular, introducing the stability constant

$$C_{\text{stab}} := \frac{1}{\min\{A_{\min}, n_{\min}\}} \left(\frac{1}{k_0 R_0} + 4 \sqrt{\frac{1}{\mu_A/2} + \frac{1}{\mu_n/2} \left(1 + \frac{d-1}{2 k_0 R_0} \right)^2} \frac{n_{\max}}{\sqrt{\min\{\mu_A/2, \mu_n/2\}}} \right), \quad (2.16)$$

then we have, for all $k \geq k_0$, $R \geq R_0$, and $\mathbf{y} \in U$:

(i) *Given $f \in L^2(D_{R_0})$, the solution of the EDP of Definition 2.4 satisfies*

$$\|u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H_k^1(D_R)} \leq C_{\text{stab}} R \|f\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})}. \quad (2.17)$$

(ii) *Given $F \in H_{0,D}^1(D_R)'$, the solution of the variational problem (2.3) satisfies*

$$\|u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H_k^1(D_R)} \leq C_{\text{stab}} k R \|F\|_{H_k^1(D_R)'}.$$
 (2.18)

3 Parametric regularity

In this subsection we estimate the partial derivatives of $u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ with respect to \mathbf{y} . Let $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ denote the set of nonnegative integers. For any multi-index $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathbb{N}_0^\infty$ with finite order $|\boldsymbol{\nu}| := \sum_{j \geq 1} \nu_j < \infty$, let

$$\partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = \partial_{\mathbf{y}}^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = \prod_{j \geq 1} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \right)^{\nu_j}$$

denote the mixed partial derivative with respect to \mathbf{y} .

Theorem 3.1 *Suppose that $u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ is the solution of the EDP with D , A , n , and R_0 satisfying Assumptions 2.1, 2.9 and 2.12, and let $k_0 > 0$. Then, for any multi-index $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathbb{N}_0^\infty$ with $|\boldsymbol{\nu}| < \infty$, all $k \geq k_0$, $R \geq R_0$ and all $\mathbf{y} \in U$,*

$$\|\partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H_k^1(D_R)} \leq (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|} |\boldsymbol{\nu}|! b^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \|u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H_k^1(D_R)}, \quad (3.1)$$

with $\xi = \xi_n + \xi_A$, and $b^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} := \prod_{j \geq 1} b_j^{\nu_j}$, where b_j is defined in (2.14) and C_{stab} is defined in (2.16).

Proof. We prove this result by induction on $|\boldsymbol{\nu}|$. The result holds trivially for $\boldsymbol{\nu} = \mathbf{0}$. For $\boldsymbol{\nu} \neq \mathbf{0}$, we first note that, with a_k and F as in (2.5), the solution $u(\cdot, \mathbf{y}) \in H_{0,D}^1(D_R)$ satisfies the variational formulation

$$a_k(u, v) = F(v) \quad \text{for all } v \in H_{0,D}^1(D_R). \quad (3.2)$$

To obtain the result, we use the following consequence of the Leibnitz rule.

$$\partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(A \nabla u) = \sum_{\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{m} \leq \boldsymbol{\nu}} \binom{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\mathbf{m}} (\partial^{\mathbf{m}} A) \nabla (\partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}-\mathbf{m}} u), \quad \partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(n u) = \sum_{\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{m} \leq \boldsymbol{\nu}} \binom{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\mathbf{m}} (\partial^{\mathbf{m}} n) (\partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}-\mathbf{m}} u); \quad (3.3)$$

here $\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{m} \leq \boldsymbol{\nu}$ means that $0 \leq m_j \leq \nu_j$ for all $j \geq 1$, and $\binom{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\mathbf{m}} = \prod_{j \geq 1} \binom{\nu_j}{m_j}$.

Noting the linearity of $n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ with respect to \mathbf{y} in (1.6), it is easy to see that if we differentiate $n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ with respect to y_j , we obtain $\xi_n \psi_j(\mathbf{x})$, and if we differentiate a second time with respect to any variable we get 0. The derivatives of A behave analogously. Thus we have

$$(\partial^{\mathbf{m}} n)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \begin{cases} n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) & \text{if } \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{0}, \\ \xi_n \psi_j(\mathbf{x}) & \text{if } \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{e}_j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad (\partial^{\mathbf{m}} A)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \begin{cases} A(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) & \text{if } \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{0}, \\ \xi_A \Psi_j(\mathbf{x}) & \text{if } \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{e}_j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

where \mathbf{e}_j denotes the multi-index whose j th component is 1 and all other components are 0.

We now assume the inductive hypothesis, that the estimate (3.1) holds for all $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ of order $|\boldsymbol{\nu}| \leq M$, and then choose any $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ with $|\boldsymbol{\nu}| = M + 1$. Then, applying $\partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ to (3.2), the right-hand side vanishes (since it is independent of \mathbf{y}). Applying $\partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ to the left-hand side, inserting the formulae (3.3) and using (3.4), and then finally moving the terms corresponding to $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{0}$ to the right-hand side, we obtain

$$a_k(\partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} u, v) = F_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(v) \quad \text{for all } v \in H_{0,D}^1(D_R), \quad (3.5)$$

with

$$F_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(v) := -\xi_A \sum_{j \geq 1} \nu_j \int_{D_R} (\Psi_j \nabla \partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}-\mathbf{e}_j} u) \cdot \nabla \bar{v} + k^2 \xi_n \sum_{j \geq 1} \nu_j \int_{D_R} \psi_j \partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}-\mathbf{e}_j} u \bar{v}. \quad (3.6)$$

Due to linearity of the DtN $_k$ map, the boundary integral in (2.5) becomes $\int_{\partial B_R} \text{DtN}_k(\partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} u|_{\partial B_R}) \bar{v}$ which is part of the left-hand side $a_k(\partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} u, v)$, while no boundary term appears in the right-hand side $F_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}(v)$. From Corollary 2.13(ii) we then conclude that

$$\|\partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H_k^1(D_R)} \leq C_{\text{stab}} k R \|F_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\|_{H_k^1(D_R)'} . \quad (3.7)$$

We now estimate the norm on the right-hand side of (3.7). For the first sum on the right-hand side of (3.6), we apply Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and then the inductive hypothesis to obtain (recalling Notation 2.2):

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \xi_A \sum_{j \geq 1} \nu_j \int_{D_R} (\Psi_j \nabla \partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}-\mathbf{e}_j} u) \cdot \nabla \bar{v} \right| &\leq \xi_A \sum_{j \geq 1} \nu_j \|\Psi_j\|_{L^\infty(D_R)} \|\partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}-\mathbf{e}_j} u\|_{H_k^1(D_R)} \|v\|_{H_k^1(D_R)} \\ &\leq \xi_A \sum_{j \geq 1} \nu_j \|\Psi_j\|_{L^\infty(D_R)} (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^{|\boldsymbol{\nu}-\mathbf{e}_j|} |\boldsymbol{\nu} - \mathbf{e}_j|! b^{\boldsymbol{\nu}-\mathbf{e}_j} \|u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H_k^1(D_R)} \|v\|_{H_k^1(D_R)} \\ &\leq \xi_A (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|-1} |\boldsymbol{\nu}|! b^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \|u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H_k^1(D_R)} \|v\|_{H_k^1(D_R)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\|\Psi_j\|_{L^\infty(D_R)} \leq b_j$, $|\boldsymbol{\nu} - \mathbf{e}_j| = |\boldsymbol{\nu}| - 1$, and $\sum_{j \geq 1} \nu_j = |\boldsymbol{\nu}|$.

We can apply an analogous process to estimate the second term on the right-hand side of (3.6), but in this case we apply Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in $L^2(D)$. Then the k^2 factor appearing there is cancelled out by the fact that (recalling (1.10)), $\|w\|_{L^2(D_R)} \leq k^{-1} \|w\|_{H_k^1(D_R)}$ for any $w \in H^1(D_R)$. Putting these estimates together and using $\xi = \xi_n + \xi_A$, we obtain

$$\|F_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\|_{H_k^1(D_R)'} \leq \xi (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|-1} |\boldsymbol{\nu}|! b^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \|u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H_k^1(D_R)}.$$

Substituting this into (3.7) yields the desired result. \square

Corollary 3.2 Suppose that $u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ is the solution of the EDP with $f \in L^2(D_{R_0})$ and D, A, n , and R_0 satisfying Assumptions 2.1, 2.9 and 2.12, and let $k_0 > 0$. Then, for all $k \geq k_0, R \geq R_0, r \in [0, 1]$, and $\mathbf{y} \in U$,

$$\|\partial^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H^r(D_R)} \leq (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|} |\boldsymbol{\nu}|! b^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} C_{\text{stab}} R k^{r-1} \|f\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})}. \quad (3.8)$$

where b_j is defined in (2.14) and C_{stab} is defined in (2.16).

Proof. Combining Theorem 3.1 with the bound given by Corollary 2.13(i), we obtain

$$\|\partial^\nu u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H_k^1(D_R)} \leq (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^{|\nu|} |\nu|! \mathbf{b}^\nu C_{\text{stab}} R \|f\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})}. \quad (3.9)$$

Then the estimates (3.8) for $r = 0$ and $r = 1$ then follow on recalling the definition of the H_k^1 -norm in (1.10). The case of general $r \in (0, 1)$ is obtained by applying operator interpolation (see, e.g., [7, §14]) to the linear operator $T : L^2(D_{R_0}) \rightarrow H^r(D_R)$ defined by $Tf := \partial^\nu u$, where u is the solution of the EDP. \square

4 Dimension truncation

In this section we estimate the quantity E^{trunc} defined in (1.12). For $G \in H^r(D_R)'$ and $r \in [0, 1]$ we define

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{y}) = G(u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})|_{D_R}), \quad \mathbf{y} \in U,$$

where u is the solution to the EDP from Definition 2.4. Also for any finite $s \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the truncated functional

$$\mathcal{G}_s(\mathbf{y}_s) = G(u(\cdot, (\mathbf{y}_s; \mathbf{0}))|_{D_R}), \quad \text{where } \mathbf{y}_s = (y_1, \dots, y_s).$$

Then

$$E^{\text{trunc}} = \left| \int_U (\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{y}) - \mathcal{G}_s(\mathbf{y}_s)) d\mathbf{y} \right|.$$

Theorem 4.1 *Let D , A , n , and R_0 satisfy Assumptions 2.1, 2.9 and 2.12, and let $k_0 > 0$. Let $\mathbf{b} = (b_j)_{j \geq 1}$ be the sequence defined in (2.14). Let $f \in L^2(D_{R_0})$ and let $G \in H^r(D_R)'$ for some $r \in [0, 1]$. Then for any finite $s \in \mathbb{N}$, for all integers $M \geq 0$, and all $k \geq k_0$, $R \geq R_0$, there is a constant $C(M, \mathbf{b})$ (depending on M and \mathbf{b} , but independent of other parameters) such that*

$$E^{\text{trunc}} \leq C(M, \mathbf{b}) C_{\text{stab}} R k^{r-1} K_r(f, G) \\ \times \left[\Lambda_M (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^2 \max \{1, (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^{M-2}\} s^{-2/p+1} + (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^{M+1} s^{(-1/p+1)(M+1)} \right], \quad (4.1)$$

where C_{stab} is defined in (2.16),

$$K_r(f, G) := \|f\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})} \|G\|_{H^r(D_R)'} \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$\Lambda_M = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{when } M = 0, 1, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 4.2 *The choices $M = 0, 1$ respectively yield the bounds of order:*

$$C_{\text{stab}} R k^{r-1} (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^{-1/p+1} \quad \text{and} \quad C_{\text{stab}} R k^{r-1} (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^2 s^{-2/p+2}$$

(omitting constants independent of $C_{\text{stab}}, k, R, \xi, s$). For $M \geq 2$ we obtain estimates with two terms which can be balanced in various ways, either to ensure the fastest decay with s or to ensure the two terms are equal in magnitude. For example, the choice $M = \lceil \frac{1}{1-p} \rceil$ gives the optimal rate as $s \rightarrow \infty$ of order

$$C_{\text{stab}} R k^{r-1} (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^{\lceil \frac{1}{1-p} \rceil + 1} s^{-2/p+1}.$$

Proof. We give the proof for $r \in \{0, 1\}$; and then extend to $r \in (0, 1)$ using operator interpolation. The proof uses an extension of arguments found in [34, Theorem 4.1] to the Helmholtz case, with the emphasis here on obtaining estimates explicit in the wavenumber k as well as the dimension truncation parameter s . (See also [36] for further extensions and generalisations of these arguments.)

Using the linearity of G together with Corollary 3.2 and (4.2), we have for any multi-index ν with $|\nu| < \infty$ and $\mathbf{y} \in U$,

$$\begin{aligned} |(\partial^\nu \mathcal{G})(\mathbf{y})| &= |G(\partial^\nu u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})|_{D_R})| \leq \|G\|_{H^r(D_R)'} \|\partial^\nu u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H^r(D_R)} \\ &\leq (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^{|\nu|} |\nu|! b^\nu C_{\text{stab}} R k^{r-1} K_r(f, G). \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

With this preliminary, the next step in the proof is to write $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{y})$ in terms of its Taylor polynomial of order M about the point $(\mathbf{y}_s; \mathbf{0})$, plus remainder, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_U (\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{y}) - \mathcal{G}_s(\mathbf{y}_s)) d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \underbrace{\sum_{\ell=1}^M \sum_{\substack{|\nu|=\ell \\ \nu_j=0 \forall j \leq s}} \frac{1}{\nu!} \int_U \mathbf{y}^\nu \partial^\nu \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{y}_s; \mathbf{0}) d\mathbf{y}}_{=: T_1} + \underbrace{\sum_{\substack{|\nu|=M+1 \\ \nu_j=0 \forall j \leq s}} \frac{M+1}{\nu!} \int_U \int_0^1 (1-t)^M \mathbf{y}^\nu \partial^\nu \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{y}_s; t \mathbf{y}_{s+}) dt d\mathbf{y}}_{=: T_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{y}_{s+} := (y_{s+1}, y_{s+2}, \dots)$, and so

$$E^{\text{trunc}} \leq |T_1| + |T_2|. \quad (4.4)$$

We estimate each of the terms T_1, T_2 separately.

The $\ell = 1$ term in T_1 vanishes, since when $|\nu| = 1$ and $\nu_j = 0$ for all $j \leq s$ we have

$$\int_U \mathbf{y}^\nu \partial^\nu \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{y}_s; \mathbf{0}) d\mathbf{y} = \left(\int_{U_s} \partial^\nu \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{y}_s; \mathbf{0}) d\mathbf{y}_s \right) \left(\prod_{j>s} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} y_j^{\nu_j} dy_j \right), \quad (4.5)$$

where $U_s := [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^s$ as before and the product on the right-hand side vanishes because $\nu_j = 1$ for one j . This fact was first observed by [32]. Thus we can start the summation in T_1 from $\ell = 2$, and trivially $T_1 = 0$ if $M = 0$ or $M = 1$. For $M \geq 2$, we use the facts that (inside the double sum), $|y_j| \leq 1/2$, $\nu! \geq 1$ and $|\nu| \geq 2$, thus obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} |T_1| &\leq \sum_{\ell=2}^M \sum_{\substack{|\nu|=\ell \\ \nu_j=0 \forall j \leq s}} \frac{1}{2^{|\nu|} \nu!} \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in U} |(\partial^\nu \mathcal{G})(\mathbf{y})| \leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\ell=2}^M \sum_{\substack{|\nu|=\ell \\ \nu_j=0 \forall j \leq s}} \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in U} |(\partial^\nu \mathcal{G})(\mathbf{y})| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} M! \max \{(C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^2, (C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^M\} \left(\sum_{\ell=2}^M \sum_{\substack{|\nu|=\ell \\ \nu_j=0 \forall j \leq s}} b^\nu \right) C_{\text{stab}} R k^{r-1} K_r(f, G), \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where in the second step we used (4.3). The double sum on the right-hand side of (4.6) is estimated in [34, eq (4.10)] by

$$\sum_{\ell=2}^M \sum_{\substack{|\nu|=\ell \\ \nu_j=0 \forall j \leq s}} b^\nu \leq C s^{-2/p+1}, \quad (4.7)$$

where C depends on b but not s . Combining (4.6) and (4.7), we obtain a bound for $|T_1|$ in (4.4), giving the first term in the bound (4.1).

Also, using similar arguments, T_2 can be estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} |T_2| &\leq \sum_{\substack{|\nu|=M+1 \\ \nu_j=0 \forall j \leq s}} \frac{M+1}{2^{|\nu|} \nu!} \left(\int_0^1 (1-t)^M dt \right) \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in U} |(\partial^\nu \mathcal{G})(\mathbf{y})| \\ &\leq (M+1)! \left(\frac{C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi}{2} \right)^{M+1} \left(\sum_{|\nu|=M+1} b^\nu \right) C_{\text{stab}} R k^{r-1} K_r(f, G), \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

and again we used (4.3) in the last step. The sum appearing in (4.8) is also estimated in [34, eq (4.11)], with the result

$$\sum_{|\nu|=M+1} \mathbf{b}^\nu \leq C s^{(-1/p+1)(M+1)}, \quad (4.9)$$

with a constant depending on \mathbf{b} . Combining (4.8) and (4.9) yields a bound for $|T_2|$ in (4.4), giving the second term in (4.1). This completes the proof for $r \in \{0, 1\}$.

To extend the result to $r \in (0, 1)$, we apply operator interpolation to the linear functional $T : H^r(D_R)' \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$TG = \int_U G(u(\cdot, \mathbf{y}) - u(\cdot, \mathbf{y}_s)) d\mathbf{y}, \quad \text{for any } G \in H^r(D_R)'.$$

The above estimates show that there is a scalar C_* independent of r , such that $\|T\|_{H^r(D_R)' \rightarrow \mathbb{C}} \leq C_* k^{r-1}$ for $r = 0, 1$. Thus the result for $r \in (0, 1)$ follows on recalling that the dual spaces $H^r(D_R)'$ are interpolation spaces. \square

5 QMC error bound

In this section we use QMC methods to approximate the expected value of a linear functional of our PDE solution, $G(u_s(\cdot, \mathbf{y}))$, with respect to $\mathbf{y} \in U_s := [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^s$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}[Gu_s] = \int_{U_s} G(u_s(\cdot, \mathbf{y})) d\mathbf{y}.$$

This general problem has been analyzed in many previous papers, for example, in [45] with a family of first order QMC methods known as “randomly shifted lattice rules”, and in [17] with a family of higher order QMC methods known as “interlaced polynomial lattice rules”. The surveys [43, 44] cover both methods. The paper [29] also includes both methods for a Helmholtz PDE.

An N -point randomly shifted lattice rule [18] for the integral of a function Θ over U_s is given by

$$Q_{s,N,\Delta}(\Theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \Theta(\{\mathbf{t}_i + \Delta\} - \frac{1}{2}),$$

where $\mathbf{t}_i = \{iz/n\} \in [0, 1]^s$, $z \in \mathbb{N}^s$ is the lattice generating vector, the braces indicate that we take the fractional part of each component in a vector, and $\Delta \in [0, 1]^s$ is a random vector where all components are i.i.d. uniform random numbers in $[0, 1]$. The subtraction by $\frac{1}{2}$ translates the standard unit cube $[0, 1]^s$ to U_s . An N -point interlaced polynomial lattice rule takes the form

$$Q_{s,N}(\Theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \Theta(\mathbf{t}_i - \frac{1}{2}),$$

where the points $\mathbf{t}_i \in [0, 1]^s$ are obtained by “interlacing” the points of a “polynomial lattice rule”, which are specified by a generating vector of “polynomials” rather than of integers. For the precise details as well as implementation, see, e.g., [17, 43] and the references there.

The general QMC theory (e.g., [18]) says that the integration error depends on the function space setting assumed for the integrand, as well as properties of the specific family of QMC methods. In a nutshell, the absolute integration error is bounded by a product of two factors: (i) the “worse case error” measuring the quality of the QMC method in the function space, and (ii) the norm of the integrand in this function space. Modern QMC analysis works with “weighted” function spaces, allowing “weights” to be chosen to model the dimension structure of a given integrand. These chosen weights then enter the expression for the norm and the worst case error, with the latter in turn used to construct tailored QMC methods, leading to QMC error bounds with the best convergence rate and with implied constant independent of dimension s . To apply QMC theory to PDE problems, we need

to bound the norm of the integrand using the regularity estimates for the PDE solutions. Bounds on the worst case errors are known from QMC theory.

In the following we make use of known QMC results without too much further detail. However, we focus on one important new point to address, namely, the dependence of the error bound on k . For simplicity we state the results for N being a power of a prime.

Theorem 5.1 *Let D , A , n , and R_0 satisfy Assumptions 2.1, 2.9 and 2.12, and let $k_0 > 0$. Let $f \in L^2(D_{R_0})$ and let $G \in H^r(D_R)'$ for some $r \in [0, 1]$. For $s \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{y} \in U_s$, let $u_s(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ denote the solution of the EDP with random coefficients where the series in (1.5) and (1.6) are truncated to s terms. Then for all $k \geq k_0$ and $R \geq R_0$ we have the following QMC results.*

- (i) *Randomly shifted lattice rules can be constructed such that*

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\Delta} [|\mathbb{E}[Gu_s] - Q_{s,N,\Delta}(Gu_s)|^2]} \leq C R k^{r-1} K_r(f, G) N^{-\min(1-\delta, 1/p-1/2)},$$

where the constant C grows unboundedly as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. If k satisfies $C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi \leq \Upsilon < \infty$ then C is bounded independently of s but depends on Υ (see (5.7) below). If s is bounded then the rate of convergence is $N^{-1+\delta}$ and the constant C is proportional to $(C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^s$.

- (ii) *Interlaced polynomial lattice rules with interlacing factor $\alpha = \lfloor 1/p \rfloor + 1$ can be constructed such that*

$$|\mathbb{E}[Gu_s] - Q_{s,N}(Gu_s)| \leq C R k^{r-1} K_r(f, G) N^{-1/p}.$$

If k satisfies $C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi \leq \Upsilon < \infty$ then C is bounded independently of s but depends on α and Υ . If s is bounded then the rate of convergence is $N^{-\alpha}$ and the constant C is proportional to $(C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^{\alpha s}$.

Proof. (i) From the standard QMC theory for randomly shifted lattice rules (see e.g., [44, formulas (11) and (12) with translated unit cube] or [45, Theorem 2.1]), we have

$$E^{\text{QMC}} := \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\Delta} [|\mathbb{E}[Gu_s] - Q_{s,N,\Delta}(Gu_s)|^2]} \leq \left(\frac{2}{N} \sum_{\emptyset \neq \mathbf{u} \subseteq \{1:s\}} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^{\lambda} [\vartheta(\lambda)]^{|\mathbf{u}|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\lambda}} \|Gu_s\|_{\mathcal{W}_{s,\gamma}}, \quad \forall \lambda \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1],$$

with $\vartheta(\lambda) := \frac{2\zeta(2\lambda)}{(2\pi^2)^{\lambda}}$, where ζ denotes the Riemann-zeta function, and with the weighted Sobolev space norm

$$\|Gu_s\|_{\mathcal{W}_{s,\gamma}} := \left(\sum_{\mathbf{u} \subseteq \{1:s\}} \frac{1}{\gamma_{\mathbf{u}}} \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{|\mathbf{u}|}} \left| \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{s-|\mathbf{u}|}} \frac{\partial^{|\mathbf{u}|}}{\partial \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{u}}} G(u_s(\cdot, \mathbf{y})) d\mathbf{y}_{\{1:s\} \setminus \mathbf{u}} \right|^2 d\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{u}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In this norm, for each subset $\mathbf{u} \subseteq \{1:s\} := \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, we take the mixed first derivative of the function with respect to the variables $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{u}} := (y_j)_{j \in \mathbf{u}}$, integrate out the remaining variables $\mathbf{y}_{\{1:s\} \setminus \mathbf{u}} := (y_j)_{j \in \{1:s\} \setminus \mathbf{u}}$, and then take the squared L^2 norm. The weight parameter $\gamma_{\mathbf{u}} > 0$ moderates the relative importance between the different subsets of variables. A small $\gamma_{\mathbf{u}}$ means that the function depends weakly on $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{u}}$.

With $G \in H^r(D_R)'$, we obtain from (4.3) for mixed first derivatives (taking $\nu_j = 1$ for $j \in \mathbf{u}$ and $\nu_j = 0$ for $j \notin \mathbf{u}$) that

$$\|Gu_s\|_{\mathcal{W}_{s,\gamma}} \leq C_{\text{stab}} R k^{r-1} K_r(f, G) \left(\sum_{\mathbf{u} \subseteq \{1:s\}} \frac{(|\mathbf{u}|!)^2 \prod_{j \in \mathbf{u}} \beta_j^2}{\gamma_{\mathbf{u}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \beta_j := C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi b_j. \quad (5.1)$$

Thus

$$E^{\text{QMC}} \leq C_{\text{stab}} R k^{r-1} K_r(f, G) \left(\frac{2}{N} \sum_{\emptyset \neq \mathbf{u} \subseteq \{1:s\}} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^{\lambda} [\vartheta(\lambda)]^{|\mathbf{u}|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\lambda}} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{u} \subseteq \{1:s\}} \frac{(|\mathbf{u}|!)^2 \prod_{j \in \mathbf{u}} \beta_j^2}{\gamma_{\mathbf{u}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (5.2)$$

This is exactly of the form in [44, Page 64 Step 12]. By choosing the weights to minimize this bound (or equivalently and more simply, just equating the terms inside the two sums), we obtain the weights

$$\gamma_{\mathbf{u}} = \left(|\mathbf{u}|! \prod_{j \in \mathbf{u}} \frac{\beta_j}{\sqrt{\vartheta(\lambda)}} \right)^{\frac{2}{1+\lambda}}, \quad (5.3)$$

where β_j is as defined in (5.1) and $\vartheta(\lambda) := \frac{2\zeta(2\lambda)}{(2\pi^2)^\lambda}$ is as stated earlier in the proof. Substituting (5.3) into (5.2) yields finally

$$E^{\text{QMC}} \leq C_{\text{stab}} R k^{r-1} K_r(f, G) \left(\frac{2}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\lambda}} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{u} \subseteq \{1:s\}} \left(|\mathbf{u}|! \prod_{j \in \mathbf{u}} (\beta_j [\vartheta(\lambda)]^{\frac{1}{2\lambda}}) \right)^{\frac{2\lambda}{1+\lambda}} \right)^{\frac{1+\lambda}{2\lambda}}, \quad (5.4)$$

which is of the form in [44, Page 64 Step 14]. Note that the above result holds for all s and for all k .

If k is bounded and satisfies

$$C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi \leq \Upsilon < \infty \quad \text{for some } \Upsilon > 0, \quad (5.5)$$

then we may follow the argument in [44, Page 64 Step 15 and Page 65 Step 16] to choose

$$\lambda = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2-2\delta} & \text{for some } \delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \\ \frac{p}{2-p} & \text{if } p \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1). \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

This leads to the convergence rate $E^{\text{QMC}} = \mathcal{O}(N^{-\min(1-\delta, 1/p-1/2)})$, where the implied constant is independent of s , but depends on Υ through the factor

$$\left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (\ell!)^{\eta-1} \left(\Upsilon^\eta [\vartheta(\lambda)]^{\eta/(2\lambda)} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_j^\eta \right)^\ell \right)^{1/\eta}, \quad (5.7)$$

with $\eta := 2\lambda/(1+\lambda) \in [p, 1]$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_j^\eta < \infty$. The outer sum in (5.7) is finite by the ratio test.

On the other hand, if s is bounded then we may pull out a factor of $(C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^s$ from the last sum in (5.2), leading to the choice of weights in (5.3) with β_j replaced by b_j . This is what we will do for our numerical experiment.

Weights of the form (5.3) are known as POD weights (“product and order dependent weights”). The component-by-component construction of lattice generating vector can be done for POD weights in $\mathcal{O}(s N \log N + s^2 N)$ operations, see [45].

(ii) The error for an interlaced polynomial lattice rule satisfies (see e.g., [43, Theorem 5.4] or [17, Theorem 3.1])

$$E^{\text{QMC}} := |\mathbb{E}[Gu_s] - Q_{s,N}(Gu_s)| \leq \left(\frac{2}{N} \sum_{\emptyset \neq \mathbf{u} \subseteq \{1:s\}} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^\lambda [\varrho_\alpha(\lambda)]^{|\mathbf{u}|} \right)^{1/(2\lambda)} \|Gu_s\|_{s,\alpha,\gamma} \quad \forall \lambda \in (\frac{1}{\alpha}, 1],$$

where $\alpha \geq 2$ is an integer smoothness parameter (also known as the “interlacing factor”), N is a power of 2, $\varrho_\alpha(\lambda) = 2^{\alpha\lambda(\alpha-1)/2}[(1 + \frac{1}{2^{\alpha\lambda}-2})^\alpha - 1]$, and the norm is

$$\|Gu_s\|_{s,\alpha,\gamma} := \sup_{\mathbf{u} \subseteq \{1:s\}} \sup_{\mathbf{y}_u \in [0,1]^{|\mathbf{u}|}} \frac{1}{\gamma_{\mathbf{u}}} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbf{u}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_{\mathbf{u} \setminus \mathbf{v}} \in \{1:\alpha\}^{|\mathbf{u} \setminus \mathbf{v}|}} \left| \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{s-|\mathbf{v}|}} (\partial^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{v}}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{\mathbf{u} \setminus \mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{0})} G(u_s(\cdot, \mathbf{y})) d\mathbf{y}_{\{1:s\} \setminus \mathbf{v}} \right|.$$

Here $\partial^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{v}}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{\mathbf{u} \setminus \mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{0})}$ indicates that we take the partial derivative α times with respect to y_j for $j \in \mathbf{v}$ and τ_j times with respect to y_j for $j \in \mathbf{u} \setminus \mathbf{v}$. Using again (4.3) (this time with general $\boldsymbol{\nu}$), we obtain instead of (5.1),

$$\|Gu_s\|_{s,\alpha,\gamma} \leq C_{\text{stab}} R k^{r-1} K_r(f, G) \sup_{\mathbf{u} \subseteq \{1:s\}} \frac{1}{\gamma_{\mathbf{u}}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\mathbf{u}} \in \{1:\alpha\}^{|\mathbf{u}|}} |\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\mathbf{u}}|! \prod_{j \in \mathbf{u}} (2^{\delta(\nu_j, \alpha)} \beta_j^{\nu_j}), \quad (5.8)$$

where $\delta(\nu_j, \alpha)$ is 1 if $\nu_j = \alpha$ and is 0 otherwise.

For bounded k satisfying (5.5), we now choose $\gamma_{\mathbf{u}}$ so that the supremum in (5.8) is 1, i.e.,

$$\gamma_{\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{\nu_{\mathbf{u}} \in \{1:\alpha\}^{|\mathbf{u}|}} |\nu_{\mathbf{u}}|! \prod_{j \in \mathbf{u}} (2^{\delta(\nu_j, \alpha)} \beta_j^{\nu_j}). \quad (5.9)$$

Using the above weights and following the arguments in [17, Pages 2694–2695], by taking $\lambda = p$ and the interlacing factor $\alpha = \lfloor 1/p \rfloor + 1$, we eventually arrive at the convergence rate $E^{\text{QMC}} = \mathcal{O}(N^{-1/p})$, with the implied constant independent of s , but depends on α and Υ through a factor similar to (5.7).

For bounded s , we may pull out a factor of $(C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^{\alpha s}$ from the supremum in (5.8), leading to the choice of weights in (5.9) with β_j replaced by b_j .

Weights of the form (5.9) are called SPOD weights (“smoothness-driven product and order dependent weights”). The generating vector (of polynomials) can be obtained by a component-by-component construction in $\mathcal{O}(\alpha s N \log N + \alpha^2 s^2 N)$ operations, see [17]. \square

6 PML truncation and FEM approximation

6.1 Definition of radial PML truncation.

We now approximate the EDP (2.3)–(2.5), using a perfectly-matched layer (PML) truncation. The PML is chosen to minimise spurious reflections, and will act in the annulus $B_{R_2} \setminus \overline{B_{R_1}}$ where

$$R_0 < R_1 < R_2 < \infty, \quad (6.1)$$

with R_0 as given in Assumption 2.1. The truncation can be thought of as a practical approximation of the Dirichlet to Neumann map DtN_k appearing in (2.5) (with $R = R_1$). But, while DtN_k is a global operator on the surface ∂B_R , the PML only requires computations with local operators. While PMLs have been well-known since the work of Berenger [3] (see also Remark 6.4), we make particular use here of very recent theoretical results from [25] proving that fixed width PML truncation is exponentially accurate as $k \rightarrow \infty$ (see Theorem 6.8 below).

The PML truncated problem (which is subsequently solved computationally) is then posed on

$$D_{R_2} = B_{R_2} \setminus \overline{D}. \quad (6.2)$$

Since $R_1 > R_0$, we have $A = I$, $n = 1$ and $f = 0$ in a neighbourhood of the region of truncation. We illustrate this in Figure 2.

For what follows we adopt the following notational convention.

Notation 6.1 Throughout the rest of the paper A and n (also A_{PML} and n_{PML} – introduced below) are random coefficients which depend on \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} (recall (1.5), (1.6)). We suppress dependence on \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} from the notation, except where is needed to aid understanding. Similarly the sesquilinear forms a_k (from (2.5)) and a_{PML} (introduced below) also depend on \mathbf{y} but we also suppress this from the notation.

Remark 6.2 (Choice of computational domain) To make the PML truncation as simple as possible we have assumed here that the truncation boundary is ∂B_{R_2} . However this spherical truncation boundary could be replaced by a polygon (or polyhedron), as long as it contains B_{R_1} , and does not touch ∂B_{R_1} . We explain in Remark 6.13 how the theory extends to this case.

Under Assumption 2.1, let u be the solution of the EDP (2.3)–(2.5). Then the PML truncated approximation $u_{\text{PML}} \in H_0^1(D_{R_2})$ is defined to be the solution of the variational problem

$$a_{\text{PML}}(u_{\text{PML}}, v) := \int_{D_{R_2}} \left((A_{\text{PML}} \nabla u_{\text{PML}}) \cdot \overline{\nabla v} - k^2 n_{\text{PML}} u_{\text{PML}} \overline{v} \right) = \int_{D_{R_2}} f \overline{v} \quad \text{for all } v \in H_0^1(D_{R_2}). \quad (6.3)$$




Figure 2: The PML truncation problem is posed on the domain D_{R_2} which is the region inside the ball B_{R_2} , excluding \overline{D} . The red gradient shading illustrates the radial cutoff function $\varphi_{\text{PML}} \in C^3(\mathbb{R}_+)$ satisfying (6.4); it is increasing in the annulus between radii R_1 and R_2 .

Here A_{PML} and n_{PML} are complex modifications of A and n , which are defined as follows.

First, choose a univariate smooth cutoff function $\varphi_{\text{PML}} \in C^3(\mathbb{R}_+)$, satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_{\text{PML}}(r) = 0 \text{ for } r \leq R_1, \\ \varphi_{\text{PML}}(r) \text{ is increasing for } R_1 \leq r \leq R_2, \text{ and} \\ \varphi_{\text{PML}}(r) = \varphi_{\text{PML, const}} > 0 \text{ for } r \geq R_2, \end{cases} \quad (6.4)$$

and then define

$$\sigma(r) := (r \varphi_{\text{PML}}(r))', \quad \alpha(r) := 1 + i\sigma(r), \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(r) := 1 + i\varphi_{\text{PML}}(r). \quad (6.5)$$

Then A_{PML} and n_{PML} are defined by:

$$A_{\text{PML}} := \begin{cases} A & \text{for } r \leq R_1 \\ H K H^\top & \text{for } r > R_1, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad n_{\text{PML}} := \begin{cases} n & \text{for } r \leq R_1 \\ \alpha(r)\beta(r)^{d-1} & \text{for } r > R_1, \end{cases} \quad (6.6)$$

where, in polar coordinates (r, θ) ,

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} \beta(r)\alpha(r)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha(r)\beta(r)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad H = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \text{ for } d = 2,$$

and, in spherical polar coordinates (r, θ, ϕ) ,

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} \beta(r)^2\alpha(r)^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha(r) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha(r) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad H = \begin{pmatrix} \sin \theta \cos \phi & \cos \theta \cos \phi & -\sin \phi \\ \sin \theta \sin \phi & \cos \theta \sin \phi & \cos \phi \\ \cos \theta & -\sin \theta & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ for } d = 3.$$

We note that $A = I$ and $n = 1$ when $r = R_1$ and thus A_{PML} and n_{PML} are continuous at $r = R_1$.

Remark 6.3 (The definition of the PML scaling function σ) *Here we have started from φ_{PML} , and defined σ in terms of φ_{PML} , thus following, e.g., [6, §2], [25, §1.2]. Alternatively, one can start from a non-decreasing function σ and define φ_{PML} such that the first equation in (6.5) holds; see, e.g., [14, §3], [47, §2], [39, §4], [9, §2]. The notation α and β is also used by [47, 49].*

Remark 6.4 (Relation to notation used in [25, 26]) In [25, 26] the PML is defined in terms of a scaling function f_θ (see [25, §1.2], [26, §1.3]); this corresponds to our function φ_{PML} above via the relation $\varphi_{\text{PML}}(r) = f_\theta(r)/r$. The use in [25, 26] of the subscript θ in f_θ originates in the notation used in the method of complex scaling – the original name for PML when it was developed in the 1970s by analysts; see, e.g., the references in [20, §4.7] (and see also comments given in the proof of Lemma 6.5).

6.2 Properties of the PML sesquilinear form a_{PML} and solution u_{PML}

In this subsection we collect some known properties of problem (6.3) that are needed in the proof of Theorem 6.12. (Recall Notation 6.1.)

Lemma 6.5 Suppose A, n satisfy Assumption 2.9 and φ_{PML} is chosen as in (6.4). Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{y} \in U$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\Re((A_{\text{PML}}\zeta) \cdot \zeta) \geq C|\zeta|_2^2, \quad \text{for all } \zeta \in \mathbb{C}^d. \quad (6.7)$$

Proof. By Assumption 2.9 and Lemma 2.10, A is real symmetric and positive definite so (6.7) holds with A_{PML} replaced by A . Also [26, Lemma 2.3] proves (6.7) for HKH^\top . Thus the result follows from the definition (6.6) of A_{PML} . (Note that [26, Lemma 2.3] actually considers a family of scaling functions $f_\theta(r) := f(r)\tan\theta$, for a given f , parametrized by $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$, and proves the estimate of the form (6.7) uniformly with respect to $\epsilon < \theta < \pi/2 - \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. However, we do not need that detail here.) \square

Corollary 6.6 (Continuity and Gårding inequality for a_{PML}) Suppose A, n satisfy Assumption 2.9 and φ_{PML} is as in (6.4). Then there exists constants $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$ such that, for all $\mathbf{y} \in U$, $k > 0$, and $u, v \in H^1(D_{R_2})$,

$$|a_{\text{PML}}(u, v)| \leq C_1 \|u\|_{H_k^1(D_{R_2})} \|v\|_{H_k^1(D_{R_2})} \quad (\text{Continuity}), \quad (6.8)$$

and

$$\Re a_{\text{PML}}(v, v) \geq C_2 \|v\|_{H_k^1(D_{R_2})}^2 - C_3 k^2 \|v\|_{L^2(D_{R_2})}^2 \quad (\text{Gårding inequality}). \quad (6.9)$$

Proof. The continuity property follows from the definitions of $a_{\text{PML}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H_k^1(D_{R_2})}$, together with the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. For the Gårding inequality, we write

$$\Re a_{\text{PML}}(v, v) = \int_{D_{R_2}} \Re((A_{\text{PML}}\nabla v) \cdot \nabla \bar{v}) - k^2 n_{\text{PML}} |v|^2.$$

Then we apply the reverse triangle inequality, using Lemma 6.5 and also the fact that n_{PML} can be bounded above on D_{R_2} . \square

The following theorem shows that the PML solution operator inherits the bound satisfied by the non-truncated solution operator, up to a k -independent constant, denoted C below, uniformly in $\mathbf{y} \in U$. (Compare (6.10) to (2.17).)

Theorem 6.7 (Bound on the solution of PML problem) Let D, A, n , and R_0 satisfy Assumptions 2.1, 2.9 and 2.12, and let $R_1 > R_0$. Then, given $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $C > 0$ and $k_0 > 0$ such that for all $R_2 > (1 + \epsilon)R_1$, $k \geq k_0$, $\mathbf{y} \in U$, and $f \in L^2(D_{R_0})$, with φ_{PML} as in (6.4), the solution $u_{\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ of (6.3) exists, is unique, and satisfies the bound

$$\|u_{\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H_k^1(D_{R_2})} \leq C C_{\text{stab}} R_2 \|f\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})}, \quad (6.10)$$

where C_{stab} is defined in (2.16).

We highlight that, both here and elsewhere, the order of the quantifiers in the statement of a result indicates on what quantities constants depend. For example, the constant C in Theorem 6.7 depends on ϵ but is independent of k and \mathbf{y} .

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 6.7] This result follows from [25, Theorem 1.6]. To see this, note that (i) here we are taking R_{tr} in [25] to be R_2 ; (ii) the norm $\|\chi_{R_2}(k)\chi\|_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}}$ on the right-hand side of [25, Equation (1.22)] is the norm of the solution operator for the untruncated problem, which in our case is estimated by (2.17); (iii) the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}(\Omega_{\text{tr}})}$ in [25] corresponds to $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(D_{R_2})}$ and the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}(\Omega_{\text{tr}})}$ in [25, Theorem 1.6] is the norm on the domain of the PDE operator (see [25, Equation 2.3]) and thus controls the norm $\|\cdot\|_{H_k^1(D_{R_2})}$. \square

6.3 The accuracy of PML truncation for k large.

The following theorem shows that the error in approximating $u(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ by $u_{\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$, when measured on the domain D_{R_1} (i.e., the part of D_{R_2} that does not contain the PML), decreases exponentially with respect to the wavenumber k and also with respect to the PML depth $R_2 - (1 + \epsilon)R_1$, for any $\epsilon > 0$. The exponential decay is uniform over all $\mathbf{y} \in U$.

Theorem 6.8 (Radial PMLs are exponentially accurate for k large) *Let D , A , n , and R_0 satisfy Assumptions 2.1, 2.9 and 2.12, and let $R_1 > R_0$ and $k_0 > 0$. Then, given $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $C_{\text{PML},1} > 0$, $C_{\text{PML},2} > 0$ and $k_0 > 0$ such that for all $R_2 > (1 + \epsilon)R_1$, $k \geq k_0$, $\mathbf{y} \in U$, and $f \in L^2(D_{R_0})$, with φ_{PML} as in (6.4), the solution $u_{\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ of (6.3) satisfies the bound*

$$\|u(\cdot, \mathbf{y}) - u_{\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H_k^1(D_{R_1})} \leq C_{\text{PML},1} \exp(-C_{\text{PML},2} k(R_2 - (1 + \epsilon)R_1)) \|f\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})}. \quad (6.11)$$

Proof. This result is a special case of [25, Theorem 1.5]. To see this note that (i) here we considering a nontrapping problem, so that in the notation of [25], $\Lambda(P, J) = 0$ (see the discussion below equation (1.18) in [25]); (ii) the role of R_{tr} in [25] is played by R_2 here; (iii) the estimates in [25, Equations (1.11), (1.16), and (1.21)] imply that the exponential on the right-hand side of [25, Equation 1.21] is of the form of the one on the right-hand side (6.11); (iv) as noted in the proof of Theorem 6.7, the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}(\Omega_{\text{tr}})}$ in [25, Theorem 1.5] controls the norm $\|\cdot\|_{H_k^1(D_{R_1})}$.

In fact [25, Theorem 1.5] actually proves that the error in the PML truncation decays exponentially not only in the parameters k and $R_2 - (1 + \epsilon)R_1$, but also in the the PML scaling parameter – here denoted $\varphi_{\text{PML, const}}$ in (6.4). However, to reduce technical detail, here we have hidden the dependence on $\varphi_{\text{PML, const}}$ in the constant $C_{\text{PML},2}$. Increasing the scaling parameter provides more damping. \square

6.4 The accuracy of the h -FEM approximation of the PML solution

In this section we give the theory of the approximation of problem (6.3) using a family of finite dimensional spaces $(V_h)_{h>0}$. The required approximation properties of V_h as $h \rightarrow 0$ are encapsulated in the following abstract assumption.

Assumption 6.9 (Approximation property of V_h) *There exists approximation degree $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and a constant $C = C(m) > 0$ such that, for all $R_2 > R_0$ and for any $v \in H_0^1(D_{R_2}) \cap H^{r'+1}(D_{R_2})$ with $0 \leq r' \leq m$, there exists an approximant $w_h \in V_h$ satisfying*

$$\|v - w_h\|_{H^r(D_{R_2})} \leq C h^{r'+1-r} \|v\|_{H^{r'+1}(D_{R_2})} \quad \text{for all } h > 0 \quad \text{and } 0 \leq r \leq r' \leq m. \quad (6.12)$$

Example 6.10 When D_{R_2} is a polygon/polyhedron, Assumption 6.9 holds when $(V_h)_{h>0}$ consists of continuous piecewise degree- m Lagrange elements on shape-regular simplicial triangulations, indexed by the meshwidth; see, e.g., [10, Theorem 17.1], [7, Proposition 3.3.17]. For a discussion of the geometric error incurred by using simplicial elements on curved domains, see Remark 6.13 below. When D_{R_2} is curved, Assumption 6.9 holds for piecewise polynomials on curved meshes satisfying certain (natural) derivative bounds on the element maps; see [11, Theorem 2], [48, Theorem 1], [5, Theorem 5.1].

Now, using V_h , the solution of PML problem (6.3) is defined by the usual Galerkin formulation:

$$\text{Find } u_{\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y})_h \in V_h \text{ such that } a_{\text{PML}}(u_{\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y})_h, v_h) = \int_{D_{R_2}} f \bar{v}_h \quad \text{for all } v_h \in V_h. \quad (6.13)$$

The convergence estimates in Theorem 6.12 below require the following regularity assumptions on the expansion functions in (1.5), (1.6).

Assumption 6.11 (Additional smoothness of random coefficients) *Following Assumption 2.9, suppose A_0 , n_0 , Ψ_j , and ψ_j are all in $W^{\tau, \infty}(D_{R_0})$ for some smoothness degree $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and that*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|\Psi_j\|_{W^{\tau, \infty}(D_{R_0})} + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|\psi_j\|_{W^{\tau, \infty}(D_{R_0})} < \infty, \quad (6.14)$$

where the norm for matrix-valued functions are defined analogously to Notation 2.2.

Assumption 6.11 coincides with Assumption 2.9 when $\tau = 1$, but when $\tau > 1$ Assumption 6.11 is stronger.

The following theorem provides k -explicit error estimates for the FEM approximation (6.13) of the PML problem (6.3). These error estimates hold on the whole computational domain D_{R_2} , which includes the PML (recall (6.2)). For simplicity, we restrict attention to the case where the data f is a k -dependent oscillatory function – such an f arises when we consider the plane-wave scattering problem in the following section.

Theorem 6.12 (k -explicit quasioptimality of FEM, uniformly in $\mathbf{y} \in U$) *Let D , A , n , and R_0 satisfy Assumptions 2.1, 2.9 and 2.12, and let $R_1 > R_0$. Suppose A and n also satisfy Assumption 6.11 with smoothness degree τ . Let $(V_h)_{h>0}$ satisfy Assumption 6.9 with approximation degree m . For*

$$\ell := \min(\tau, m),$$

suppose that ∂D_{R_2} is Hölder continuous $C^{\ell, 1}$ (see, e.g., [50, Page 90]) and that φ_{PML} as defined in (6.4) is in $C^{\ell, 1}(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Then, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $C_{\text{FEM}, 1} > 0$ and $k_0 > 0$, and for all $C_{\text{osc}} > 0$ there exists $C_{\text{FEM}, 2} > 0$ such that the following is true for all $R_2 > (1 + \epsilon)R_1$, $k \geq k_0$, and $\mathbf{y} \in U$.

Suppose $f \in L^2(D_{R_0})$ is a k -dependent oscillatory function in the sense that $f \in H^{\ell-1}(D_{R_0})$ with

$$\|f\|_{H^{\ell-1}(D_{R_0})} \leq C_{\text{osc}} k^{\ell-1} \|f\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})} \quad \text{for all } k \geq k_0. \quad (6.15)$$

Then, if $h = h(k)$ satisfies

$$(hk)^{2\ell} k R_2 \leq C_{\text{FEM}, 1}, \quad (6.16)$$

the solution $u_{\text{PML}, h}(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ of (6.13) satisfies

$$\|u_{\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y}) - u_{\text{PML}, h}(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H_k^1(D_{R_2})} \leq C_{\text{FEM}, 2} ((hk)^\ell + (hk)^{2\ell} k R_2) \|u_{\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H_k^1(D_{R_2})}, \quad (6.17)$$

$$k \|u_{\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y}) - u_{\text{PML}, h}(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{L^2(D_{R_2})} \leq C_{\text{FEM}, 2} ((hk)^{\ell+1} + (hk)^{2\ell} k R_2) \|u_{\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y})\|_{H_k^1(D_{R_2})}, \quad (6.18)$$

where $u_{\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ is the solution of (6.3).

Theorem 6.12 implies that if $(hk)^{2\ell} k R_2$ is kept sufficiently small as $k \rightarrow \infty$, then (by (6.17)) the relative $H_k^1(D_{R_2})$ error is controllably small, uniformly in k , as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This is because the condition (6.16) implies $hk \leq (C_{\text{FEM}, 1}/(k_0 R_2))^{1/(2\ell)}$. The condition (6.16) is observed empirically to be sharp (going back to the work of Ihlenburg and Babuška in 1D [40, 41]); see the discussion in [27, §1.2] and the references therein.

Proof. We obtain the estimates (6.17)–(6.18) under the mesh threshold (6.16) by showing that the PML problem (6.3) and its Galerkin discretisation (6.13) fit into the class of problems considered by [27]. To do this, we first note that Assumption 6.9 is [27, Assumption 4.8]. Moreover, the analysis of [27] applies to Helmholtz problems whose sesquilinear forms are (i) continuous, (ii) satisfy a Gårding inequality, and (iii) satisfy the natural elliptic-regularity shift results (i.e., if the data is in $H^{\ell-1}(D_{R_0})$ and the coefficients and domain boundary are sufficiently smooth, then the solution is in $H^{\ell+1}(D_{R_2})$).

Properties (i) and (ii) follow from Corollary 6.6 and (iii) can be established by combining the result in Lemma 6.5 above with standard elliptic regularity results, e.g., [50, Theorem 4.18] (the details of this are given for the PML problem in [27, Lemma 4.7]). For all the properties (i)–(iii), it is essential that the constants are (a) bounded independently of the PML parameters and (b) bounded independently of the parameters $\mathbf{y} \in U$. (a) is achieved via [27, Lemma 4.7], and (b) is achieved via Lemma 6.5 and the $W^{\ell,\infty}$ bounds provided by Assumption 6.11 since $\ell \leq \tau$.

As a result, (6.17) follows from [27, Eq. 4.19]. The bound (6.18) is not stated explicitly in [27], but follows from the last displayed equation in [27, §2.2] (one repeats the arguments that obtain (6.17) from the quasi-optimality bound [27, Eq. 4.16] but now one starts from the L^2 bound [27, Eq. 4.17]). \square

Remark 6.13 (Approximation of more general boundaries) *Theorem 6.12 requires that ∂D_{R_2} is at least $C^{1,1}$, and gives better convergence rates under additional smoothness of ∂D_{R_2} . In these cases, using simplicial triangulations incurs a non-conforming error coming from the approximation of ∂D_{R_2} . The result of Theorem 6.12 holds verbatim when this error is taken into account, with the Galerkin errors on the left-hand sides of (6.17) and (6.18) measured in the subset of D_{R_2} where both u_{PML} and $u_{\text{PML},h}$ are defined. This is thanks to the recent result of [8], which extend the arguments of [27] (used in the proof of Theorem 6.12) to the non-conforming setting. The key point is that, for nontrapping problems solved with simplicial elements, the geometric error is of order hk , which is smaller than the pollution error $(hk)^{2\ell} k R_2$ under the mesh condition (6.16) (see [8, Main Result 1.1 and Theorem 4.11]).*

We now apply the results above to the estimation of the quantity E^{FEM} defined in (1.12). In this connection we make the following remark.

Remark 6.14 (Dimension truncation) *Now recall from (1.12) that the analysis of E^{FEM} requires estimating the error in approximating the dimension truncated solution u_s (as defined in (1.8)) by its combined PML-FEM approximation $u_{s,\text{PML},h}$. However, because the estimates in these theorems are uniform in $\mathbf{y} \in U$, they hold without modification for \mathbf{y} replaced by \mathbf{y}_s .*

Using this we obtain the following Corollary to Theorems 6.8 and 6.12.

Corollary 6.15 *Assume that the conditions of Theorems 6.8 and 6.12 all hold and assume $G \in H^r(D_R)'$ for $r \in [0, 1]$ and $R_0 \leq R \leq R_1$. Given $\epsilon > 0$ and $k_0 > 0$ there exists C such that, for all $R_2 > (1 + \epsilon)R_1$, $k \geq k_0$, s , $\mathbf{y}_s \in U_s$, and $f \in L^2(D_{R_0})$, with φ_{PML} as in (6.4), if $h = h(k)$ satisfies (6.16) then*

$$\begin{aligned} & |G(u_s - u_{s,\text{PML},h})(\cdot, \mathbf{y}_s)| \\ & \leq C k^{r-1} K_r(f, G) \left[\exp(-C_{\text{PML},2} k (R_2 - (1 + \epsilon)R_1)) + ((hk)^{\ell+1-r} + (hk)^{2\ell} k R_2) R_2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (6.19)$$

with $K_r(f, G)$ defined in (4.2) and $C_{\text{PML},2}$ as in Theorem 6.8.

Proof. We prove (6.19) for $r \in \{0, 1\}$. The result then follows for all $r \in [0, 1]$ by interpolation (see, e.g., [7, §14]). We write

$$|G(u_s - u_{s,\text{PML},h})(\cdot, \mathbf{y}_s)| \leq \|u_s(\cdot, \mathbf{y}_s) - u_{s,\text{PML},h}(\cdot, \mathbf{y}_s)\|_{H^r(D_R)} \|G\|_{H^r(D_R)'} . \quad (6.20)$$

Then, we use the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_s(\cdot, \mathbf{y}_s) - u_{s,\text{PML},h}(\cdot, \mathbf{y}_s)\|_{H^r(D_R)} \\ & \leq \|u_s(\cdot, \mathbf{y}_s) - u_{s,\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y}_s)\|_{H^r(D_R)} + \|u_{s,\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y}_s) - u_{s,\text{PML},h}(\cdot, \mathbf{y}_s)\|_{H^r(D_R)} . \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

Using the norm bound $\|v\|_{L^2(D_R)} \leq k^{-1} \|v\|_{H_k^1(D_R)}$ when $r = 0$, and $\|v\|_{H^1(D_R)} \leq (1+k_0^{-2})^{1/2} \|v\|_{H_k^1(D_R)}$ for $k \geq k_0$ when $r = 1$, the first term in (6.21) is estimated by (6.11) noting Remark 6.14. To estimate the second term in (6.21), we use (6.17) when $r = 0$, and (6.18) when $r = 1$, and then use (6.10) to estimate $\|u_{s,\text{PML}}(\cdot, \mathbf{y}_s)\|_{H_k^1(D_R)}$. \square

7 Sound-soft plane-wave scattering

Returning to the plane wave scattering problem introduced in §2.2, we now show that this can be reformulated as a particular case of the EDP (1.1)–(1.3). Then we provide a computable formula for the far-field pattern u_∞^S defined in (2.11), as well as an error estimate for computing this via PML truncation and FEM approximation. The error estimate is uniform in the random parameter \mathbf{y} and therefore leads to an analogous estimate for approximation of the expected value of u_∞^S , allowing us to estimate the quantity E^{FEM} (discussed in §1) in the particular case when G denotes the far-field pattern operator.

7.1 The plane-wave scattering problem formulated as an EDP

While both u^T (the total field) and u^S (the scattered field) solve problem (1.1), neither satisfy the whole EDP problem (1.1)–(1.3); u^T satisfies (1.2), but not (1.3), while u^S satisfies (1.3) but not (1.2). However, by introducing a cutoff function φ_{alt} with value 1 in a neighbourhood of D and vanishing in the far field, and defining

$$u^{\text{alt}} := u^S + \varphi_{\text{alt}} u^I = u^T - (1 - \varphi_{\text{alt}}) u^I, \quad (7.1)$$

we see that u^{alt} satisfies both (1.2) and (1.3) and thus it satisfies an EDP with a special source term f^{alt} (see Lemma 7.1). Then one can immediately apply the bounds in Lemma 2.7, and also approximate u^{alt} via PML truncation and FEM as in §6.

We construct φ_{alt} so that it has value 1 on the set $\text{supp}(A - I) \cup \text{supp}(n - 1) \cup \overline{D}$: this then ensures that f^{alt} has a simple form and also leads to a simple formula for the quantity u_∞^S (see Theorem 7.2).

In more detail, by definition of R_0 in Assumption 2.1, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\text{supp}(A - I) \cup \text{supp}(n - 1) \cup \overline{D} \subseteq B_{R_0 - \eta}. \quad (7.2)$$

Accordingly, we introduce a univariate smooth cutoff function $\varphi_{\text{alt}} \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$ satisfying

$$\varphi_{\text{alt}}(r) = 1 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq r \leq R_0 - \eta \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{\text{alt}}(r) = 0 \quad \text{for } r \geq R_0 - \eta/2. \quad (7.3)$$

Then (with an obvious abuse of notation) we extend this to a radial function $\varphi_{\text{alt}} \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with values in $[0, 1]$, by setting

$$\varphi_{\text{alt}}(\mathbf{x}) = \varphi_{\text{alt}}(|\mathbf{x}|_2). \quad (7.4)$$

Note that, without loss of generality, we may assume that R_0 in Definition 2.1 is chosen sufficiently far from the boundary of the set on the left-hand side of (7.2) so that φ_{alt} does not have an unpleasantly-large gradient. This is illustrated in Figure 3.

Lemma 7.1 (Plane-wave sound-soft scattering rewritten as an EDP with L^2 data) *Let u^T be the solution of the plane-wave sound-soft scattering problem of Definition 2.8. Then u^{alt} defined by (7.1) and (7.4) satisfies the EDP:*

$$\nabla \cdot (A \nabla u^{\text{alt}}) + k^2 n u^{\text{alt}} = f^{\text{alt}} := 2 \nabla \varphi_{\text{alt}} \cdot \nabla u^I + u^I \Delta \varphi_{\text{alt}} \quad \text{in } D_+. \quad (7.5)$$

together with (1.2) and (1.3). Moreover, with $R_0 > 0$ as in Assumption 2.1, $u^{\text{alt}} \equiv u^T$ on $D_{R_0 - \eta}$ and $u^{\text{alt}} \equiv u^S$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{R_0 - \eta/2}$, while f^{alt} is only nonzero on the annulus $B_{R_0 - \eta/2} \setminus B_{R_0 - \eta}$.




Figure 3: When formulating the plane-wave sound-soft scattering problem as an EDP, the blue gradient shading illustrates the radial cutoff function $\varphi_{\text{alt}} \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying (7.3). The support of the data f^{alt} as defined in (7.5) is in the annulus between radii $R_0 - \eta$ (solid red circle) and $R_0 - \eta/2$ (dashed red circle).

Proof. Given φ_{alt} as in (7.4), the function $u^{\text{alt}} = u^T - (1 - \varphi_{\text{alt}})u^I$ satisfies both the Sommerfeld radiation condition (1.3) and

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla \cdot (A\nabla) + k^2 n)u^{\text{alt}} &= -(\nabla \cdot (A\nabla) + k^2 n)(1 - \varphi_{\text{alt}})u^I \\ &= -(\Delta + k^2)(1 - \varphi_{\text{alt}})u^I = 2\nabla\varphi_{\text{alt}} \cdot \nabla u^I + u^I \Delta \varphi_{\text{alt}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $A \equiv I$ and $n \equiv 1$ on $\text{supp}(1 - \varphi_{\text{alt}})$ and also the fact that $(\Delta + k^2)u^I = 0$. \square

7.2 The far-field pattern of u^S

The goal of this section is to express the far-field pattern of u^S , (2.11), as a functional of u^{alt} , with the result being (7.13) below. The numerical experiments in §8 then compute this quantity of interest.

We first show in Theorem 7.2 how the far-field pattern of any solution v of $(\Delta + k^2)v = 0$ satisfying (1.3) can be obtained from knowledge of v in an annulus. Then in Corollary 7.3 we apply this technique to obtain a formula for the far-field pattern of u^S . For convenience, the result is stated for the deterministic case, under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3, although the random case is entirely analogous.

Theorem 7.2 (Expression for far-field pattern as integral over an annulus) *Suppose that for some $\rho_0 > 0$, $v \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{B}_{\rho_0})$ satisfies the Helmholtz equation $(\Delta + k^2)v = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{B}_{\rho_0}$, together with the Sommerfeld radiation condition (1.3). Let $\rho_1 > \rho_0$ and suppose $\varphi_{\text{ffp}} \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a radial cutoff function with $\varphi_{\text{ffp}} \equiv 0$ in a neighbourhood of B_{ρ_0} and $\varphi_{\text{ffp}} \equiv 1$ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus B_{\rho_1}$. Then*

$$v_\infty(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = c(d, k) \int_{\text{supp } \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}}} v(\mathbf{x}') (\Delta \varphi_{\text{ffp}}(\mathbf{x}') - 2i k \hat{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}}(\mathbf{x}')) \exp(-i k \mathbf{x}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}) d\mathbf{x}', \quad \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, \quad (7.6)$$

where

$$c(2, k) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \frac{e^{i\pi/4}}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \quad \text{and} \quad c(3, k) = \frac{1}{4\pi}. \quad (7.7)$$

Theorem 7.2 is essentially [53, Theorem 2.2], but is written in a slightly-more general way here.

Proof. For $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let

$$G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') := \frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'|_2) \quad \text{for } d = 2, \quad \text{and} \quad G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') := \frac{\exp(i k |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'|_2)}{4\pi |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'|_2} \quad \text{for } d = 3, \quad (7.8)$$

where $H_0^{(1)}$ denotes the Hankel function of the first kind of order zero, see e.g., [15, (3.83)]. Recall that G is the fundamental solution for the operator $-(\Delta + k^2)$, i.e.,

$$(\Delta_{\mathbf{x}'} + k^2) G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = -\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}') \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

with δ denoting the Dirac delta function. Using this, for any $R > 0$, any $w \in C^2(\overline{B_R})$ can be represented (using Green's integral representation theorem – see, e.g., [15, Theorem 2.1]) as:

$$w(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\partial B_R} \left(\frac{\partial w(\mathbf{x}')}{\partial \nu(\mathbf{x}')} G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') - w(\mathbf{x}') \frac{\partial G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')}{\partial \nu(\mathbf{x}')} \right) dS(\mathbf{x}') - \int_{B_R} G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') ((\Delta + k^2)w)(\mathbf{x}') d\mathbf{x}', \quad (7.9)$$

for $\mathbf{x} \in B_R$, where $\partial/\partial\nu(\mathbf{x}')$ denotes the outward normal derivative with respect to \mathbf{x}' .

Now, with v and φ_{ffp} as given in the hypotheses, let $R > \rho_1$, consider the function w defined by $w \equiv v \varphi_{\text{ffp}}$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{B_{\rho_0}}$ and $w \equiv 0$ on B_{ρ_0} . Then (since $\varphi_{\text{ffp}} \equiv 0$ on a neighbourhood of B_{ρ_0}) we have $w \in C^2(\overline{B_R})$. With this choice of w , as $R \rightarrow \infty$, the integral over ∂B_R in (7.9) tends to zero. This is because both v and $G(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ (for \mathbf{x} fixed) satisfy the Sommerfeld radiation condition and both v and $G(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ decay with $\mathcal{O}(r^{(1-d)/2})$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. (Similar arguments are used in, e.g., [13, Last equation in the proof of Theorem 3.3]). Moreover,

$$(\Delta + k^2)w = (\Delta + k^2)(\varphi_{\text{ffp}}v) = 2\nabla\varphi_{\text{ffp}} \cdot \nabla v + v\Delta\varphi_{\text{ffp}} + \varphi_{\text{ffp}}(\Delta + k^2)v \quad (7.10)$$

Therefore inserting (7.10) into (7.9) and letting $R \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$v(\mathbf{x}) = - \int_{\text{supp} \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}}} G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') (2\nabla\varphi_{\text{ffp}} \cdot \nabla v + v\Delta\varphi_{\text{ffp}})(\mathbf{x}') d\mathbf{x}', \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{B_{\rho_1}}.$$

where we used the fact that $\nabla\varphi_{\text{ffp}}(\mathbf{x}') = \Delta\varphi_{\text{ffp}}(\mathbf{x}') = 0$ for $\mathbf{x}' \notin \text{supp} \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}}$ and $(\Delta + k^2)v(\mathbf{x}') = 0$ for $|\mathbf{x}'|_2 > \rho_0$.

Now, using the definition (2.11) of the far-field pattern and (when $d = 2$) using the large-argument asymptotics of the Hankel function $H_0^{(1)}$ (see, e.g., [19, Equation 10.17.5]) or (when $d = 3$) via an elementary calculation, we find that

$$v_\infty(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = -c(d, k) \int_{\text{supp} \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}}} (2\nabla\varphi_{\text{ffp}} \cdot \nabla v + v\Delta\varphi_{\text{ffp}})(\mathbf{x}') \exp(-ik\mathbf{x}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}) d\mathbf{x}'.$$

The result (7.6) then follows by integrating by parts (via the divergence theorem) the term involving $\nabla\varphi_{\text{ffp}} \cdot \nabla v$ (moving the derivative from v onto φ_{ffp}). \square

Recall that our goal is to find the far-field pattern of u^S from knowledge of u^{alt} defined by (7.1). Recall also that $u^{\text{alt}} \equiv u^S$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{R_0-\eta/2}$, and that we will ultimately compute an approximation to u^{alt} on D_{R_0} via PML truncation. We therefore choose the annulus $\text{supp} \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}}$ in Theorem 7.2 to be $B_{R_0} \setminus B_{R_0-\eta/2}$, since in this region we will have an approximation to $u^{\text{alt}} \equiv u^S$.

Corollary 7.3 (Far-field pattern for u^S as an integral involving u^{alt}) *Given $\eta > 0$ as in (7.2), let $\varphi_{\text{ffp}} \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that*

$$\varphi_{\text{ffp}} \equiv 1 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_{R_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{\text{ffp}} \equiv 0 \text{ on } B_{R_0-\eta/2}. \quad (7.11)$$

Then, with u^{alt} defined by (7.1) and (7.4),

$$u_\infty^S(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = c(d, k) \int_{\text{supp} \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}}} u^{\text{alt}}(\mathbf{x}') (\Delta\varphi_{\text{ffp}}(\mathbf{x}') - 2ik\hat{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \nabla\varphi_{\text{ffp}}(\mathbf{x}')) \exp(-ik\mathbf{x}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}) d\mathbf{x}'. \quad (7.12)$$

Proof. The conditions in (7.11) imply that $\text{supp} \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}} \subset B_{R_0} \setminus B_{R_0-\eta/2}$. That is, $\nabla\varphi_{\text{ffp}}$ is only supported where $u^{\text{alt}} \equiv u^S$ by Lemma 7.1. The result then follows from Theorem 7.2. \square

7.3 PML-FEM approximation

In this subsection we obtain an error estimate for the approximation of u_∞^S , as given by the formula (7.12). We apply dimension truncation (replacing \mathbf{y} by \mathbf{y}_s , as in §4) and then combined PML-FEM approximation (as in §6), to the EDP (7.5), thus obtaining an approximation $u_{s,\text{PML},h}^{\text{alt}}$. This is then substituted into (7.12) in place of u^{alt} , yielding the far-field approximation which we call $u_{\infty,s,\text{PML},h}^S$. We note that source f^{alt} in (7.5) is oscillatory (in the sense of (6.15)), allowing us to use the estimates from Theorem 6.12, in particular the L^2 bound in (6.18).

In the following theorem we give the PML-FEM error estimate for the far-field pattern without truncation of the variable \mathbf{y} (i.e., $s = \infty$). However the case of finite s is identical as explained in Remark 6.14.

Theorem 7.4 (FEM approximation of the far-field pattern for plane-wave scattering) *Let D, A, n , and R_0 satisfy Assumptions 2.1, 2.9 and 2.12, and let $R_1 > R_0$. Suppose A and n also satisfy Assumption 6.11 with smoothness degree τ . Let $(V_h)_{h>0}$ satisfy Assumption 6.9 with approximation degree m . For $\ell := \min(\tau, m)$ suppose that ∂D_{R_2} is Hölder continuous $C^{\ell,1}$ and that φ_{PML} as defined in (6.4) is in $C^{\ell,1}(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Let $u_{\text{PML}}^{\text{alt}}$ be the PML approximation of u^{alt} , i.e., the solution of the PML variational problem (6.3) with f replaced by f^{alt} defined by (7.5). Let $u_{\text{PML},h}^{\text{alt}}$ be the FEM approximation to $u_{\text{PML}}^{\text{alt}}$, i.e., the solution of the variational problem (6.13) with f replaced by f^{alt} . Let*

$$\begin{aligned} & u_{\infty,\text{PML},h}^S(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \\ &:= c(d, k) \int_{\text{supp } \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}}} u_{\text{PML},h}^{\text{alt}}(\mathbf{x}') (\Delta \varphi_{\text{ffp}}(\mathbf{x}') - 2i k \hat{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}}(\mathbf{x}')) \exp(-i k \mathbf{x}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}) d\mathbf{x}', \quad \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.13)$$

with φ_{ffp} satisfying (7.11). Given $\epsilon > 0$, there exist constants $C > 0$ and $k_0 > 0$ such that for all $R_2 > (1 + \epsilon)R_1$, $k \geq k_0$, $\mathbf{y} \in U$, and for all incident directions $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|_2 = 1$, if $h = h(k)$ satisfies (6.16) then

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_\infty^S - u_{\infty,\text{PML},h}^S\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} \\ & \leq c(d, k) C \left[\exp(-C_{\text{PML},2} k (R_2 - (1 + \epsilon)R_1)) + ((hk)^{\ell+1} + (hk)^{2\ell} k R_2) R_2 \right] \|f^{\text{alt}}\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.14)$$

where $c(d, k)$ is given by (7.7), $C_{\text{PML},2}$ is as in Theorem 6.8, and $\|f^{\text{alt}}\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})} \lesssim k$.

The bound (7.14) implies that if

$$c(d, k) (hk)^{2\ell} k^2 R_2^2$$

is a sufficiently small constant, then the error in computing the far-field pattern via (7.13) is bounded independently of k . From (7.7) we see that the condition for $d = 3$ is $(hk)^{2\ell} k^2 R_2^2$ being sufficiently small, and for $d = 2$ it is (slightly weaker) $(hk)^{2\ell} k^{3/2} R_2^2$ being sufficiently small.

Proof. By the definitions of u_∞^S and $u_{\infty,\text{PML},h}^S$ together with Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, there exists $C' > 0$ (independent of $\epsilon, \mathbf{y}, k, \boldsymbol{\alpha}$, and h) such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_\infty^S - u_{\infty,\text{PML},h}^S\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})} \leq c(d, k) C' k \|u^{\text{alt}} - u_{\text{PML},h}^{\text{alt}}\|_{L^2(\text{supp } \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}})} \\ & \leq c(d, k) C' \left(k \|u^{\text{alt}} - u_{\text{PML}}^{\text{alt}}\|_{L^2(\text{supp } \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}})} + k \|u_{\text{PML}}^{\text{alt}} - u_{\text{PML},h}^{\text{alt}}\|_{L^2(\text{supp } \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (7.15)$$

By the exponential accuracy of the PML approximation (6.11),

$$k \|u^{\text{alt}} - u_{\text{PML}}^{\text{alt}}\|_{L^2(\text{supp } \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}})} \leq C_{\text{PML},1} \exp(-C_{\text{PML},2} k (R_2 - (1 + \epsilon)R_1)) \|f^{\text{alt}}\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})}. \quad (7.16)$$

By the FEM error estimate (6.18), the fact that f^{alt} is k -oscillating in the sense of (6.15), and the bound (6.10),

$$k \|u_{\text{PML}}^{\text{alt}} - u_{\text{PML},h}^{\text{alt}}\|_{L^2(\text{supp } \nabla \varphi_{\text{ffp}})} \leq C'' ((hk)^{\ell+1} + (hk)^{2\ell} k R_2) R_2 \|f^{\text{alt}}\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})}. \quad (7.17)$$

The result (7.14) then follows from inputting (7.16) and (7.17) into (7.15). Note that we have $\|f^{\text{alt}}\|_{L^2(D_{R_0})} \lesssim k$ by the definitions of f^{alt} (7.5) and u^I (2.9). \square

8 Numerical Experiments

In this section we illustrate the performance of our algorithm for computing the far-field pattern of the scattered field in the case of 2-dimensional plane-wave scattering by a random medium with an impenetrable obstacle. To verify our implementation, we computed the solution for a Dirac impulse at the origin with no obstacle, for which the exact solution is known. We also computed the far-field pattern with a triangular obstacle with a homogeneous field ($A = I$, $n = 1$) and obtained good agreement with the results for this case from the authors of [37]. The paper [37] use a much more efficient and accurate boundary element method, but one suitable only for the homogeneous case, see also [33].

8.1 Problem specification

For $d = 2$ we consider a butterfly-shaped obstacle defined by the smooth radial function $(0.3 + \sin^2(\theta))(1.5 + 1.4 \cos(2\theta))$ for $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. The boundary of the obstacle is contained in the annulus between radii 0.130 and 1.249. For our domain we consider the annuli given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{radius} &= 1.25 && (\text{contains a butterfly-shaped obstacle}), \\ R_0 - 3\eta/2 &= 3 && (\text{random field fluctuation starts to diminish}), \\ R_0 - \eta &= 3.5 && (\text{random field fluctuation ends; support of } f^{\text{alt}} \text{ starts}), \\ R_0 - \eta/2 &= 4 && (\text{support of } f^{\text{alt}} \text{ ends; far-field pattern calculation region starts}), \\ R_0 &= 4.5 && (\text{far-field pattern calcuation region ends}), \\ R_1 &= 4.52 && (\text{PML starts}), \\ R_2 &= 5 && (\text{PML ends}). \end{aligned}$$

The incident wave comes from above, i.e., at angle 90° and $\alpha = (0, -1)$ in (2.9). We need a number of cutoff functions with varying smoothness requirements as we specify below.

The PML takes place between radii $R_1 = 4.52$ and $R_2 = 5$. The function $\varphi_{\text{PML}} \in C^3(\mathbb{R}_+)$ satisfying (6.4) is taken as (with a scaling parameter $\varphi_{\text{PML, const}} := 3$)

$$\varphi_{\text{PML}}(r) := 3 \varphi_{\text{cut},3} \left(\frac{r - R_1}{R_2 - R_1} \right), \quad \text{with} \quad \varphi_{\text{cut},3}(r) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } r \leq 0, \\ 35r^4 - 84r^5 + 70r^6 - 20r^7 & \text{for } 0 \leq r \leq 1, \\ 1 & \text{for } r \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

The active region of f^{alt} defined in (7.5) for plane-wave scattering is between radii $R_0 - \eta = 3.5$ and $R_0 - \eta/2 = 4$ (thus $\eta = 1$), while the far-field pattern is calculated between radii $R_0 - \eta/2 = 4$ and $R_0 = 4.5$. The functions $\varphi_{\text{alt}} \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying (7.3)–(7.4) and $\varphi_{\text{ffp}} \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying (7.11) are taken respectively as

$$\varphi_{\text{alt}}(\mathbf{x}) := 1 - \varphi_{\text{cut},2} \left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}|_2 - (R_0 - \eta)}{\eta/2} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{\text{ffp}}(\mathbf{x}) := \varphi_{\text{cut},2} \left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}|_2 - (R_0 - \eta/2)}{\eta/2} \right),$$

with

$$\varphi_{\text{cut},2}(r) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } r \leq 0, \\ 10r^3 - 15r^4 + 6r^5 & \text{for } 0 \leq r \leq 1, \\ 1 & \text{for } r \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

We compute the far-field pattern (7.13) at directions $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ corresponding to integer degrees $1^\circ, 2^\circ, \dots, 360^\circ$.

We restrict here to the case of (2.10) with fixed homogeneous matrix $A(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = I$ (therefore $A_0(\mathbf{x}) = I$, $\xi_A = 0$, $\Psi_j(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ in (1.5), and we may take $\mu_A = 1$ in (2.6)), and we take the coefficient $n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ as in (1.6), with

$$n_0(\mathbf{x}) = 1, \quad \xi_n = 0.8319, \quad \psi_j(\mathbf{x}) = j^{-q} \sin(j\pi x_1) \sin(j\pi x_2) \varphi_{\text{fluc}}(\mathbf{x}), \quad q = 3, \quad (8.1)$$

where

$$\varphi_{\text{fluc}}(\mathbf{x}) := 1 - \varphi_{\text{cut},1}\left(\frac{|\mathbf{x}|_2 - (R_0 - 3\eta/2)}{\eta/2}\right), \quad \text{with} \quad \varphi_{\text{cut},1}(r) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } r \leq 0, \\ 3r^2 - 2r^3 & \text{for } 0 \leq r \leq 1 \\ 1 & \text{for } r \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

The cutoff function $\varphi_{\text{fluc}} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is chosen to ensure that $\text{supp}(\psi_j) \subseteq B_{R_0-\eta}$ as required in (7.2), as well as $\|\nabla \psi_j\|_{L^\infty(D_{R_0})} < \infty$ as required in (2.13). Consequently, Assumption 6.11 holds with smoothness degree for the random coefficients being $\tau = 1$.

The value of ξ_n is chosen so that the condition (2.13) is satisfied. The condition (2.13) is sufficient to ensure positivity of $n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. There is another condition (2.15) which is sufficient to ensure nontrapping, but in our experiment we will not impose this latter condition, see discussion in §1.4. Indeed, with $n_0(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ we have $n_{0,\min} = 1$, $n_{\min} = 1/2$, $n_{\max} = 3/2$, and we may take $\mu_n = 1$ in (2.6). The definition of ψ_j in (8.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|\psi_j\|_{L^\infty(D_{R_0})} &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-q} \leq 1.2021, \\ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \underset{\mathbf{x} \in D_{R_0}}{\text{ess sup}} |\psi_j(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{x} \cdot \nabla \psi_j(\mathbf{x})| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \underset{\mathbf{x} \in D_{R_0}}{\text{ess sup}} j^{-q} \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^d |x_i| \left(j\pi + \left|\frac{\partial \varphi_{\text{fluc}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_i}\right|\right)\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-q} \left(1 + 2(R_0 - \eta)(j\pi + 3)\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-q} (7j\pi + 22) \leq 62.6193, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $|x_i| \leq R_0 - \eta$ since $\text{supp}(\psi_j) \subseteq B_{R_0-\eta}$, and

$$\left|\frac{\partial \varphi_{\text{fluc}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_i}\right| = \left|(-6r + 6r^2)\Big|_{r=\frac{|\mathbf{x}|_2 - (R_0 - 3\eta/2)}{\eta/2}} \cdot \frac{x_i}{|\mathbf{x}|_2} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta/2}\right| \leq \frac{3}{2} \times 1 \times \frac{1}{\eta/2} = 3.$$

Thus, to satisfy (2.13) it suffices to take $\xi_n \leq n_{0,\min}/1.2021 \approx 0.8319$, while (2.15) would ask for the much more restrictive $\xi_n \leq \mu_n/62.6193 \approx 0.01597$. As indicated above, we take $\xi_n = 0.8319$.

Below we will consider $k \in \{12, 24, 48\}$ so we may take $k_0 = 12$. This yields from (2.16)

$$C_{\text{stab}} = \frac{1}{\min\{1, 1/2\}} \left(\frac{1}{12 \times 4.5} + 4 \sqrt{\frac{1}{1/2} + \frac{1}{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{2-1}{2 \times 12 \times 4.5}\right)^2} \frac{3/2}{\sqrt{\min\{1/2, 1/2\}}} \right) \leq 48.26.$$

The wavelength is $2\pi/k \leq 2\pi/k_0 = 2\pi/12 \leq 0.5236$. The radii listed at the start of this subsection were chosen to be roughly 0.5 apart so that we have around one or more waves in each annulus.

8.2 PML-FEM discretization

We use the Julia packages Gridap and GridapEmbedded [2, 58, 1] to discretize our domain and solve the PDE using an aggregated unfitted finite element method (AgFEM) [1]. Specifically, we divide the square $[-R_2, R_2]^2 = [-5, 5]^2$ into 800^2 square cells each divided into two triangles, resulting in more than a million triangles in the background mesh, with

$$h = \frac{2R_2}{800} = \frac{10}{800} = 0.0125.$$

A circle of radius R_2 is extracted from this background mesh and then the butterfly-shaped obstacle is cut out from the centre. Both boundaries are “refined” by triangles and then the AgFEM method is used to solve the PDE. The Dirichlet boundary conditions are enforced in a weak form and we use a “Nitsche factor” (see [1]) of γ/h with $\gamma = 100$.

We set the approximation degree of AgFEM to be $m = 2$ (cf. Assumption 6.9). Together with the smoothness degree of the random field being $\tau = 1$ (cf. Assumption 6.11), we see from Theorem 6.12 that, with $\ell = \min(\tau, m) = 1$, if $h = h(k)$ satisfies the the condition (6.16), i.e.,

$$(hk)^{2\ell} k R_2 \leq C_{\text{FEM},1} \implies (hk)^{2\ell} k \lesssim 1 \implies h \lesssim k^{-1-1/(2\ell)} = k^{-3/2},$$




Figure 4: Computed total field $|u^T|$ and scattered field $|u^S|$ within radius $R_0 = 4.5$ for $k = 48$. Top row: homogeneous field $n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}) = 1$. Bottom row: heterogeneous field $n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ with $\mathbf{y} = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \mathbf{0})$.

then the relative error for the FEM solution of the PML problem is controllably small. Moreover, we see from Theorem 7.4 that (with $d = 2$) if

$$(hk)^{2\ell} k^{3/2} R_2^2 \leq C \implies (hk)^{2\ell} k^{3/2} \lesssim 1 \implies h \lesssim k^{-1-3/(4\ell)} = k^{-7/4},$$

then the error in computing the far-field pattern is bounded independently of k . Hence our fixed value of h above is sufficient for all of the values of $k \in \{12, 24, 48\}$.

Figure 4 plots the modulus of the computed total field $|u^T|$ and scattered field $|u^S|$ in the circle with radius $R_0 = 4.5$ for $k = 48$. The top two images correspond to the homogeneous field $n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}) = n_0(\mathbf{x}) = 1$. The bottom two images correspond to one single realization of the heterogeneous field $n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ where $\mathbf{y} = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \mathbf{0})$, which is equivalent to taking $\mathbf{y} = \frac{1}{2} := (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \dots)$ and then truncating the series (1.6) to $s = 3$ terms. Recall that the incident wave comes from the top so we observe some shadow below the butterfly in the plots of u^T . We clearly see the effect of the field in the heterogeneous region (circle with radius $R_0 - \eta = 3.5$) in the bottom images compared to the top images. Notice that the solutions in the bottom images are not symmetric around the vertical axis of the butterfly. This is because $\sin(j\pi x_1)$ in the definition (8.1) is not symmetric along the $x_1 = 1/2$ line. However, since $\sin(j\pi x_1)$ is actually anti-symmetric in x_1 , later when we average over many realizations with $y_j \sim \text{Uniform}([- \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}])$, we should observe symmetry in the expected solution. With




Figure 5: Far-field pattern for $k = 12$ computed with the homogeneous field $n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}) = 1$ (top left) and with realizations of the heterogeneous field $n(\mathbf{x}, \frac{1}{2})$ truncated to $s = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ terms.

$k = 48$ the wavelength is $2\pi/k \approx 0.13$ so in each circle with radius $R_0 = 4.5$ we expect to see about $2R_0/0.13 \approx 69$ ripples.

Figure 5 plots (the log₁₀ of the modulus) of the far-field pattern for $k = 12$ evaluated at angles $1^\circ, 2^\circ, \dots, 360^\circ$ for the solutions with homogeneous field $n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}) = 1$ and with realizations of the heterogeneous field $n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ where \mathbf{y} is taken successively to be $(\frac{1}{2}, \mathbf{0})$, $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \mathbf{0})$, $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \mathbf{0})$, $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \mathbf{0})$, $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \mathbf{0})$, which is equivalent to taking $\mathbf{y} = \frac{1}{2}$ and truncating the series (1.6) to $s = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ terms, respectively. We see that the homogeneous case (top left) looks very different to the other five heterogeneous cases, while the five heterogeneous cases look quite similar. From further plots for even higher dimensions we can spot a visible difference up to dimension $s = 6$, and in the corresponding plots of the solutions (similar to Figure 4 but with $k = 12$), we can spot a visible difference only up to dimension $s = 4$. These indicate that our problem has a fairly low “effective dimension”.

8.3 QMC quadrature

Since the far-field pattern is calculated using the numerical approximation to u^{alt} in the annulus between radii 4 and 4.5, we may take $R = 4.5$ in Theorem 5.1. We construct one generating vector up to dimension $s = 64$ for an ‘‘embedded’’ (see [16]) randomly shifted lattice rule for $N \in \{128, 256, 512, 1024\}$ based on POD weights given by (5.3), taking (since $p \approx 1/3$)

$$\delta = 0.1, \quad \lambda = 1/1.8, \quad \vartheta(\lambda) = \frac{2\zeta(2\lambda)}{(2\pi^2)^{\lambda}} \approx 3.666, \quad \beta_j := b_j = 1/j^3.$$

We do not follow the definition (5.1)

$$\beta_j := C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi b_j = 48.26 \times 48 \times 4.5 \times 0.8319 \times 1/j^3 = 8672/j^3,$$

since the constant is too big (due to loose theoretical estimates) for practical use. Although this means theoretically that the error bound could scale with $(C_{\text{stab}} k R \xi)^s$, we do not expect to observe this in practice. In our component-by-component construction we avoid picking a repeated choice of component to improve the quality of the lower-dimensional projections of the lattice rule. This one generating vector is used for all our computations with different values of $k \in \{12, 24, 48\}$, $s \in \{16, 32, 64\}$ and $N \in \{128, 256, 512, 1024\}$. We use 10 random shifts to estimate the standard error.

Figure 6 plots the expected value of the far-field pattern and the estimated standard errors computed using 10 random shifts of $N \in \{128, 256, 512, 1024\}$ realizations of the random field with $s = 32$ terms, varying $k \in \{12, 24, 48\}$ from top down. Individual lines on the right plots correspond to the estimated errors at angles $1^\circ, 2^\circ, \dots, 360^\circ$. The red solid lines are the means and the blue dashed lines are reference lines for order N^{-1} , demonstrating that we are achieving the order N^{-1} convergence rate in all cases. The far-field pattern becomes significantly rougher as k increases, and the standard error lines shift noticeably higher as k increases, all as we expected. We observe symmetry in the expected value of the far-field pattern along 90° and 270° as we predicted. We also made similar plots for $k = 48$ and varying $s \in \{16, 32, 64\}$, but we could not spot any visible difference between the three different value of s . This indicates that for $k = 48$ the effective dimension is lower than 16.

9 Conclusion

In this paper we combined QMC quadrature with PML truncation and FEM approximation to solve the Helmholtz equation formulated on the infinite propagation domain, after scattering by the heterogeneity as well as a bounded impenetrable scatterer. One important special case is the plane-wave sound-soft scattering problem where our quantity of interest is the far-field pattern of the scattered field. We developed theory for (a) dimension truncation in parameter space; (b) QMC quadrature for computing expectation; and (c) PML truncation and FEM approximation error. Our error estimates are explicit in s (the dimension truncation parameter), N (the number of QMC points), h (the FEM grid size) and most importantly k (the Helmholtz wavenumber). The method is also exponentially accurate with respect to the PML truncation radius. We give numerical experiments computing the expected value of the far-field patterns for domains containing about 70 wavelengths. We observe close to $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1})$ convergence which is optimal for randomly shifted lattice rules.

Acknowledgments

I. G. Graham and E. A. Spence acknowledge support from EPSRC grant EP/S003975/1, and E. A. Spence acknowledges support from EPSRC grant EP/R005591/1. F. Y. Kuo and I. H. Sloan acknowledge the support from the Australian Research Council Discovery Project DP210100831. We are grateful to Andrew Gibbs and Stephen Langdon for sharing their data for some computed far-field patterns. This research includes computations using the computational cluster Katana supported by Research Technology Services at UNSW Sydney [42].




Figure 6: Expected value of the far-field pattern and estimated standard errors for the random field with $s = 32$ terms and varying $k \in \{12, 24, 48\}$ from top down.

References

- [1] S. Badia, E. Neiva, and F. Verdugo. Robust high-order unfitted finite elements by interpolation-based discrete extension. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 127: 105–126, 2022.
- [2] S. Badia and F. Verdugo. Gridap: An extensible Finite Element toolbox in Julia. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 5(52): 2520, 2020.
- [3] J. Berenger. A perfectly matched layer for the absorption of electromagnetic waves. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 114(2): 185–200, 1994.
- [4] J. Bergh and J. Löfström. Interpolation Spaces: An Introduction. Springer, Berlin, 1976
- [5] C. Bernardi. Optimal finite-element interpolation on curved domains. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 26(5): 1212–1240, 1989.

- [6] J. Bramble and J. Pasciak. Analysis of a finite PML approximation for the three dimensional time-harmonic Maxwell and acoustic scattering problems. *Mathematics of Computation*, 76(258): 597–614, 2007.
- [7] S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott. *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, volume 15 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer Science+Business Media, New York, 3rd edition, 2008.
- [8] T. Chaumont-Frelet and E. A. Spence. The geometric error is less than the pollution error when solving the high-frequency Helmholtz equation with high-order FEM on curved domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16413*, 2024.
- [9] T. Chaumont-Frelet, D. Gallistl, S. Nicaise, and J. Tomezyk. Wavenumber explicit convergence analysis for finite element discretizations of time-harmonic wave propagation problems with perfectly matched layers. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, 20(1):1–52, 2022.
- [10] P. G. Ciarlet. Basic Error Estimates for Elliptic Problems. *Handbook of Numerical Analysis*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 18–351, 1991.
- [11] P. G. Ciarlet and P.-A. Raviart. Interpolation theory over curved elements, with applications to finite element methods, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 1 (1972), pp. 217–249.
- [12] A. Cohen and R. DeVore. Approximation of high-dimensional parametric PDEs. *Acta Numer.* 24: 1–159, 2015.
- [13] D. Colton and R. Kress. *Integral Equation Methods in Scattering Theory*. Wiley, New York, 1983.
- [14] F. Collino and P. Monk. The perfectly matched layer in curvilinear coordinates. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 19(6):2061–2090, 1998.
- [15] D. Colton and R. Kress. *Inverse Acoustic and Electromagnetic Scattering Theory*, volume 93 of Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer Science+Business Media, New York, 3rd edition, 2013.
- [16] R. Cools, F. Y. Kuo, and D. Nuyens. Constructing embedded lattice rules for multivariate integration. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 28: 2162–2188, 2006.
- [17] J. Dick, F. Y. Kuo, Q. T. Le Gia, D. Nuyens, and Ch. Schwab. Higher order QMC Galerkin discretization for parametric operator equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 52: 2676–2702, 2014.
- [18] J. Dick, F. Y. Kuo, and I. H. Sloan. High-dimensional integration: The quasi-Monte Carlo way. *Acta Numer.* 22: 133–288, 2013.
- [19] NIST. *Digital Library of Mathematical Functions*. <http://dlmf.nist.gov/>, 2022.
- [20] S. Dyatlov and M. Zworski. *Mathematical theory of scattering resonances*. volume 200 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2019.
- [21] S. Esterhazy and J. M. Melenk. An analysis of discretizations of the helmholtz equation in l2 and in negative norms. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 67(4): 830–853, 2014.
- [22] X. H. Feng, J. Lin, and C. Lorton. An efficient numerical method for acoustic wave scattering in random media. *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification*, 3(1): 790–822, 2015.
- [23] X. H. Feng, J. Lin and C. Lorton. A multi-modes Monte Carlo interior penalty discontinuous Galerkin method for the time-harmonic Maxwell's equations with random coefficients. *J. Sci. Comput.* 80(3): 1498–1528, 2019.
- [24] J. Galkowski, D. Lafontaine, and E. A. Spence. Local absorbing boundary conditions on fixed domains give order-one errors for high-frequency waves. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 44:1946–2069, 2024.

- [25] J. Galkowski, D. Lafontaine, and E. A. Spence. Perfectly-matched-layer truncation is exponentially accurate at high frequency. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 55(4):3344–3394, 2023.
- [26] J. Galkowski, D. Lafontaine, E. A. Spence, and J. Wunsch. The hp -FEM applied to the Helmholtz equation with PML truncation does not suffer from the pollution effect. *Comm. Math. Sci.*, 22(7):1761–1816, 2024.
- [27] J. Galkowski and E. A. Spence. Sharp preasymptotic error bounds for the Helmholtz h -FEM. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 63(1), 1–22, 2025.
- [28] J. Galkowski, E. A. Spence, and J. Wunsch. Optimal constants in nontrapping resolvent estimates. *Pure and Applied Analysis*, 2(1): 157–202, 2020.
- [29] M. Ganesh, F. Y. Kuo, and I. H. Sloan. Quasi-Monte Carlo finite element analysis for wave propagation in heterogeneous random media. *SIAM/ASA J. Uncertainty Quantification*, 9: 106–134, 2021.
- [30] M. Ganesh, F. Y. Kuo, and I. H. Sloan. Corrigendum: Quasi-Monte Carlo finite element analysis for wave propagation in heterogeneous random media. *SIAM/ASA J. Uncertainty Quantification*, 12: 212, 2024.
- [31] M. Ganesh and C. Morgenstern. A coercive heterogeneous media Helmholtz model: formulation, wavenumber-explicit analysis, and preconditioned high-order FEM. *Numerical Algorithms*, 83(4): 1441–1487, 2020.
- [32] R. N. Gantner. Dimension truncation in QMC for affine-parametric operator equations. *Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods* (A. B. Owen and P. W. Glynn, eds), Springer, Berlin, 249–264, 2018.
- [33] A. Gibbs, S. Langdon. An efficient frequency-independent numerical method for computing the far-field pattern induced by polygonal obstacles. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 46(4): A2324–A2350, 2024.
- [34] A. D. Gilbert, I. G. Graham, F. Y. Kuo, R. Scheichl, and I. H. Sloan. Analysis of quasi-Monte Carlo methods for elliptic eigenvalue problems with stochastic coefficients. *Numer. Math.*, 142(4): 863–915, 2019.
- [35] I. G. Graham, O. R. Pembery, and E. A. Spence. The Helmholtz equation in heterogeneous media: a priori bounds, well-posedness, and resonances. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 266(6): 2869–2923, 2019.
- [36] P. A. Guth and V. Kaarnioja. Generalized dimension truncation error analysis for high-dimensional numerical integration: lognormal setting and beyond. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 62(2): 872–892, 2024.
- [37] D. P. Hewett, S. L. Langdon, and J. M. Melenk. A high frequency hp boundary element method for scattering by convex polygons. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 51(1): 629–653 (2013)
- [38] R. Hiptmair, C. Schwab, and E. A. Spence. Frequency-explicit shape uncertainty quantification for acoustic scattering. *arXiv 2408.01194*, 2024.
- [39] T. Hohage, F. Schmidt, and L. Zschiedrich. Solving time-harmonic scattering problems based on the pole condition II: convergence of the PML method. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 35(3): 547–560, 2003.
- [40] F. Ihlenburg and I. M. Babuška. Finite Element Solution of the Helmholtz Equation with High Wave Number Part I: The h-Version of the FEM. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 30(9): 9–37, 1995.

- [41] F. Ihlenburg and I. M. Babuška. Finite element solution of the Helmholtz equation with high wave number part II: the h-p version of the FEM. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 34(1): 315–358, 1997.
- [42] Katana. PVC (Research Infrastructure), UNSW Sydney, Katana, (2010). doi: 10.26190/669X-A286.
- [43] F. Y. Kuo and D. Nuyens. Application of quasi-Monte Carlo methods to elliptic PDEs with random diffusion coefficients – a survey of analysis and implementation. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 16: 1631–1696, 2016.
- [44] F. Y. Kuo and D. Nuyens. Application of Quasi-Monte Carlo methods to PDEs with random coefficients – an overview and tutorial. *Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods* (A. B. Owen and P. W. Glynn, eds.), Springer-Verlag, 53–71, 2018.
- [45] F. Y. Kuo, Ch. Schwab, and I. H. Sloan. Quasi-Monte Carlo finite element methods for a class of elliptic partial differential equations with random coefficients. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 50(6): 3351–3374, 2012.
- [46] D. Lafontaine, E. A. Spence, and J. Wunsch. For most frequencies, strong trapping has a weak effect in frequency-domain scattering. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 74(10): 2025–2063, 2021.
- [47] M. Lassas and E. Somersalo. On the existence and convergence of the solution of PML equations. *Computing*, 60(3): 229–241, 1998.
- [48] M. Lenoir. Optimal isoparametric finite elements and error estimates for domains involving curved boundaries, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 23 (1986), pp. 562–580.
- [49] Y. Li and H. Wu. FEM and CIP-FEM for Helmholtz equation with high wave number and perfectly matched layer truncation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 57(1): 96–129, 2019.
- [50] W. C. H. McLean. *Strongly Elliptic Systems and Boundary Integral Equations*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [51] A. Moiola and E. A. Spence. Is the helmholtz equation really sign-indefinite? *SIAM Rev.*, 56: 274–312, 2014.
- [52] A. Moiola and E. A. Spence. Acoustic transmission problems: wavenumber-explicit bounds and resonance-free regions. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 29(2): 317–354, 2019.
- [53] P. Monk. The near field to far field transformation. *COMPEL-The international journal for computation and mathematics in electrical and electronic engineering*, 14: 41–56, 1995.
- [54] O. R. Pembery. The Helmholtz equation in heterogeneous and random media: analysis and numerics. PhD thesis, University of Bath, 2019.
- [55] O. R. Pembery and E. A. Spence. The Helmholtz equation in random media: well-posedness and a-priori bounds. *e-print, arXiv:1805.00282 [math.AP]*, 2019.
- [56] O. R. Pembery and E. A. Spence. The Helmholtz equation in random media: well-posedness and a priori bounds. *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification*, 8(1): 58–87, 2020.
- [57] A. Tarantola. Inversion of seismic reflection data in the acoustic approximation. *Geophysics*, 49(8): 1259–1266, 1984.
- [58] F. Verdugo and S. Badia. The software design of Gridap: A Finite Element package based on the Julia JIT compiler. *Computer Physics Communications*, 276: 108341, 2022.
- [59] Z. Wu, I. G. Graham, D. Ma, and Z. Zhang. A Filon-Clenshaw-Curtis-Smolyak rule for multi-dimensional oscillatory integrals with application to a UQ problem for the Helmholtz equation. *Math. Comp.*, appeared online <https://doi.org/10.1090/mcom/4007>, August 2024.