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Abstract. A theory of a posteriori estimates for the finite-element method was developed earlier by the authors. Based on this theory, for a two-point boundary value problem the existence of a unique optimal mesh distribution is proved and its properties analyzed. This mesh is characterized in terms of certain, easily computable local error indicators which in turn allow for a simple adaptive construction of the mesh and also permit the computation of a very effective a posteriori error bound. While the error estimates are asymptotic in nature, numerical experiments show the results to be excellent already for 10% accuracy. The approaches are not restricted to the model problem considered here only for clarity; in fact, they allow for rather straightforward extensions to more general problems in one dimension, as well as to higher-order elements.

1. Introduction. For the numerical solution of boundary value problems by finite-element techniques, the construction of optimal, or near-optimal meshes is of considerable practical importance. The same can be said when finite-difference or collocation methods are used. Many articles in the literature deal with questions that bear a relation to this problem, yet, as observed in [15], even for two-point boundary value problems relatively few address it directly. We shall not attempt to survey this literature.

There are various analyses of the approximation error of a given function by piecewise polynomials with a fixed number of pieces of fixed order (see, e.g., [7], [8], [10], [12], [21] and the references cited there). In principle, such studies may relate to the finite-element method since that method leads to optimal approximations under the energy norm. The mentioned error estimates involve higher derivatives of the given function. With these results as a basis, a number of authors developed methods for the construction of optimal meshes for collocation and finite-difference methods ([11], [13], [14], [17], [22], [23]). For this the needed information about the derivatives of the solution is obtained from the approximate solution, for instance, by means of difference formulas. This procedure can be theoretically justified in the case of regular meshes (see, e.g., [20]). However, when there are abrupt changes in the mesh—as they arise with refinement techniques—the ‘internal boundary layers’
appear in the error function (see, e.g., [2], [6]); and hence, the difference formulas cease to approximate well the desired derivatives.

Various results on optimizing finite-element meshes have appeared in the engineering literature. Without entering into any details, we mention, for instance, the articles [9], [18], [19], [25], [26] and [27].

In recent years, for initial value problems for ordinary differential equations, very effective procedures have been designed and analyzed for adapting the stepsizes and the order of the numerical methods (see, e.g., the survey [15]). The principal tool is the availability of an error analysis with a local, a posteriori character. These estimates are asymptotic in nature; yet practical experience has proved their reliability for reasonable tolerances.

In this paper we use a new approach to the construction of optimal finite-element meshes. It is based on a theory of a posteriori estimates for the finite-element method developed in [3], [4] (see also [5]). As in the case of the initial value problems, the estimates are asymptotic in character. More specifically, higher-order terms in the maximal meshsize \( \bar{h} \) are neglected; that is, asymptotic expressions of the form \( 1 + o(1) \) as \( \bar{h} \to 0 \) are considered to be approximately equal to one. At the same time, all constant factors of these \( (1 + o(1)) \)-terms can be evaluated computationally.

For clarity of presentation, we restrict the discussion to a simple two-point boundary value problem involving a linear, selfadjoint operator of second order. Moreover, for simplicity, we employ only piecewise linear elements. The approaches allow for rather straightforward extensions to a variety of more general problems in one dimension, and there are no essential limitations to the use of higher-order elements. In fact, analogous techniques even permit consideration of elements of different order in different parts of the mesh.

Continuous mesh distribution functions are used to prove the existence of a unique, optimal mesh distribution and to analyze its properties. In particular, it is shown that the value of the optimal error is rather stable under perturbations of the optimal mesh. Hence, it is indeed unnecessary to compute this mesh with excessive accuracy. The optimal mesh is characterized in terms of certain easily computable local error indicators. This allows for a simple adaptive method to construct that mesh (see [4]) and, at the same time, to compute very effective a posteriori error bounds. Although, as mentioned, the error estimates have only asymptotic character, numerical experience shows that, as in the case of initial value problems, the results are excellent already for accuracies of the order of ten percent.

2. Notation. Let \( I = (\alpha, \beta), \alpha < \beta, \) be the open interval \( \{x \in \mathbb{R}^1; \alpha < x < \beta \} \) and \( \overline{I} = \overline{I}(\alpha, \beta) \) its closure. As usual, \( H^0(I) \) denotes the space of square-integrable functions on \( \overline{I} \) and \( C^0(I) \subset H^0(I) \) the subspace of continuous functions on \( \overline{I} \). The norms on \( H^0(I) \) and \( C^0(I) \) will be written as \( \| \cdot \|_0 \) and \( \| \cdot \|_c \), respectively.

Define \( E(I) \) as the space of real, infinitely differentiable functions on \( I \) for which all derivatives have continuous extensions on \( \overline{I} \). Moreover, let \( D(I) \subset E(I) \) be the subspace of all functions with compact support in \( I \). For any integer \( k \geq 1 \), the spaces
$H^k(I)$ and $C^k(I)$ are the completions of $E(I)$ under the norms

\begin{equation}
J \|u\|^2_k = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \left\| \frac{d^i u}{dx^i} \right\|_0^2
\end{equation}

and

\begin{equation}
J \|u\|_{c,k} = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \left\| \frac{d^i u}{dx^i} \right\|_c^2,
\end{equation}

respectively. Analogously, the completions of $V(I)$ under these two norms are the spaces $H^k_0(I)$ and $C^k_0(I)$.

Let $a, b \in C^0(I)$ be given such that $a(x) > a > 0$, $b(x) > 0$, $\forall x \in I$. Then $E(I)$ and $E_0(I)$ shall be the spaces $H^1(I)$ and $H^1_0(I)$, respectively, with their norm replaced by

\begin{equation}
J \|u\|^2_E = \left[ \int_I (a u'^2 + b u^2) \, dx \right], \quad (u' = \frac{du}{dx}).
\end{equation}

If $b \equiv 0$ on $I$, then (2.3) is only a seminorm on $E(I)$. On the other hand, on $E_0(I)$, (2.3) is always a norm which, moreover, is equivalent to $J \|\cdot\|_1$. Obviously, $E_0(I)$ is a Hilbert space and for $b \not\equiv 0$ the same is true for $E(I)$. We denote the inner product in either space by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_E$. For $b \equiv 0$ on $I$, $E(I)$ is a Hilbert space modulo the constant functions.

On $\overline{I} = [x_0, \beta]$ we consider partitions

\begin{equation}
\Delta(I): \alpha = x_0^\Delta < x_1^\Delta < \cdots < x_{m-1}^\Delta < x_m^\Delta = \beta, \quad m = m(\Delta) \geq 1,
\end{equation}

and introduce the notations

\begin{equation}
\begin{align*}
I_j(\Delta) &= I(x_{j-1}^\Delta, x_j^\Delta), \\
h_j(\Delta) &= x_j^\Delta - x_{j-1}^\Delta,
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\overline{h}(\Delta) = \max_{j=1, \ldots, m} h_j(\Delta), \quad \underline{h}(\Delta) = \min_{j=1, \ldots, m} h_j(\Delta).
\end{equation}

All partitions $\Delta$ which for fixed $\lambda > 0$, $\kappa \geq 1$ satisfy

\begin{equation}
\overline{h}(\Delta) \geq \lambda \overline{h}^{\kappa}(\Delta)
\end{equation}

are said to be $(\lambda, \kappa)$-regular.

For given $\Delta = \Delta(I)$, we denote by $S(I, \Delta) \subset H^1(I)$ and $S_0(I, \Delta) \subset H^1_0(I)$ the subspaces of all functions for which the restriction to any $I_j(\Delta)$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$, is linear. Analogously, $P^k(I, \Delta) \subset H^1(I)$ and $P^k_0(I, \Delta) \subset H^1_0(I)$, $k \geq 0$, shall consist of the functions for which the restrictions to $I_j(\Delta)$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$, belong to $C^k(I_j)$.

For later use we note the following well-known lemma (see, e.g., [24]):

**Lemma 2.1.** For given $I = [x_0, \beta]$, $\alpha < \beta$, and $\Delta = \Delta(I)$ there exists a positive constant $K$ such that

\begin{equation}
\inf_{w \in S_0^0(I, \Delta)} J \|u - w\|_E \leq K \overline{h}(\Delta) J \|u\|_2 \quad \forall u \in H^2(I) \cap H^1_0(I).
\end{equation}
3. A Boundary Value Problem.

3.1. Basic Formulation. As mentioned in the introduction, we restrict the discussion to a simple model problem. For ease of notation, the unit interval \( I = I(0, 1) \) is used from now on throughout the remainder of the paper. On \( I \) we consider the equation

\[
L[u] \equiv - \frac{d}{dx} a(x) \frac{du}{dx} + b(x)u = f(x), \quad x \in I(0, 1),
\]

together with the boundary conditions

\[
u(0) = u(1) = 0.
\]

We assume that \( a \in C^2(I) \), \( b, f \in C^1(I) \), and, as before, that \( a(x) \geq a > 0, b(x) \geq 0 \), \( \forall x \in I \).

The weak solution of the problem is the unique \( u_0 \in E_0(I) \) with

\[
f(u_0, v)_E = F_f(v) \quad \forall v \in E_0(I),
\]

where

\[
F_f(v) = \int_I f v \, dx.
\]

Note that under our differentiability assumptions about \( a, b, f \) the solution \( u_0 \) of (3.3) belongs to \( C^3(I) \) and also satisfies (3.1.2).

With the partition \( \Delta \) and the space \( S_0(I, \Delta) \subset H^1_0(I) \) specified as in Section 2, we consider the finite-element solution \( u_\Delta \in S_0(I, \Delta) \) defined by

\[
f(u_\Delta, v)_E = F_f(v) \quad \forall v \in S_0(I, \Delta).
\]

Since \( u_0 \in H^2(I) \cap H^1_0(I) \), it then follows from Lemma 2.1 that

\[
f\|u_\Delta - u_0\|_E \leq K \bar{h}(\Delta)\|u_0\|_2.
\]

3.2. A Posteriori Error Analysis. We consider the residual \( r = L(u_\Delta) - f \) on the intervals \( I_j \), that is,

\[
r_j(x) = (L(u_\Delta) - f)(x) \quad \forall x \in I_j, j = 1, \ldots, m.
\]

Let \( z_j \in E_0(I_j) \) be the solutions of

\[
f_j(z_j, v)_E = F_{r_j}(v) \quad \forall v \in E_0(I_j), j = 1, \ldots, m,
\]

and set

\[
Z(\Delta)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^m I_j \|z_j\|_E^2.
\]

The following result was proved in [3]:

**Theorem 3.1.** The error \( e = u_\Delta - u_0 \) satisfies

\[
f\|e\|_E^2 = Z(\Delta)^2(1 + O(\bar{h}(\Delta))) \quad \text{as } \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0,
\]

where the constant in the bound of the \( O \)-term depends on \( a \) and \( b \) but not on \( f \) and \( \Delta \).
We analyze the quantity \( Z(\Delta) \) of (3.9) in some more detail. Because \( u_\Delta \) is linear on any \( I_j \), we may write

\[
(3.11) \quad r_j = L(u_\Delta) - f = -a'u_\Delta + bu_\Delta - f = \rho_j + \tau_j,
\]

where

\[
(3.12) \quad \rho_j(x) = a(x)u_\Delta'', \quad \tau_j(x) = -a'(x)e'(x) + b(x)e(x) \quad \forall x \in I_j.
\]

Let \( \varphi_j, \psi_j \in E_0(I_j) \) be such that

\[
(3.13) \quad
\begin{align*}
(a) & \quad I_j(\varphi_j, v)_E = F_{\rho_j}(v) \quad \forall v \in E_0(I_j), \\
(b) & \quad I_j(\psi_j, v)_E = F_{\tau_j}(v) \quad \forall v \in E_0(I_j)
\end{align*}
\]

and, therefore, \( z_j = \varphi_j + \psi_j \).

The smallest eigenvalue of the differential operator \( L \) on \( I_j \) with zero boundary conditions is bounded below by the smallest eigenvalue \( \lambda \pi^2/h^2 \) of the operator \(-a'd^2/dx^2\) on \( I_j \). Hence, it follows from (3.13(b)) that \( I_j \| \psi_j \|_0 \leq Ch_j^2 I_j \| \tau_j \|_0 \); and therefore,

\[
(3.14) \quad I_j \| \psi_j \|_E^2 = F_{\tau_j}(\psi_j) \leq I_j \| \tau_j \|_0 \cdot I_j \| \psi_j \|_0 \leq Ch_j^2 I_j \| \tau_j \|_0^2.
\]

Here as in subsequent estimates \( C \) denotes a generic constant which has different values in each instance but is independent of the other essential variables in the same expression. Now note that

\[
(3.15) \quad I_j \| \tau_j \|_0^2 = \int_{I_j} (-a'd'e' + be^2) \, dx \leq C \int_{I_j} [(a'e')^2 + (be)^2] \, dx \leq C I_j \| e \|_E^2,
\]

which together with (3.14) gives

\[
(3.16) \quad I_j \| \psi_j \|_E \leq Ch_j I_j \| e \|_E.
\]

We introduce the quantities

\[
R(\Delta) = \frac{1}{I_j \| e \|_E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{m} I_j \| \psi_j \|_E^2 \right]^{1/2}
\]

and

\[
(3.17) \quad Q(\Delta)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{m} I_j \| \varphi_j \|_E^2.
\]

From Theorem 3.1 we obtain—with some \(|\alpha| \leq 1−\)

\[
I_j \| e \|_E^2 = Z^2(\Delta)(1 + O(\bar{h})) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} I_j \| \varphi_j + \psi_j \|_E(1 + O(\bar{h}))
\]

\[
(3.18) \quad = [Q(\Delta)^2 + 2\alpha_2Q(\Delta) I_j \| e \|_E R(\Delta) + I_j \| e \|_E^2 R(\Delta)^2] (1 + O(\bar{h}))
\]

\[
= (Q(\Delta) + \alpha_1 I_j \| e \|_E R(\Delta))^2(1 + O(\bar{h})) + (1 - \alpha_2) I_j \| e \|_E^2 R(\Delta)^2(1 + O(\bar{h})).
\]

But by (3.16) we have \( R(\Delta) = O(\bar{h}) \); and thus

\[
(3.19) \quad I_j \| e \|_E^2 = (Q(\Delta) + \alpha_1 I_j \| e \|_E R(\Delta))^2(1 + O(\bar{h})),
\]
which in turn implies that

\[(3.20) \quad \|e\|_E = Q(\Delta)(1 + O(\bar{h})).\]

Therefore, in view of (3.10), we have proved the following result:

**Theorem 3.2.** Let \(Z(\Delta)\) and \(Q(\Delta)\) be defined by (3.9) and (3.19), respectively. Then

\[(3.21) \quad Q(\Delta)^2 = Z(\Delta)^2(1 + O(\bar{h})) \quad \text{as} \quad \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0,
\]

where the constant in the bound of the \(O\)-term depends on \(a\) and \(b\) but not on \(f\) and \(\Delta\).

While approximations of \(Z(\Delta)\) can be computed and \(Q(\Delta)\) is not readily accessible, the quantity \(Q\) is better suited than \(Z\) for our theoretical studies of optimal partitions \(\Delta\).

4. **Optimal Partitions—Part I.** In this section we restrict ourselves to the case when \(u_0'' \neq 0\) on \(I\). This condition will be removed in Section 5.

4.1. **Representations of \(Q(\Delta)\).** Recall that under our assumptions about \(a, b, f\) we have \(u_0 \in C^3(I)\) and, hence, \(\rho = au''_0 \in C^1(I)\).

**Lemma 4.1.** Suppose that \(u''(x) \neq 0\) for all \(x \in I\) and set \(x_{j-1/2} = (x_j + x_{j-1})/2\), \(a_{j-1/2} = a(x_{j-1/2})\), \(\bar{\rho}_j = \rho(\xi_j)\), where \(|\rho(\xi_j)| = \max \{|\rho(x)|, x \in \bar{I}_j\}\). Then

\[(4.1) \quad Q(\Delta)^2 = \frac{1}{12} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\bar{\rho}_j^2}{a_{j-1/2}} \right] \frac{h_j^3}{\bar{h}(\Delta)} (1 + O(\bar{h}(\Delta))) \quad \text{as} \quad \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0,
\]

where the constant in the bound of the \(O\)-term depends on \(a, b\) and \(\|f\|_{C,1}\).

**Proof.** Set

\[(4.2) \quad \sigma_j(x) = \rho(x) - \bar{\rho}_j \quad \forall x \in I_j, j = 1, \ldots, m,
\]

and define \(\varphi_{1,j}, \varphi_{2,j} \in E_0(I_j)\) as the solutions of

\[I_j(\varphi_{1,j}, \varphi) = F_{\bar{\rho}_j}(\varphi) \quad \forall \varphi \in E_0(I_j)\]

\[I_j(\varphi_{2,j}, \varphi) = F_{\sigma_j}(\varphi) \quad \forall \varphi \in E_0(I_j)\]

respectively. Then we have \(\varphi_j = \varphi_{1,j} + \varphi_{2,j}\).

By assumption there exists a constant \(\rho_0 > 0\) such that \(|\rho(x)| \geq \rho_0\) for all \(x \in I\) and, hence, that for all sufficiently small \(\bar{h}\)

\[(4.4) \quad |\sigma_j(x)| \leq C \frac{|\bar{\rho}_j|}{\rho_0} h_j \quad \forall x \in I_j.
\]

Note also that for all \(x \in I_j\)

\[(4.5) \quad a_j = \min \{a(x); x \in I_j\} = a_{j-1/2}(1 + O(h_j)) \quad \text{as} \quad h_j \to 0.
\]

Since for any \(\varphi \in E_0(I_j)\)

\[I_j \|\varphi\|_E^2 = \left[ \int_{I_j} a(x)\varphi(x)^2 \, dx \right] (1 + O(h_j^2)) \quad \text{as} \quad h_j \to 0,
\]
it follows from (4.3) and (4.5) that
\[
I_j \left\| \varphi_{1,j} \right\|_E^2 = \left[ \sup_{u \in E_0(I_j)} \frac{1}{I_j \left\| u \right\|_E} \left\| F_{\rho_j} (u) \right\| \right]^2
\]
\[
= \rho_j^2 \left[ \sup_{u \in E_0(I_j)} \left\{ \int_{I_j} u \, dx / \int_{I_j} (u')^2 \, dx \right\} \right] (1 + O(h_j))
\]
\[
= \rho_j^2 \left[ \int_{I_j} (\tilde{v}')^2 \, dx \right] (1 + O(h_j)),
\]
where \( \tilde{v} \in E_0(I_j) \) is the solution of \(-\tilde{v}'' = 1, \tilde{v}(x_{j-1}) = \tilde{v}(x_j) = 0\). This implies that
\[
(4.6) \quad I_j \left\| \varphi_{1,j} \right\|_E^2 = \frac{1}{12} \frac{\rho_j^2}{a_j^{-1/2}} h_j^3 (1 + O(h_j)) \quad \text{as } h_j \to 0, \ j = 1, \ldots, m.
\]

In order to estimate \( \varphi_{2,j} \), we proceed as in the proof of (3.14). The smallest
eigenvalue of the operator \( L \) on \( I_j \) is bounded below by \( a_j \pi^2 / h_j^2 \). Hence, by (4.3) it follows that
\[
(4.7) \quad I_j \left\| \varphi_{2,j} \right\|_E^2 = \frac{\rho_j^2}{a_j^{-1}} h_j^5 (1 + O(h_j)) \quad \text{as } h_j \to 0, \ j = 1, \ldots, m.
\]

which together with (4.4) implies that
\[
(4.8) \quad I_j \left\| \varphi_{2,j} \right\|_E^2 \leq \frac{C}{\rho_0^2 \pi^2 a_j^{-1/2}} h_j^5 (1 + O(h_j)) \quad \text{as } h_j \to 0, \ j = 1, \ldots, m.
\]

Combining this with (4.6), we obtain—with some \( |\alpha| \leq 1 \)—
\[
(4.9) \quad I_j \left\| \varphi_j \right\|_E^2 = I_j \left\| \varphi_{1,j} \right\|_E^2 + 2\alpha I_j \left\| \varphi_{1,j} \right\|_E I_j \left\| \varphi_{2,j} \right\|_E + I_j \left\| \varphi_{2,j} \right\|_E^2
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{12} \frac{\rho_j^2}{a_j^{-1/2}} h_j^5 (1 + O(h_j)) \quad \text{as } h_j \to 0, \ j = 1, \ldots, m.
\]

By definition (3.17) of \( Q(\Delta) \) this proves the lemma.

A partition \( \Delta \) shall be a \((\xi, m)\)-partition if \( \Delta \) is a refinement of a fixed partition \( \Delta^* \) and
\[
(4.10) \quad \xi(x_j) = j/m, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, m,
\]
for some function \( \xi \), independent of \( m \), with
\[
(4.11) \quad \xi \in P^2(I, \Delta^*), \xi'(x) \geq \delta > 0 \ \forall x \in I_j^*, \ j = 1, \ldots, m, \ \xi(0) = 0, \ \xi(1) = 1.
\]

For example, for given \( \Delta^* \), a class of \((\xi, m)\)-partitions is defined by the piecewise
linear function \( \xi \in S(I, \Delta^*) \)
\[
(4.12) \quad \xi(x) = \frac{j - 1}{m^*} + \frac{1}{m^* h_j^*} (x - x_{j-1}) \quad \forall x \in I_j^*, \ j = 1, \ldots, m^*.
\]
For a \((\xi, m)\)-partition we have

\[(4.13) \quad \frac{1}{m} = \int_{I_j} \xi'(t) \, dt = h_j \xi'(x_j-1/2)(1 + O(h_j)) \quad \text{as } h_j \to 0,\]

where the constant in the bound of the \(O\)-term depends on \(\xi\) but not on \(m\).

In terms of \((\xi, m)\)-partitions our Lemma 4.1 can be rewritten as follows:

**Theorem 4.2.** For the \((\xi, m)\)-partition \(\Delta\) we have

\[(4.14) \quad Q(\Delta)^2 = \frac{1}{12m^2} \left[ \int_0^1 \left( \frac{\rho(x)}{\xi'(x)} \right)^2 \frac{1}{a(x)} \, dx \right] (1 + O(\bar{h}(\Delta))) \quad \text{as } \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0,\]

where the constant in the bound of the \(O\)-term depends on \(a, b, f\) and \(\xi\) but not on \(m\).

Because \(\rho \in C^1(I)\) and \(1/\xi' \in P^1(I, \Delta)\), the proof follows directly from the fact that the expression for \(Q(\Delta)^2\) in Lemma 4.1 is a Riemann sum of \((4.14)\).

By combining Theorems 3.1, 3.2, and 4.2 we obtain the following result:

**Theorem 4.3.** For the \((\xi, m)\)-partition \(\Delta\) the error satisfies

\[(4.15) \quad \|\xi\|_E^2 = \frac{1}{12m^2} \left[ \int_0^1 \left( \frac{\rho(x)}{\xi'(x)} \right)^2 \frac{1}{a(x)} \, dx \right] (1 + O(\bar{h}(\Delta))) \quad \text{as } \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0,\]

where the constant in the bound of the \(O\)-term depends on \(a, b, f\) and \(\xi\) but not on \(m\).

4.2. **Optimal Partitions.** The error formula of Theorem 4.3 suggests that we consider minimizing the variational integral

\[(4.16a) \quad J(\xi) = \int_0^1 \left( \frac{\rho(x)}{\xi'(x)} \right)^2 \frac{1}{a(x)} \, dx\]

subject to the boundary conditions

\[(1.16b) \quad \xi(0) = 0, \quad \xi(1) = 1.\]

The Euler equation is directly solvable and the functions

\[(4.17) \quad \xi(x, \gamma) = \gamma \int_0^x \left[ \frac{\rho(t)^2}{a(t)} \right]^{1/3} \, dt, \quad x \in I,\]

form a field of extremals in \(0 < x, \gamma < 1\). A standard application of the \(E\)-function test (see, e.g., [1]) then proves the following result:

**Theorem 4.4.** For all functions \((4.10)\) we have

\[(4.18) \quad J(\xi) \geq J(\xi_0) = 1/\gamma_0^3,\]

where \(\xi_0 = \xi(\cdot, \gamma_0)\) with

\[(4.19) \quad \gamma_0 = \left[ \int_0^1 \left[ \frac{\rho(t)^2}{a(t)} \right]^{1/3} \, dt \right]^{-1}.\]

Moreover, equality holds in \((4.18)\) exactly when \(\xi = \xi_0\).

Note that the function \(\xi_0\) belongs to the class of functions \((4.11)\); in fact, we have \(\xi_0 \in C^2(I)\) and \(\xi_0'(x) \geq 0 > 0\) for \(x \in I_j\) because \(|\rho(x)| \geq \rho_0\) in that interval.

For the partition \(\Delta_0\) given by \(\xi_0\) we obtain from Theorems 4.3 and 4.4 the following error formula:
Theorem 4.5. The \((\xi_0, m)\)-partition \(\Delta_0\) is asymptotically optimal with

\begin{equation}
I_0 \| e \|^2_E = \frac{1}{12m^2\gamma_0^3} (1 + O(\Delta_0)) \quad \text{as} \quad \Delta_0 \rightarrow 0,
\end{equation}

where the constant in the bound of the \(O\)-term depends on \(\xi_0\) but not on \(m\).

By "asymptotic optimality" we mean here that for any other \((\xi, m)\)-partition with sufficiently small \(\Delta\) the error is larger than (4.20).

For any \((\xi, m)\)-partition \(\Delta\) set

\begin{equation}
2m270'
\end{equation}

These \(\vartheta_j\) are related to the functions \(\varphi_j\) of (3.13) by

\begin{equation}
I_j \| \varphi_j \|^2_E = \vartheta_j(\xi, m)^2(1 + O(h_j)) \quad \text{as} \quad h_j \rightarrow 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m.
\end{equation}

This follows directly from the fact that the expression (4.9) for the norms of \(\varphi_j\) is—up to a factor \(1 + O(h_j)\)—a Riemann sum of (4.22).

For the optimal partition \(\Delta_0\) we have

\begin{equation}
\vartheta_j(\xi_0, m)^2 = \frac{1}{12m^2\gamma_0^3} \int_{I_j} \left( \frac{\rho(t)^2}{a(t)} \right)^{1/3} dt
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= \frac{1}{12m^2\gamma_0^3} \int_{I_j} \frac{\xi_j(t)}{a(t)} dt = \frac{1}{12m^2\gamma_0^3}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m.
\end{equation}

In other words, for \(\xi_0\) all \(\vartheta_j\) are exactly equal and—by (4.22)—all \(I_j \| \varphi_j \|^2_E\) are asymptotically equal.

Since the \(\vartheta_j\) are not readily computable, we turn now to the quantities

\begin{equation}
\mu_j(\xi, m) = I_j \| \varphi_j \|^2_E, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m,
\end{equation}

which can be calculated. For the optimal partition \(\Delta_0\) we obtain from (3.16), (4.13) and Theorem 4.5 that

\begin{equation}
I_j \| \psi_j \|^2_E = \frac{1}{12m^3\gamma_0^3} (1 + O(\Delta_0))(O(\Delta_0)) \quad \text{as} \quad \Delta_0 \rightarrow 0,
\end{equation}

where the constant in the \(O\)-term depends on \(a, b, f\) and \(\xi_0\) but not on \(m\). Thus, it follows from (4.22), (4.23) and (4.25) that

\begin{align*}
\mu_j(\xi_0, m)^2 &= I_j \| \varphi_j + \psi_j \|^2_E = \frac{1}{12m^3\gamma_0^3} (1 + O(h)) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{12m^3/2}\gamma_0^{3/2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{12m^3/2}\gamma_0^{3/2}} (1 + O(h))O(h^{1/2}) \\
&= \frac{1}{12m^3\gamma_0^3} (1 + O(h))O(h) = \frac{1}{12m^3\gamma_0^3} (1 + O(h^{1/2})).
\end{align*}

We summarize this in the following form:
For the optimal partition \( \Delta_0 \) we have

\[
\mu_j(\xi_0, m)^2 = \frac{1}{12m^3\gamma_0^3} (1 + O(\bar{h}(\Delta_0)^{1/2})) \quad \text{as} \quad \bar{h}(\Delta_0) \to 0,
\]

where the constant in the bound of the \( O \)-term depends on \( \xi_0 \) but not on \( m \).

Thus, we see that also the quantities \( \mu_j(\xi_0, m) \) are asymptotically equal.

From (4.13) we find for the steps \( h_j \) of the optimal partition \( \Delta_0 \) that

\[
h_j = \frac{1}{\gamma_0 m} \left[ \frac{a_j - 1}{\rho_j} \right]^{1/3} \left( 1 + O\left( \frac{1}{m} \right) \right) \quad \text{as} \quad m \to \infty
\]

and, hence, that \( \bar{h}(\Delta_0)/\bar{h}(\Delta_0) \geq \lambda_0 > 0 \) with a constant \( \lambda_0 \) that does not depend on \( m \) but only on the problem and \( \rho_0 \). In other words, the optimal partition is \((\lambda_0, 1)\)-regular.

Conversely, it turns out that asymptotically the optimal partition \( \Delta_0 \) is characterized by the asymptotic equality of the \( \mu_j \). This is the content of the following theorem:

**Theorem 4.7.** For the partition \( \Delta \) suppose that

\[
j \| z_j(\Delta) \|_E = \mu(1 + O(\bar{h}^{1/2})) \quad \text{as} \quad \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m,
\]

where \( \mu \) does not depend on \( j \). Then

\[
j \| e(\Delta) \|_E = j \| e(\Delta_0) \|_E (1 + O(\bar{h}^{1/2})) \quad \text{as} \quad \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m,
\]

and

\[
|x_j^\Delta - x_j^{\Delta_0}| = O(\bar{h}^{1/2}) \quad \text{as} \quad \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m.
\]

**Proof.** We show first that \( \Delta \) is \((\lambda, 1)\)-regular. For ease of notation let

\[
\eta_j = \left[ \frac{1}{12 \rho_j a_j^{-1/2}} \right]^{1/2}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m.
\]

For any \( j = 1, \ldots, m \), we have by (4.9), with some \(|\alpha| < 1\),

\[
I_j \| z_j \|_E^2 = I_j \| \psi \|_E^2 + I_j \| \phi \|_E^2
\]

\[
= I_j \| z_j \|_E^2 = \eta_j^2 h_j^3 (1 + O(\bar{h})) + 2\alpha \eta_j^2 h_j^{3/2} I_j \| \psi \|_E (1 + O(\bar{h})) + I_j \| \psi \|_E^2.
\]

Let now \( h_j = \bar{h} \). Then (3.16) and (3.6) show that

\[
I_j \| \psi \|_E \leq C \bar{h} \quad I_j \| e \|_E \leq C \bar{h}^2
\]

or

\[
I_j \| \psi \|_E = \bar{h}^{3/2} O(\bar{h}^{1/2}) \quad \text{as} \quad \bar{h} \to 0.
\]

Hence, we obtain from (4.31) and (4.28) that

\[
\mu^2 (1 + O(\bar{h}^{1/2})) = \eta_j^2 \bar{h}^3 (1 + O(\bar{h})) + \bar{h}^3 O(\bar{h}^{1/2}) + \bar{h}^3 O(\bar{h})
\]

or

\[
\mu^2 = \eta_j^2 \bar{h}^3 (1 + O(\bar{h}^{1/2})) \quad \text{as} \quad \bar{h} \to 0.
\]
Now let $h_{i_1} = \frac{h}{2}$. Then we have instead of (4.32)

$$I_{i_1} \| \psi_{i_1} \|_E = h \frac{h^{1/2}O(h^{1/2})}{2h^{1/2}};$$

and hence, by (4.31), (4.28), and (4.33)

$$\eta^2_{i_1} \frac{h^3}{3}(1 + O(h^{1/2})) = \eta^2_{i_1} h^3(1 + O(\bar{h})) + 2\alpha \eta^2_{i_1} h^{5/2} \bar{h}^{1/2} O(h^{1/2})$$

$$+ h^2 \bar{h} O(\bar{h}).$$

In other words, $z^2 = \frac{h}{\bar{h}}$ satisfies the polynomial equation

$$\eta^2_{i_0} (1 + O(h^{1/2}))z^6 + O(h^4)z^4 + O(h^{1/2})z - \eta^2_{i_1} (1 + O(\bar{h})) = 0.$$

By comparing (4.35) with the equation

$$\eta^2_{i_0} (1 + O(h^{1/2}))z^6 - \eta^2_{i_1} (1 + O(\bar{h})) = 0,$$

Rouche's theorem shows that for sufficiently small $\bar{h}$ we have

$$|z| \leq 2(\eta_{i_1}/\eta_{i_0})^{1/3}.$$

This shows that $\Delta$ is indeed $(\lambda, 1)$-regular.

Our assumption about $a$ and $\rho$ ensure that for any fixed $j, 1 \leq j \leq m$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \eta^2_i h_i \leq C \eta^2_j.$$

We represent $\Delta$ by the piecewise linear function $\xi$ of (4.12). Then from Theorems 3.1, 3.2, and Lemma 4.1 it follows that

$$I_j \| e \|^2_E = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{m} \eta^2_i h_i^3 \right] (1 + O(\bar{h})) \leq C \eta^2_j h^2,$$

and hence, by (3.16) that

$$I_j \| \psi_j \|^2_E \leq Ch^2_j I_j \| e \|^2_E \leq C \eta^2_j h_j^2 \bar{h}^2 \leq C \eta^2_j h^3 \bar{h},$$

where in the last inequality the regularity of $\Delta$ was used. Therefore, we have $I_j \| \psi_j \|_E = \eta_j h_j^{1/2} O(h^{1/2})$, whence by (4.31)

$$I_j \| z_j \|^2_E = \eta^2_j h_j^3 \left(1 + O(\bar{h}) + O(h^{1/2}) + O(\bar{h}) + O(h^{1/2})\right) = \eta^2_j h_j^3 (1 + O(\bar{h})),$$

that is, by (4.28)

$$\mu^2 = \eta^2_j h_j^3 (1 + O(\bar{h}^{1/2})).$$

Since

$$[12 \eta_j^2]^{1/3} h_j = \left[ \frac{\bar{h}^2}{a_{j-1/2}} \right]^{1/3} h_j = \left[ \int_{I_j} \left( \rho(t)^2 \frac{1}{a(t)} \right)^{1/3} \ dt \right] (1 + O(\bar{h}))$$

as $\bar{h} \to 0$,

(4.40) implies that

$$\int_{I_j} \left( \rho(t)^2 \frac{1}{a(t)} \right)^{1/3} \ dt = (12 \mu^2)^{1/3} (1 + O(\bar{h}^{1/2})).$$
which by (4.19) shows that

\[ \frac{1}{\gamma_0} = \int_0^1 \left[ \frac{\rho(t)^2}{a(t)} \right]^{1/3} \, dt = m(12\mu^2)^{1/3}(1 + O(\bar{h}^{1/2})). \]

By (4.38) and (4.40) we obtain now \( \int \|e\|_E^2 = m\mu^2(1 + O(\bar{h}^{1/2})) \), which by (4.42) and Theorem 4.5 gives (4.29). Finally, from (4.41) it follows by summation over the first \( j \) intervals that

\[ \int_{x_j^0}^{x_j} \left[ \frac{\rho(t)^2}{a(t)} \right]^{1/3} \, dt = \frac{j}{m\gamma_0} (1 + O(\bar{h}^{1/2})). \]

On the other hand, we obtain from (4.23)

\[ \int_{x_j^0}^{x_j} \left[ \frac{\rho(t)^2}{a(t)} \right]^{1/3} \, dt = \frac{j}{m\gamma_0} (1 + O(\bar{h}^{1/2})). \]

Thus, we have

\[ \left| \int_{x_j^0}^{x_j} \left[ \frac{\rho(t)^2}{a(t)} \right]^{1/3} \, dt \right| = O(\bar{h}^{1/2}), \]

which implies (4.30).

4.3. **Computational Aspects.** Suppose that the optimal partition function \( \xi_0 \) is changed to some partition function \( \xi = \xi_0 + \epsilon \) satisfying (4.11). By (4.13) the derivatives control the stepsizes; and hence, we assume that \( J\|\epsilon\|_c \) is small. For any given \( m \), let \( J\|e\|_E \) and \( J\|e_0\|_E \) be the errors associated with the \((\xi, m)\)-partition and \((\xi_0, m)\)-partition, respectively. Then by Theorem 4.3 and (4.16a) we have

\[ |J\|e\|_E^2 - J\|e_0\|_E^2| = O(1/m^2)|J(\xi) - J(\xi_0)| \quad \text{as} \quad m \to \infty. \]

Since the variational integral \( J \) is stationary at \( \xi_0 \), we have \( J'(\xi_0) = 0 \); and hence, it follows from the mean-value theorem that \( |J(\xi) - J(\xi_0)| = O(\|\epsilon\|_c^2) \). Therefore, because (4.15) implies that

\[ J\|e\|_E + J\|e_0\|_E = O(1/m) \quad \text{as} \quad m \to \infty, \]

we obtain

\[ |J\|e\|_E - J\|e_0\|_E| = O(1/m)O(J\|\epsilon\|_c^2) \quad \text{as} \quad J\|\epsilon\|_c \to 0, \ m \to \infty. \]

In other words, a change of \( \xi_0 \) by some small \( J\|\epsilon\|_c \) leads to a change of the error proportional to \( J\|\epsilon\|_c^2 \). This shows that the value of the optimal error is rather stable under perturbations of the optimal partition. On the other hand, the optimal partition itself is not too stable and, hence, needs to be computed only with relatively low accuracy.

By Theorem 4.7 the optimal partition is characterized by the asymptotic equality of the quantities \( \mu_j = \mu_j(\xi_0, m) \) of (4.24). Let \( r_j \) again denote the residual \( r = L(u_{\Delta}) - f \) on the subinterval \( I_j \) and set

\[ v_j^2 = \int_{I_j} r_j(x)^2 \, dx, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m. \]
We call the quantities
\[ e_j^2 = \frac{1}{12} \frac{\nu_j^2 h_j^2}{a_{j-1/2}}, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, m, \]
the error indicators for the intervals \( I_1, \ldots, I_m \), and set
\[ e(\Delta) = \left( \sum_{j=1}^{m} e_j(\Delta)^2 \right)^{1/2}. \]
All these quantities are directly computable once the finite-element solution is known.

The next theorem shows that \( e(\Delta) \) is asymptotically equal to the error \( \| e \|_E \).

**Theorem 4.8.** (a) For any partition \( \Delta \) we have
\[ \| e \|_E^2 = e(\Delta)^2 (1 + O(\bar{h})) \quad \text{as} \quad \bar{h}(\Delta) \rightarrow 0. \]

(b) If \( \Delta \) is \((\lambda, \kappa)\)-regular, \( 1 \leq \kappa < 2 \), then
\[ \nu_j^2 = \bar{\nu}_j^2 h_j (1 + O(\bar{h}^\epsilon)) \quad \text{as} \quad \bar{h}(\Delta) \rightarrow 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m, \]
where \( \epsilon = 1 - \pi/2 \).

**Proof.** (a) The definition of \( \bar{\nu}_j \) given in Lemma 4.1 provides that
\[ |\bar{\nu}_j| = \max_{x \in I_j} |\nu_j(x)| \geq \rho_0 > 0, \]
and by (4.4), and (3.15) we have
\[ |\sigma_j(x)| \leq C \frac{1}{\rho_0} \bar{\nu}_j h_j, \quad \| I_j \| \| \tau_j \|_0 \leq C I_j \| e \|_E. \]
Hence, by (3.11) and (4.2) we obtain with some \( |\alpha_i| \leq 1, i = 1, 2, 3 \), that
\[ \nu_j^2 = \int_{I_j} (\bar{\nu}_j + \sigma_j(x) + \tau_j(x))^2 \, dx \]
\[ = \bar{\nu}_j^2 h_j + \frac{1}{\rho_0^2} \bar{\nu}_j^2 h_j^2 O(\bar{h}) + \| I_j \| \| \tau_j \|_0^2 \]
\[ + 2 \alpha_1 \frac{1}{\rho_0} \bar{\nu}_j^2 h_j O(\bar{h}) + 2 \alpha_2 \bar{\nu}_j h_j^{1/2} \| I_j \| \| \tau_j \|_0 + 2 \alpha_3 \frac{1}{\rho_0} \bar{\nu}_j h_j^{3/2} \| I_j \| \| \tau_j \|_0. \]

With
\[ S(\Delta)^2 = \frac{1}{12} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \bar{\nu}_j^2 h_j^3 \frac{1}{a_{j-1/2}}, \]
\[ T(\Delta)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{m} I_j \| \tau_j \|_0^2 \]
it then follows that
\[ e(\Delta)^2 = S(\Delta)^2 + \frac{1}{\rho_0^2} S(\Delta)^2 O(\bar{h}^2) + T(\Delta)^2 O(\bar{h}^2) \]
\[ + 2 \frac{\alpha_1}{\rho_0} S(\Delta)^2 O(\bar{h}) + 2 \alpha_2 S(\Delta) T(\Delta) O(\bar{h}) + 2 \alpha_3 S(\Delta) T(\Delta) O(\bar{h}^2). \]
This proves (4.46a) since by Lemma 4.1 and Theorems 3.1 and 3.2
\[ S(\Delta)^2 = \| e \|_E^2 (1 + O(\bar{h})), \quad T(\Delta)^2 \leq C \sum_{j=1}^{m} I_j \| e \|_E^2 = C \| e \|_E^2. \]
(b) For \((\lambda, \kappa)\)-regular \(\Delta\) with \(1 \leq \kappa < 2\) we have by (3.6)
\[ I_j \| r_j \|_0 \leq C I_j \| e \|_E \leq C \bar{h} \leq C h_j^{1/2} \bar{h}^\kappa. \]
Hence, (4.47) implies that
\[ \nu_j^2 = \frac{1}{\rho_0^2} h_j \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{\rho_0^2} O(\bar{h}) + \frac{1}{\rho_0^2} O(\bar{h}^2) + \frac{1}{\rho_0^2} O(\bar{h}^3) \right], \]
which is (4.46b).

It may be noted that in [3] we proved an upper bound for \(\| e \|_E\) of the form (4.46a) with \(1/12\) in (4.44) replaced by the larger factor \(1/\pi^2\).

Theorem 4.8 states that
\[ \theta(\Delta) = \frac{\| e \|_E}{\epsilon(\Delta)} = 1 + O(\bar{h}(\Delta)) \quad \text{as } \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0. \]
In other words, the effectivity quotient \(\theta\) tends to one with \(\bar{h} \to 0\). In contrast, the corresponding estimates in [3] only provided for \(\theta^2 \leq 12/\pi^2\).

We expect the error indicators to be asymptotically equal to the quantities \(\mu_j\) of (4.24). Theorem 4.9 below shows that this is indeed correct for regular partitions. Hence, our aim is to construct such partitions for which all \(e_j\) are asymptotically equal. It turns out that—as before—these partitions are automatically regular.

**Theorem 4.9.** (a) Let \(\Delta\) be a \((\lambda, \kappa)\)-regular partition with \(1 < \kappa < 2\). Then
\[ I_j \| z_j \|_E^2 = e_j^2 (1 + O(\bar{h}^\kappa)) \quad \text{as } \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0, \]
with \(e = 1 - \kappa/2\).
(b) All partitions \(\Delta\) for which
\[ \epsilon_j = \mu(1 + o(1)) \quad \text{as } \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m, \]
with \(\mu\) independent of \(j\), are \((\lambda, 1)\)-regular.

**Proof.** (a) As in the case of (4.39), it follows from (3.16) and the assumed regularity of \(\Delta\) that \(I_j \| \psi_j \|_E^2 \leq C \eta_j^2 \bar{h}^2 \leq C \eta_j^2 h_j^{3/2} \bar{h}^2\) and, thus, \(I_j \| \psi_j \|_E = \eta_j h_j^{3/2} O(\bar{h}^\kappa)\) as \(\bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0\). Now (4.31) shows that
\[ I_j \| z_j \|_E^2 = \eta_j^2 h_j^3 (1 + O(\bar{h})) + 2\alpha \eta_j^2 h_j^3 O(\bar{h}^2) (1 + O(\bar{h})) + \eta_j^2 h_j^3 O(\bar{h}^2) \]
\[ = \eta_j^2 h_j^3 (1 + O(\bar{h}^\kappa)). \]
Since by Theorem 4.8(b)
\[ \eta_j^2 h_j^3 = \frac{1}{12} \frac{\bar{h}^2}{a_{j-1/2}} = e_j^2 (1 + O(\bar{h}^\kappa)), \]
this proves (4.49).
(b) Because, generally, \(I_j \| \tau_j \|_E \leq C I_j \| e \|_E \leq C \bar{h}\), it follows from (4.47) that
\[ \nu_j^2 = \frac{1}{\rho_j^2} h_j (1 + O(\bar{h}^\kappa)) + O(\bar{h}^{3/2}), \]
whence
\[ \mu^2 (1 + o(1)) = e_j^2 = \eta_j^2 h_j^3 + h_j^2 \bar{h} O(\bar{h}^{1/2}). \]
Now suppose that (4.50) holds for $\Delta$ and that $h_{\Delta} = h$; then $\mu^2(1 + o(1)) = h^3(\eta_{j_0}^2 + O(h^{1/2}))$. Similarly, for $h_{\Delta} = h$ we obtain

$$\mu^2(1 + o(1)) = \eta_{j_1}^2 h^3 + h^2 \bar{h} O(h^{1/2})$$

and, hence, $z = \bar{h}/h$ satisfies

$$[\eta_{j_0}^2 + O(h^{1/2})] z^3 = \eta_{j_1}^2 + O(h^{1/2}) z.$$

By comparing this with the polynomial for $z$ in which the last term on the right has been dropped, it follows by Rouche's theorem that $|z| \leq 2(\eta_{j_1} / \eta_{j_0})^{2/3}$ for sufficiently small $\bar{h}$ and, therefore, that $\Delta$ is $(\lambda, 1)$-regular.

Theorems 4.9 and 4.7 confirm that, as expected, our aim should be to construct partitions for which all $e_j$ are asymptotically equal. Then the error of the partition will be close to the asymptotically optimal error (4.20). A natural approach for this construction is the use of an adaptive mesh refinement algorithm of the form discussed, for instance, in [4]. We shall not repeat the details.

5. Optimal Partitions—Part II. In the previous section we assumed that $u''_0(\xi) \neq 0$ for $\xi \in I$. Clearly, this represents a severe restriction. Actually, the results are largely valid also when $u''_0$ has zeros in $I$, but the proofs become more delicate. We illustrate the approach for the frequent case when $u''_0 \in C^{1}(I)$ has finitely many simple roots in $I$, say

$$(5.1) u''_0(\xi_k) = 0, \quad u''_0(\xi_k) \neq 0, \quad k = 1, \ldots, q, \quad 0 \leq \xi_1 < \xi_2 < \cdots < \xi_q \leq 1.$$

LEMMA 5.1. Under the stated assumptions we have for any $(\lambda, \kappa)$-regular partition $\Delta$ with $1 \leq \kappa < 2$,

$$(5.2) Q(\Delta)^2 = \frac{1}{12} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\bar{p}_j^2}{a_{j-1/2}} h_j^3 \right] (1 + O(\bar{h}(\Delta)^{e})) \quad \text{as } \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0,$$

where $e = 1 - \kappa/2$ and the constant in the bound of the $O$-term depends on $a, b$ and $f$.

Proof. Because of (5.1), we may choose $c_2 > c_1 > 0, \delta_0 > 0$, such that

$$(5.3) c_2 |x - \xi_k| \geq |\rho(\xi)| \geq c_1 |x - \xi_k| \quad \forall |x - \xi_k| \leq \delta_0, \quad k = 1, \ldots, q.$$

For any $\delta > 0$ we introduce the sets

$$(5.4) I_\delta = \{x \in \bar{I} | |x - \xi_k| < \delta \text{ for some } \xi_k \}, \quad I^c_\delta = \bar{I} \setminus I_\delta,$$

$$(5.5) J_\delta = \{j = 1, \ldots, m; I_j \cap I_\delta \neq \emptyset \}, \quad J^c_\delta = \{1, \ldots, m\} \setminus J_\delta.$$

We assume that $\delta_0 \leq (8q)^{-1}$ and, hence, that

$$\sum_{j \in J_0^c} h_j \leq 2(\delta_0 + \bar{h})q \leq 4\delta_0 q \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for } \bar{h} \leq \delta_0.$$

Since $\min \{|\rho(x)|, x \in I_{0}^c\} = \rho_0 > 0$, the estimate (4.9) of the proof of Lemma 4.1 holds for the subintervals $I_j$ with $j \in J_0^c$; that is

$$I_j \|\varphi_j\|_E^2 = \eta_j^2 h_j^3 (1 + O(\bar{h})) \quad \text{as } \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0, \quad j \in J_0^c.$$
Hence, for $\overline{h} < \delta_0$ we have

$$Q(\Delta)^2 \geq \left\{ \sum_{j \in J_0^c} \eta_j^2 h_j^2 \right\} (1 + O(\overline{h})) \geq C\rho_0^2 \lambda^2 \overline{h}^{2\kappa} \sum_{j \in J_0^c} h_j \geq C\overline{h}^{2\kappa}.$$  

Now consider the sets (5.4) with $\delta = \overline{h}^{\kappa/2} \leq \delta_0$. Then (5.3) implies that $|\overline{\rho}_j| \geq c_1 \overline{h}^{\kappa/2}$, $j \in J_0^c$, and, hence, (4.8) modifies to

$$I_j \|\varphi_{2,j}\|^2 \leq C \frac{1}{\overline{h}^k} \eta_j^2 h_j^5 (1 + O(\overline{h})) \leq C\eta_j^2 \overline{h}^3 \overline{h}^{2e} \text{ as } \overline{h}(\Delta) \to 0, \ j \in J_0^c.$$  

On the other hand, we have

$$|\sigma_j(x)| \leq 2 \max_{x \in I_j} |\rho(x)| \leq C \overline{h}^{\kappa/2}, \quad j \in J_0,$$  

whence by (4.7) and (5.5)

$$I_j \|\varphi_{2,j}\|^2 \leq C \eta_j^2 \overline{h}^3 (1 + O(\overline{h})) \leq CQ(\Delta)^2 \overline{h}^{2e} h_j \text{ as } \overline{h}(\Delta) \to 0, \ j \in J_0.$$

For ease of notation set

$$S(\Delta)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^m \eta_j^2 h_j^2, \quad R(\Delta)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^m I_j \|\varphi_{2,j}\|^2.$$  

Then it follows from (5.6) and (5.7) that

$$R(\Delta)^2 \leq C \left[ \sum_{j \in J_0^c} \eta_j^2 h_j^2 \right] \overline{h}^{2e} + C Q(\Delta)^2 \overline{h}^{2e} \sum_{j \in J_0} h_j$$

$$\leq C [S(\Delta)^2 + Q(\Delta)^2] \overline{h}^{2e}.$$  

In the case of Lemma 4.1 the assumption $u_0'' = 0$ does not enter into the proof of (4.6); and thus, we have also in the present case

$$I_j \|\varphi_{1,j}\|^2 = \eta_j^2 h_j (1 + O(\overline{h})) \text{ as } \overline{h}(\Delta) \to 0, \ j = 1, \ldots, m,$$  

and, therefore,

$$\sum_{j=1}^m I_j \|\varphi_{1,j}\|^2 = S(\Delta)^2 (1 + O(\overline{h})) \text{ as } \overline{h} \to 0.$$  

Altogether, with some suitable constants $\alpha, \beta \in [-1, 1]$ it follows from (5.8) and (5.10) that

$$Q(\Delta)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^m I_j \|\varphi_{1,j}\|^2 + 2\alpha \left( \sum_{j=1}^m I_j \|\varphi_{1,j}\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \sum_{j=1}^m I_j \|\varphi_{2,j}\|^2 \right)^{1/2} + R(\Delta)^2$$

$$= S(\Delta)^2 (1 + O(\overline{h})) + \alpha CS(\Delta)(1 + O(\overline{h}))(S(\Delta)^2 + Q(\Delta)^2)^{1/2}$$

$$+ \beta C(S(\Delta)^2 + Q(\Delta)^2) \overline{h}^{2e}.$$  

After separating the middle term on the right and squaring, we obtain the equation

$$\alpha^2 C S(\Delta)^2 (S(\Delta)^2 + Q(\Delta)^2) \overline{h}^{2e}$$

$$= Q(\Delta)^4 (1 + O(\overline{h}^{2e})) - 2Q(\Delta)^2 S(\Delta)^2 (1 + O(\overline{h}^{2e})) + S(\Delta)^4 (1 + O(\overline{h}^{2e})), \text{ as } \overline{h}(\Delta) \to 0, \ j \in J_0.$$
which has the solutions
\[ Q(\Delta)^2 = S(\Delta)^2 (1 + O(h^2 e)) \pm [S(\Delta)^4 O(h^2 e)]^{1/2} \quad \text{as } h(\Delta) \to 0, \]
and, hence, proves (5.2).

Now the theory of Section 4 can be carried over to the present case. As before, we consider partition functions \( \xi \), but here we need to weaken (4.11) by requiring instead of \( \xi'(x) \geq \delta > 0 \) on each \( I \) that \( \xi'(x) \) and \( \rho(x)/\xi'(x) \) are Hölderian functions on \( I \). Moreover, we assume that for given \( \xi \) and \( m \to \infty \) the resulting \( (\xi, m) \)-partitions are \((\lambda, \kappa)\)-regular with \( 1 \leq \kappa < 2 \).

Then as in the case of Theorem 4.2 it follows that
\[
(5.11) \quad Q(\Delta)^2 = \frac{1}{12m^2} \left[ \int_0^1 \left( \frac{\rho(x)}{\xi'(x)} \right)^2 \frac{1}{a(x)} \, dx \right] (1 + o(\bar{h})) \quad \text{as } \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0,
\]
where the constant in the bound of the \( O \)-term depends on \( a, b, f \) and \( \xi \) but not on \( m \). This suggests again consideration of the variational problems (4.16a/b) and, hence, of the optimal partition function \( \xi_0 \) of Theorem 4.4. Clearly,
\[
\frac{\rho(x)}{\xi_0'(x)} = \frac{1}{\gamma_0} (\rho(x)a(x))^{1/3}
\]
and \( \xi_0'(x) \) are Hölderian functions on \( I \).

We show first that the \((\xi_0, m)\)-partitions are \((\lambda, 5/3)\)-regular. Since
\[
(5.12) \quad |\rho(x)| \geq C \min \left\{ 1, \min_k |x - \xi_k| \right\} \quad \forall x \in I,
\]
with some \( C > 0 \), it follows that
\[
C_1 h_j \geq \int_{I_j} \xi_0(x) \, dx = \frac{1}{m} \geq C_2 \int_{I_j} \rho(x)^{2/3} \, dx \geq C_3 h_j^{5/3},
\]
where again \( C_3 > 0 \). This implies that \( \bar{h} \leq C h_1^{-3/5} \) as well as \( 1/m \leq C \bar{h} \); and hence, the partition is indeed \((\lambda, 5/3)\)-regular. Now Theorem 4.5 is easily shown to hold with \( O(\bar{h}) \) replaced by \( O(\bar{h}^{1/6}) \) because by using (5.5) we need to sum (5.2) only over \( J_6 \) and integrate (5.11) only over \( I_5 \), \( \delta = \bar{h}^{5/6} \).

For any \( I_j \) which intersects \( I_5 \) with \( \delta = \bar{h}^{5/6} \) we can use (5.6) in the estimates leading to Theorem 4.6 to obtain
\[
(5.13) \quad \mu_j(\xi_0, m)^2 = \frac{1}{12m^3 \gamma_0^3} (1 + O(\bar{h}^{1/6})) \quad \text{as } \bar{h} \to 0, \ j \in J_5, \ \delta = \bar{h}^{5/6}.
\]
In other words, for the optimal partition the \( \mu_j \) are asymptotically equal for all intervals which are not too close to a root of \( u_0'' \). As the numerical examples of Section 6 show, the \( \mu_j(\xi_0, m) \) for the intervals close to roots are generally larger; and the ratio of the largest to the smallest of these values does not tend to one for \( m \to \infty \).

The analog of Theorem 4.7 is somewhat more complicated. We formulate it as the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.2.** For the partition \( \Delta \) suppose that
\[
(5.14) \quad I_j \| z_j(\Delta) \|_E = \mu(1 + O(\bar{h}^e)) \quad \text{as } \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0, \ j = 1, \ldots, m,
\]
where \( \mu \) does not depend on \( j \) and \( \epsilon = 1/12 \). Then \( \Delta \) is \((\lambda, 5/3)\)-regular and

\[
I \|e(\Delta)\|_E \leq I \|e(\Delta_0)\|_E (1 + O(\sqrt{h})) \quad \text{as } \sqrt{h}(\Delta) \to 0.
\]

**Proof.** (1) We show first that

\[
I_j \|\varphi_j\|_E \geq C h_j^{5/2}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m,
\]

with some \( C > 0 \) which depends only on \( \rho \). From (3.13) it follows that

\[
I_j \|\varphi_j\|_E = \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{I_j \|\varphi_j\|_E} \left. \int_{I_j} \rho(x) u(x) \, dx \right| \forall u \in E_0(I_j) \right\}.
\]

Clearly, for given \( \gamma, \delta \) the function

\[
u_j(x) = \left(\frac{1}{2} \gamma h_j + \frac{1}{6} \delta h_j^2\right) (x - x_{j-1}) - \frac{1}{2} \gamma (x - x_{j-1})^2 - \frac{1}{6} \delta (x - x_{j-1})^3 \quad \forall x \in I_j
\]

belongs to \( E_0(I_j) \) and a short calculation shows that

\[
C_1 \alpha_j^2 h_j^3 \leq \int_{I_j} v(x)^2 \, dx \leq C_2 \alpha_j^2 h_j^3, \quad \int_{I_j} v(x)^2 \, dx \leq C_3 \alpha_j^2 h_j^5,
\]

where \( \alpha_j = (\gamma^2 + (\delta h_j)^2)^{1/2} \) and all constants are positive. Hence, also \( I_j \|v_j\|_E^2 \leq C \alpha_j^2 h_j^3 \). Now with

\[
\gamma = \rho(x_{j-1}), \quad \delta = \rho'(x_{j-1}), \quad \rho(x) = -v_j''(x) + \tilde{\rho}_j(x) \quad \forall x \in I_j,
\]

we obtain

\[
\left| \int_{I_j} \rho(x) u(x) \, dx \right| \geq \int_{I_j} v(x)^2 \, dx - \left( \int_{I_j} \tilde{\rho}_j(x) \, dx \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_{I_j} v(x)^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2},
\]

whence—for sufficiently small \( h \)—

\[
I_j \|\varphi_j\|_E \geq C \frac{1}{\alpha_j^2 h_j^{3/2}} \left[ \alpha_j^2 h_j^3 - o(h_j) h_j^{1/2} \alpha_j h_j^{5/2} \right] \geq C \alpha_j^2 h_j^{5/2} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha_j} o(h_j) \right].
\]

By assumption we have

\[
u_0''(x)^2 + \nu''''(x)^2 \geq C > 0 \quad \forall x \in I;
\]

and hence, also, with some \( C > 0 \)

\[
\alpha_j^2 = \gamma^2 + (\delta h_j)^2 \geq h_j^2 (\rho(x_{j-1})^2 + \rho'(x_{j-1})^2) \geq C h_j^2 > 0,
\]

which together with (5.17) proves (5.16).

(2) Next we show that for sufficiently small \( h_j \)

\[
I \|e\|_E \geq I_j \|e\|_E \geq C h_j^{5/2}, \quad C > 0.
\]

Obviously, we have

\[
I_j \|e\|_E^2 \geq \inf_v \int_{I_j} a(x) [u_0'(x) - v'(x)]^2 \, dx,
\]

where the infimum is taken over all linear functions on \( I_j \). Thus, \( v'(x) \) is constant; and
it follows that
\[ I_j \| e \|^2_E \geq C \left[ \int I_j u_0'(x)^2 \, dx - \frac{1}{h_j} \left( \int I_j u_0'(x) \, dx \right)^2 \right]. \]

Since
\[ u_0'(x) = u_0'(x_{j-1}) + u_0''(x_{j-1})(x - x_{j-1}) + \frac{1}{2} u_0'''(x_{j-1})(x - x_{j})^2 + o(h_j^2) \quad \text{as } h_j \to 0, \]
a simple calculation shows that
\[ I_j \| e \|^2_E \geq C \left[ u_0''(x_{j-1})^2 h_j^3 + u_0'''(x_{j-1})^2 h_j^5 \right] - o(1) h_j^5. \]

Using (5.18), we then obtain (5.19) for sufficiently small \( h_j \).

(3) Now we can show that \( \Delta \) is a \((\lambda, 5/3)\)-regular partition. By Theorem 3.1 and (5.14) it follows that
\[ (5.20) \quad I_j \| e \|^2_E = m \mu^2 (1 + (\bar{h}^{1/12})), \]
and, thus, by (5.19) that
\[ (5.21) \quad \bar{h} \leq C m^{1/5} \mu^{2/5}. \]

On the other hand, we have by (5.9), (4.7) and (3.16)
\[ \begin{align*}
\mu(1 + O(\bar{h}^{1/12})) &= I_j \| \varphi_{1,j} + \varphi_{2,j} + \psi_j \|_E \\
&\leq C [\eta_j h_j^{3/2} + h_j^{5/2} + h_j I_j \| e \|_E] \leq C [h_j^{3/2} + m^{1/2} \mu h_j].
\end{align*} \]

Let \( h_{i_0} = h \) and note that \( m \leq 1/h \), then \( \mu \leq C(h_j^{3/2} + h_j^{1/2}) \); and hence, for sufficiently small \( \bar{h} \),
\[ (5.23) \quad \bar{h} \geq C \mu^{2/3}. \]

On the other hand, (5.16) and (3.16) give
\[ \begin{align*}
\mu(1 + O(\bar{h}^{1/12})) &\geq I_j \| \varphi_j + \psi_j \|_E \geq I_j \| \varphi_j \|_E - I_j \| \psi_j \|_E \geq C(h_j^{5/2} - h_j I_j \| e \|_E);
\end{align*} \]
and therefore, by (5.21) and (5.23), for \( h_{i_0} = \bar{h} \),
\[ (5.24) \quad \mu \geq C \left[ \bar{h}^{5/2} - \bar{h}^{1/2} \mu \right] \geq C [\bar{h}^{5/2} - \bar{h}^{2/3}]. \]

If the term on the right is positive then, with some positive constant (independent of \( \bar{h} \)), \( z = \bar{h}^{1/2} \) must satisfy \( z^5 - \mu^{2/3} z^2 = C \mu \). By Cauchy’s rule this implies that
\[ \bar{h}^{1/2} \leq \max((2 C \mu)^{1/5}, (2 \mu^{2/3})^{1/3}) \leq C \mu^{1/5}, \]
since by (5.23) we have \( \mu \leq 1 \) for sufficiently small \( \bar{h} \). On the other hand, if the term on the right of (5.24) is nonpositive, then we have immediately \( \bar{h} \leq \mu^{4/9} \leq \mu^{2/5} \).

Thus with (5.23) this gives indeed \( \bar{h}^{5/3} \leq C h \).

(4) For the proof of (5.15) let now \( \delta = \bar{h}^{\epsilon} \). By (5.12) we have \( \eta_j \geq C \delta \) for \( j \in J^e_\delta \) and, hence,
\[ \sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i^2 h_j \leq C (\frac{\eta_j}{\delta})^2 \quad \forall j \in J^e_\delta. \]
Thus, from Lemma 5.1 and Theorems 3.1, 3.2 it follows that

\[(5.25) \quad I\|e\|^2_E \leq C \frac{1}{\delta^2} \eta_j^2 \bar{h}^2 \quad \forall j \in J^c_b,\]

and, therefore, (3.16) gives

\[(5.26) \quad I_\|\psi\|^2_E \leq C \frac{\eta_j}{\delta} h_j \bar{h} \leq C \frac{\eta_j}{\delta} h_j^{3/2} \bar{h}^{2\epsilon} \leq C \eta_j h_j^{3/2} \bar{h}^{\epsilon}, \quad j \in J^c_b,\]

respectively. Note that in the second inequality the \((\lambda, 5/3)\)-regularity of \(\Delta\) was used. Together with (5.6) and (5.9), (5.26) leads to

\[I_j\|z_j\|^2_E = I_j\|\varphi_{1,j} + \varphi_{2,j} + \psi_j\|^2_E = \eta_j^2 h_j^3 (1 + O(\bar{h}^\epsilon)), \quad j \in J^c_b,\]

and, therefore, by (5.14) to

\[(5.27) \quad \mu^2 = \eta_j^2 h_j^3 (1 + O(\bar{h}^\epsilon)), \quad j \in J^c_b.\]

Hence, analogous to (4.41), we have

\[(5.28) \quad \int_{J^c_b} \left[ \frac{p(t)^2}{a(t)} \right]^{1/3} dt = (12 \mu^2)^{1/3} (1 + O(\bar{h}^\epsilon)), \quad j \in J^c_b.\]

Let \(m_1\) and \(m_2\) denote the cardinalities of \(J^c_b\) and \(J_b\), respectively, that is, \(m = m_1 + m_2\). We want to show that

\[(5.29) \quad m_2/m_1 = O(\delta) = O(\bar{h}^\epsilon).\]

For this note first that because of \(\eta_j \leq C\delta\) for \(j \in J_b\) we have by (5.22)

\[(5.30) \quad \mu \leq C(\delta h_j^{3/2} + h_j^{5/2} + h_j m^{1/2} \mu), \quad j \in J_b,\]

and, thus,

\[(5.31) \quad h_j \geq C \min(\mu/\delta)^{2/3}, m^{-1/2}, \mu^{2/5}), \quad j \in J_b.\]

Suppose first that

\[h_j \geq C(\mu/\delta)^{2/3}, \quad j \in J_b;\]

then

\[(5.32) \quad m_2 \leq \delta \left( \min_{j \in J_b} h_j \right)^{-1} \leq C \frac{\delta^{5/3}}{\mu^{2/3}}, \quad j \in J_b.\]

Because of \(\eta_j \geq C\delta\) for \(j \in J^c_b\), it follows from (5.27) that \(h_j \leq C(\mu/\delta)^{2/3}, \quad j \in J^c_b,\)

and, hence,

\[m_1 \geq (1 - \delta) \left( \max_{j \in J^c_b} h_j \right)^{-1} \geq C \left( \frac{\delta}{\mu} \right)^{2/3}.\]

Together with (5.32) this proves (5.29) in this case.

Now suppose that in (5.31) we have \(h_j \geq C\mu^{2/5}\). Then \(m_2 \leq C\delta \mu^{-2/5}\), while (5.24) implies that \(m_1 \geq C\mu^{-2/5}\). Together these estimates show once more that (5.29) holds.
Finally, consider the case \( h \to C \delta m^{1/2} \), \( j \in J_\delta \). Then \( m_2 \leq C \delta m^{1/2} = C \delta (m_1 + m_2)^{1/2} \) or \( m_2^2 - C^2 \delta^2 m_2 \leq C^2 \delta^2 m_1 \). By applying Rouche's theorem to the pair of polynomials \( z^2 - az - am_1 = 0 \), \( z^2 - am_1 = 0 \), \( a = C^2 \delta^2 \) it follows readily that \( m_2 \leq C \delta m_1^{1/2} \leq C \delta m_1 \). Thus (5.29) is valid, and we have

\[
(5.33) \quad m_1 = m(1 + O(\overline{\delta}^{1/12})).
\]

By definition of \( \overline{\xi_0} \) it follows now from (5.28) and (5.33) that

\[
\frac{1}{\gamma_0} = \int_0^1 \left[ \frac{\rho(t)^2}{a(t)} \right]^{1/3} dt = \sum_{j \in J_\delta} \int_{I_j} \left[ \frac{\rho(t)^2}{a(t)} \right]^{1/3} dt + \sum_{j \in J_\delta} \int_{I_j} \left[ \frac{\rho(t)^2}{a(t)} \right]^{1/3} dt
\]

\[
\geq m_1 (12 \mu^2)^{1/3} (1 + O(\overline{\delta}^\varepsilon)) = m(12 \mu^2)^{1/3} (1 + O(\overline{\delta}^\varepsilon))
\]
or

\[
m_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{\gamma_0 m^2} (1 + O(\overline{\delta}^\varepsilon)).
\]

From (5.20) and Theorem 4.5 (modified to the present case) this implies (5.15).

It may be noted that the analogous relation to (4.30), namely, \( |x_i^\Delta - x_i^\Delta 0| = O(\overline{\delta}^\varepsilon) \) is easily proved when there is only one root of \( u_0'' \) in \( \overline{I} \). In general, the situation appears to be more complicated.

Now we turn to the analog of Theorem 4.8.

**Theorem 5.3.** For any \((\lambda, \kappa)\)-regular partition with \( 1 \leq \kappa < 2 \),

\[
(5.34) \quad ||e||_E^2 = \frac{1}{12} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{v_j^2 h_j^2}{a_j^{-1/2}} \right] (1 + O(\overline{\delta}^\varepsilon)),
\]

where \( v_j \) is given by (4.44) and \( \varepsilon = 1 - \kappa/2 \).

**Proof.** Recall that

\[
e(\Delta)^2 = \frac{1}{12} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{v_j^2 h_j^2}{a_j^{-1/2}}.
\]

Using

\[
(5.35) \quad v_j^2 = \int_{I_j} (\overline{p}_j + \sigma_j(t) + \tau_j(t))^2 \, dt, \quad |\sigma_j(x)| \leq C h_j, \quad |\tau_j|_0 \leq C ||e||_E,
\]

we obtain, with certain \( |C_j| \leq C, \, i = 1, \ldots, 5 \),

\[
12e(\Delta)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\overline{p}_j^2 h_j^3}{a_j^{-1/2}} + C_1 \sum_{j=1}^m h_j^5 + C_2 \sum_{j=1}^m ||e||_E^2 h_j^2
\]

\[+ C_3 \sum_{j=1}^m \overline{p}_j h_j^4 + C_4 \sum_{j=1}^m I_j||e||_E h_j^{5/2} + C_5 \sum_{j=1}^m I_j||e||_E h_j^{7/2}.
\]

By Lemma 5.1 and Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 the first term is asymptotically equal to

\[12 ||e||_E^2 \]

and from (5.5) it follows that \( j||e||_E \geq C_h \). The other terms are then easily estimated to give—with different constants \( C_i- \)
\[ \epsilon(\Delta)^2 = \int_{\Omega} \| \epsilon_{\Delta} \|^2_E(1 + \mathcal{O}(\bar{h}^\epsilon)) + C_1 \int_{\Omega} \| \epsilon_{\Delta} \|^2_E \bar{h}^{4\epsilon} + C_2 \int_{\Omega} \| \epsilon_{\Delta} \|^2_E \bar{h}^2 \]
\[ + C_3 \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\bar{\rho}_j h_j^3}{a_j - 1/2} \right]^{1/2} \left[ \bar{h}^2 + \int_{\Omega} \| \epsilon_{\Delta} \|_{E_h}^{1/2} \right] + C_4 \int_{\Omega} \| \epsilon_{\Delta} \|^2_E \bar{h}^{2\epsilon+1/2} \]
\[ = \int_{\Omega} \| \epsilon_{\Delta} \|^2_E(1 + \mathcal{O}(\bar{h}^\epsilon)), \]

which proves (5.34).

Finally, we show that also Theorem 4.9 carries over to this case.

**Theorem 5.4.** For the partition \( \Delta \) suppose that

\[ \epsilon_j = \mu(1 + \mathcal{O}(\bar{h}^\epsilon)) \quad \text{as} \quad \bar{h}(\Delta) \to 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m, \]

where \( \mu \) does not depend on \( j \) and \( \epsilon = 1/12 \). Then \( \Delta \) is \((\lambda, 5/3)\)-regular and

\[ \int_{\Omega} \| \epsilon(\Delta) \|_E \leq \int_{\Omega} \| \epsilon(\Delta_0) \|_E(1 + \mathcal{O}(\bar{h}^\epsilon)) \quad \text{as} \quad m \to \infty. \]

**Proof.** We show first that \( \Delta \) is \((\lambda, 5/3)\)-regular. For this, note that generally

\[ \| f \|_{E_h} \leq \frac{12}{\pi^2} \epsilon_j^2(1 + \mathcal{O}(h_j)) \quad \text{as} \quad h_j \to 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m. \]

This follows from (3.8) in the same manner as (3.14) follows from (3.13b). Thus by Theorem 3.1 and (5.36) we have \( \int_{\Omega} \| \epsilon \|^2_E \leq C\mu^2 \), whence by (5.19) \( \bar{h} \leq Cm^{1/5}\mu^{2/5} \).

Now (5.35) gives

\[ \nu_j = I_j \| \bar{\rho}_j \|_E \leq C(\bar{\rho}_j h_j^{1/2} + h_j^{3/2} + I_j \| \epsilon \|_E) \]

and thus, as in the case of (5.23), for sufficiently small \( \bar{h} \), \( \bar{h} \geq C\mu^{2/3} \). By (5.12) we have

\[ \int_{I_j} \rho(x)^2 \, dx \geq Ch_j^2; \]

and thus,

\[ \mu \geq Ch_j(I_j \| \rho \|_0 - I_j \| \tau_j \|_0) \geq C(h_j^{5/2} - h_j I_j \| \epsilon \|_E) \]

leads to (5.24). The remainder of the proof of the regularity of \( \Delta \) now proceeds exactly as part (3) of the proof of Theorem 5.3.

Similarly, the proof of (5.37) follows that of (5.15). In fact, for \( j \in J_\delta^c \) we have

\[ I_j \| \sigma_j \|_0 = \frac{\bar{\rho}_j h_j^{1/2}}{\delta} \mathcal{O}(h_j) = \frac{\bar{\rho}_j h_j^{1/2}}{\delta} \mathcal{O}(\bar{h}^{1-\epsilon}), \]
\[ I_j \| \tau_j \|_0 = \mathcal{O}(\bar{h}) = \frac{\bar{\rho}_j}{\delta} h_j^{1/2} \mathcal{O}(\bar{h}^{2\epsilon}) = \frac{\bar{\rho}_j}{\delta} h_j^{1/2} \mathcal{O}(\bar{h}^{2\epsilon}), \]

which as in (4.47) leads to \( \nu_j^2 = \bar{\rho}_j^2 h_j^3(1 + \mathcal{O}(\bar{h}^\epsilon)), \quad j \in J_\delta^c \), that is, \( \mu^2 = \eta_j^2 h_j^3(1 + \mathcal{O}(\bar{h}^\epsilon)), \quad j \in J_\delta^c \). Therefore, (5.28) holds again. Moreover, because of \( \bar{\rho}_j \leq C\eta_j \) we obtain from (5.38) the estimates (5.30) and (5.31) which in turn imply (5.29).

Now the remaining conclusions of the proof of Theorem 5.4 apply verbatim.
6. Numerical Examples. We illustrate the theoretical results with some computational results for the following two sample problems:

Sample Problem A.

\[ (-\frac{d}{dx} (x + \alpha)^p \frac{du}{dx} + (x + \alpha)^q u = f, \quad 0 < x < 1, \quad \alpha > 0, \]

\[ u(0) = u(1) = 0, \]

where \( f \) is chosen such that the solution of (6.1a/b) is

\[ u_0(x) = (x + \alpha)^r - [\alpha^r(1 - x) + (1 + \alpha^r)x], \quad x \in \overline{I}. \]

Here the coefficient functions and \( f \) are analytic in \( \overline{I} \), and we have \( u_0''(x) \neq 0 \) for \( x \in \overline{I} \). Hence, the theory of Section 4 applies. Note that for small \( \alpha \) and negative \( r \) we can create severe near-singularities.

Sample Problem B.

\[ -u'' + u = f, \quad 0 < x < 1, \]

\[ u(0) = u(1) = 0, \]

where \( f \) is chosen such that the true solution is

\[ u_0(x) = e^{\alpha x}(x - \beta) + [\beta(1 - x) - e^\alpha(1 - \beta)x], \quad \alpha \neq 0, \quad \beta = 1/2 + 2/\alpha. \]

Here \( f \) is analytic on \( I \) and \( u_0''(x) \) has a simple root at \( x = 1/2 \), and hence we can apply the theory of Section 5.

The tables of computational results given below include the following data:

| \( m \) | number of intervals used in the partition |
| \( E = 100\gamma_E/\gamma_0 \) | relative error in the energy norm expressed in percent |
| \( E_0 = \frac{1}{12m^3\gamma_0^2} \) | asymptotically smallest error achievable with meshes of \( m \) intervals |
| \( \omega = (\max_{j=1,...,m} \varepsilon_j)/(\min_{j=1,...,m} \varepsilon_j) \) | ratio between the largest and smallest value of the error indicators \( \varepsilon_j(\Delta) \) of (4.38a) |
| \( x_j \) | partition points of the particular mesh |

Tables 1 through 6 concern two cases of Sample Problem A. Each time the left endpoint \( x = 0 \) of the interval is near a singularity of \( u_0 \); and this is reflected in the fact that the largest and smallest error indicators \( \varepsilon_j(\Delta) \) always occur on the first and last subinterval \( I_1 \) and \( I_m \), respectively. But in the second case the energy expression includes a weight \( (x + \alpha)^2 \) which goes strongly down near \( x = 0 \). Thus in this case the near-singularity of the solution shows up more weakly under the energy norm.

In all cases the effectivity quotient is less than one; and hence, the estimate \( \varepsilon(\Delta) \) turns out to be an upper bound of \( \gamma_E/\gamma_0 \). Of course, the theory is only asymptotic.
in nature and, thus, \( e(\Delta) \) could be smaller than \( \|e\|_E \). Note that for relative accuracies better than 10\% the estimate never overshoots the true error by more than 10\%. In fact, for higher accuracies \( \theta \) equals one for all practical purposes. This is in complete agreement with the theory and shows that the a posteriori error estimate is very reliable and not at all pessimistic.

In the presence of the near-singularity, the use of nonuniform meshes is very advantageous (see, e.g., Table 6), and the approximately optimal meshes produce errors close to the optimal values which by Theorem 4.5 decrease with \( 1/m \). Here the "weaker" singularity of the second case is rather noticeable. The nonuniform meshes are only approximately optimal as the ratio \( \omega \) shows which in each case is reasonably close to one but certainly not equal to it. Nevertheless, as expected, the corresponding errors are clearly not very sensitive to such changes of the mesh except for low accuracies.

Tables 7 through 11 contain results for two cases of Sample Problem B. Essentially, all aspects are the same as for problem A. However, in all cases the maximal \( e_j \) occurs in the neighborhood of the root \( x_0 = 1/2 \) of \( u''_0(x) \), and, as expected, the ratio \( \omega \) does not converge to one. However, if \( \omega \) is computed only for all intervals outside a small neighborhood of \( x_0 \), then we have again the desired convergence of \( \omega \) to one.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( m )</th>
<th>( E )</th>
<th>( E_0 )</th>
<th>( \theta )</th>
<th>( \omega )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>85.301</td>
<td>22.613</td>
<td>.1706</td>
<td>8.84(+6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>73.768</td>
<td>11.306</td>
<td>.2950</td>
<td>2.34(+7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>58.784</td>
<td>5.653</td>
<td>.4702</td>
<td>5.31(+7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>41.933</td>
<td>2.827</td>
<td>.6708</td>
<td>1.11(+8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>26.316</td>
<td>1.413</td>
<td>.8419</td>
<td>2.19(+8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note here the asymptotic nature of the estimate \( E_0 \) of the lowest achievable error.*
Table 3
Problem A with $p = 2, q = 1, r = -1, \alpha = 1/100$
Uniform mesh, $\|u_0\|_E = 0.28678$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>$E$</th>
<th>$E_0$</th>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>$\omega$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.215</td>
<td>9.619</td>
<td>.3270</td>
<td>3.227(+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.696</td>
<td>4.809</td>
<td>.4467</td>
<td>4.640(+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.296</td>
<td>2.404</td>
<td>.5966</td>
<td>8.316(+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.813</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>.7610</td>
<td>1.055(+4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.959</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>.8947</td>
<td>1.308(+4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Problem A with $p = 2, q = 1, r = -1, \alpha = 1/100$
Asymptotically optimal mesh, $\|u_0\|_E = 0.28678$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>$E$</th>
<th>$E_0$</th>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>$\omega$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.994</td>
<td>9.619</td>
<td>.7679</td>
<td>3.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.809</td>
<td>4.809</td>
<td>.9331</td>
<td>1.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.409</td>
<td>2.404</td>
<td>.9828</td>
<td>1.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>.9956</td>
<td>1.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>.9989</td>
<td>1.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Problem A: Asymptotically optimal mesh for $m = 10$
Case A1: $p = 0, q = 1, r = -1/4, \alpha = 1/100$
Case A2: $p = 2, q = 1, r = -1, \alpha = 1/100$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x_j$</th>
<th>Case A1</th>
<th>Case A2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00207</td>
<td>.0127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00487</td>
<td>.0340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.00877</td>
<td>.0676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.01443</td>
<td>.1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.02308</td>
<td>.1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.03732</td>
<td>.2798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.06318</td>
<td>.4025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.11781</td>
<td>.5598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.26831</td>
<td>.7569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Problem A with $p = 0, q = 1, r = -1/4, \alpha = 1/100$
Partitions obtained from the uniform mesh by successively subdividing the first interval into half

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>$E$</th>
<th>$E_0$</th>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>$\omega$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>73.768</td>
<td>11.306</td>
<td>.2950</td>
<td>2.34(+7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>58.853</td>
<td>10.278</td>
<td>.4705</td>
<td>5.85(+6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.286</td>
<td>9.421</td>
<td>.6922</td>
<td>1.45(+6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.357</td>
<td>8.696</td>
<td>.8457</td>
<td>3.45(+5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.634</td>
<td>8.075</td>
<td>.9340</td>
<td>7.49(+4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.580</td>
<td>7.530</td>
<td>.9447</td>
<td>1.41(+4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7
Problem B with $\alpha = 1, \beta = 5/2$
Uniform mesh, $\|u_0\|_E = .071070$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>$E$</th>
<th>$E_0$</th>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>$\omega$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>43.462</td>
<td>32.317</td>
<td>.9759</td>
<td>1.126(+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.080</td>
<td>16.158</td>
<td>.9939</td>
<td>1.757(+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.083</td>
<td>8.079</td>
<td>.9984</td>
<td>7.568(+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.547</td>
<td>4.039</td>
<td>.99924</td>
<td>3.142(+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.774</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>.99990</td>
<td>1.281(+4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
Problem B with $\alpha = 1, \beta = 5/2$
Asymptotically optimal mesh, $\|u_0\|_E = .071070$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>$E$</th>
<th>$E_0$</th>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>$\omega$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.869</td>
<td>32.317</td>
<td>.9466</td>
<td>1.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.519</td>
<td>16.158</td>
<td>.9694</td>
<td>1.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.153</td>
<td>8.079</td>
<td>.9823</td>
<td>1.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.049</td>
<td>4.039</td>
<td>.9894</td>
<td>1.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.018</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>.9933</td>
<td>2.437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9
Problem B with $\alpha = 5$, $\beta = 9/10$
Uniform mesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>$E$</th>
<th>$E_0$</th>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>$\omega$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>49.477</td>
<td>18.174</td>
<td>.9059</td>
<td>4.049(+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.554</td>
<td>9.087</td>
<td>.9742</td>
<td>1.229(+4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.530</td>
<td>4.543</td>
<td>.9934</td>
<td>4.621(+4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.797</td>
<td>2.271</td>
<td>.9983</td>
<td>1.808(+5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.403</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>.9995</td>
<td>7.173(+5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10
Problem B with $\alpha = 5$, $\beta = 9/10$
Asymptotically optimal mesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>$E$</th>
<th>$E_0$</th>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>$\omega$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.021</td>
<td>18.174</td>
<td>.7988</td>
<td>2.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.181</td>
<td>9.087</td>
<td>.9217</td>
<td>2.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.521</td>
<td>4.543</td>
<td>.9595</td>
<td>2.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.254</td>
<td>2.271</td>
<td>.9820</td>
<td>1.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>.9958</td>
<td>1.614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11
Problem B: Asymptotically optimal mesh for $m = 10$
Case B1: $\alpha = 1$, $\beta = 5/2$
Case B2: $\alpha = 5$, $\beta = 9/10$

$$x_j$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$j$</th>
<th>Case B1</th>
<th>Case B2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0887</td>
<td>.4192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1859</td>
<td>.6918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3001</td>
<td>.7715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5218</td>
<td>.8255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.6872</td>
<td>.8673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.7754</td>
<td>.9016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.8442</td>
<td>.9309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.9025</td>
<td>.9565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.9538</td>
<td>.9794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


