

Analyticity and Stable Computation of Dirichlet–Neumann Operators for Laplace’s Equation under Quasiperiodic Boundary Conditions in Two and Three Dimensions

David P. Nicholls
Department of Mathematics, Statistics,
and Computer Science,
University of Illinois at Chicago,
Chicago, IL 60607, USA.

Jon Wilkening
Department of Mathematics,
University of California,
Berkeley, CA 94720, USA.

Xinyu Zhao
Department of Mathematical Sciences,
New Jersey Institute of Technology,
Newark, NJ 07102, USA.

October 28, 2024

Abstract

Dirichlet–Neumann Operators (DNOs) are important to the formulation, analysis, and simulation of many crucial models found in engineering and the sciences. For instance, these operators permit moving–boundary problems, such as the classical water wave problem (free–surface ideal fluid flow under the influence of gravity and capillarity), to be restated in terms of interfacial quantities, which not only eliminates the boundary tracking problem, but also reduces the problem dimension. While these DNOs have been the object of much recent study regarding their numerical simulation and rigorous analysis, they have yet to be examined in the setting of laterally quasiperiodic boundary conditions. The purpose of this contribution is to begin this investigation with a particular eye towards the problem of more realistically simulating two and three dimensional surface water waves. Here we not only carefully define the DNO with respect to these boundary conditions for Laplace’s equation, but we also show the rigorous analyticity of these operators with respect to sufficiently smooth boundary perturbations. These theoretical developments suggest a novel algorithm for the stable and high–order simulation of the DNO, which we implement and extensively test.

1 Introduction

Many models arising in engineering and science couple partial differential equations (PDEs) for volumetric field quantities to their Dirichlet and Neumann traces at domain boundaries and interfaces. Often, the governing PDEs in the bulk are rather trivial (e.g., linear and constant coefficient) and the simulation challenges (numerical and analytical) arise from the complicated nature of the problem geometry (e.g., non–separable or unbounded) or from nonlinear conditions at the interfaces. For these problems, not only can these technical challenges be effectively addressed, but also the dimension of the problem can be reduced by restating them entirely in terms of interfacial quantities (the Dirichlet data). However,

this requires that the corresponding surface normal derivatives (the Neumann data) can be recovered by solving the underlying PDE. Dirichlet–Neumann operators (DNOs) accomplish this procedure. These DNOs arise in a wide array of applications ranging from linear acoustic [Ihl98], electromagnetic [Jac75, Pet80], and elastic [Ach73] scattering to solid [God92] and fluid [Lam93, Ach90] mechanics. Of particular interest in this contribution are the DNOs which arise in the study of the water waves problem [Lam93, Whi99, CS93] which models the free–surface evolution of an ideal fluid under the influence of gravity and capillarity. In light of these considerations it is clearly desirable to have a thorough understanding of not only the analytical properties of these DNOs, but also accurate and stable methods for their numerical simulation.

All of the classical methods for the numerical approximation of solutions of PDEs have been brought to bear upon this problem: Finite Difference Methods [Str04, LeV07], Finite Element Methods [Joh87, Goc06], Spectral Methods [GO77, Boy01, STW11], and their various generalizations and refinements. However, for the problems that we have in mind, which feature *homogeneous* PDEs in the bulk, these *volumetric* solvers are needlessly expensive as they discretize the full domain rather than simply the boundaries. Consequently, interfacial methods such as Boundary Integral/Element Methods (BIM/BEM) have very successfully been applied to the problem of simulating DNOs [BMO82, HLS94, Bea01, WV15]. Of particular note in the two–dimensional setting, are the conformal mapping techniques [DKSZ96, CC99, Rub04, DLK16, HIT16], which map the fluid domain to the lower half plane or a horizontal strip, thus simplifying the computation of the DNOs to Hilbert transforms which can be easily computed in Fourier space. Another major advantage of the conformal mapping techniques is that they can be used to compute water waves that are not graphs of functions, such as overhanging waves. However, these techniques cannot be easily extended to three dimensions.

In this work we advocate for a different class of efficient and accurate interfacial methods for simulating DNOs which view the problem geometry as a deviation from a simpler configuration (e.g., planar, circular). In summary, the DNO can be shown to depend *analytically* upon the deviation magnitude, ε , [NR01a] implying that it can be expressed as a convergent Taylor series in ε . The numerical algorithm then consists of approximating, say, the first N terms in this series and performing the (finite) summation [NR01b]. Initially one makes the assumption that the perturbation parameter ε is sufficiently small, however, it can be demonstrated that, under certain reasonable geometrical constraints, the domain of analyticity includes the *entire* real axis [NR03] so that (real) perturbations of any size can be simulated provided one has an appropriate analytic continuation strategy (e.g., Padé summation [BGM96]). These “High–Order Perturbation of Surfaces” (HOPS) methods have been shown to be highly efficient, accurate, and stable [NR01a, NR01b, NR03] within their domain of applicability, which is certainly the case for water wave simulations up to the limitations of the formulation (e.g., overturning and breaking). Importantly, and in contrast to volumetric methods or BEM/BIM, the derivation, implementation, and rigorous analysis of these HOPS methods do *not* depend strongly on the problem dimension.

Perhaps due to the extreme analytical and numerical difficulties presented by the strongly nonlinear interfacial boundary conditions of the water wave free–boundary problem, the issue of lateral boundary conditions for this model has been given secondary consideration over the years. In fact, almost all progress has been reported for water waves which exhibit either periodic patterns [Sto47, LC25, CN00] or decay to a flat state as the lateral coordinates approach infinity [Ray76, VBD92, MVBW10]. However, not only do such conditions prohibit the study of subharmonic (of periods longer than the base pe-

riod) or noncommensurate (of periods irrationally related to the base period) wave interactions, but also, ocean waves simply look neither periodic nor decaying at infinity. For these reasons, researchers have studied model equations exhibiting quasi-periodic patterning [BD96, WZ21a, WZ21b, WZ23a, WZ23b, ST23, DS23]. Particularly, two of the authors studied the full water wave problem with solutions exhibiting quasiperiodic patterning in the sense advocated by Moser [Mos66] and made precise in § 2.1. They utilized a surface integral formulation specific to water waves which they addressed with a conformal mapping technique that delivered highly accurate solutions in a rapid and stable fashion. However, this scheme is inherently limited to two-dimensional configurations (one lateral and one vertical) and a three-dimensional version is highly desirable.

As mentioned in the work of Wilkening & Zhao [WZ21b] one possible approach to extending their results to higher dimensions is to follow the work of Craig & Sulem [CS93] and restate the water wave equations in terms of the DNO associated to Laplace’s equation subject to quasiperiodic boundary conditions. For this one requires not only a fast, stable, and accurate numerical algorithm for the simulation of these DNOs, but also a rigorous analysis justifying their convergence. In this publication we provide, for the first time in the setting of quasiperiodic boundary conditions, *three* such HOPS algorithms, together with an analyticity theory which provides the crucial first step in a full numerical analysis.

The paper is organized as follows: We begin by stating the governing equations for the water wave problem [Lam93] (§ 2) which is the motivation for our study, with a particular discussion of the quasiperiodic boundary conditions we employ (§ 2.1). We then define the Dirichet–Neumann Operator (DNO), which allows us to restate the water wave problem in terms of surface variables, (§ 3) with a detailed specification of the transparent boundary conditions which permit a precise and uniform statement of the boundary conditions in the far field (§ 3.1). With this we establish analyticity of the DNO in § 4 which requires a change of variables (§ 4.1), a discussion of function spaces (§ 4.2), an elliptic estimate (§ 4.3), and an inductive lemma (§ 4.4) to deliver the analyticity results for the field (§ 4.5) and the DNO (§ 4.6). In § 5 we describe our numerical algorithms with a brief summary of our High–Order Spectral approach in § 5.1. For the simulation of DNOs subject to quasiperiodic boundary conditions, we describe our novel generalizations of the methods of Operator Expansions (OE), § 5.2, Field Expansions (FE), § 5.3, Transformed Field Expansions (TFE), § 5.4. In § 5.5 we recall the method of Padé approximation which we use to implement numerical analytic continuation. Finally, in § 6 we present numerical results of our implementations of the OE, FE, and TFE algorithms as compared with exact solutions from the Method of Manufactured Solutions (§ 6.1). In Appendix A we present a proof of the requisite elliptic estimate under quasiperiodic boundary conditions which is central to establishing our result.

2 The Water Wave Problem

The classical water wave model simulates the free–surface evolution of an irrotational, inviscid, and incompressible (ideal) fluid under the influence of gravity and capillarity [Lam93, Ach90]. These Euler equations are posed on the moving domain

$$S_{h,\eta} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbf{R} \mid -h < y < \eta(x, t)\}, \quad n \in \{2, 3\},$$

where $0 < h \leq \infty$. The irrotational nature of the flow demands that the fluid velocity be the gradient of a potential, $\vec{v} = \nabla\varphi$, while incompressibility enforces that the fluid’s velocity

be divergence free, $\operatorname{div}[\vec{v}] = 0$. Therefore, the velocity potential φ is harmonic,

$$\Delta_x \varphi + \partial_y^2 \varphi = 0.$$

In the case of finite depth, the bottom is assumed to be impermeable so that

$$\partial_y \varphi(x, -h) = 0,$$

while a fluid of infinite depth mandates

$$\partial_y \varphi \rightarrow 0, \quad y \rightarrow -\infty.$$

These are supplemented with initial conditions, and the kinematic and Bernoulli conditions at the free surface,

$$\partial_t \eta + \nabla_x \eta \cdot \nabla_x \varphi - \partial_y \varphi = 0, \quad y = \eta, \quad (2.1a)$$

$$\partial_t \varphi + \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \varphi|^2 + g\eta - \sigma \operatorname{div}_x \left[\frac{\nabla_x \eta}{1 + |\nabla_x \eta|^2} \right] = 0, \quad y = \eta. \quad (2.1b)$$

All that remains is to specify the lateral boundary conditions which the velocity potential, φ , and interface, η , must satisfy. For this we choose quasiperiodicity in a sense we now make precise.

2.1 Quasiperiodic Functions

There are many notions of quasiperiodicity that have been advanced in the literature and we focus on the one prescribed by J. Moser [Mos66]. We define a function $f(x)$ to be quasiperiodic if

$$f(x) = \tilde{f}(\alpha), \quad \alpha = Kx, \quad x \in \mathbf{R}^n, \quad \alpha \in \mathbf{R}^d, \quad K \in \mathbf{R}^{d \times n},$$

and the envelope function $\tilde{f}(\alpha)$ is *periodic* with respect to the lattice

$$\Gamma = (2\pi \mathbf{Z})^d,$$

so that

$$\tilde{f}(\alpha) = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \hat{f}_p e^{ip \cdot \alpha}, \quad \hat{f}_p = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{P(\Gamma)} \tilde{f}(\alpha) e^{-ip \cdot \alpha} d\alpha,$$

where

$$\Gamma' = \mathbf{Z}^d, \quad P(\Gamma) = [0, 2\pi]^d.$$

In order to specify truly non-periodic functions we demand that $d > n$ and the rows of K are linearly independent over the integers. For example, in the case $n = 1$ and $d = 2$, we can choose

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \kappa \end{pmatrix}, \quad \kappa \notin \mathbf{Q}.$$

For later use we point out that simple calculations reveal

$$\nabla_x f(x) = K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}(\alpha), \quad \Delta_x f(x) = \operatorname{div}_\alpha \left[K K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}(\alpha) \right], \quad \alpha = Kx.$$

Inspired by this definition of quasiperiodic functions of the lateral variable x , we extend this notion to functions which are laterally quasiperiodic but not vertically. For instance, u is said to be laterally quasiperiodic if

$$u(x, y) = \tilde{u}(\alpha, y), \quad \alpha = Kx, \quad x \in \mathbf{R}^n, \quad \alpha \in \mathbf{R}^d, \quad K \in \mathbf{R}^{d \times n},$$

and $\tilde{u}(\alpha, y)$ is α -periodic with respect to the lattice $\Gamma = (2\pi\mathbf{Z})^d$ so that

$$\tilde{u}(\alpha, y) = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \hat{u}_p(y) e^{ip \cdot \alpha}, \quad p \in \Gamma' = \mathbf{Z}^d.$$

3 The Dirichlet–Neumann Operator

Following the work of Craig & Sulem [CS93] we restate the water wave problem in terms of the DNO. Due to the time-independent nature of the DNO we suppress time dependence of the free interface in its definition and use the notation $y = g(x)$ to denote its parameterization, which is assumed to be quasi-periodic throughout the current work. For this we require the following definition.

Definition 3.1. Given Dirichlet data, $\xi(x)$, the unique laterally quasiperiodic solution of the boundary value problem

$$\Delta_x \varphi + \partial_y^2 \varphi = 0 \quad \text{in } S_{h,g}, \quad (3.1a)$$

$$\varphi(x, g(x)) = \xi(x), \quad \text{at } y = g(x), \quad (3.1b)$$

subject to the condition,

$$\partial_y \varphi(x, -h) = 0, \quad \text{if } h < \infty, \quad (3.1c)$$

$$\partial_y \varphi \rightarrow 0, \quad y \rightarrow -\infty, \quad \text{if } h = \infty, \quad (3.1d)$$

specifies the Neumann data,

$$\nu(x) = \partial_y \varphi(x, g(x)) - \nabla_x g(x) \cdot \nabla_x \varphi(x, g(x)).$$

The Dirichlet–Neumann Operator is defined by

$$G(g) : \xi(x) \rightarrow \nu(x). \quad (3.2)$$

Given this definition we can restate the water wave problem as the system of PDEs [CS93, CN00],

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \eta &= G(\eta) \xi, \\ \partial_t \xi &= -g\eta - \frac{1}{2(1 + |\nabla_x \eta|^2)} \left[|\nabla_x \xi|^2 - (G(\eta)\xi)^2 - 2(G(\eta)\xi) \nabla_x \xi \cdot \nabla_x \eta \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\nabla_x \xi|^2 |\nabla_x \eta|^2 - (\nabla_x \xi \cdot \nabla_x \eta)^2 \right] + \sigma \operatorname{div}_x \left[\frac{\nabla_x \eta}{1 + |\nabla_x \eta|^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For our purposes it is more convenient to restate the definition of the DNO in terms of the independent variable α and the envelope functions $\{\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{g}, \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\nu}\}$. To do so, we lift the lower-dimensional quasi-periodic problem in the lateral direction to a periodic problem defined on a higher-dimensional torus. Therefore, the equations are defined on the new domain

$$S_{h,\tilde{g}} = \{(\alpha, y) \in P(\Gamma) \times \mathbf{R} \mid -h < y < \tilde{g}(\alpha)\}.$$

Definition 3.2. Given Dirichlet data, $\tilde{\xi}(\alpha)$, the unique laterally periodic solution of the boundary value problem

$$\operatorname{div}_\alpha [KK^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, y)] + \partial_y^2 \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, y) = 0, \quad \text{in } S_{h, \tilde{g}}, \quad (3.3a)$$

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, \tilde{g}(\alpha)) = \tilde{\xi}(\alpha), \quad y = \tilde{g}(\alpha), \quad (3.3b)$$

subject to the condition,

$$\partial_y \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, -h) = 0, \quad \text{if } h < \infty, \quad (3.3c)$$

$$\partial_y \tilde{\varphi} \rightarrow 0, \quad y \rightarrow -\infty, \quad \text{if } h = \infty, \quad (3.3d)$$

specifies the Neumann data,

$$\tilde{\nu}(\alpha) = \partial_y \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, \tilde{g}(\alpha)) - (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{g}(\alpha)) \cdot K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, \tilde{g}(\alpha)).$$

The Dirichlet–Neumann Operator is defined by

$$\tilde{G}(\tilde{g}) : \tilde{\xi}(\alpha) \rightarrow \tilde{\nu}(\alpha).$$

3.1 Transparent Boundary Conditions

Regarding boundary conditions at the bottom of the fluid domain we can state a rigorous formulation for periodic waves which simultaneously accounts for a fluid of *any* depth, even infinite. We begin with the case of a fluid of infinite depth and select a value a such that $-a < -\|\tilde{g}\|_{L^\infty}$. Clearly, beneath the artificial boundary at $y = -a$ the bounded quasiperiodic solution of Laplace’s equation is

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, y) = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \hat{\psi}_p e^{|K^T p|(y+a)} e^{ip \cdot \alpha}.$$

From this we have

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, -a) = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \hat{\psi}_p e^{ip \cdot \alpha} =: \tilde{\psi}(\alpha).$$

Since

$$\partial_y \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, y) = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \hat{\psi}_p |K^T p| e^{|K^T p|(y+a)} e^{ip \cdot \alpha},$$

we find

$$\partial_y \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, -a) = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} |K^T p| \hat{\psi}_p e^{ip \cdot \alpha} =: |K^T D| [\tilde{\psi}(\alpha)],$$

which defines the order–one Fourier multiplier $|K^T D|$. With this we can state the infinite depth transparent boundary condition, (3.3d), as

$$\partial_y \tilde{\varphi} - |K^T D| [\tilde{\varphi}] = 0, \quad y = -a.$$

Similarly, in finite depth, $h < \infty$, we choose a such that $-h < -a < -\|\tilde{g}\|_{L^\infty}$ so that beneath the artificial boundary at $y = -a$ the solution of Laplace’s equation satisfying

$$\partial_y \tilde{\varphi} = 0, \quad y = -h,$$

is

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, y) = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \hat{\psi}_p \frac{\cosh(|K^T p|(h+y))}{\cosh(|K^T p|(h-a))} e^{ip \cdot \alpha}.$$

With this we have

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, -a) = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \hat{\psi}_p e^{ip \cdot \alpha} =: \tilde{\psi}(\alpha),$$

and, since

$$\partial_y \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, y) = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \hat{\psi}_p |K^T p| \frac{\sinh(|K^T p|(h+y))}{\cosh(|K^T p|(h-a))} e^{ip \cdot \alpha},$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_y \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, -a) &= \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} |K^T p| \tanh(|K^T p|(h-a)) \hat{\psi}_p e^{ip \cdot \alpha} \\ &=: |K^T D| \tanh((h-a) |K^T D|) [\tilde{\psi}(\alpha)], \end{aligned}$$

which defines the order–one Fourier multiplier $|K^T D| \tanh((h-a) |K^T D|)$. Thus the transparent boundary condition in finite depth, (3.3c), reads

$$\partial_y \tilde{\varphi} - |K^T D| \tanh((h-a) |K^T D|) [\tilde{\varphi}] = 0, \quad y = -a.$$

Therefore, if we define

$$\tilde{T} := \begin{cases} |K^T D| \tanh((h-a) |K^T D|), & h < \infty, \\ |K^T D|, & h = \infty, \end{cases}$$

then we have the uniform statement of the transparent boundary conditions, (3.3c) & (3.3d), as

$$\partial_y \tilde{\varphi} - \tilde{T}[\tilde{\varphi}] = 0, \quad y = -a. \quad (3.4)$$

With this we can (equivalently) restate the definition of the DNO.

Definition 3.3. Given Dirichlet data, $\tilde{\xi}(\alpha)$, the unique laterally periodic solution of the boundary value problem

$$\operatorname{div}_\alpha [K K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, y)] + \partial_y^2 \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, y) = 0, \quad \text{in } S_{h, \tilde{g}}, \quad (3.5a)$$

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, \tilde{g}(\alpha)) = \tilde{\xi}(\alpha), \quad y = \tilde{g}(\alpha), \quad (3.5b)$$

$$\partial_y \tilde{\varphi} - \tilde{T}[\tilde{\varphi}] = 0, \quad y = -a, \quad (3.5c)$$

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\alpha + \gamma, y) = \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, y), \quad \gamma \in \Gamma, \quad (3.5d)$$

specifies the Neumann data,

$$\tilde{\nu}(\alpha) = \partial_y \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, \tilde{g}(\alpha)) - (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{g}(\alpha)) \cdot K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, \tilde{g}(\alpha)). \quad (3.6)$$

The Dirichlet–Neumann Operator is defined by

$$\tilde{G}(\tilde{g}) : \tilde{\xi}(\alpha) \rightarrow \tilde{\nu}(\alpha). \quad (3.7)$$

4 Analyticity of the Dirichlet–Neumann Operator

We now follow the approach of Nicholls & Reitich [NR01a, NR03] and utilize the Method of Transformed Field Expansions (TFE) to establish the analyticity with respect to boundary deformation, \tilde{g} , of not only the field, $\tilde{\varphi}$, but also the DNO, \tilde{G} . The procedure is, by now, well-established and begins with a domain-flattening change of variables. Once this has been accomplished, the candidate solution is expanded in a Taylor series in powers of the interfacial deformation, resulting in a recurrence of (inhomogeneous) linearized problems to be solved. These are recursively estimated to establish the convergence of the Taylor series for the field which then yields the analyticity of the DNO.

4.1 Change of Variables

Consider the change of variables (known as the C-Method [CMR80, CDCM82] in electromagnetics or σ -coordinates [Phi57] in oceanography)

$$\alpha' = \alpha, \quad y' = a \left(\frac{y - \tilde{g}(\alpha)}{a + \tilde{g}(\alpha)} \right),$$

and the transformed field

$$\tilde{u}(\alpha', y') = \tilde{\varphi} \left(\alpha', \left(\frac{a + \tilde{g}(\alpha')}{a} \right) y' + \tilde{g}(\alpha') \right),$$

which, upon dropping the primes for simplicity, transforms (3.5) to

$$\operatorname{div}_\alpha [KK^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}(\alpha, y)] + \partial_y^2 \tilde{u}(\alpha, y) = \tilde{F}(\alpha, y; \tilde{g}, \tilde{u}), \quad -a < y < 0, \quad (4.1a)$$

$$\tilde{u}(\alpha, 0) = \tilde{\xi}(\alpha), \quad y = 0, \quad (4.1b)$$

$$\partial_y \tilde{u} - \tilde{T}[\tilde{u}] = \tilde{J}(\alpha; \tilde{g}, \tilde{u}), \quad y = -a, \quad (4.1c)$$

$$\tilde{u}(\alpha + \gamma, y) = \tilde{u}(\alpha, y), \quad \gamma \in \Gamma, \quad (4.1d)$$

from which one can produce the Neumann data

$$\tilde{\nu}(\alpha) = \partial_y \tilde{u}(\alpha, 0) + \tilde{L}(\alpha; \tilde{g}, \tilde{u}). \quad (4.1e)$$

The forms for \tilde{F} , \tilde{J} , and \tilde{L} are readily derived and are all $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{g})$.

We now make the smallness assumption on \tilde{g} ,

$$\tilde{g}(\alpha) = \varepsilon \tilde{f}(\alpha), \quad \varepsilon \ll 1, \quad \tilde{f} = \mathcal{O}(1),$$

where previous results indicate that we will be able to drop the size assumption on ε provided that it is *real* [NR03, NT08]. With this assumption we seek a solution of the form

$$\tilde{u} = \tilde{u}(\alpha, y; \varepsilon) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{u}_n(\alpha, y) \varepsilon^n, \quad (4.2)$$

which, upon insertion into (4.1), delivers

$$\operatorname{div}_\alpha [KK^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_n(\alpha, y)] + \partial_y^2 \tilde{u}_n(\alpha, y) = \tilde{F}_n(\alpha, y), \quad -a < y < 0, \quad (4.3a)$$

$$\tilde{u}_n(\alpha, 0) = \delta_{n,0} \tilde{\xi}(\alpha), \quad y = 0, \quad (4.3b)$$

$$\partial_y \tilde{u}_n - \tilde{T}[\tilde{u}_n] = \tilde{J}_n(\alpha), \quad y = -a, \quad (4.3c)$$

$$\tilde{u}_n(\alpha + \gamma, y) = \tilde{u}_n(\alpha, y), \quad \gamma \in \Gamma, \quad (4.3d)$$

where $\delta_{n,m}$ is the Kronecker delta, from which one can produce the Neumann data

$$\tilde{\nu}_n(\alpha) = \partial_y \tilde{u}_n(\alpha, 0) + \tilde{L}_n(\alpha), \quad (4.3e)$$

which gives $\tilde{G}_n(\tilde{f})[\tilde{\xi}] = \tilde{\nu}_n$. Here we have

$$\tilde{F}_n = \operatorname{div}_\alpha \left[K \tilde{F}_n^\alpha \right] + \partial_y \tilde{F}_n^y + \tilde{F}_n^0, \quad (4.4a)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a^2 \tilde{F}_n^\alpha &= -2a \tilde{f} (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_{n-1}) + a(a+y) (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \partial_y \tilde{u}_{n-1} \\ &\quad - (\tilde{f})^2 (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_{n-2}) + (a+y) \tilde{f} (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \partial_y \tilde{u}_{n-2}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4b)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} a^2 \tilde{F}_n^y &= a(a+y) (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \cdot (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_{n-1}) \\ &\quad + (a+y) \tilde{f} (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \cdot (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_{n-2}) \\ &\quad - (a+y)^2 \left| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right|^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{n-2}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4c)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} a^2 \tilde{F}_n^0 &= a (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \cdot (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_{n-1}) + \tilde{f} (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \cdot (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_{n-2}) \\ &\quad - (a+y) \left| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right|^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{n-2}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4d)$$

and

$$a \tilde{J}_n = \tilde{f} \tilde{T}[\tilde{u}_{n-1}(\alpha, -a)], \quad (4.4e)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} a \tilde{L}_n &= -a (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \cdot (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_{n-1}(\alpha, 0)) - \tilde{f} \tilde{\nu}_{n-1} \\ &\quad - \tilde{f} (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \cdot (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_{n-2}(\alpha, 0)) + a \left| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right|^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{n-2}(\alpha, 0). \end{aligned} \quad (4.4f)$$

We point out that (4.3e) and (4.4f) give the following formula for the n -th correction of the DNO (Neumann data)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_n(\tilde{f})[\tilde{\xi}] &= \partial_y \tilde{u}_n(\alpha, 0) - (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \cdot (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_{n-1}(\alpha, 0)) - \frac{1}{a} \tilde{f} \tilde{G}_{n-1}(\tilde{f})[\tilde{\xi}] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{a} \tilde{f} (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \cdot (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_{n-2}(\alpha, 0)) + \left| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right|^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{n-2}(\alpha, 0). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

4.2 Function Spaces

We now establish the analyticity of the transformed field, \tilde{u} , and DNO, \tilde{G} , under quasiperiodic boundary conditions. Our proof follows Nicholls & Reitich [NR01a], with extra attention given to handling the small divisors and the derivatives along the quasiperiodic direction in the estimates. We begin by defining the Fourier multipliers $|K^T D|^q$,

$$\begin{aligned} |K^T D|^q \tilde{\psi}(\alpha) &:= \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} |K^T p|^q \hat{\psi}_p e^{ip \cdot \alpha}, & q \in \mathbf{R}, \\ |K^T D|^q \tilde{w}(\alpha, y) &:= \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} |K^T p|^q \hat{w}_p(y) e^{ip \cdot \alpha}, & q \in \mathbf{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we recall the classical interfacial Sobolev spaces

$$H^s(P(\Gamma)) = \left\{ \tilde{\xi}(\alpha) \in L^2(P(\Gamma)) \mid \left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^s} < \infty \right\},$$

where

$$\left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^s}^2 = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \langle p \rangle^{2s} \left| \hat{\xi}_p \right|^2 = \left\| \langle D \rangle^s \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{L^2(P(\Gamma))}^2, \quad \langle p \rangle^s = (1 + |p|^2)^{s/2}.$$

and volumetric spaces

$$X^s(\Omega) = \left\{ \tilde{u}(\alpha, y) \in L^2(\Omega) \mid \|\tilde{u}\|_{X^s} < \infty \right\},$$

on

$$\Omega := P(\Gamma) \times (-a, 0),$$

where

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{X^s}^2 = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \langle p \rangle^{2s} \|\hat{u}_p(y)\|_{L^2((-a, 0))}^2 = \|\langle D \rangle^s \tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Remark 4.1. With these definitions we can illustrate a curious, but crucial, property of the operators $|K^T D|^q$. If we consider the space of zero-mean functions

$$H_0^s(P(\Gamma)) = \left\{ \tilde{\xi}(\alpha) \in H^s(P(\Gamma)) \mid \hat{\xi}_0 = 0 \right\},$$

then a direct application of the Poincaré inequality yields

$$\left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{s+1} \leq C \left\| \nabla_\alpha \tilde{\xi} \right\|_s.$$

However, an estimate of (4.1) no longer holds if we replace ∇_α by $|K^T D|$. Instead one typically settles for a “non-resonance” condition of the form [Mos66]

$$\gamma \langle p \rangle^{-r} < |K^T p|, \quad |p| \geq 1, \tag{4.6}$$

for some $\gamma, r > 0$. With this we can only realize

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{s-r}^2 &= \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \langle p \rangle^{2s-2r} \left| \hat{\xi}_p \right|^2 \leq \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \gamma^{-2} |K^T p|^2 \langle p \rangle^{2s} \left| \hat{\xi}_p \right|^2 \\ &= \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \gamma^{-2} \langle p \rangle^{2s} \left| |K^T p| \hat{\xi}_p \right|^2 = \gamma^{-2} \left\| |K^T D| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_s^2, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$|K^T D| \tilde{\xi} \in H_0^s \quad \implies \quad \tilde{\xi} \in H_0^{s-r}.$$

In particular, $|K^T D| \tilde{\xi} \in H^s$ does *not* imply $\tilde{\xi} \in H_0^{s+1}$ as one might expect.

With the definitions of H^s , X^s , and their norms we can state and prove the following important Algebra Property [Fol76, NR01a, Eva10].

Lemma 4.2. *Given an integer $s > d/2$ there exists a constant $M = M(s)$ such that all of the following estimates are true.*

- If $\tilde{f} \in H^s(P(\Gamma))$ and $\tilde{\xi} \in H^s(P(\Gamma))$ then

$$\left\| \tilde{f} \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^s} \leq M \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s} \left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^s}. \quad (4.7a)$$

- If $\tilde{f} \in H^s(P(\Gamma))$ and $\tilde{u} \in X^s(\Omega)$ then

$$\left\| \tilde{f} \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s} \leq M \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s} \left\| \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}. \quad (4.7b)$$

- If $\tilde{g} \in H^{s+1/2}(P(\Gamma))$, $\tilde{\psi} \in H^s(P(\Gamma))$, and $|K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{\psi} \in H^s(P(\Gamma))$ then

$$\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} [\tilde{g} \tilde{\psi}] \right\|_{H^s} \leq M \left\| \tilde{g} \right\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \left\{ \left\| \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s} + \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s} \right\}. \quad (4.7c)$$

- If $\tilde{g} \in H^{s+1/2}(P(\Gamma))$, $\tilde{v} \in X^s(\Omega)$, and $|K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{v} \in X^s(\Omega)$ then

$$\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} [\tilde{g} \tilde{v}] \right\|_{X^s} \leq M \left\| \tilde{g} \right\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \left\{ \left\| \tilde{v} \right\|_{X^s} + \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{v} \right\|_{X^s} \right\}. \quad (4.7d)$$

Proof. The proofs of (4.7a) and (4.7b) are standard [Eva10], while the proof of (4.7d) is similar to that of (4.7c). Therefore we now work to establish (4.7c) and begin with

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} [\tilde{g} \tilde{\psi}] \right\|_{H^s}^2 &\leq \sum_{q \in \Gamma'} \langle q \rangle^{2s} |K^T q| \left\{ \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} |\hat{g}_{q-p}| |\hat{\psi}_p| \right\}^2 \\ &= \sum_{q \in \Gamma'} \left\{ \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \langle q \rangle^s |K^T q|^{1/2} |\hat{g}_{q-p}| |\hat{\psi}_p| \right\}^2 \\ &\leq C \sum_{q \in \Gamma'} \left\{ \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} (\langle q-p \rangle^s + \langle p \rangle^s) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(|K^T(q-p)|^{1/2} + |K^T p|^{1/2} \right) |\hat{g}_{q-p}| |\hat{\psi}_p| \right\}^2 \\ &\leq CC' \sum_{q \in \Gamma'} \left\{ \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} (\langle q-p \rangle^s + \langle p \rangle^s) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(\langle q-p \rangle^{1/2} + |K^T p|^{1/2} \right) |\hat{g}_{q-p}| |\hat{\psi}_p| \right\}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the Young's convolution inequality

$$\|f_1 * f_2\|_{\ell^2} \leq \|f_1\|_{\ell^1} \|f_2\|_{\ell^2},$$

we can show that

$$\left\{ \sum_{q \in \Gamma'} \left(\sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \langle q-p \rangle^{s+1/2} |\hat{g}_{q-p}| |\hat{\psi}_p| \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \leq \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} |\hat{\psi}_p| \leq C \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \left\| \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s}.$$

Similarly, we can also prove that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \sum_{q \in \Gamma'} \left(\sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \langle q-p \rangle^s |\hat{g}_{q-p}| |K^T p|^{1/2} |\hat{\psi}_p| \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} &\leq C \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^s} \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s}, \\ \left\{ \sum_{q \in \Gamma'} \left(\sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \langle q-p \rangle^{1/2} |\hat{g}_{q-p}| \langle p \rangle^s |\hat{\psi}_p| \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} &\leq C \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \left\| \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s}, \\ \left\{ \sum_{q \in \Gamma'} \left(\sum_{p \in \Gamma'} |\hat{g}_{q-p}| \langle p \rangle^s |K^T p|^{1/2} |\hat{\psi}_p| \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} &\leq \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^s} \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

$$\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} [\tilde{g}\tilde{\psi}] \right\|_{H^s} \leq M \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \left(\left\| \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s} + \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s} \right).$$

□

Remark 4.3. At this point we observe how our current theory will differ in an important way from the periodic case explored in Nicholls & Reitich [NR01b]. In the latter we were able to establish

$$\left\| |D|^{1/2} [\tilde{g}\tilde{\psi}] \right\|_{H^s} \leq M \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \left(\left\| \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s} + \left\| |D|^{1/2} \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s} \right) \leq 2M \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \left\| |D|^{1/2} \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s},$$

c.f. Remark 4.1. By contrast, we *cannot* bound $\left\| \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s}$ by $\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s}$ (see Remark 4.1) which will necessitate a more powerful elliptic estimate (Theorem 4.8) that controls not only

$$\left\{ |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{u}, |K^T D|^{1/2} \partial_y \tilde{u}, |K^T D|^{1/2} K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u} \right\}$$

but also

$$\left\{ \tilde{u}, \partial_y \tilde{u}, K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u} \right\}.$$

From this it is straightforward to establish the following.

Corollary 4.4. *Given an integer $s > d/2$ there exists a constant $M = M(s)$ such that all of the following estimates are true.*

- If $\tilde{g}, \tilde{h} \in H^{s+1/2}(P(\Gamma))$, $\tilde{\psi} \in H^s(P(\Gamma))$, and $|K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{\psi} \in H^s(P(\Gamma))$ then

$$\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} [\tilde{g}\tilde{h}\tilde{\psi}] \right\|_{H^s} \leq M^2 \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \|\tilde{h}\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \left\{ \left\| \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s} + \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{\psi} \right\|_{H^s} \right\}. \quad (4.8a)$$

- If $\tilde{g}, \tilde{h} \in H^{s+1/2}(P(\Gamma))$, $\tilde{v} \in X^s(\Omega)$, and $|K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{v} \in X^s(\Omega)$ then

$$\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} [\tilde{g}\tilde{h}\tilde{v}] \right\|_{X^s} \leq M^2 \|\tilde{g}\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \|\tilde{h}\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \left\{ \|\tilde{v}\|_{X^s} + \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{v} \right\|_{X^s} \right\}. \quad (4.8b)$$

Finally, we state the following, readily proven, result for later use.

Lemma 4.5. *There exists a constant $Y = Y(s)$ such that all of the following are true*

- If $\tilde{v} \in X^s(\Omega)$ then

$$\|(a + y)\tilde{v}\|_{X^s} \leq Y(s) \|\tilde{v}\|_{X^s}. \quad (4.9a)$$

- If $|K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{v} \in X^s(\Omega)$ then

$$\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} [(a + y)\tilde{v}] \right\|_{X^s} \leq Y(s) \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{v} \right\|_{X^s}. \quad (4.9b)$$

4.3 Elliptic Estimate

We now state the elliptic estimate we require concerning the the generic boundary value problem,

$$\operatorname{div}_\alpha [K K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}(\alpha, y)] + \partial_y^2 \tilde{u}(\alpha, y) = \tilde{F}(\alpha, y), \quad -a < y < 0, \quad (4.10a)$$

$$\tilde{u}(\alpha, 0) = \tilde{\xi}(\alpha), \quad (4.10b)$$

$$\partial_y \tilde{u}(\alpha, -a) - \tilde{T}[\tilde{u}(\alpha, -a)] = \tilde{J}(\alpha), \quad (4.10c)$$

where

$$\tilde{F}(\alpha, y) := \operatorname{div}_\alpha [K \tilde{F}^\alpha(\alpha, y)] + \partial_y \tilde{F}^y(\alpha, y) + \tilde{F}^0(\alpha, y). \quad (4.10d)$$

For convenience we define the maximum of a number of quantities we must control in our estimation.

Definition 4.6. Given an integer $s \geq 0$ we define the following maximum

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_s[\tilde{u}] := \max \{ & \|\tilde{u}\|_{X^s}, \|\partial_y \tilde{u}\|_{X^s}, \|K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}\|_{X^s}, \\ & \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}, \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \partial_y \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}, \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}, \\ & \left\| \partial_y \tilde{u}(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s}, \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s}, \left\| \tilde{T}[\tilde{u}(\alpha, -a)] \right\|_{H^s} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.7. As we shall see later in Section 4.4, our analyticity result does not strictly require estimates of $\|\tilde{u}\|_{X^s}$ and $\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}$. However, as their inclusion requires no additional effort, we include them here for completeness.

The elliptic estimate, proven in Appendix A, can now be stated as follows.

Theorem 4.8. *Given an integer $s \geq 0$, provided that*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\xi} & \in H^{s+1}(P(\Gamma)), \quad \tilde{J} \in H^s(P(\Gamma)), \\ \tilde{F}^j, |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{F}^j & \in X^s(\Omega), \quad \tilde{F}^j(\alpha, 0) \in H^s(P(\Gamma)), \quad j \in \{\alpha, y, 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{F}^y(\alpha, -a) = 0,$$

there exists a unique solution $\tilde{u} \in X^s(\Omega)$ of (4.10) such that, for some $C_e > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_s[\tilde{u}] \leq C_e \left\{ & \left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^{s+1}} + \left\| \tilde{J} \right\|_{H^s} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{j \in \{\alpha, y, 0\}} \left(\left\| \tilde{F}^j \right\|_{X^s} + \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{F}^j \right\|_{X^s} + \left\| \tilde{F}^j(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.9. To illustrate the advance we have made in the current contribution, we point out the difference between the elliptic estimates in the periodic and quasiperiodic cases. In the (zero-mean) periodic case [NR01b],

$$\Delta_x u + \partial_y^2 u = F \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \hat{u}_p(y) = \left[\partial_y^2 + |p|^2 \right]^{-1} \hat{F}_p \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \|u\|_{X^{s+2}} \leq C_e \|F\|_{X^s},$$

i.e., u is two more orders regular than F . However, the same is *not* true in the (zero-mean) quasiperiodic case where

$$\operatorname{div}_\alpha [K K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}] + \partial_y^2 u = F \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \hat{u}_p(y) = \left[\partial_y^2 + |K^T p|^2 \right]^{-1} \hat{F}_p,$$

and the factor $|K^T p|$ can be arbitrarily close to zero as $|p| \rightarrow \infty$. This is why \tilde{u} only belongs to X^s instead of X^{s+2} in Theorem 4.8. Moreover, $|K^T D| \tilde{u} \in H^s$ does *not* imply that $\tilde{u} \in H^{s+1}$ or even $\tilde{u} \in H^s$ (see Remark 4.1). Thus both $\|\partial_y \tilde{u}\|_{X^s}$ and $\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \partial_y \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}$ appear in the elliptic estimates.

Remark 4.10. We point out that the condition $\tilde{F}^y(\alpha, -a) = 0$ is satisfied in equation (4.4) above.

4.4 A Recursive Lemma

To prove the analyticity of the field we establish the following recursive estimate.

Lemma 4.11. *Given an integer $s > d/2$, if $\tilde{f} \in H^{s+3/2}(P(\Gamma))$ and*

$$\mathcal{M}_s[\tilde{u}_n] \leq K_0 B^n, \quad \forall n < N,$$

for constants $K_0, B > 0$, then we have, for all $j \in \{\alpha, y, 0\}$, the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \max \left\{ \left\| \tilde{J}_N \right\|_{H^s}, \left\| \tilde{F}_N^j \right\|_{X^s}, \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{F}_N^j \right\|_{X^s}, \left\| \tilde{F}_N^j(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s} \right\} \\ \leq K_1 K_0 \left(\left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}} B^{N-1} + \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}}^2 B^{N-2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

for a positive constant $K_1 > 0$.

Proof. Noting that, c.f. (4.4a),

$$\tilde{F}_N = \operatorname{div}_\alpha \left[K \tilde{F}_N^\alpha \right] + \partial_y \tilde{F}_N^y + \tilde{F}_N^0,$$

we focus on one representative term from each \tilde{F}_N^j ; the proof for the other terms follows similarly. To begin we consider, c.f. (4.4b),

$$\tilde{F}_N^\alpha = \mathcal{A}_N + \dots, \quad \mathcal{A}_N := \frac{(a+y)}{a^2} \tilde{f}(K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2},$$

and estimate, using (4.9b) and (4.8a),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{A}_N\|_{X^s} &= \left\| \frac{(a+y)}{a^2} \tilde{f}(K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2} \right\|_{X^s} \\ &\leq \frac{YM^2}{a^2} \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s} \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s} \left\| \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2} \right\|_{X^s} \\ &\leq K_1 \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}}^2 K_0 B^{N-2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \mathcal{A}_N \right\|_{X^s} &= \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \left[\frac{(a+y)}{a^2} \tilde{f} (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2} \right] \right\|_{X^s} \\
&\leq \frac{YM^2}{a^2} \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+1/2}} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \left\| \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2} \right\|_{X^s} + \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2} \right\|_{X^s} \right\} \\
&\leq K_1 \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}}^2 K_0 B^{N-2},
\end{aligned}$$

for K_1 chosen appropriately. Also, since

$$\mathcal{A}_N(\alpha, 0) = \frac{1}{a} \tilde{f} (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2}(\alpha, 0),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \mathcal{A}_N(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s} &\leq \left\| \frac{\tilde{f}}{a} (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2}(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s} \\
&\leq \frac{M^2}{a} \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s} \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s} \left\| \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2}(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s} \\
&\leq K_1 \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}}^2 K_0 B^{N-2},
\end{aligned}$$

for K_1 large enough. Next we recall that, c.f. (4.4c),

$$\tilde{F}_N^y = \mathcal{B}_N + \dots, \quad \mathcal{B}_N := -\frac{(a+y)^2}{a^2} \left| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right|^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2},$$

and compute, with (4.9b) and (4.8a),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \mathcal{B}_N \right\|_{X^s} &= \left\| \frac{(a+y)^2}{a^2} \left| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right|^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2} \right\|_{X^s} \\
&\leq \frac{Y^2 M^2}{a^2} \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s}^2 \left\| \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2} \right\|_{X^s} \\
&\leq K_1 \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}}^2 K_0 B^{N-2},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \mathcal{B}_N \right\|_{X^s} &= \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \left[\frac{(a+y)^2}{a^2} \left| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right|^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2} \right] \right\|_{X^s} \\
&\leq \frac{Y^2 M^2}{a^2} \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+1/2}}^2 \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \left\| \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2} \right\|_{X^s} + \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2} \right\|_{X^s} \right\} \\
&\leq K_1 \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}}^2 K_0 B^{N-2},
\end{aligned}$$

if K_1 is chosen large enough. Also, since

$$\mathcal{B}_N(\alpha, 0) = -\left| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right|^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2}(\alpha, 0),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{B}_N(\alpha, 0)\|_{H^s} &\leq \left\| \left| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right|^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2}(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s} \\
&\leq M^2 \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s}^2 \|\partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2}(\alpha, 0)\|_{H^s} \\
&\leq K_1 \|f\|_{H^{s+3/2}}^2 K_0 B^{N-2},
\end{aligned}$$

for K_1 large enough. Finally, c.f. (4.4d),

$$\tilde{F}_N^0 = \mathcal{C}_N + \dots, \quad \mathcal{C}_N := -\frac{(a+y)}{a^2} \left| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right|^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2},$$

and we estimate, using (4.9b) and (4.8a),

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{C}_N\|_{X^s} &= \left\| \frac{(a+y)}{a^2} \left| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right|^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2} \right\|_{X^s} \\
&\leq \frac{YM^2}{a^2} \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s}^2 \|\partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2}\|_{X^s} \\
&\leq K_1 \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}}^2 K_0 B^{N-2},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \mathcal{C}_N \right\|_{X^s} &= \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \left[\frac{(a+y)}{a^2} \left| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right|^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2} \right] \right\|_{X^s} \\
&\leq \frac{YM^2}{a^2} \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+1/2}}^2 \\
&\quad \times \left\{ 2 \|\partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2}\|_{X^s} + \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2} \right\|_{X^s} \right\} \\
&\leq K_1 \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}}^2 K_0 B^{N-2},
\end{aligned}$$

for K_1 sufficiently large. Also, since

$$\mathcal{C}_N(\alpha, 0) = -\frac{1}{a} \left| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right|^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2}(\alpha, 0),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{C}_N(\alpha, 0)\|_{H^s} &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{a} \left| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right|^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2}(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s} \\
&\leq \frac{M^2}{a} \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s}^2 \|\partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2}(\alpha, 0)\|_{H^s} \\
&\leq K_1 \|f\|_{H^{s+3/2}}^2 K_0 B^{N-2},
\end{aligned}$$

for K_1 large enough. To close, c.f. (4.4e),

$$\tilde{J}_N = \frac{1}{a} \tilde{f} \tilde{T}[\tilde{u}_{N-1}(\alpha, -a)],$$

and we compute, using (4.7a),

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{J}_N\|_{H^s} &= \left\| \frac{1}{a} \tilde{f} \tilde{T}[\tilde{u}_{N-1}(\alpha, -a)] \right\|_{H^s} \leq \frac{M}{a} \|\tilde{f}\|_{H^s} \|\tilde{T}[\tilde{u}_{N-1}(\alpha, -a)]\|_{H^s} \\
&\leq \frac{M}{a} \|\tilde{f}\|_{H^s} K_0 B^{N-1} \leq K_1 \|\tilde{f}\|_{H^{s+3/2}} K_0 B^{N-1},
\end{aligned}$$

for K_1 big enough. \square

4.5 Analyticity of the Field

We are now in a position to establish the analyticity of the transformed field \tilde{u} in a sense which we now make precise.

Theorem 4.12. *Given an integer $s > d/2$, if $\tilde{f} \in H^{s+3/2}(P(\Gamma))$ and $\tilde{\xi} \in H^{s+1}(P(\Gamma))$ there exists a unique solution*

$$\tilde{u}(\alpha, y; \varepsilon) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{u}_n(\alpha, y) \varepsilon^n,$$

of (4.1) satisfying

$$\mathcal{M}_s[\tilde{u}_n] \leq K_0 B^n, \quad \forall n \geq 0, \quad (4.11)$$

for any $B > C_0 \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}}$ and positive constants $K_0, C_0 > 0$.

Proof. We work by induction on n . At order $n = 0$ we must solve (4.3) where $\tilde{F}_0 \equiv \tilde{J}_n \equiv 0$. From Theorem 4.8 we have that

$$\mathcal{M}_s[\tilde{u}_0] \leq C_e \left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^{s+1}} =: K_0 < \infty.$$

We now assume estimate (4.11) for all $n < N$ and study $\mathcal{M}_s[\tilde{u}_N]$. For this we invoke the elliptic estimate, Theorem 4.8, to realize that

$$\mathcal{M}_s[u_N] \leq C_e \left\{ \left\| \tilde{J}_N \right\|_{H^s} + \sum_{j \in \{\alpha, y, 0\}} \left(\left\| \tilde{F}_N^j \right\|_{X^s} + \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{F}_N^j \right\|_{X^s} + \left\| \tilde{F}_N^j(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s} \right) \right\}.$$

From the recursive estimate in Lemma 4.11 we now deduce that

$$\mathcal{M}_s[u_N] \leq C_e 10 K_1 K_0 \left(\left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}} B^{N-1} + \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}} B^{N-2} \right).$$

We realize

$$\mathcal{M}_s[u_N] \leq K_0 B^N,$$

provided that, for instance,

$$B > \max \left\{ 20 C_e K_1, \sqrt{20 C_e K_1} \right\} \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}},$$

and we are done. \square

4.6 Analyticity of the DNO

At last we can establish the analyticity of the DNO, \tilde{G} , more specifically we prove the following result.

Theorem 4.13. *Given an integer $s > d/2$, if $\tilde{f} \in H^{s+3/2}(P(\Gamma))$ and $\tilde{\xi} \in H^{s+1}(P(\Gamma))$ then the series*

$$\tilde{G}(\varepsilon \tilde{f}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{G}_n(\tilde{f}) \varepsilon^n, \quad (4.12)$$

converges strongly as an operator from $H^{s+1}(P(\Gamma))$ to $H^s(P(\Gamma))$. More precisely,

$$\left\| \tilde{G}_n(\tilde{f})[\tilde{\xi}] \right\|_{H^s} \leq K_2 B^n, \quad \forall n \geq 0, \quad (4.13)$$

for any $B > C_0 \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}}$ and positive constant $K_2 > 0$.

Proof. We work by induction in n and begin with the formula for \tilde{G}_0 ,

$$\tilde{G}_0[\tilde{\xi}] = \begin{cases} \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} |K^T p| \hat{\xi}_p e^{i\alpha \cdot p}, & h = \infty, \\ \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} |K^T p| \tanh(h |K^T D|) \hat{\xi}_p e^{i\alpha \cdot p}, & h < \infty. \end{cases}$$

We focus our attention on the infinite depth case ($h = \infty$) and note that the finite depth case ($h < \infty$) can be established in a similar fashion. We estimate

$$\left\| \tilde{G}_0[\tilde{\xi}] \right\|_{H^s}^2 \leq \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \langle p \rangle^{2s} |K^T p|^2 \left| \hat{\xi}_p \right|^2 \leq C \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \langle p \rangle^{2(s+1)} \left| \hat{\xi}_p \right|^2 \leq \left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 =: K_2.$$

We now assume (4.13) for all $n < N$ and, from (4.5), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{G}_N(\tilde{f})[\tilde{\xi}] \right\|_{H^s} &\leq \left\| \partial_y \tilde{u}_N(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s} + \left\| (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \cdot (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_{N-1}(\alpha, 0)) \right\|_{H^s} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{a} \left\| \tilde{f} \tilde{G}_{N-1}(\tilde{f})[\tilde{\xi}] \right\|_{H^s} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{a} \left\| \tilde{f} (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}) \cdot (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_{N-2}(\alpha, 0)) \right\|_{H^s} \\ &\quad + \left\| (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f})^2 \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2}(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, from (4.7a) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{G}_N(\tilde{f})[\tilde{\xi}] \right\|_{H^s} &\leq \left\| \partial_y \tilde{u}_N(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s} + M \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s} \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_{N-1}(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{a} M \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s} \left\| \tilde{G}_{N-1}(\tilde{f})[\tilde{\xi}] \right\|_{H^s} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{a} M^2 \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s} \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s} \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}_{N-2}(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s} \\ &\quad + M^2 \left\| K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^s}^2 \left\| \partial_y \tilde{u}_{N-2}(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s}. \end{aligned}$$

From (4.11) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{G}_N(\tilde{f})[\tilde{\xi}] \right\|_{H^s} &\leq K_0 B^N + M \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}} K_0 B^{N-1} + \frac{1}{a} M \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}} K_2 B^{N-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{a} M^2 \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}} \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}} K_0 B^{N-2} + M^2 \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}}^2 K_0 B^{N-2} \\ &\leq K_2 B^N, \end{aligned}$$

provided that each of the five terms is bounded above by $(K_2/5)B^N$. This demands that

$$K_2 \geq 5K_0, \quad B \geq M \max \left\{ \frac{5K_0}{K_2}, \frac{5}{a}, \sqrt{\frac{5K_0}{aK_2}}, \sqrt{\frac{5K_0}{K_2}} \right\} \left\| \tilde{f} \right\|_{H^{s+3/2}},$$

and accommodating all of these delivers the theorem. \square

5 Numerical Algorithms

In order to illustrate the possibilities enabled by the analyticity theory outlined above, we now briefly describe and validate three High-Order Perturbation of Surfaces (HOPS)

algorithms [NR01a, NR01b, NR03] suggested by this. Presently we focus on simple two-dimensional geometries ($x, y \in \mathbf{R}$) which feature lateral quasiperiodicity specified by the matrix $K \in \mathbf{R}^{2 \times 1}$ (two base periods). However, we also describe a limited selection of much more intensive three-dimensional simulations ($x \in \mathbf{R}^2, y \in \mathbf{R}$) with lateral quasiperiodicity determined by $K \in \mathbf{R}^{3 \times 2}$.

5.1 High-Order Spectral Methods

In light of the separable geometries we consider (the fundamental period cell determined by the lattice Γ , $P(\Gamma)$, in tensor product with the interval $[-a, 0]$) we chose High-Order Spectral (HOS) methods to discretize each of our algorithms. The interested reader should consult one of the excellent texts on the topic (e.g., [GO77, CHQZ88, Boy01, ST06]) for complete details as we now provide only a brief description of the concepts we require in this subsection.

In our schemes we approximated doubly 2π -periodic functions by their truncated Fourier series, e.g.,

$$\tilde{f}(\alpha) \approx \tilde{f}^{N_\alpha}(\alpha) := \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{N_\alpha}} \hat{f}_p e^{ip \cdot \alpha},$$

where

$$p = \begin{pmatrix} p_1 \\ p_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad N_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} N_\alpha^1 \\ N_\alpha^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{N_\alpha} = \left\{ p \in \Gamma' \mid -\frac{N_\alpha^m}{2} \leq p_m \leq \frac{N_\alpha^m}{2} - 1, \quad m = 1, 2 \right\}.$$

The gradient of such a function can be readily approximated with high accuracy by

$$\nabla_\alpha \tilde{f}(\alpha) \approx \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{N_\alpha}} (ip) \hat{f}_p e^{ip \cdot \alpha},$$

as can Fourier multipliers, e.g.,

$$m(D)[\tilde{f}(\alpha)] \approx \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{N_\alpha}} m(p) \hat{f}_p e^{ip \cdot \alpha}.$$

Using well-known procedures involving the Fast Fourier Transform (FFT), products of these functions can be simulated at the equally-spaced gridpoints

$$\alpha_j^m = \frac{2\pi j_m}{N_\alpha^m}, \quad 0 \leq j_m \leq N_\alpha^m - 1, \quad m = 1, 2.$$

This can also be used in conjunction with the Trapezoidal Rule to approximate the Fourier coefficients, \hat{f}_p , with very high accuracy (in fact, spectral, if $\tilde{f}(\alpha)$ is analytic) [GO77, CHQZ88, Boy01, ST06].

In relation to the recursions we have analyzed in our theory above, we also require the approximation of volumetric functions. For this we simulate laterally doubly 2π -periodic functions of y on the interval $[-a, 0]$ by their truncated Fourier-Chebyshev series, e.g.,

$$\tilde{u}(\alpha, y) \approx \tilde{u}^{N_\alpha, N_y}(\alpha, y) := \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{N_\alpha}} \sum_{q=0}^{N_y} \hat{u}_{p,q} T_q \left(\frac{2y+a}{a} \right) e^{ip \cdot \alpha}.$$

Again, classical techniques from the theory of Spectral Methods can be used to compute derivatives of these functions with respect to both α and y . As above, using methods involving the Fast Chebyshev Transform, products of these functions can be simulated at the Chebyshev points

$$y_r = \frac{a}{2} \left(\cos \left(\frac{\pi r}{N_y} \right) - 1 \right), \quad 0 \leq r \leq N_y.$$

Once again, these can also be used in conjunction with quadrature formulas to approximate the Fourier–Chebyshev coefficients, $\hat{u}_{p,q}$, with high fidelity.

5.2 The Method of Operator Expansions

The first HOPS method we discuss is the classical Method of Operator Expansions (OE) due to Milder [Mil91a, Mil91b, MS91, MS92] and Craig & Sulem [CS93]. In the infinite depth case ($h = \infty$) the description of this approach begins by defining the function

$$\tilde{\varphi}_p(\alpha, y) := e^{|K^T p|y} e^{ip \cdot \alpha},$$

for some $p \in \mathbf{Z}^2$. This function satisfies the quasiperiodic Laplace’s equation, (3.5a), and the boundary conditions, (3.5c) and (3.5d), so that we can insert it into the definition of the quasiperiodic DNO, (3.7), to realize the true statement

$$\tilde{G}(\tilde{g})[\tilde{\varphi}_p(\alpha, \tilde{g})] = \partial_y \tilde{\varphi}_p(\alpha, \tilde{g}) - (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{g}) (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{\varphi}_p(\alpha, \tilde{g})).$$

Setting $\tilde{g}(\alpha) = \varepsilon \tilde{f}(\alpha)$ and using the analyticity of the DNO with respect to ε , we expand to find

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{G}_n(\tilde{f}) \varepsilon^n \right) \left[\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \tilde{F}_m |K^T p|^m e^{ip \cdot \alpha} \varepsilon^m \right] &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{F}_n |K^T p|^{n+1} e^{ip \cdot \alpha} \varepsilon^n \\ &\quad - \left(\varepsilon K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right) \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{F}_n (iK^T p) |K^T p|^n e^{ip \cdot \alpha} \varepsilon^n \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{F}_n(\alpha) := \frac{\tilde{f}(\alpha)^n}{n!}.$$

At order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^0)$ we find

$$\tilde{G}_0 [e^{ip \cdot \alpha}] = |K^T p| e^{ip \cdot \alpha},$$

while at order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^n)$ for $n > 0$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_n(\tilde{f}) [e^{ip \cdot \alpha}] &= \tilde{F}_n |K^T p|^{n+1} e^{ip \cdot \alpha} - \left(K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right) \tilde{F}_{n-1} (iK^T p) |K^T p|^{n-1} e^{ip \cdot \alpha} \\ &\quad - \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \tilde{G}_\ell(\tilde{f}) \left[\tilde{F}_{n-\ell} |K^T p|^{n-\ell} e^{ip \cdot \alpha} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, if we express the generic function $\tilde{\xi}$ in the Fourier series

$$\tilde{\xi}(\alpha) = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \hat{\xi}_p e^{ip \cdot \alpha},$$

then we can conclude that

$$\tilde{G}_0 [\tilde{\xi}] = \tilde{G}_0 \left[\sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \hat{\xi}_p e^{ip \cdot \alpha} \right] = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \hat{\xi}_p \tilde{G}_0 [e^{ip \cdot \alpha}] = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} |K^T p| \hat{\xi}_p e^{ip \cdot \alpha} =: |K^T D| \tilde{\xi}, \quad (5.1)$$

which we use to define the order-one Fourier multiplier $|K^T D|$. In a similar fashion we express, for $n > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_n(\tilde{f}) [\tilde{\xi}] &= \tilde{F}_n |K^T D|^{n+1} \tilde{\xi} - \left(K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right) \tilde{F}_{n-1} (iK^T D) |K^T D|^{n-1} \tilde{\xi} \\ &\quad - \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \tilde{G}_\ell(\tilde{f}) \left[\tilde{F}_{n-\ell} |K^T D|^{n-\ell} \tilde{\xi} \right], \end{aligned}$$

and we point out the *recursive* nature of this formula: \tilde{G}_ℓ must be recomputed for all $0 \leq \ell \leq n-1$ at each perturbation order n .

It was noted in [Nic98a, Nic98b] that the self-adjointness of the DNO could be used to advantage in producing a *rapid* version of these recursions. Recalling that the adjoint operation satisfies $(AB)^* = B^*A^*$ for any two linear operators A and B , we can express $\tilde{G}_n = \tilde{G}_n^*$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_n(\tilde{f}) [\tilde{\xi}] &= |K^T D|^{n+1} \left[\tilde{F}_n \tilde{\xi} \right] - |K^T D|^{n-1} (iK^T D) \left[\left(K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{f} \right) \tilde{F}_{n-1} \tilde{\xi} \right] \\ &\quad - \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} |K^T D|^{n-\ell} \left[\tilde{F}_{n-\ell} \tilde{G}_\ell(\tilde{f}) [\tilde{\xi}] \right], \quad (5.2) \end{aligned}$$

which is much faster than the formula above as the $\tilde{G}_\ell[\tilde{\xi}]$ may simply be stored from one perturbation order to the next rather than recomputed from scratch.

The OE algorithm is a Fourier HOS discretization of the formulas (5.1) and (5.2) where we begin by considering $\tilde{g}(\alpha) = \varepsilon \tilde{f}(\alpha)$, expanding

$$\tilde{G}(\alpha; \varepsilon) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{G}_n \varepsilon^n,$$

and approximating

$$\tilde{G}(\alpha; \varepsilon) \approx \tilde{G}^N(\alpha; \varepsilon) := \sum_{n=0}^N \tilde{G}_n(\alpha) \varepsilon^n,$$

where

$$\tilde{G}_n(\alpha) \approx \tilde{G}_n^{N_\alpha}(\alpha) := \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{N_\alpha}} \hat{G}_{p,n} e^{ip \cdot \alpha}. \quad (5.3)$$

Given

$$\tilde{\xi}^{N_\alpha}(\alpha) = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{N_\alpha}} \hat{\xi}_p e^{ip \cdot \alpha},$$

we then insert these forms into (5.1) and (5.2), and demand these be true for $0 \leq n \leq N$. Using the approach outlined in Section 5.1 the coefficients $\{\hat{G}_{p,n}\}$ are readily recovered enabling the approximation $\tilde{\nu}^{N, N_\alpha}$.

5.3 The Method of Field Expansions

The second HOPS method we discuss is Bruno & Reitich's Method of Field Expansions (FE) [BR93a, BR93b, BR93c]. To describe this approach we again consider $\tilde{g}(\alpha) = \varepsilon \tilde{f}(\alpha)$ and note that the solution of (3.5) will depend upon ε ; we assume that this dependence is *analytic* so that

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\alpha, y; \varepsilon) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\varphi}_n(\alpha, y) \varepsilon^n.$$

It can be shown that these $\tilde{\varphi}_n$ satisfy

$$\operatorname{div}_{\alpha} [K K^T \nabla_{\alpha} \tilde{\varphi}_n(\alpha, y)] + \partial_y^2 \tilde{\varphi}_n(\alpha, y) = 0, \quad -a < y < 0, \quad (5.4a)$$

$$\tilde{\varphi}_n(\alpha, 0) = \delta_{n,0} \tilde{\xi}(\alpha) + Q_n(\alpha), \quad y = 0, \quad (5.4b)$$

$$\partial_y \tilde{\varphi}_n - \tilde{T}[\tilde{\varphi}_n] = 0, \quad y = -a, \quad (5.4c)$$

$$\tilde{\varphi}_n(\alpha + \gamma, y) = \tilde{\varphi}_n(\alpha, y), \quad \gamma \in \Gamma. \quad (5.4d)$$

where

$$Q_n(\alpha) = - \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \tilde{F}_{n-\ell} \partial_y^{n-\ell} \tilde{\varphi}_{\ell}(\alpha, 0). \quad (5.4e)$$

In the infinite depth case ($h = \infty$) the solutions of (5.4a), (5.4c), and (5.4d) can be expressed as

$$\tilde{\varphi}_n(\alpha, y) = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} a_{n,p} e^{|K^T p| y} e^{i p \cdot \alpha},$$

while (5.4b) and (5.4e) can be used to discover the $\{a_{n,p}\}$. More specifically,

$$a_{n,p} = \delta_{n,0} \hat{\xi}_p - \sum_{q \in \Gamma'} \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \hat{F}_{n-\ell, p-q} |K^T q|^{n-\ell} a_{\ell, q}, \quad (5.5)$$

which constitute the FE recursions.

The FE approach is a Fourier HOS approximation of the recursions (5.5) which recovers the $\{a_{n,p}\}$ given the Fourier coefficients $\{\hat{\xi}_p, \hat{f}_p\}$. With these it is not difficult to approximate the \tilde{G}_n which gives a simulation of the form (5.3).

5.4 The Method of Transformed Field Expansions

The final HOPS scheme we discuss is Nicholls and Reitich's Method of Transformed Field Expansions (TFE) [NR01a, NR01b, NR03, NR04a, NR04b]. Simply put, this algorithm is a HOS [GO77, CHQZ88, Boy01, ST06] discretization and approximation of the transformed problem (4.3) which we utilized in our theoretical demonstrations earlier. In a bit more detail we consider $\tilde{g}(\alpha) = \varepsilon \tilde{f}(\alpha)$ and use our *rigorous* demonstration of the *analyticity* of the solution to write

$$\tilde{u}(\alpha, y; \varepsilon) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{u}_n(\alpha, y) \varepsilon^n.$$

We begin by approximating

$$\tilde{u}(\alpha; y; \varepsilon) \approx \tilde{u}^N(\alpha, y; \varepsilon) := \sum_{n=0}^N \tilde{u}_n(\alpha, y) \varepsilon^n, \quad (5.6)$$

and then represent

$$\tilde{u}_n(\alpha, y) \approx \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_N} \sum_{q=0}^{N_y} \hat{u}_{p,q,n} e^{ip \cdot \alpha} T_q \left(\frac{2z + a}{a} \right).$$

We then insert this form into (4.3) and utilize the collocation approach as described in Section 5.1. Using well-known procedures involving the FFT and the Fast Cheybshev Transform [GO77, CHQZ88, Boy01, ST06] the coefficients $\{\hat{u}_{p,q,n}\}$ are readily recovered. These, in turn, can be used to approximate the DNO, \tilde{G} .

5.5 Padé Approximation

An important question is how the Taylor series, e.g. (5.6), in ε is summed, for instance the approximation of $\hat{u}_{p,q}(\varepsilon)$ by

$$\hat{u}_{p,q}^N(\varepsilon) := \sum_{n=0}^N \hat{u}_{p,q,n} \varepsilon^n.$$

As we have seen in [BR93b, NR03, Nic22], Padé approximation [BGM96] has been used in conjunction with HOPS methods with great success and we recommend its use here. Padé approximation estimates the truncated Taylor series $\hat{u}_{p,q}^N(\varepsilon)$ by the rational function

$$[L/M](\varepsilon) := \frac{a^L(\varepsilon)}{b^M(\varepsilon)} = \frac{\sum_{\ell=0}^L a_\ell \varepsilon^\ell}{1 + \sum_{m=1}^M b_m \varepsilon^m}, \quad L + M = N,$$

and

$$[L/M](\varepsilon) = \hat{u}_{p,q}^N(\varepsilon) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{L+M+1});$$

classical formulas for the coefficients $\{a_\ell, b_m\}$ can be found in [BGM96]. This method has stunning properties of enhanced convergence, and we refer the interested reader to § 2.2 of Baker & Graves-Morris [BGM96] and the insightful calculations of § 8.3 of Bender & Orszag [BO78] for a thorough discussion of the capabilities and limitations of Padé approximants.

6 Numerical Results

We now present numerical results which not only demonstrate the validity of our implementations of the three algorithms presented above (OE, FE, and TFE) but also illuminate their characteristics and behavior. With each of these we see that for small and smooth interfaces (e.g., \tilde{f} analytic and $\varepsilon \ll 1$) all three algorithms deliver highly accurate solutions in a stable and efficient manner. However, for large and rough profiles (e.g., \tilde{f} Lipschitz and $\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(1)$) the enhanced stability properties of the TFE method [NR01b, NR04b] and superior accuracy of Padé summation become extremely important to realize accurate solutions.

6.1 The Method of Manufactured Solutions

To test the validity of our implementation, we used the Method of Manufactured Solutions [Bur66, Roa02, Roy05]. To summarize this, consider the general system of partial differential equations subject to generic boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}v &= 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathcal{B}v &= 0, & \text{at } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

It is typically just as easy to implement a numerical algorithm to solve the nonhomogeneous version of this set of equations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}v &= \mathcal{F}, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathcal{B}v &= \mathcal{J}, & \text{at } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

To validate our code we began with the “manufactured solution,” \tilde{v} , and set

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{v}} := \mathcal{P}\tilde{v}, \quad \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{v}} := \mathcal{J}\tilde{v}.$$

Thus, given the pair $\{\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{v}}, \mathcal{J}_{\tilde{v}}\}$ we had an *exact* solution of the nonhomogeneous problem, namely \tilde{v} . While this does not prove an implementation to be correct, if the function \tilde{v} is chosen to imitate the behavior of anticipated solutions (e.g., satisfying the boundary conditions exactly) then this gives us confidence in our algorithm.

6.2 Two-Dimensional Simulations

For a two-dimensional fluid of infinite depth ($h = \infty$) we considered the laterally doubly 2π -periodic function

$$\tilde{\varphi}^{\text{exact}}(\alpha, y) = A_q e^{|K^T q| y} e^{iq \cdot \alpha}, \quad K \in \mathbf{R}^{2 \times 1}, \quad q = \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbf{Z}^2,$$

from which we readily computed

$$\tilde{\xi}^{\text{exact}}(\alpha) = \tilde{\varphi}^{\text{exact}}(\alpha, \tilde{g}(\alpha)), \tag{6.1a}$$

$$\tilde{\nu}^{\text{exact}}(\alpha) = \partial_y \tilde{\varphi}^{\text{exact}}(\alpha, \tilde{g}(\alpha)) - (K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{g}(\alpha)) \cdot K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{\varphi}^{\text{exact}}(\alpha, \tilde{g}(\alpha)), \tag{6.1b}$$

and, from these,

$$\varphi^{\text{exact}}(x, y) = \tilde{\varphi}^{\text{exact}}(Kx, y), \quad \xi^{\text{exact}}(x) = \tilde{\xi}^{\text{exact}}(Kx), \quad \nu^{\text{exact}}(x) = \tilde{\nu}^{\text{exact}}(Kx).$$

We chose the following physical parameters

$$A_q = -3, \quad q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad K = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \kappa \end{pmatrix}, \quad \kappa = \sqrt{2}, \tag{6.2}$$

and the numerical parameters

$$N_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 64 \\ 64 \end{pmatrix}, \quad N_y = 16, \quad N = 16, \quad a = \frac{1}{10}. \tag{6.3}$$

To illuminate the behavior of our scheme we considered

$$\tilde{g}(\alpha) = \varepsilon \tilde{f}(\alpha), \quad \tilde{f}(\alpha) = \cos(\alpha_1) \sin(\alpha_2),$$

so that $g(x) = \varepsilon f(x)$, and studied three choices

$$\varepsilon = 0.02, 0.5, 1.$$

For this we supplied the “exact” input data, $\tilde{\xi}^{\text{exact}}$, from (6.1) to our HOPS algorithm and compared the output of this, $\tilde{\nu}^{\text{approx}}$, with the “exact” output, $\tilde{\nu}^{\text{exact}}$, by computing the relative error

$$\text{Error}_{\text{rel}} := \frac{\|\tilde{\nu}^{\text{exact}} - \tilde{\nu}^{\text{approx}}\|_{L^\infty}}{\|\tilde{\nu}^{\text{exact}}\|_{L^\infty}}. \tag{6.4}$$

To evaluate our implementation and demonstrate the behavior of each of the three schemes, we report our results in Figures 1, 2, and 3. More specifically, Figure 1 ($\varepsilon = 0.02$) shows both the rapid and stable decay of the relative error for this small perturbation as N is increased for all three algorithms. By contrast, Figure 2 ($\varepsilon = 0.5$) shows the extremely beneficial effects of using the TFE algorithm for this much larger deformation, particularly in concert with Padé summation. Finally, in Figure 3 ($\varepsilon = 1$) we see the *necessity* of using both the TFE method and Padé summation to realize any accuracy for such a huge perturbation.




Figure 1: Plot of relative error, (6.4), for a small perturbation ($\varepsilon = 0.02$) in the surface Neumann data for the three HOPS algorithms (OE, FE, TFE) using both Taylor and Padé summation. Physical parameters were (6.2) and numerical discretization was (6.3).




Figure 2: Plot of relative error, (6.4), for a medium perturbation ($\varepsilon = 0.5$) in the surface Neumann data for the three HOPS algorithms (OE, FE, TFE) using both Taylor and Padé summation. Physical parameters were (6.2) and numerical discretization was (6.3).




Figure 3: Plot of relative error, (6.4), for a large perturbation ($\varepsilon = 1$) in the surface Neumann data for the three HOPS algorithms (OE, FE, TFE) using both Taylor and Padé summation. Physical parameters were (6.2) and numerical discretization was (6.3).

6.3 Three-Dimensional Simulations

We begin a description of our three-dimensional numerical simulations with the infinite depth case ($h = \infty$) where we chose the following triply 2π -periodic function

$$\tilde{\varphi}^{\text{exact}}(\alpha, y) = \{A_q e^{iq \cdot \alpha} + \bar{A}_q e^{-iq \cdot \alpha}\} e^{|K^T q|y}, \quad K \in \mathbf{R}^{3 \times 2}, \quad q = \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \\ q_3 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbf{Z}^3.$$

As before, with this we can generate all of $\{\tilde{\xi}^{\text{exact}}, \tilde{\nu}^{\text{exact}}\}$ and $\{\varphi^{\text{exact}}, \xi^{\text{exact}}, \nu^{\text{exact}}\}$. We chose the physical parameters

$$A_q = -1, \quad K = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \\ 1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.5)$$

and the numerical parameters

$$N_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 128 \\ 128 \\ 128 \end{pmatrix}, \quad N_y = 128, \quad N = 32, \quad a = 0.5. \quad (6.6)$$

Finally, we considered the profile

$$\tilde{g}(\alpha) = \varepsilon \tilde{f}(\alpha), \quad \tilde{f}(\alpha) = \cos(\alpha_1) + \cos(\alpha_2) + \sin(\alpha_3).$$

We summarize our results in Figure 4 which focuses on the TFE algorithm utilizing Taylor summation alone. Here we see that for the small perturbation, $\varepsilon = 0.02$, we see stable and rapid convergence to nearly machine zero after merely 4–5 perturbation orders. In the moderate deformation case, $\varepsilon = 0.1$, we again see the speedy convergence of our algorithm which achieves machine precision by 15–16 perturbation orders. From extensive experimentation we learned that $\varepsilon = 0.02$ is *outside* the disk of convergence of our perturbation




Figure 4: Plot of relative error, (6.4), in the surface Neumann data for the TFE algorithms using Taylor summation for perturbation sizes $\varepsilon = 0.01, 0.1, 0.2$. Physical parameters were (6.5) and numerical discretization was (6.6).




Figure 5: Plot of the computed Neumann data, \tilde{u} , for $\varepsilon = 0.16$. (a) The full field; (b) A slice of the full field with a plane that has normal vector $(1/\sqrt{2}, -1/\sqrt{3}, -1)^T$.

series which explains the slow, but noticeable divergence of our results as N is increased. (In fact, our experiments show that $\varepsilon = 0.16$ is *inside* the disk while $\varepsilon = 0.17$ is *outside*.) To further illustrate the capabilities of our implementation we conducted this simulation in the case $\varepsilon = 0.16$, right at the boundary of convergence of the Taylor series (4.12). In Figure 5 on the left we show a plot of our simulation of the Neumann data, $\tilde{\nu}(\alpha)$. On the right of this we depict a slice of this Neumann data with a plane that has normal vector $(1/\sqrt{2}, -1/\sqrt{3}, -1)^T$. This simulation produced Taylor corrections $\tilde{\nu}_n$ and we depict in Figure 6 contour plots of $\tilde{\nu}_0$ (panel (a)), $\tilde{\nu}_2$ (panel (b)), $\tilde{\nu}_4$ (panel (c)), and $\tilde{\nu}_6$ (panel (d)).

We conclude with a description of our three-dimensional numerical simulations in the finite depth case ($h = 1/4$) where we chose the following triply 2π -periodic function

$$\tilde{\varphi}^{\text{exact}}(\alpha, y) = \{A_q e^{iq \cdot \alpha} + \bar{A}_q e^{-iq \cdot \alpha}\} \frac{\cosh(|K^T q|(h+y))}{\cosh(|K^T q|h)}, \quad K \in \mathbf{R}^{3 \times 2}, \quad q = \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \\ q_3 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbf{Z}^3.$$

Once again, with this we can generate all of $\{\tilde{\xi}^{\text{exact}}, \tilde{\nu}^{\text{exact}}\}$ and $\{\varphi^{\text{exact}}, \xi^{\text{exact}}, \nu^{\text{exact}}\}$. We




Figure 6: Contour plots of the Taylor corrections \tilde{v}_n for $n = 0$ (panel (a)), $n = 2$ (panel (b)), $n = 4$ (panel (c)), and $n = 6$ (panel (d)).

chose the physical parameters

$$A_q = -1, \quad K = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \\ 1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.7)$$

and the numerical parameters

$$N_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 128 \\ 128 \\ 128 \end{pmatrix}, \quad N_y = 128, \quad N = 32, \quad a = 0.1. \quad (6.8)$$

Additionally, we considered the profile

$$\tilde{g}(\alpha) = \varepsilon \tilde{f}(\alpha), \quad \tilde{f}(\alpha) = \cos(\alpha_1) + \cos(\alpha_2) + \sin(\alpha_3).$$

In Figure 7 we display results from our simulations using the TFE algorithm with Taylor summation. As before, we see that for the small perturbation, $\varepsilon = 0.02$, we have stable and rapid convergence to nearly machine zero after merely 11–12 perturbation orders.




Figure 7: Plot of relative error, (6.4), in the surface Neumann data for the TFE algorithms using Taylor summation for perturbation sizes $\varepsilon = 0.01, 0.1, 0.2$. Physical parameters were (6.7) and numerical discretization was (6.8).

Acknowledgments

D.P.N. gratefully acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation through grant No. DMS-1813033 and No. DMS-2111283. J.W. gratefully acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation under award number DMS-1716560 and from the Department of Energy, Office of Science, Applied Scientific Computing Research, under award number DE-AC02-05CH11231. X.Z. gratefully acknowledges the high-performance computing resources provided by Digital Research Alliance of Canada.

A Proof of the Elliptic Estimate

In this appendix we take up the proof of Theorem 4.8 which we restate here for completeness. Recall that we consider the generic boundary value problem, (4.10),

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}_\alpha [KK^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}(\alpha, y)] + \partial_y^2 \tilde{u}(\alpha, y) &= \tilde{F}(\alpha, y), & -a < y < 0, \\ \tilde{u}(\alpha, 0) &= \tilde{\xi}(\alpha), \\ \partial_y \tilde{u}(\alpha, -a) - \tilde{T}[\tilde{u}(\alpha, -a)] &= \tilde{J}(\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{F}(\alpha, y) := \operatorname{div}_\alpha [K\tilde{F}^\alpha(\alpha, y)] + \partial_y \tilde{F}^y(\alpha, y) + \tilde{F}^0(\alpha, y).$$

Recalling the maximum,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_s[\tilde{u}] := \max \{ & \|\tilde{u}\|_{X^s}, \|\partial_y \tilde{u}\|_{X^s}, \|K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}\|_{X^s}, \\ & \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}, \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \partial_y \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}, \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}, \\ & \left. \|\partial_y \tilde{u}(\alpha, 0)\|_{H^s}, \|K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}(\alpha, 0)\|_{H^s}, \left\| \tilde{T}[\tilde{u}(\alpha, -a)] \right\|_{H^s} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

the elliptic estimate we require (Theorem 4.8) can be stated as follows.

Theorem A.1. *Given an integer $s \geq 0$, provided that*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\xi} &\in H^{s+1}(P(\Gamma)), \quad \tilde{J} \in H^s(P(\Gamma)), \\ \tilde{F}^j, |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{F}^j &\in X^s(\Omega), \quad \tilde{F}^j(\alpha, 0) \in H^s(P(\Gamma)), \quad j \in \{\alpha, y, 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{F}^y(\alpha, -a) = 0,$$

there exists a unique solution $\tilde{u} \in X^s(\Omega)$ of (4.10) such that, for some $C_e > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_s[\tilde{u}] \leq C_e \left\{ & \left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^{s+1}} + \left\| \tilde{J} \right\|_{H^s} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{j \in \{\alpha, y, 0\}} \left(\left\| \tilde{F}^j \right\|_{X^s} + \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{F}^j \right\|_{X^s} + \left\| \tilde{F}^j(\alpha, 0) \right\|_{H^s} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We will focus on the case $h = \infty$ and note that the proof for the case $h < \infty$ follows similarly. We expand the data and solution in Fourier series as,

$$\{\tilde{u}, \tilde{F}^j\}(\alpha, y) = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \left\{ \hat{u}_p(y), \hat{F}_p^j(y) \right\} e^{ip \cdot \alpha}, \quad \{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{J}\}(\alpha) = \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \left\{ \hat{\xi}_p, \hat{J}_p \right\} e^{ip \cdot \alpha},$$

giving,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_y^2 \hat{u}_p(y) - |K^T p|^2 \hat{u}_p(y) &= (iK^T p) \cdot \hat{F}_p^\alpha(y) + \partial_y \hat{F}_p^y(y) + \hat{F}_p^0(y), & -a < y < 0, \\ \hat{u}_p(0) &= \hat{\xi}_p, \\ \partial_y \hat{u}_p(-a) - |K^T p| \hat{u}_p(-a) &= \hat{J}_p. \end{aligned}$$

To complete our proof we work with the exact solutions of these which we now derive and estimate explicitly.

(a.) **Inhomogeneous BCs:** We begin with the case $\hat{F}^j \equiv 0$ and write

$$\hat{u}_p(y) = \hat{\xi}_p E_p(y) + \hat{J}_p S_p(y),$$

where

$$E_p(y) := \exp(|K^T p| y), \quad S_p(y) := \begin{cases} y, & p = 0, \\ \frac{\sinh(|K^T p| y)}{|K^T p| \exp(|K^T p| a)}, & p \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

From this we compute

$$\partial_y \hat{u}_p(y) = |K^T p| \hat{\xi}_p E_p(y) + \hat{J}_p C_p(y),$$

where

$$C_p(y) := \begin{cases} 1, & p = 0, \\ \frac{\cosh(|K^T p| y)}{\exp(|K^T p| a)}, & p \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Computing the L^2 norms of $E_p(y)$, $S_p(y)$ and $C_p(y)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_p\|_{L^2}^2 &= \frac{1 - \exp(-2|K^T p| a)}{2|K^T p|}, \\ \|S_p\|_{L^2}^2 &= \begin{cases} a^3/3, & p = 0, \\ \frac{-2a|K^T p| + \sinh(2a|K^T p|)}{4 \exp(2a|K^T p|) |K^T p|^3}, & p \neq 0, \end{cases} \\ \|C_p\|_{L^2}^2 &= \begin{cases} a, & p = 0, \\ \frac{2a|K^T p| + \sinh(2a|K^T p|)}{4 \exp(2a|K^T p|) |K^T p|}, & p \neq 0, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

which have the following limits when $p \neq 0$: As $|K^T p| \rightarrow 0$ we have

$$\|E_p\|_{L^2}^2 \rightarrow a, \quad \|S_p\|_{L^2}^2 \rightarrow \frac{a^3}{3}, \quad \|C_p\|_{L^2}^2 \rightarrow a,$$

and, as $|K^T p| \rightarrow \infty$ we find

$$\|E_p\|_{L^2}^2 \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} |K^T p|^{-1}, \quad \|S_p\|_{L^2}^2 \rightarrow \frac{1}{4} |K^T p|^{-3}, \quad \|C_p\|_{L^2}^2 \rightarrow \frac{1}{4} |K^T p|^{-1}.$$

From these, through interpolation it is not difficult to establish the following result.

Lemma A.2.

$$\begin{aligned} |K^T p|^m \|E_p\|_{L^2}^2 &< C, & 0 \leq m \leq 1, \quad \forall p \in \Gamma', \\ |K^T p|^m \|S_p\|_{L^2}^2 &< C, & 0 \leq m \leq 3, \quad \forall p \in \Gamma', \\ |K^T p|^m \|C_p\|_{L^2}^2 &< C, & 0 \leq m \leq 1, \quad \forall p \in \Gamma', \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{u}_p(0) &= \hat{\xi}_p, \quad \partial_y \hat{u}_p(0) = |K^T p| \hat{\xi}_p + \hat{J}_p \exp(-|K^T p| a), \\ \hat{u}_p(-a) &= \begin{cases} \hat{\xi}_0 - a \hat{J}_0, & p = 0, \\ \hat{\xi}_p \exp(-|K^T p| a) - \hat{J}_p \frac{(1 - \exp(-2|K^T p| a))}{2|K^T p|}, & p \neq 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We now estimate the eight terms in $\mathcal{M}_s(\tilde{u})$.

(i.) **Field:**

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{u}\|_{X^s}^2 &= \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \langle p \rangle^{2s} \left\| \hat{\xi}_p E_p(y) + \hat{J}_p S_p(y) \right\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} 2 \langle p \rangle^{2s} \left(\left| \hat{\xi}_p \right|^2 \|E_p(y)\|_{L^2}^2 + \left| \hat{J}_p \right|^2 \|S_p(y)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\leq 2C \left(\left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^s}^2 + \left\| \tilde{J} \right\|_{H^s}^2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma A.2. In a similar manner we can show that

$$\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s} \leq 2C \left(\left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^s}^2 + \left\| \tilde{J} \right\|_{H^s}^2 \right).$$

(ii.) **Vertical derivative:**

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_y \tilde{u}\|_{X^s}^2 &= \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \langle p \rangle^{2s} \left\| |K^T p| \hat{\xi}_p E_p(y) + \hat{J}_p C_p(y) \right\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} 2 \langle p \rangle^{2s} \left(|K^T p| \left| \hat{\xi}_p \right|^2 \|E_p(y)\|_{L^2}^2 + \left| \hat{J}_p \right|^2 \|C_p(y)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\leq 2CC' \left(\left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^{s+1/2}}^2 + \left\| \tilde{J} \right\|_{H^s}^2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma A.2 and $|K^T p| \leq C' |p|$ for some $C' \geq 1$ and for any $p \in \Gamma'$. Similarly, one can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \partial_y \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}^2 &\leq 2CC'^2 \left(\left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 + \left\| \tilde{J} \right\|_{H^s}^2 \right), \\
\|\partial_y \tilde{u}(0)\|_{H^s}^2 &\leq 2C'^2 \left(\left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 + \left\| \tilde{J} \right\|_{H^s}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

(iii.) **Horizontal derivative:**

$$\begin{aligned}
\|K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}\|_{X^s}^2 &= \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \langle p \rangle^{2s} |K^T p|^2 \left\| \hat{\xi}_p E_p(y) + \hat{J}_p S_p(y) \right\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} 2 \langle p \rangle^{2s} \left(|K^T p| \left| \hat{\xi}_p \right|^2 |K^T p| \|E_p(y)\|_{L^2}^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left| \hat{J}_p \right|^2 |K^T p|^2 \|S_p(y)\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\
&\leq 2CC' \left(\left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^{s+1/2}}^2 + \left\| \tilde{J} \right\|_{H^s}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can prove that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}^2 &\leq 2CC'^2 \left(\left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 + \left\| \tilde{J} \right\|_{H^s}^2 \right), \\
\|K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}(0)\|_{H^s}^2 &\leq C'^2 \left\| \tilde{\xi} \right\|_{H^{s+1}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

(iv.) **DNO at the lower boundary:** Moving to $y = -a$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{T}[\tilde{u}(-a)] \right\|_{H^s}^2 &= \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} \langle p \rangle^{2s} \left| \hat{\xi}_p |K^T p| \exp(-|K^T p| a) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \hat{J}_p (1 - \exp(-2|K^T p| a)) \right|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{p \in \Gamma'} 2 \langle p \rangle^{2s} \left(|K^T p|^2 |\hat{\xi}_p|^2 + |\hat{J}_p|^2 \right) \\ &\leq 2C'^2 \left(\left\| \hat{\xi} \right\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 + \left\| \hat{J} \right\|_{H^s}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

(b.) **Inhomogeneous PDE** ($\tilde{F}^0 \neq 0$): We move to the case $\hat{\xi}_p \equiv \hat{J}_p \equiv 0$ and $\hat{F}^j \equiv 0$, $j \in \{\alpha, y\}$. For $\tilde{F} = \tilde{F}^0$, we have

$$\hat{u}_p(y) = \exp(|K^T p| a) \left\{ \int_y^0 E_p(y) S_p(t) \hat{F}_p(t) dt + \int_{-a}^y E_p(t) S_p(y) \hat{F}_p(t) dt \right\}.$$

In Appendix B we prove the following estimates of this function and its derivatives.

Lemma A.3.

$$\begin{aligned} |K^T p|^m \|\hat{u}_p\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}, & 0 \leq m \leq 2, & \quad \forall p \in \Gamma', \\ |K^T p|^m \|\partial_y \hat{u}_p\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}, & 0 \leq m \leq 1, & \quad \forall p \in \Gamma', \\ |K^T p|^m |\partial_y \hat{u}_p(0)| &\leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}, & 0 \leq m \leq 1/2, & \quad \forall p \in \Gamma', \\ |K^T p|^m |\hat{u}_p(-a)| &\leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}, & 0 \leq m \leq 3/2, & \quad \forall p \in \Gamma'. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma A.3 we can prove the following estimates in a rather straightforward way.

(i.) **Field:**

$$\max \left\{ \|\tilde{u}\|_{X^s}, \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s} \right\} \leq C \left\| \tilde{F}^0 \right\|_{X^s}.$$

(ii.) **Vertical derivative:**

$$\max \left\{ \|\partial_y \tilde{u}\|_{X^s}, \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \partial_y \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}, \|\partial_y \tilde{u}(0)\|_{H^s}^2 \right\} \leq C \left\| \tilde{F}^0 \right\|_{X^s}.$$

(iii.) **Horizontal derivative:**

$$\max \left\{ \|K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}\|_{X^s}, \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}, \|K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}(0)\|_{H^s} \right\} \leq C \left\| \tilde{F}^0 \right\|_{X^s}.$$

(iv.) **DNO at the lower boundary:**

$$\left\| \tilde{T}[\tilde{u}(-a)] \right\|_{H^s} = \left\| |K^T D| \tilde{u}(-a) \right\|_{H^s} \leq C \left\| \tilde{F}^0 \right\|_{X^s}.$$

(c.) **Inhomogeneous PDE** ($\tilde{F}^\alpha \neq 0$): We move to the case $\hat{\xi}_p \equiv \hat{J}_p \equiv 0$ and $\hat{F}^j \equiv 0$, $j \in \{0, y\}$. Setting $\tilde{F} = \tilde{F}^\alpha$, we have

$$\hat{u}_p(y) = \exp(|K^T p| a) \left\{ \int_y^0 E_p(y) S_p(t) (iK^T p) \hat{F}_p(t) dt + \int_{-a}^y E_p(t) S_p(y) (iK^T p) \hat{F}_p(t) dt \right\}.$$

By simply replacing \hat{F}_p by $(iK^T p) \hat{F}_p$ in Lemma A.3 we obtain the following estimates.

Lemma A.4.

$$\begin{aligned} |K^T p|^m \|\hat{u}_p\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}, & 0 \leq m \leq 1, & \quad \forall p \in \Gamma', \\ \|\partial_y \hat{u}_p\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}, & & \quad \forall p \in \Gamma', \\ |\partial_y \hat{u}_p(0)| &\leq C |K^T p|^{1/2} \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}, & & \quad \forall p \in \Gamma', \\ |K^T p|^m |\hat{u}_p(-a)| &\leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}, & 0 \leq m \leq 1/2, & \quad \forall p \in \Gamma'. \end{aligned}$$

With this it is not difficult to show the following.

(i.) **Field:**

$$\max \left\{ \|\tilde{u}\|_{X^s}, \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s} \right\} \leq C \left\| \tilde{F}^\alpha \right\|_{X^s}.$$

(ii.) **Vertical derivative:**

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_y \tilde{u}\|_{X^s} &\leq C \left\| \tilde{F}^\alpha \right\|_{X^s}, \\ \max \left\{ \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \partial_y \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}, \|\partial_y \tilde{u}(0)\|_{H^s}^2 \right\} &\leq C \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{F}^\alpha \right\|_{X^s}. \end{aligned}$$

(iii.) **Horizontal derivative:**

$$\begin{aligned} \|K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}\|_{X^s} &\leq C \left\| \tilde{F}^\alpha \right\|_{X^s}, \\ \left\{ \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}, \|K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}(0)\|_{X^s} \right\} &\leq C \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{F}^\alpha \right\|_{X^s}. \end{aligned}$$

(iv.) **DNO at the lower boundary:**

$$\left\| \tilde{T}[\tilde{u}(-a)] \right\|_{H^s} = \left\| |K^T D| \tilde{u}(-a) \right\|_{H^s} \leq C \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{F}^\alpha \right\|_{X^s}.$$

(d.) **Inhomogeneous PDE** ($\tilde{F}^y \neq 0$): We move to the case the case $\hat{\xi}_p \equiv \hat{J}_p \equiv 0$ and $\hat{F}^j \equiv 0$, $j \in \{0, \alpha\}$. For $\tilde{F} = \tilde{F}^y$, we have

$$\hat{u}_p(y) = \exp(|K^T p| a) \left\{ \int_y^0 E_p(y) S_p(t) \hat{F}'_p(t) dt + \int_{-a}^y E_p(t) S_p(y) \hat{F}'_p(t) dt \right\}.$$

Writing this as

$$\hat{u}_p(y) = I_1[\partial_y \hat{F}_p](y) - I_2[\partial_y \hat{F}_p](y) + I_3[\partial_y \hat{F}_p](y) - I_4[\partial_y \hat{F}_p](y).$$

Using Integration-by-Parts, together with $\hat{F}_p^y(-a) = 0$, we discover

$$\hat{u}_p(y) = |K^T p| \left\{ -I_1[\hat{F}_p](y) - I_2[\hat{F}_p](y) - I_3[\hat{F}_p](y) + I_4[\hat{F}_p](y) \right\}.$$

From this we compute

$$\partial_y \hat{u}_p(y) = |K^T p|^2 \left\{ -I_1[\hat{F}_p](y) - I_2[\hat{F}_p](y) - I_3[\hat{F}_p](y) - I_4[\hat{F}_p](y) \right\} + \hat{F}_p(y),$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{u}_p(0) &= 0, & \hat{u}_p(-a) &= |K^T p| \{ -I_1(-a) - I_2(-a) \}, \\ \partial_y \hat{u}_p(0) &= -2 |K^T p|^2 I_3(0) + \hat{F}_p(0). \end{aligned}$$

Following the proof of Lemma A.3 we can show the following bounds.

Lemma A.5.

$$\begin{aligned} |K^T p|^m \|\hat{u}_p\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}, & 0 \leq m \leq 1, & \quad \forall p \in \Gamma', \\ \|\partial_y \hat{u}_p\|_{L^2} &\leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}, & & \quad \forall p \in \Gamma', \\ |\partial_y \hat{u}_p(0)| &\leq C |K^T p|^{1/2} \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}, & & \quad \forall p \in \Gamma', \\ |K^T p|^m |\hat{u}_p(-a)| &\leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}, & 0 \leq m \leq 1/2, & \quad \forall p \in \Gamma'. \end{aligned}$$

With this we obtain the following estimates.

(i.) **Field:**

$$\max \left\{ \|\tilde{u}\|_{X^s}, \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s} \right\} \leq C \left\| \tilde{F}^y \right\|_{X^s}.$$

(ii.) **Vertical derivative:**

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_y \tilde{u}\|_{X^s} &\leq C \left\| \tilde{F}^y \right\|_{X^s}, \\ \max \left\{ \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \partial_y \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}, \|\partial_y \tilde{u}(0)\|_{H^s}^2 \right\} &\leq C \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{F}^y \right\|_{X^s}. \end{aligned}$$

(iii.) **Horizontal derivative:**

$$\begin{aligned} \|K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}\|_{X^s} &\leq C \left\| \tilde{F}^y \right\|_{X^s}, \\ \max \left\{ \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u} \right\|_{X^s}, \|K^T \nabla_\alpha \tilde{u}(0)\|_{X^s} \right\} &\leq C \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{F}^y \right\|_{X^s}. \end{aligned}$$

(iv.) **DNO at the lower boundary:**

$$\left\| \tilde{T}[\tilde{u}(-a)] \right\|_{H^s} = \left\| |K^T D| \tilde{u}(-a) \right\|_{H^s} \leq C \left\| |K^T D|^{1/2} \tilde{F}^y \right\|_{X^s}.$$

□

B Proof of Lemma A.3

We now provide the full proof of Lemma A.3.

Proof. The proof for the case when $p = 0$ is straightforward and we focus on the case when $p \neq 0$. To simplify our developments we write

$$\hat{u}_p(y) = I_1[\hat{F}_p](y) - I_2[\hat{F}_p](y) + I_3[\hat{F}_p](y) - I_4[\hat{F}_p](y),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1[\hat{F}_p](y) &:= \frac{\exp(|K^T p| y)}{2|K^T p|} \int_y^0 \exp(|K^T p| t) \hat{F}_p(t) dt, \\ I_2[\hat{F}_p](y) &:= \frac{\exp(|K^T p| y)}{2|K^T p|} \int_y^0 \exp(-|K^T p| t) \hat{F}_p(t) dt, \\ I_3[\hat{F}_p](y) &:= \frac{\exp(|K^T p| y)}{2|K^T p|} \int_{-a}^y \exp(|K^T p| t) \hat{F}_p(t) dt, \\ I_4[\hat{F}_p](y) &:= \frac{\exp(-|K^T p| y)}{2|K^T p|} \int_{-a}^y \exp(|K^T p| t) \hat{F}_p(t) dt. \end{aligned}$$

From this we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_y \hat{u}_p(y) &= |K^T p| \left\{ I_1[\hat{F}_p](y) - I_2[\hat{F}_p](y) + I_3[\hat{F}_p](y) + I_4[\hat{F}_p](y) \right\}, \\ \hat{u}_p(0) &= 0, \quad \hat{u}_p(-a) = I_1[\hat{F}_p](-a) - I_2[\hat{F}_p](-a), \\ \partial_y \hat{u}_p(0) &= 2|K^T p| \left\{ I_3[\hat{F}_p](0) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Computing the L^2 norm of $I_1[\hat{F}_p](y) - I_2[\hat{F}_p](y)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| I_1[\hat{F}_p](y) - I_2[\hat{F}_p](y) \right\|_{L^2}^2 &= \int_{-a}^0 \exp(|K^T p| 2a) dy \left| \int_y^0 E_p(y) S_p(t) \hat{F}_p(t) dt \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{|K^T p|^2} \int_{-a}^0 \exp(2|K^T p| y) dy \left(\int_y^0 \sinh(|K^T p| t) \hat{F}_p(t) dt \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|K^T p|^2} \int_{-a}^0 \exp(2|K^T p| y) dy \int_y^0 \sinh^2(|K^T p| t) dt \int_y^0 |\hat{F}_p(t)|^2 dt \\ &\leq \frac{a}{|K^T p|^2} \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}^2 \int_{-a}^0 \exp(2|K^T p| y) \sinh^2(|K^T p| y) dy, \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\int_y^0 \sinh^2(|K^T p| t) dt \leq \sinh^2(|K^T p| y) \int_y^0 dt \leq a \sinh^2(|K^T p| y).$$

Continuing

$$\left\| I_1[\hat{F}_p](y) - I_2[\hat{F}_p](y) \right\|_{L^2}^2 \leq a f(|K^T p|) \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where

$$f(|K^T p|) = -\frac{1}{16|K^T p|^3} (\exp(-4|K^T p|a) - 4\exp(-2|K^T p|a) - 4a|K^T p| + 3) \\ \rightarrow \begin{cases} \frac{a^3}{3}, & |K^T p| \rightarrow 0, \\ \frac{a}{4|K^T p|^2}, & |K^T p| \rightarrow \infty. \end{cases}$$

Similarly, one can prove that

$$\left\| I_3[\hat{F}_p](y) - I_4[\hat{F}_p](y) \right\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}^2,$$

thus, we have

$$\|\hat{u}_p\|_{L^2} \leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Next, we are going to show that

$$|K^T p|^2 \|\hat{u}_p\|_{L^2} \leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}.$$

Computing the squared L^2 norm of $|K^T p|^2 I_1[\hat{F}_p]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |K^T p|^4 \left\| I_1[\hat{F}_p] \right\|_{L^2}^2 &= \frac{|K^T p|^2}{4} \int_{-a}^0 \exp(2|K^T p|y) dy \left| \int_y^0 \exp(|K^T p|t) \hat{F}_p(t) dt \right|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{|K^T p|^2}{4} \int_{-a}^0 \exp(2|K^T p|y) dy \int_y^0 \exp(2|K^T p|t) dt \int_y^0 |\hat{F}_p(t)|^2 dt \\ &\leq \frac{|K^T p|^2}{4} \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}^2 \int_{-a}^0 \exp(2|K^T p|y) dy \int_{-a}^0 \exp(2|K^T p|t) dt \\ &\leq \frac{1}{16} \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}^2 (1 - \exp(-2|K^T p|a))^2 \\ &\leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

An estimation of L^2 norm of $|K^T p|^2 I_2[\hat{F}_p]$ proceeds as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |K^T p|^2 \left\| I_2[\hat{F}_p] \right\|_{L^2} &= \frac{|K^T p|}{2} \left(\int_{-a}^0 dy \left| \int_y^0 \exp(|K^T p|(y-t)) \hat{F}_p(t) dt \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{|K^T p|}{2} \left(\int_{-a}^0 dy \left(\int_{-a}^0 \exp(|K^T p|(y-t)) |\hat{F}_p(t)| dt \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{|K^T p|}{2} \int_{-a}^0 \exp(|K^T p|y) dy \left(\int_{-a}^0 |\hat{F}_p(y)|^2 dy \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (1 - \exp(-|K^T p|a)) \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show that

$$|K^T p|^2 \left\| I_j[\hat{F}_p] \right\|_{L^2} \leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}, \quad j = 3, 4.$$

Therefore, we completed the proof of

$$|K^T p|^2 \|\hat{u}_p\|_{L^2} \leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Interpolating (B.1) and (B.2), we obtain the first inequality in Lemma A.3. The second inequality in Lemma A.3 can be proved similarly.

At $y = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_y \hat{u}_p(0)| &= \left| \int_{-a}^0 \exp(|K^T p| t) \hat{F}_p(t) dt \right| \\ &\leq \left(\int_{-a}^0 \exp(2|K^T p| t) dt \right)^{1/2} \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2} \\ &= \left(\frac{1 - \exp(-2|K^T p| a)}{2|K^T p|} \right)^{1/2} \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$|\partial_y \hat{u}_p(0)| \leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}, \quad |K^T p|^{1/2} |\partial_y \hat{u}_p(0)| \leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}.$$

Through interpolation, we finish the proof of the third inequality in Lemma A.3. We use the following two inequalities to prove the last inequality in Lemma A.3. At $y = -a$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{u}_p(-a)| &\leq \frac{\exp(-|K^T p| a)}{|K^T p|} \int_{-a}^0 \left| \sinh(|K^T p| t) \hat{F}_p(t) \right| dt \\ &\leq \frac{\exp(-|K^T p| a)}{|K^T p|} \int_{-a}^0 \sinh(|K^T p| a) \left| \hat{F}_p(t) \right| dt \\ &\leq \frac{1 - \exp(-2|K^T p| a)}{2|K^T p|} \int_{-a}^0 \left| \hat{F}_p(t) \right| dt, \end{aligned}$$

since $|\sinh(|K^T p| t)| \leq \sinh(|K^T p| a)$ on $[-a, 0]$. Continuing,

$$|\hat{u}_p(-a)| \leq \frac{1 - \exp(-2|K^T p| a)}{2|K^T p|} \sqrt{a} \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2} \leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}.$$

Finally, since $\sinh(z) \leq \exp(-z)$ for $z < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |K^T p|^{3/2} |\hat{u}_p(-a)| &\leq |K^T p|^{1/2} \exp(-|K^T p| a) \int_{-a}^0 \exp(-|K^T p| t) \left| \hat{F}_p(t) \right| dt \\ &\leq |K^T p|^{1/2} \exp(-|K^T p| a) \left(\int_{-a}^0 \exp(-2|K^T p| t) dt \right)^{1/2} \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \left\| \hat{F}_p \right\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

References

- [Ach73] J. D. Achenbach. *Wave Propagation in Elastic Solids*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1973.
- [Ach90] D. J. Acheson. *Elementary fluid dynamics*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1990.
- [BD96] TJ Bridges and F Dias. Spatially quasi-periodic capillary-gravity waves. *Contemp. Math.*, 200:31–46, 1996.
- [Bea01] J. Thomas Beale. Discretization of layer potentials and numerical methods for water waves. *Sūrikaisekikenkyūsho Kōkyūroku*, (1234):18–26, 2001. Tosio Kato’s method and principle for evolution equations in mathematical physics (Sapporo, 2001).
- [BGM96] George A. Baker, Jr. and Peter Graves-Morris. *Padé approximants*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 1996.
- [BMO82] Gregory R. Baker, Daniel I. Meiron, and Steven A. Orszag. Generalized vortex methods for free-surface flow problems. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 123:477–501, 1982.
- [BO78] Carl M. Bender and Steven A. Orszag. *Advanced mathematical methods for scientists and engineers*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1978. International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics.
- [Boy01] John P. Boyd. *Chebyshev and Fourier spectral methods*. Dover Publications Inc., Mineola, NY, second edition, 2001.
- [BR93a] O. Bruno and F. Reitich. Numerical solution of diffraction problems: A method of variation of boundaries. *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, 10(6):1168–1175, 1993.
- [BR93b] O. Bruno and F. Reitich. Numerical solution of diffraction problems: A method of variation of boundaries. II. Finitely conducting gratings, Padé approximants, and singularities. *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, 10(11):2307–2316, 1993.
- [BR93c] O. Bruno and F. Reitich. Numerical solution of diffraction problems: A method of variation of boundaries. III. Doubly periodic gratings. *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, 10(12):2551–2562, 1993.
- [Bur66] O. R. Burggraf. Analytical and numerical studies of the structure of steady separated flows. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 24:113–151, 1966.
- [CC99] Wooyoung Choi and Roberto Camassa. Exact evolution equations for surface waves. *J. Eng. Mech.*, 125(7):756–760, 1999.
- [CDCM82] J. Chandezon, M.T. Dupuis, G. Cornet, and D. Maystre. Multicoated gratings: a differential formalism applicable in the entire optical region. *J. Opt. Soc. Amer.*, 72(7):839, 1982.
- [CHQZ88] C. Canuto, M. Y. Hussaini, A. Quarteroni, and T. A. Zang. *Spectral methods in fluid dynamics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.

- [CMR80] J. Chandezon, D. Maystre, and G. Raoult. A new theoretical method for diffraction gratings and its numerical application. *J. Opt.*, 11(7):235–241, 1980.
- [CN00] W. Craig and D. P. Nicholls. Traveling two and three dimensional capillary gravity water waves. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 32(2):323–359, 2000.
- [CS93] Walter Craig and Catherine Sulem. Numerical simulation of gravity waves. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 108:73–83, 1993.
- [DKSZ96] Alexander I Dyachenko, Evgenii A Kuznetsov, MD Spector, and Vladimir E Zakharov. Analytical description of the free surface dynamics of an ideal fluid (canonical formalism and conformal mapping). *Phys. Letters A*, 221(1-2):73–79, 1996.
- [DLK16] Sergey A Dyachenko, Pavel M Lushnikov, and Alexander O Korotkevich. Branch cuts of Stokes wave on deep water. Part I: Numerical solution and Padé approximation. *Stud. Appl. Math.*, 137(4):419–472, 2016.
- [DS23] Sergey A Dyachenko and Anastassiya Semenova. Quasiperiodic perturbations of stokes waves: Secondary bifurcations and stability. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 492:112411, 2023.
- [Eva10] Lawrence C. Evans. *Partial differential equations*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2010.
- [Fol76] Gerald B. Folland. *Introduction to partial differential equations*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1976. Preliminary informal notes of university courses and seminars in mathematics, Mathematical Notes.
- [GO77] D. Gottlieb and S. A. Orszag. *Numerical analysis of spectral methods: theory and applications*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, Pa., 1977. CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics, No. 26.
- [Goc06] Mark S. Gockenbach. *Understanding and implementing the finite element method*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2006.
- [God92] C. Godrèche, editor. *Solids far from equilibrium*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.
- [HIT16] John K Hunter, Mihaela Ifrim, and Daniel Tataru. Two dimensional water waves in holomorphic coordinates. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 346(2):483–552, 2016.
- [HLS94] Thomas Y. Hou, John S. Lowengrub, and Michael J. Shelley. Removing the stiffness from interfacial flows with surface tension. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 114(2):312–338, 1994.
- [Ihl98] Frank Ihlenburg. *Finite element analysis of acoustic scattering*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.

- [Jac75] J. D. Jackson. *Classical electrodynamics*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, second edition, 1975.
- [Joh87] Claes Johnson. *Numerical solution of partial differential equations by the finite element method*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.
- [Lam93] Horace Lamb. *Hydrodynamics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, sixth edition, 1993.
- [LC25] Tullio Levi-Civita. Determination rigoureuse des ondes permanentes d’amplitude finie. *Mathematische Annalen*, 93(1):264–314, 1925.
- [LeV07] Randall J. LeVeque. *Finite difference methods for ordinary and partial differential equations*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2007. Steady-state and time-dependent problems.
- [Mil91a] D. Michael Milder. An improved formalism for rough-surface scattering of acoustic and electromagnetic waves. In *Proceedings of SPIE - The International Society for Optical Engineering (San Diego, 1991)*, volume 1558, pages 213–221. Int. Soc. for Optical Engineering, Bellingham, WA, 1991.
- [Mil91b] D. Michael Milder. An improved formalism for wave scattering from rough surfaces. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 89(2):529–541, 1991.
- [Mos66] J. Moser. On the theory of quasiperiodic motions. *SIAM Rev.*, 8:145–172, 1966.
- [MS91] D. Michael Milder and H. Thomas Sharp. Efficient computation of rough surface scattering. In *Mathematical and numerical aspects of wave propagation phenomena (Strasbourg, 1991)*, pages 314–322. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1991.
- [MS92] D. Michael Milder and H. Thomas Sharp. An improved formalism for rough surface scattering. ii: Numerical trials in three dimensions. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 91(5):2620–2626, 1992.
- [MVBW10] P. A. Milewski, J.-M. Vanden-Broeck, and Z. Wang. Dynamics of steep two-dimensional gravity–capillary solitary waves. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 664:466–477, 2010.
- [Nic98a] D. P. Nicholls. *Traveling Gravity Water Waves in Two and Three Dimensions*. PhD thesis, Brown University, 1998.
- [Nic98b] D. P. Nicholls. Traveling water waves: Spectral continuation methods with parallel implementation. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 143(1):224–240, 1998.
- [Nic22] D. P. Nicholls. A high-order spectral algorithm for the numerical simulation of layered media with uniaxial hyperbolic materials. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 453:110961, 2022.
- [NR01a] D. P. Nicholls and F. Reitich. A new approach to analyticity of Dirichlet-Neumann operators. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 131(6):1411–1433, 2001.

- [NR01b] D. P. Nicholls and F. Reitich. Stability of high-order perturbative methods for the computation of Dirichlet-Neumann operators. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 170(1):276–298, 2001.
- [NR03] D. P. Nicholls and F. Reitich. Analytic continuation of Dirichlet-Neumann operators. *Numer. Math.*, 94(1):107–146, 2003.
- [NR04a] D. P. Nicholls and F. Reitich. Shape deformations in rough surface scattering: Cancellations, conditioning, and convergence. *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, 21(4):590–605, 2004.
- [NR04b] D. P. Nicholls and F. Reitich. Shape deformations in rough surface scattering: Improved algorithms. *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, 21(4):606–621, 2004.
- [NT08] D. P. Nicholls and M. Taber. Joint analyticity and analytic continuation for Dirichlet–Neumann operators on doubly perturbed domains. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 10(2):238–271, 2008.
- [Pet80] R. Petit, editor. *Electromagnetic theory of gratings*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1980.
- [Phi57] N. A. Phillips. A coordinate system having some special advantages for numerical forecasting. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 14(2):184–185, 1957.
- [Ray76] L. Rayleigh. On waves. *Philos. Mag.*, 5(1):257–279, 1876.
- [Roa02] P. J. Roache. Code verification by the method of manufactured solutions. *J. Fluids Eng.*, 124(1):4–10, 2002.
- [Roy05] C. J. Roy. Review of code and solution verification procedures for computational simulation. *J. Comp. Phys.*, 205(1):131–156, 2005.
- [Rub04] VP Ruban. Water waves over a strongly undulating bottom. *Phys. Rev. E*, 70(6):066302, 2004.
- [ST06] Jie Shen and Tao Tang. *Spectral and high-order methods with applications*, volume 3 of *Mathematics Monograph Series*. Science Press Beijing, Beijing, 2006.
- [ST23] Xu Sun and Peter Topalov. Spatially quasi-periodic solutions of the euler equation. *Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics*, 25(3):66, 2023.
- [Sto47] G.G. Stokes. On the theory of oscillatory waves. *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 8:441–473, 1847.
- [Str04] John C. Strikwerda. *Finite difference schemes and partial differential equations*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, second edition, 2004.
- [STW11] Jie Shen, Tao Tang, and Li-Lian Wang. *Spectral methods*, volume 41 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011. Algorithms, analysis and applications.

- [VBD92] J.M. Vanden-Broeck and F. Dias. Gravity-capillary solitary waves in water of infinite depth and related free-surface flows. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 240:549–557, 1992.
- [Whi99] G. B. Whitham. *Linear and nonlinear waves*. Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York). John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1999. Reprint of the 1974 original, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [WV15] Jon Wilkening and Vishal Vasan. Comparison of five methods of computing the Dirichlet-Neumann operator for the water wave problem. In *Nonlinear wave equations: analytic and computational techniques*, volume 635 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 175–210. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2015.
- [WZ21a] Jon Wilkening and Xinyu Zhao. Quasi-periodic travelling gravity–capillary waves. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 915:Paper No. A7, 35, 2021.
- [WZ21b] Jon Wilkening and Xinyu Zhao. Spatially quasi-periodic water waves of infinite depth. *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 31(3):Paper No. 52, 43, 2021.
- [WZ23a] Jon Wilkening and Xinyu Zhao. Spatially quasi-periodic bifurcations from periodic traveling water waves and a method for detecting bifurcations using signed singular values. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 478:Paper No. 111954, 34, 2023.
- [WZ23b] Jon Wilkening and Xinyu Zhao. Spatially quasi-periodic water waves of finite depth. *Proc. A.*, 479(2272):Paper No. 20230019, 28, 2023.