



Asymptotic modelling of conductive thin sheets

Kersten Schmidt, Sébastien Tordeux

► To cite this version:

Kersten Schmidt, Sébastien Tordeux. Asymptotic modelling of conductive thin sheets. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Physik*, 2010, 61 (4), pp.603-626. 10.1007/s00033-009-0043-x . inria-00527608

HAL Id: inria-00527608

<https://inria.hal.science/inria-00527608>

Submitted on 13 Dec 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Asymptotic modelling of conductive thin sheets

Kersten Schmidt and Sébastien Tordeux

Abstract. We derive and analyse models which reduce conducting sheets of a small thickness ε in two dimensions to an interface and approximate their shielding behaviour by conditions on this interface. For this we consider a model problem with a conductivity scaled reciprocal to the thickness ε , which leads to a nontrivial limit solution for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The functions of the expansion are defined hierarchically, i.e. order by order. Our analysis shows that for smooth sheets the models are well defined for any order and have optimal convergence meaning that the H^1 -modelling error for an expansion with N terms is bounded by $O(\varepsilon^{N+1})$ in the exterior of the sheet and by $O(\varepsilon^{N+1/2})$ in its interior. We explicitly specify the models of order zero, one and two. Numerical experiments for sheets with varying curvature validate the theoretical results.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000). 65N30, 35C20, 35J25, 41A60, 35B40, 78M30, 78M35 .

Keywords. Asymptotic Expansions, Model Reduction, Thin Sheets.

Introduction

Many electric devices contain very thin conducting parts either for electromagnetic shielding [13, 16], or as casings, tank walls [9, 25] or supply lines [5]. The large aspect ratio of these sheets of about few millimetres or centimetres to metres or hundreds of micrometres to centimetres and the high conductivity causes variations in thickness direction in much smaller scales than in the longitudinal directions. Their discretisation by the finite element method (FEM) is challenging when the thickness ε of the thin sheets is considerably smaller than the size of neighbouring parts for three reasons. First, domains with such thin sheets are difficult to mesh by most mesh generators. Secondly, a discretisation on meshes with cell sizes of different magnitudes can lead to ill-conditioned matrices, and thirdly, meshes of good quality may also contain cells around the sheet with sizes comparable to the sheet thickness which leads to a high number of additional degrees of freedom. By reducing the thin sheet to an interface and by approximating its effect by conditions on this interface, a highly accurate modelling with standard discretisation schemes like the FEM is possible.

The so called impedance boundary conditions (IBCs), first proposed by Shchukin [29] and Leontovich [19], are traditionally used for replacing solid conductors, where the domain is artificially confined, by an approximate boundary condition [28, 3, 1, 2, 15, 11, 8]. This technique is proved to be accurate for smooth sheets and can be readily implemented.

However, in the context of thin conducting sheets this technique of Shchukin and Leontovich has been seldom applied. Interface conditions for thin sheets are often based on a tensor product ansatz of a set of simple functions in thickness direction and functions defined on the interface. The simplest approaches assume no variation in thickness direction, which leads to a surface quantity [22, 5]. Using two functions in thickness direction Krähenbühl and Muller [18] derived a relation between the mean value of the tangential component of the electric or magnetic field on the interfaces of the sheet and the jump of the magnetic or electric field between the interfaces. This approach for time-harmonic Maxwell's equations is adopted by various authors [20, 13, 17] and is known as impedance boundary condition for thin layers. The functions in thickness direction depending on the frequency ω and the conductivity σ take the skin effect into account. In similar IBCs for simulations in time domain underlying functions are changed dynamically [21, 6]. Unfortunately, these interface conditions are

of low order, and even with the use of a larger number of functions in thickness direction [14] this type of conditions do not achieve higher orders [27].

Based on arguments similar to those that was used to derive IBCs, first order approximate models were derived and justified in [24] for electro-quasistatics and [23] for the Maxwell system. In this paper we derive with similar techniques high order approximations to deal with thin sheets. We attain these approximations in the context of a 2D scalar model problem with a smooth thin dissipative sheet.

The model problem defined in Section 1 includes the two major effects, the shielding and the skin effect. We investigate an asymptotics of constant shielding for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ by scaling the conductivity c like $1/\varepsilon$. For this asymptotics we derive the problems defining together the expansion functions of the solution of arbitrary order inside and outside the sheet in Section 2. Then, in Section 3 we will rearrange the problems leading to hierarchical coupled problems defining the expansion functions for each order with the knowledge of the functions of previous orders only. We will decouple these problems, introduce their variational formulation and show existence and uniqueness of the internal and external expansion functions in Section 4. Then, in Section 5 we analyse the modelling error and give the models for the first three orders explicitly in Section 6. Finally, we describe in Section 7 the numerical discretisation of the asymptotic expansion models and the original model by means of high-order finite elements and show results for the modelling error in various indicators in dependence of the sheet thickness. These numerical simulations demonstrate the sharpness of the bounds for the modelling error.

1. Problem definition

Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and $\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon$ be the sub-domain occupied by a sheet of thickness $\varepsilon > 0$ with conductivity c . The remaining sub-domain $\Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon := \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon}$ is non-conducting and we denote the conductivity function $c^\varepsilon(\underline{x})$, where $c^\varepsilon(\underline{x}) = c^\varepsilon$ for $\underline{x} \in \Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon$ and $c^\varepsilon(\underline{x}) = 0$ otherwise. We call the sub-domain of the thin conducting sheet the interior and the non-conducting sub-domain the exterior.

Let u^ε be the solution of the problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u^\varepsilon(\underline{x}) + c^\varepsilon(\underline{x})u^\varepsilon(\underline{x}) &= f(\underline{x}) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u^\varepsilon(\underline{x}) &= g(\underline{x}) & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

with the source term $f(\underline{x})$ vanishing in $\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon$ and the Dirichlet data $g(\underline{x})$. This model problem borrows the eddy-current model in 2D and includes the skin and shielding effects. We use a bounded domain Ω and Dirichlet boundary conditions for sake of simplicity. However, the boundary condition is of no importance in the derivation of the thin sheet models and can be replaced easily, also by suitable radiation conditions for an unbounded domain.




FIGURE 1. (a) Family of geometries for the family of problems for $u^\varepsilon(x)$. (b) Limit geometry for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. (c) Normalised interior sub-domain.

We make the following assumptions on the sheet. The mid-line Γ_m is given as C^∞ continuous and C^∞ invertible map $\underline{x}_m(t)$ from a 1D torus (note that Γ_m is hence closed), identified with a reference interval $\hat{\Gamma} \subset \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, we assume Γ_m to have a positive distance to the boundary of Ω , and, for simplicity, $|\underline{x}'_m(t)| = 1$, *i. e.* t is an arc length parameter. The left normed normal vector and the curvature of the sheet are denoted by $\underline{n}(t)$ and $\kappa(t)$, and the normal derivative by $\partial_n = \nabla \cdot \underline{n}$. Hence, we can define a parametrisation of the sheet

$$\underline{x}(t, s) = \underline{x}_m(t) + s\underline{n}(t)$$

over the parameter domain $\hat{\Omega}^\varepsilon := \hat{\Gamma} \times [-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}]$, where $s \in [-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}]$ (see Figure 1(a)). Due to the regularity of its midline Γ_m we can assert for the sheet that

$$C_\kappa^{-1} \leq 1 + s\kappa(t) \leq C_\kappa \quad \forall (t, s) \text{ in } \hat{\Omega}^\varepsilon, \quad (2)$$

for ε small enough with a positive constant C_κ . Finally, we denote the interfaces of the sheet for $s = \pm\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ by Γ_+^ε and Γ_-^ε and its union by Γ^ε .

For an asymptotic analysis we embed the problem (1) for a sheet of a particular thickness into a family of problems with varying thicknesses and a conductivity depending on the respective thickness. There are several possible scalings of the conductivity with decreasing thickness ε , *e. g.* one can consider $c^\varepsilon = \frac{c_0}{\varepsilon^\alpha}$ for different parameters α . The choice $c^\varepsilon = c_0/\varepsilon$ is a borderline case between a perfect shielding ($\alpha > 1$) and no shielding ($\alpha < 1$) and corresponds asymptotically to a constant shielding [27]. Therefore, this choice is of practical interest.

Hence, we look for the solution $u^\varepsilon \in H^1(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon &= f && \text{in } \Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon, \\ -\Delta u_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon + \frac{c_0}{\varepsilon} u_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon, \quad \Re c_0 \geq 0, \\ u_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon &= g && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ u_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon(t, \pm\frac{\varepsilon}{2}) &= u_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon(t, \pm\frac{\varepsilon}{2}) && \text{on } \hat{\Gamma}, \\ \partial_n u_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon(t, \pm\frac{\varepsilon}{2}) &= \partial_n u_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon(t, \pm\frac{\varepsilon}{2}) && \text{on } \hat{\Gamma}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where we denote by $u_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon$ the solution restricted to $\Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon$ and by $u_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon$ its restriction to $\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon$. We assume for a positive constant ε_0 , that $f \in C^\infty(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon_0})$, and $g \in C^\infty(\partial\Omega)$ and $\partial\Omega$ to be C^∞ .

2. Derivation of the coupled problems

In this section, we derive two asymptotic expansions of the exact solution, one in each of the exterior and interior sub-domains. These two expansions are defined by a coupled problem.

2.1. The exterior and interior asymptotic expansions of the solution

The *exterior asymptotic expansion* corresponds to the asymptotic expansion of u^ε restricted to $\Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon$. It consists in a formal power series

$$u_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon(\underline{x}) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^i u_{\text{ext}}^i(\underline{x}) + o(\varepsilon^\infty) \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon, \quad (4)$$

in which the terms of the asymptotic expansion are independent of ε and defined on $\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0 = \Omega \setminus \Gamma_m$ (see Figure 1(c)), the limit of $\Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The term $o(\varepsilon^\infty)$ has introduced to mention that this power series may diverge.

The *interior asymptotic expansion* is an asymptotic expansion of u^ε restricted to $\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon$. In order to introduce the normalised domain $\hat{\Omega} := \hat{\Gamma} \times [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ (see Figure 1(c)), we consider the *stretched variable*

$$S = \varepsilon^{-1}s. \quad (5)$$

The normalised representation of a function v defined in $\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon$ is denoted by its capital letter V : $v(\underline{x}) = v(t, s) = V(t, S)$. The interior asymptotic expansion is postulated to be a formal power series in ε

$$U_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon(t, S) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^i U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) + o(\varepsilon^\infty) \quad \text{in } \hat{\Omega}, \quad (6)$$

whose terms $U_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon$ are independent of ε and defined on $\widehat{\Omega}$.

Currently, we do not give a mathematical sense to this expansion, even if the formal computation makes sense. The expansion of the exact solution by a power series in ε emerges as a proper choice, because all the expansions involve only polynomials in ε . This ansatz of a power series in ε will be ultimately validated by Theorem 5.1.

In the remainder of this section we derive a coupled problem defining the functions u_{ext}^i and U_{int}^i .

The coupled problem. Find the families of functions $(u_{\text{ext}}^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $(U_{\text{int}}^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ such that for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$-\Delta u_{\text{ext}}^i = f \delta_0^i \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\text{ext}}^0, \quad (7a)$$

$$u_{\text{ext}}^i = g \delta_0^i \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (7b)$$

$$\partial_S^2 U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) = c_0 U_{\text{int}}^{i-1}(t, S) - \sum_{\ell=1}^i \Delta_\ell U_{\text{int}}^{i-\ell}(t, S) \quad \text{in } \widehat{\Omega}. \quad (7c)$$

$$U_{\text{int}}^i(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) - u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0) = \sum_{\ell=1}^i \left(\pm \frac{1}{2} \right)^\ell \frac{1}{\ell!} \partial_s^\ell u_{\text{ext}}^{i-\ell}(t, \pm 0) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_m, \quad (7d)$$

$$\partial_S U_{\text{int}}^i(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^i \left(\pm \frac{1}{2} \right)^{\ell-1} \frac{1}{(\ell-1)!} \partial_s^\ell u_{\text{ext}}^{i-\ell}(t, \pm 0), \quad \text{on } \Gamma_m. \quad (7e)$$

where we use the Kronecker symbol, $\delta_j^i = 1$ if $i = j$ and $\delta_j^i = 0$ if $i \neq j$, and the differential operators Δ_ℓ for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ which are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\ell(t, S) &= \widehat{\Delta}_\ell^0(t) S^{\ell-2} + \widehat{\Delta}_\ell^1(t) S^{\ell-1} \partial_S, \\ \widehat{\Delta}_\ell^0(t) &= (-\kappa(t))^{\ell-2} (\ell-1) \left(\partial_t^2 + \frac{\ell-2}{2} \frac{\kappa'(t)}{\kappa(t)} \partial_t \right) \text{ and } \widehat{\Delta}_\ell^1(t) = -(-\kappa(t))^\ell. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Equations (7a) and (7b) are readily to derive by inserting (4) in (3) and identifying terms of the same order in ε . More steps, however, are needed to obtain the leading equation for U_{int}^i . It relies on the asymptotic expansion

$$\Delta = \varepsilon^{-2} \partial_S^2 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{L-1} \varepsilon^{\ell-2} \Delta_\ell + \varepsilon^{L-2} \mathbf{R}_\varepsilon^L \quad \text{for all } L \geq 1 \quad (9)$$

of the Laplacian expressed in local coordinates [8, 27]

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= \partial_s^2 + \frac{\kappa(t)}{1 + s\kappa(t)} \partial_s + \frac{1}{1 + s\kappa(t)} \partial_t \left(\frac{1}{1 + s\kappa(t)} \partial_t \right) \\ &= \varepsilon^{-2} \partial_S^2 + \frac{\varepsilon^{-1} \kappa(t)}{1 + \varepsilon S \kappa(t)} \partial_S + \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon S \kappa(t)} \partial_t \left(\frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon S \kappa(t)} \partial_t \right), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

with $(t, s) = (t, S\varepsilon)$, where for its remainder it holds for any $L \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\|\mathbf{R}_\varepsilon^L U\|_{L^2(\widehat{\Omega})} \leq C_L \|U\|_{H^2(\widehat{\Omega})} \quad (11)$$

Inserting (4) and (9) in (3) leads to equation (7c). The coupling conditions (7d) and (7e) need a specific treatment that will be detailed in Section 2.2.

Remark. The first terms of the expansion of the Laplacian are required in the sequel

$$\Delta_0 = \partial_S^2, \quad \Delta_1 = \kappa(t) \partial_S, \quad \Delta_2 = \partial_t^2 - \kappa^2(t) S \partial_S. \quad (12)$$

2.2. The Dirichlet and Neumann coupling conditions

In this section we derive the transmission conditions (7d) and (7e). These relations result from the exact Dirichlet and Neumann transmission conditions on Γ_m written in local coordinates

$$u_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) = U_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}), \quad (13)$$

$$\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_s U_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}). \quad (14)$$

Since these conditions are written at $s = \pm \varepsilon/2$, Taylor expansions of u_{ext}^i expressed on Γ_m will be used to obtain conditions on a single interface. They require regularity of u_{ext}^i that will be a posteriori validated in Theorem 4.4, by assuming smoothness of Γ_m .

Remark. The interfaces between the thin sheet and the exterior domain consist of two parts ($s = \pm \varepsilon/2$). Even if one decides to shift the position of the mid-line Γ_m ($s = 0$), at least one of the interfaces is not fixed with respect to ε . This leads to rather more complicated coupling conditions than for thin coatings [3, 2, 8], where the interface consists of one part only and can be fixed independently of ε .

The Dirichlet transmission condition (7d). The Taylor expansion of u_{ext}^i reads

$$u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right)^j \frac{1}{j!} \partial_s^j u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0) + o(\varepsilon^\infty)_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}. \quad (15)$$

Inserting the expansion (4), (6) and (15) into (13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= u_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) - U_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^i \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right)^j \frac{1}{j!} \partial_s^j u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0) - U_{\text{int}}^i(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) \right) + o(\varepsilon^\infty)_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^i \left(\sum_{j=0}^i \left(\pm \frac{1}{2} \right)^j \frac{1}{j!} \partial_s^j u_{\text{ext}}^{i-j}(t, \pm 0) - U_{\text{int}}^i(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) \right) + o(\varepsilon^\infty)_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Identifying terms of same orders leads to the Dirichlet transmission condition (7d).

Remark. The exterior expansion functions u_{ext}^i may be discontinuous across Γ_m .

The Neumann transmission condition (7e). The Taylor expansion of $\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^i$ reads

$$\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right)^j \frac{1}{j!} \partial_s^{j+1} u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0) + o(\varepsilon^\infty)_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}. \quad (17)$$

Inserting the expansions (4), (6) and (17) into (16), we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \varepsilon \partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) - \partial_s U_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^i \left(\varepsilon \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right)^j \frac{1}{j!} \partial_s^{j+1} u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0) - \partial_s U_{\text{int}}^i(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) \right) + o(\varepsilon^\infty)_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^i \left(\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \left(\pm \frac{1}{2} \right)^j \frac{1}{j!} \partial_s^{j+1} u_{\text{ext}}^{i-j-1}(t, \pm 0) - \partial_s U_{\text{int}}^i(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Identifying terms of the same order results in the Neumann transmission condition (7e).

3. The hierarchical coupled problem

In the last section, we derived a coupled problem (7) that defines the families of exterior and interior terms $(u_{\text{ext}}^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(U_{\text{int}}^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. However, these equations do not define the family hierarchically. Indeed, given $(U_{\text{int}}^i, u_{\text{ext}}^i)_{i < k}$, (7) written for $i = k$, and not for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, does not uniquely define

$(U_{\text{int}}^k, u_{\text{ext}}^k)$. This is due to the fact that there is no condition for the normal derivative $\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^k(\underline{x})$ on the mid-line Γ_m .¹

Deriving a necessary condition for the existence of U_{int}^{i+1} leads to a formulation of (7) which permits the computation of $(U_{\text{int}}^i, u_{\text{ext}}^i)_{i \leq k}$ step by step.

Symbols for the mean and the jump. For the sake of brevity let us introduce the following symbols for the jumps and the mean values of the expansion functions

$$\begin{aligned} [V](t) &:= V(t, \tfrac{1}{2}) - V(t, -\tfrac{1}{2}), & \{V\}(t) &:= \tfrac{1}{2} (V(t, \tfrac{1}{2}) + V(t, -\tfrac{1}{2})), \\ [v](t) &:= v(t, 0^+) - v(t, 0^-), & \{v\}(t) &:= \tfrac{1}{2} (v(t, 0^+) + v(t, 0^-)), \end{aligned}$$

and a symbol for either the jump or the mean value of the external expansion function of both sides of the mid-line Γ_m

$$[v]^n(t) := \begin{cases} [v](t) & n \text{ even} \\ 2 \{v\}(t) & n \text{ odd.} \end{cases}$$

The latter symbol is convenient for terms resulting from the Taylor expansions (15) and (17), in which the sign changes from term to term and, hence, the difference is the jump and the mean value, in turns.

Additional condition for the normal derivative $\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^i(\underline{x})$. The missing condition for the normal derivative $\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^i(\underline{x})$ is the compatibility condition for (7c) and (7d) which is necessary for the existence of the internal functions U_{int}^{i+1} . Inserting (7c) and (7e) into the following equality for U_{int}^i

$$0 = \partial_S U_{\text{int}}^i(t, +\tfrac{1}{2}) - \partial_S U_{\text{int}}^i(t, -\tfrac{1}{2}) - \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_S^2 U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) dS,$$

we obtain

$$0 = \sum_{\ell=1}^i \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\ell-1} \frac{1}{(\ell-1)!} [\partial_s^\ell u_{\text{ext}}^{i-\ell}]^{\ell-1}(t) - \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(c_0 U_{\text{int}}^{i-1}(t, S) - \sum_{\ell=1}^i \Delta_\ell U_{\text{int}}^{i-\ell}(t, S)\right) dS. \quad (19)$$

Furthermore, inserting the equality $\Delta_1 = \kappa(t) \partial_S$ (see (12)) we can rewrite (19) for $i+1$ instead of i as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} (c_0 - \kappa(t) \partial_S) U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) dS - [\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^i](t) = \\ \sum_{\ell=1}^i \left(\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_{\ell+1} U_{\text{int}}^{i-\ell}(t, S) dS + \frac{1}{2^\ell \ell!} [\partial_s^{\ell+1} u_{\text{ext}}^{i-\ell}](t) \right), \quad (20) \end{aligned}$$

which is a condition for the normal derivative involving only terms of order i . Adding this condition to (7) yields a problem which defines the expansion functions hierarchically.

¹Remember, that for second order differential equations two transmission conditions are needed. We have with (7d) a Dirichlet transmission condition and (7e) defines the normal derivative from the interior. Thus, a condition for the normal derivative from the exterior of the sheet is missing.

The hierarchical coupled problem. For $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, find u_{ext}^i and U_{int}^i such that

$$-\Delta u_{\text{ext}}^i = f\delta_0^i \quad \text{in } \Omega_{\text{ext}}^0, \quad (21a)$$

$$u_{\text{ext}}^i = g\delta_0^i \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (21b)$$

$$\partial_S^2 U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) = c_0 U_{\text{int}}^{i-1}(t, S) - \sum_{\ell=1}^i \Delta_\ell U_{\text{int}}^{i-\ell}(t, S) \quad \text{in } \widehat{\Omega}, \quad (21c)$$

$$U_{\text{int}}^i(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) - u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0) = \sum_{\ell=1}^i \left(\pm \frac{1}{2}\right)^\ell \frac{1}{\ell!} \partial_s^\ell u_{\text{ext}}^{i-\ell}(t, \pm 0) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_m, \quad (21d)$$

$$\partial_S U_{\text{int}}^i(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^i \left(\pm \frac{1}{2}\right)^{\ell-1} \frac{1}{(\ell-1)!} \partial_s^\ell u_{\text{ext}}^{i-\ell}(t, \pm 0) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_m, \quad (21e)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} (c_0 - \kappa(t) \partial_S) U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) dS - [\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^i](t) = \\ \sum_{\ell=1}^i \left(\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_{\ell+1} U_{\text{int}}^{i-\ell}(t, S) dS + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^\ell \frac{1}{\ell!} [\partial_s^{\ell+1} u_{\text{ext}}^{i-\ell}](t) \right) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_m. \end{aligned} \quad (21f)$$

Remark. It can be easily proven that $U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S)$ is a polynomial of degree $2i$ in S for $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Thus, we define $U_{\text{int}}^0(t) := U_{\text{int}}^0(t, S)$.

In the next section, we prove the existence and uniqueness of the solution of problem (21).

4. Well-posedness of the hierarchical coupled problem

4.1. An algorithm to solve the hierarchical coupled problem

In this section we propose an algorithm to define successively the three functions

$$\widetilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) := U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) - \{U_{\text{int}}^i\}(t), \quad u_{\text{ext}}^i(\underline{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad \{U_{\text{int}}^i\}(t). \quad (22)$$

as the solutions of the following three problems which can be solved iteratively:

(i) Find $\widetilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) : \widehat{\Omega} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_S^2 \widetilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) = c_0 U_{\text{int}}^{i-1}(t, S) - \sum_{\ell=1}^i \Delta_\ell U_{\text{int}}^{i-\ell}(t, S) & \text{in } \widehat{\Omega}, \\ \partial_S \widetilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^i \left(\pm \frac{1}{2}\right)^{\ell-1} \frac{1}{(\ell-1)!} \partial_s^\ell u_{\text{ext}}^{i-\ell}(t, \pm 0) & \text{on } \Gamma_m, \\ \{\widetilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i\}(t) = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_m. \end{array} \right. \quad (23a)$$

(ii) Find $u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, S) : \Omega_{\text{ext}}^0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\Delta u_{\text{ext}}^i = f \delta_0^i & \text{in } \Omega_{\text{ext}}^0, \\ u_{\text{ext}}^i = g \delta_0^i & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ [u_{\text{ext}}^i](t) = [\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i](t) - \sum_{\ell=1}^i \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^\ell \frac{1}{\ell!} [\partial_s^\ell u_{\text{ext}}^{i-\ell}]^\ell(t) & \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{m}}, \\ [\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^i](t) - c_0 \{u_{\text{ext}}^i\}(t) = \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} c_0 \tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) \, dS - \kappa(t) [\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i](t) + \\ \sum_{\ell=1}^i \left(c_0 \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\ell+1} \frac{1}{\ell!} [\partial_s^\ell u_{\text{ext}}^{i-\ell}]^{\ell+1}(t) \right. & \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{m}}, \\ \left. - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^\ell \frac{1}{\ell!} [\partial_s^{\ell+1} u_{\text{ext}}^{i-\ell}]^\ell(t) \right. & \\ \left. - \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_{\ell+1} U_{\text{int}}^{i-\ell}(t, S) \, dS \right) & \end{array} \right. \quad (23b)$$

(iii) Find $\{U_{\text{int}}^i\} : \Gamma_{\text{m}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\{U_{\text{int}}^i\}(t) = \{u_{\text{ext}}^i\}(t) + \sum_{\ell=1}^i \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\ell+1} \frac{1}{\ell!} [\partial_s^\ell u_{\text{ext}}^{i-\ell}]^{\ell+1}(t) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{m}}. \quad (23c)$$

Lemma 4.1. *The problem (23) is equivalent to the problem (21).*

Proof. We first demonstrate that every solution of (21) is also a solution of (23). The equations (23a) are a direct consequence of (21c) and (21e) taking into account that $\{U_{\text{int}}^i\}(t)$ is a constant in S . The equation (23c) follows by applying the mean value operator to (21d). The third equation in (23b) follows by applying the jump operator to (21d). And, the fourth equation of (23b) is obtained, after calculation, by inserting $U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) = \tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) + \{U_{\text{int}}^i\}(t)$ and (23c) into (21f).

Applying the converse arguments, we can show that every solution of (23) is also solution of (21). $\square$

4.2. Variational framework

The interior solution u_{ext}^i is defined by the system (23b). This section is devoted to the existence, uniqueness and regularity of the solution of such problems.

Given $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, $g \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$, $\gamma \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_{\text{m}})$, $\delta \in H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_{\text{m}})$, we are looking for solution $u \in H^1(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)$ of the problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\Delta u = f, & \text{in } \Omega_{\text{ext}}^0, \\ u = g, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ [u] = \gamma, & \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{m}}, \\ [\partial_n u] - c_0 \{u\} = \delta, & \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{m}}. \end{array} \right. \quad (24)$$

A classical route to deal with this non-homogeneous problem consists in introducing the harmonic offset function $\tilde{u} \in H^1(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)$ satisfying

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \Delta \tilde{u} = 0, & \text{in } \Omega_{\text{ext}}^0, \\ \tilde{u}(\cdot, \pm 0) = \pm \frac{1}{2} \gamma(\cdot), & \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{m}}, \\ \tilde{u} = g, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{array} \right. \quad (25)$$

Consequently, $\tilde{u}$ fulfils the jump condition $[\tilde{u}](t) = \gamma$ and has a vanishing mean $\{\tilde{u}\}(t) = 0$. Moreover, since $\Delta \tilde{u} = 0$ in Ω_{ext}^0 and $\tilde{u} \in H^1(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)$, the jump of the normal trace $[\partial_n \tilde{u}]$ belongs to $H^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Gamma_{\text{m}})$.

Multiplying the first equation of (24) by a test function v , integrating over Ω and using the Green formula, we get the following weak formulation for $\hat{u} = u - \tilde{u}$:

$$\text{Find } \hat{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega) \text{ such that } \mathbf{a}(\hat{u}, v) = l(v) \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega), \quad (26)$$

with the bilinear form $\mathbf{a}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and the linear form $l(\cdot)$ defined by

$$\mathbf{a}(\hat{u}, v) := \int_{\Omega} \nabla \hat{u} \cdot \nabla v \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Gamma_m} c_0 \hat{u} v \, dt, \quad (27)$$

$$l(v) := \int_{\Omega} f v + \int_{\Gamma_m} ([\partial_n \tilde{u}] - \delta) v \, dt. \quad (28)$$

Using Poincaré-Friedrichs inequality [7], it is rather easy to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *The system (24), with data $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, $g \in H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)$, $\gamma \in H^{1/2}(\Gamma_m)$ and $\delta \in H^{-1/2}(\Gamma_m)$ admits a unique solution given that $\Re c_0 \geq 0$.*

Even if we seek the expansion functions $u \in H^1(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)$ they possess a higher regularity given that the mid-line of the sheet Γ_m and the source term f are smooth enough. This confirms the validity of the Taylor expansions (15) and (17).

Proposition 4.3. *For $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $f \in H^{k_0-2}(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)$, $g \in H^{k_0-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$, $\gamma \in H^{k_0-1/2}(\Gamma_m)$, $\delta \in H^{k_0-3/2}(\Gamma_m)$ and $\Gamma_m \cup \partial\Omega$ C^{k_0} -continuous, let $u(\mathbf{x}) \in H^1(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)$ be the solution of (24).*

For any positive integer $k \leq k_0$, there exists a constant $C_k > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{H^k(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)} \leq C_k \left(\|f\|_{H^{k-2}(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)} + \|g\|_{H^{k-1/2}(\partial\Omega)} + \|\gamma\|_{H^{k-1/2}(\Gamma_m)} + \|\delta\|_{H^{k-3/2}(\Gamma_m)} \right).$$

Proof. Applying the techniques of Proposition 2.8 in [27] we get the statement of proposition. $\square$

Remark. If the boundary of the domain is not smooth enough, the regularity statement of Proposition 4.3 has to be restricted to a sub-domain of Ω_{ext}^0 excluding a neighbourhood of the boundary. A sub-domain of Ω_{ext}^0 excluding the support of the source term f has to be taken, if this term is not smooth.

4.3. Existence and uniqueness of (u_{ext}^i) and (U_{int}^i)

Theorem 4.4. *The sequences (u_{ext}^i) and (U_{int}^i) exist and are uniquely defined by (23). For any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ it holds $u_{\text{ext}}^i \in H^k(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)$, $\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i \in H^k(\hat{\Omega})$, and $\{U_{\text{int}}^i\} \in H^k(\hat{\Omega})$ and consequently $U_{\text{int}}^i \in H^k(\hat{\Omega})$ as well.*

Proof. The proof is by induction in i .

For $i = 0$, the Sturm-Liouville problem (23a) with homogeneous data uniquely defines $\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^0(t) = 0$ (see [30] for a presentation of Sturm-Liouville problems). The source term and the mid-line of the sheet are C^∞ by assumption. Thus, by Proposition 4.3 there exists for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ a constant $C_{0,k}$ such that $\|u_{\text{ext}}^0(t)\|_{H^k(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)} \leq C_{0,k}$. Since $H^1(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0) \subset L^2(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)$ the same holds for $k = 0$. By (23a) we can assert that $U_{\text{int},0}^0(t) = U_{\text{int}}^0(t) = \{U_{\text{int}}^0\}(t) = \{u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) \in H^{k-1/2}(\Gamma_m)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, the statement of the theorem is proven for $i = 0$.

Assume that the assertion holds for all integer $j < i$. We divide the rest of the proof in three steps. In (i) we prove the existence, uniqueness and regularity of $\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i$ (i), in (ii) those of u_{ext}^i and in (iii) the regularity of $\{U_{\text{int}}^i\}$.

- (i) The function $\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i$ is defined by the Sturm-Liouville problem (23a). This function exists and is unique if and only if the source terms satisfy the compatibility² condition (19). This condition is fulfilled since it is equivalent to (21f) written for $i = i - 1$ which holds as $(u_{\text{ext}}^{i-1}, U_{\text{int}}^{i-1})$ is the solution of (23) and by Lemma 4.1 also of (21). The regularity of $\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i$ follows from the regularity of $(u_{\text{ext}}^j)_{j < i}$ and $(U_{\text{int}}^j)_{j < i}$.
- (ii) The function u_{ext}^i is defined by (23b). Since $(u_{\text{ext}}^j)_{j < i}$, $(U_{\text{int}}^j)_{j < i}$ and $\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i$ are regular, the existence, uniqueness and regularity of u_{ext}^i result from Lemma 4.2 and Proposition 4.3.

²This compatibility condition corresponds to a necessary condition for the existence of $\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i$:

$$\partial_S \tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i(t, +\frac{1}{2}) - \partial_S \tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i(t, -\frac{1}{2}) = \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_S^2 \tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) \, dS. \quad (29)$$

- (iii) The function $\{U_{\text{int}}^i\}$ is defined by (23c). The smoothness of $\{U_{\text{int}}^i\}$ follows from the regularity of $(u_{\text{ext}}^j)_{j \leq i}$. $\square$

Remark. Although we assume a smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ and a smooth source term f , this assumption is not needed for the existence and uniqueness of the expansion functions (Theorem 4.4) since the former terms of the expansion $(u_{\text{ext}}^j)_{j < i}$ appear only on the mid-line Γ_m and regularity is required for the traces to this mid-line only.

5. Estimates of the modelling error

To obtain an approximation $u^{\varepsilon, N}$ of order $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ of the exact solution u^ε we truncate the expansions of $u_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon$ and $U_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon$ to the first $N + 1$ terms

$$u_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon, N}(\underline{x}) := \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^i u_{\text{ext}}^i(\underline{x}), \quad \text{and} \quad U_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N}(t, S) := \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^i U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S), \quad (30)$$

and use the notation $u_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N}(t, s) := U_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N}(t, s/\varepsilon)$. Now, we formulate the main result about the modelling error in the following Theorem.

Theorem 5.1 (The modelling error in the H^1 -norm). *For any $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there exists a constant C_N independent of ε such that*

$$\|u_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon - u_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon, N}\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon)} + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \|u_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon - u_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N}\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)} \leq C_N \varepsilon^{N+1}. \quad (31)$$

Proof. In order to prove Theorem 5.1 we need to estimate the remainder $r^{\varepsilon, N+1}$

$$r_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon, N+1} = u_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon - u_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon, N} \quad \text{and} \quad r_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N+1} = u_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon - u_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N}. \quad (32)$$

In Section 5.1, we identify residuals by inserting $r^{\varepsilon, N+1}$ in the model problem (3). Then, these residuals are bounded in Section 5.2. Finally, we conclude using a stability argument in Section 5.3. $\square$

5.1. The problem for the remainder

Contrary to u^ε , the approximation $u^{\varepsilon, N}$ given in (30) does not exactly fulfil our model problem (3). Indeed, the exact solution u^ε has continuous Dirichlet and Neumann data on Γ^ε , whereas the Dirichlet and Neumann traces of $u^{\varepsilon, N}$ have jumps. Moreover, the partial differential equation in the sheet is also not satisfied exactly. More precisely, the remainder $r^{\varepsilon, N+1}$ solves the following system of equations

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\Delta r_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon, N+1} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon, \\ -\Delta r_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N+1} + \frac{c_0}{\varepsilon} r_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N+1} = \delta_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N+1} & \text{in } \Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon \\ r_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon, N+1}(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) - r_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N+1}(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) = \delta_{D, \pm}^{\varepsilon, N+1} & \text{on } \Gamma^\varepsilon, \\ \partial_s r_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon, N+1}(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) - \partial_s r_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N+1}(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) = \delta_{N, \pm}^{\varepsilon, N+1} & \text{on } \Gamma^\varepsilon, \\ r_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon, N+1} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{array} \right. \quad (33)$$

with the internal residual

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N+1}(\underline{x}) &:= \left(-\Delta + \frac{c_0}{\varepsilon}\right) \left(u_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon(\underline{x}) - u_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N}(\underline{x})\right) \\ &\stackrel{(3)}{=} -\left(-\Delta + \frac{c_0}{\varepsilon}\right) u_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N}(\underline{x}) \stackrel{(30)}{=} -\sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^i \left(-\Delta + \frac{c_0}{\varepsilon}\right) u_{\text{int}}^i(\underline{x}), \end{aligned} \quad (34a)$$

the residual of the Dirichlet jump

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{D,\pm}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t) &:= \underbrace{\left(u_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon}(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) - u_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon}(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\right)}_{0 \text{ by (3)}} - \left(u_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon,N}(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) - u_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N}(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\right) \\ &\stackrel{(30)}{=} \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^i \left(U_{\text{int}}^i(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) - u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\right) \end{aligned} \quad (34b)$$

and the residual of the Neumann jump

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{N,\pm}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t) &:= \underbrace{\left(\partial_n u_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon}(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) - \partial_n u_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon}(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\right)}_{0 \text{ by (3)}} - \left(\partial_n u_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon,N}(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) - \partial_n u_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N}(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\right) \\ &\stackrel{(30)}{=} \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^i \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_S U_{\text{int}}^i(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) - \partial_n u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\right). \end{aligned} \quad (34c)$$

5.2. Consistency estimates

In this section, we estimate the residuals $\delta_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+1}$, $\delta_{D,\pm}^{\varepsilon,N+1}$ and $\delta_{N,\pm}^{\varepsilon,N+1}$ defined in (34).

5.2.1. The internal residual.

Proposition 5.2 (Consistency error in the sheet). *There exists $C_N > 0$, independent of ε , such that*

$$\|\delta_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon})} \leq C_N \varepsilon^{N-1/2}.$$

Proof. We write the interior residual given by (34a) in local coordinates, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t, S) := \delta_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t, s)$, with $s = S\varepsilon$. Inserting the expansion of the Laplace operator (9) we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t, S) = - \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^i \left(-\varepsilon^{-2} \left(\partial_S^2 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{N-i} \left(\varepsilon^{\ell} \Delta_{\ell} \right) + \varepsilon^{N-i+1} \mathbf{R}_{\varepsilon}^{N-i+1} \right) U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) + \frac{c_0}{\varepsilon} U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) \right). \quad (35)$$

With the convention $U_{\text{int}}^{-1} \equiv 0$, we collect the terms of same powers of ε

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t, S) &= \varepsilon^{N-1} \left(\sum_{i=0}^N \mathbf{R}_{\varepsilon}^{N-i+1} U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) - c_0 U_{\text{int}}^N(t, S) \right) \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^{i-2} \left(\partial_S^2 U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S) - c_0 U_{\text{int}}^{i-1}(t, S) + \sum_{\ell=1}^i \Delta_{\ell} U_{\text{int}}^{i-\ell}(t, S) \right)}_{0 \text{ by (23a)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Since $U_{\text{int}}^i(t, S)$ is independent of ε for all i by Theorem 4.4, we obtain using (11)

$$\left\| \mathcal{D}_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+1} \right\|_{L^2(\hat{\Omega})} \leq \varepsilon^{N-1} \left(\sum_{i=0}^N C \|U_{\text{int}}^i\|_{H^2(\hat{\Omega})} + c_0 \|U_{\text{int}}^N\|_{L^2(\hat{\Omega})} \right) \leq C_N \varepsilon^{N-1}. \quad (37)$$

Considering the curved geometry, see (2), we can write the integral in the original coordinates

$$\|\delta_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon})}^2 \leq C_{\kappa} \int_{\hat{\Gamma}} \int_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} (\delta_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t, s))^2 \, ds \, dt = C_{\kappa} \varepsilon \left\| \mathcal{D}_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+1} \right\|_{L^2(\hat{\Omega})}^2 \leq C_N \varepsilon^{2N-1}.$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

5.2.2. A preliminary result on the Taylor expansion remainder. In Sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4, the estimates of the Dirichlet and the Neumann jump residuals will require the following proposition. We give the proof of this classical result for the sake of completeness.

Proposition 5.3 (Estimate of the remainder of the Taylor expansion). *Let $L \in \mathbb{N}$.*

$$\exists C_L > 0 \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0 \quad \forall u \in H^L\left(\left[-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}; \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right] \setminus \{0\}\right) \quad |\mathbf{r}_{\varepsilon, \pm}^L(u)| \leq C_L \varepsilon^{L-1/2} |u|_{H^L([0, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}])} \quad (38)$$

with $\mathbf{r}_{\varepsilon, +}^L(u)$ and $\mathbf{r}_{\varepsilon, -}^L(u)$ the two reals defined by

$$\mathbf{r}_{\varepsilon, \pm}^L(u) := u\left(\pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) - \sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} \left(\pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^\ell u^{(\ell)}(\pm 0). \quad (39)$$

Proof. We use the well-known expression of the remainder term of Taylor polynomials

$$|\mathbf{r}_{\varepsilon, \pm}^L(u)| = \frac{1}{(L-1)!} \left| \int_0^{\pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \left(\pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - s\right)^{L-1} \partial_s^L u(s) ds \right|.$$

Bounding $|\pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - s|^{L-1}$ by its maximal value $(\frac{\varepsilon}{2})^{L-1}$ and applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\left| \int_0^{\pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \left(\pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - s\right)^{L-1} \partial_s^L u(s) ds \right| \leq \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{L-\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_s^L u\|_{L^2([0, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}])} = \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{L-\frac{1}{2}} |u|_{H^L([0, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}])}.$$

The composition of the estimates completes the proof. $\square$

5.2.3. The Dirichlet jump residual. The functions $\delta_{D, \pm}^{\varepsilon, N+1}(t)$ for the Dirichlet jumps are defined on Γ_+^ε or Γ_-^ε , respectively. However, we can regard them as functions on the mid-line Γ_m . In the following proposition we bound the L^2 -norm of the error of the Dirichlet jumps evaluated on the mid-line. In Proposition 5.5, we will then define and estimate an extension function of the Dirichlet jump into the sheet.

Proposition 5.4 (Estimate of the Dirichlet jump residual). *There exists a constant $C_N > 0$, independent of ε , such that for $j = 0, 1$*

$$\|\partial_t^j \delta_{D, \pm}^{\varepsilon, N+1}\|_{L^2(\Gamma_m)} \leq C_N \varepsilon^{N+1/2}. \quad (40)$$

Proof. The Dirichlet jump residual is given by (34b). Replacing $u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ by its Taylor expansion, see Proposition 5.3, we get

$$\delta_{D, \pm}^{\varepsilon, N+1}(t) = \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^i \left(U_{\text{int}}^i(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) - \sum_{j=0}^i \left(\pm \frac{1}{2}\right)^j \frac{1}{j!} \partial_s^j u_{\text{ext}}^{i-j}(t, \pm 0) \right) - \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^i \mathbf{r}_{\varepsilon, \pm}^{N-i+1}(u_{\text{ext}}^i)(t). \quad (41)$$

Due to (21d), this simplifies to

$$\delta_{D, \pm}^{\varepsilon, N+1}(t) = - \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^i \mathbf{r}_{\varepsilon, \pm}^{N-i+1}(u_{\text{ext}}^i)(t). \quad (42)$$

Applying (38), we get the estimate with C_N a generic constant depending on N

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta_{D, \pm}^{\varepsilon, N+1}(t)| &\leq \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^i \left(C_{N-i} \varepsilon^{N-i+1/2} \|\partial_s^{N-i+1} u_{\text{ext}}^i\|_{L^2([0, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}])} \right) \\ &\leq C_N \varepsilon^{N+1/2} \sum_{i=0}^N \|\partial_s^{N-i+1} u_{\text{ext}}^i\|_{L([0, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}])}. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Thus, we can bound the $L^2(\Gamma_m)$ -norm of $\delta_{D, \pm}^{\varepsilon, N+1}$ by a triangular inequality

$$\|\delta_{D, \pm}^{\varepsilon, N+1}(t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_m)} \leq C_N \varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=0}^N \|\partial_s^{N-i+1} u_{\text{ext}}^i\|_{L^2(\Gamma_m \times [0, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}])}.$$

Considering the curvature, $C_\kappa^{-1} \leq 1 + s\kappa(t)$ by (2), and since $\Gamma_m \times (0, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}] \subset \Omega_{\text{ext}}^0$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_s^{N-i+1} u_{\text{ext}}^i\|_{L^2(\Gamma_m \times [0, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}])}^2 &\leq C_\kappa \int_{\Gamma_m} \int_0^{\pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} (\partial_s^{N-i+1} u_{\text{ext}}^i(s, t))^2 (1 + s\kappa(t)) \, ds \, dt \\ &\leq C_\kappa |u_{\text{ext}}^i|_{H^{N-i+1}(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain $\|\partial_s^{N-i+1} u_{\text{ext}}^i\|_{L^2(\Gamma_m \times [0, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}])} \leq \|u_{\text{ext}}^i\|_{H^{N+1}(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)}$. It follows that

$$\|\delta_{D,\pm}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_m)} \leq C_N \varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=0}^N |u_{\text{ext}}^i|_{H^{N-i+1}(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)} \leq C_N \varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}} \|u_{\text{ext}}\|_{H^{N+1}(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)}.$$

By inserting the regularity bound for the expansion functions u_{ext}^i (see Theorem 4.4) we obtain

$$\|\delta_{D,\pm}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_m)} \leq C_{N,0} \varepsilon^{N+1/2},$$

which is our claim for $j = 0$. With similar arguments we find

$$\|\partial_t \delta_{D,\pm}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t)\|_{L^2(\Gamma_m)} \leq C_N \varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_t u_{\text{ext}}^i\|_{H^{N+1}(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)} \leq C_N \varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}} \|u_{\text{ext}}\|_{H^{N+2}(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^0)} \leq C_N \varepsilon^{N+\frac{1}{2}}.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 5.5 (An extension function of the Dirichlet jump residual). *There exists an extension $\delta_D^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t, s)$ of $\delta_{D,\pm}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t)$ defined in (34b) into $\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon$ with*

$$\partial_s \delta_D^{\varepsilon,N+1}\left(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) = 0, \text{ and } \exists C_N > 0 \, \forall \varepsilon > 0 : \|\delta_D^{\varepsilon,N+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)} \leq C_N \varepsilon^N. \quad (44)$$

Proof. Let us define the piecewise linear, continuous function (see Figure 2)

$$\chi_\varepsilon(s) := \begin{cases} 0 & : -\varepsilon/2 < s < -\varepsilon/4, \\ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2s}{\varepsilon} & : -\varepsilon/4 \leq s \leq \varepsilon/4, \\ 1 & : \varepsilon/4 < s < \varepsilon/2, \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

for which it holds

$$\int_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \chi_\varepsilon^2(s) \, ds = \int_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} (1 - \chi_\varepsilon(s))^2 \, ds = \frac{5}{12} \varepsilon, \quad \int_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} (\chi'_\varepsilon(s))^2 \, ds = \int_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} ((1 - \chi_\varepsilon)'(s))^2 \, ds = \frac{2}{\varepsilon}. \quad (46)$$




FIGURE 2. The extension function $\chi_\varepsilon(s)$.

Using this extension function $\chi_\varepsilon(s)$ we define an extension of the error in the Dirichlet jumps

$$\delta_D^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t, s) := \chi_\varepsilon(s) \delta_{D,+}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t) + (1 - \chi_\varepsilon(s)) \delta_{D,-}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t).$$

Applying the triangle estimate we can assert that

$$\|\delta_D^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t, s)\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)} \leq \|\chi_\varepsilon(s) \delta_{D,+}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t)\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)} + \|(1 - \chi_\varepsilon(s)) \delta_{D,-}^{\varepsilon,N+1}(t)\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)}. \quad (47)$$

Due to (2), it holds for any $u \in H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)}^2 &= \int_{\Gamma_m - \varepsilon/2}^{\varepsilon/2} \int \left((u(t, s))^2 + \left(\frac{\partial_t u(t, s)}{1 + s\kappa(t)} \right)^2 + (\partial_s u(t, s))^2 \right) (1 + s\kappa(t)) \, ds \, dt \\ &\leq C \int_{\Gamma_m - \varepsilon/2}^{\varepsilon/2} \int \left((u(t, s))^2 + (\partial_t u(t, s))^2 + (\partial_s u(t, s))^2 \right) \, ds \, dt \leq C \|u\|_{H^1(\Gamma_m \times [-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2])}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it is sufficient to estimate the functions in $H^1(\Gamma_m \times [-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2])$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta_D^{\varepsilon, N+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)} &\leq C \left(\|\chi_\varepsilon(s) \delta_{D,+}^{\varepsilon, N+1}(t)\|_{H^1(\Gamma_m \times [-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2])} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \|(1 - \chi_\varepsilon(s)) \delta_{D,-}^{\varepsilon, N+1}(t)\|_{H^1(\Gamma_m \times [-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2])} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Due to the tensorial nature of the two terms on the right hand side, we can roughly bound

$$\|\delta_D^{\varepsilon, N+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)} \leq C \left(\|\chi_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\Gamma_m)} \|\delta_{D,+}^{\varepsilon, N+1}\|_{H^1([-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2])} + \|(1 - \chi_\varepsilon)\|_{H^1(\Gamma_m)} \|\delta_{D,-}^{\varepsilon, N+1}\|_{H^1([-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2])} \right).$$

Inserting the estimates (40) and (46) we finally obtain (44). $\square$

5.2.4. The Neumann jump residual.

Proposition 5.6 (Estimate of the Neumann jump residual). *There exists a constant $C_N > 0$, independent of ε , such that*

$$\|\delta_{N,\pm}^{\varepsilon, N+1}\|_{L^2(\Gamma^\varepsilon)} \leq C_N \varepsilon^{N-1/2}.$$

Proof. The error in the Neumann jump is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{N,\pm}^{\varepsilon, N+1}(\underline{x}) &\stackrel{(34c)}{=} \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^i \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_S U_{\text{int}}^i(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) - \partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(39)}{=} \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^{i-1} \underbrace{\left(\partial_S U_{\text{int}}^i(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \left(\pm \frac{1}{2} \right)^j \frac{1}{j!} \partial_s^{j+1} u_{\text{ext}}^{i-j-1}(t, \pm 0) \right)}_{0 \text{ by (7e)}} - \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^i \mathbf{r}_{\varepsilon,\pm}^{N-i}(\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^i)(t) \\ &= - \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^i \mathbf{r}_{\varepsilon,\pm}^{N-i}(\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^i)(t), \end{aligned}$$

where we inserted the Taylor polynomial of $\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ with their remainder terms in the second step. Note, that $\mathbf{r}_{\varepsilon,\pm}^L(\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^i)(t)$ depends on $t \in \hat{\Gamma}$ since $\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^i$ is a function of t . The terms in the first sum cancel due to the approximation of the Neumann continuity in (7e). Now, we use (38) to estimate the remainders of the truncated Taylor expansion:

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow |\delta_{N,\pm}^{\varepsilon, N+1}(t)| &\stackrel{(38)}{\leq} \sum_{i=0}^N \varepsilon^i \left(C_{N-i} \varepsilon^{N-i+1/2} \|\partial_s^{N-i+2} u_{\text{ext}}^i\|_{L^2([0, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}])} \right) \\ &\leq C_N \varepsilon^{N+1/2} \sum_{i=0}^N \|\partial_s^{N-i+2} u_{\text{ext}}^i\|_{L^2([0, \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}])}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the bound in the L^2 -norms is then similar to the one of Proposition 5.5. $\square$

5.3. Proof of Theorem 5.1

Let $\hat{r}_{\text{ext}} := r_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon, N+1}$, $\hat{r}_{\text{int}} := r_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon, N+1} + \delta_D^{\varepsilon, N+1}$, with $\delta_D^{\varepsilon, N+1}$ the extension function of $\delta_{D,\pm}^{\varepsilon, N+1}$ of Proposition 5.5. Then, the function $\hat{r}$ is continuous over the interfaces Γ^ε of the sheet and inherits the vanishing trace on the boundary from $r^{\varepsilon, N+1}$. It lies consequently in $H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Multiplying (33) with a test function $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and integrating by parts in $\Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon$ and in $\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon$ we get the variational formulation: Seek $\hat{r} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon} \nabla \hat{r}_{\text{ext}} \cdot \nabla v_{\text{ext}} \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon} \left(\nabla \hat{r}_{\text{int}} \cdot \nabla v_{\text{int}} + \frac{c_0}{\varepsilon} \hat{r}_{\text{int}} v_{\text{int}} \right) \, d\mathbf{x} &= \int_{\Gamma_+^\varepsilon} -\delta_{N,+}^{\varepsilon,N+1} v \, dt + \int_{\Gamma_-^\varepsilon} \delta_{N,-}^{\varepsilon,N+1} v \, dt \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon} \left(\nabla \delta_D^{\varepsilon,N+1} \cdot \nabla v_{\text{int}} + \frac{c_0}{\varepsilon} \delta_D^{\varepsilon,N+1} v_{\text{int}} \right) \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon} \delta_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+1} v \, d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

For $\Re c_0 \geq 0$, the left hand side defines a $H_0^1(\Omega)$ -elliptic continuous bilinear form. By the estimates of the Propositions 5.2, 5.5 and 5.6 the right hand side defines a $H^1(\Omega)$ -continuous linear form. The Lax-Milgram lemma [26] ensures stability. Inserting the results of the Propositions 5.2, 5.5 and 5.6 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\left\| r_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon,N+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon)}^2 + \left\| r_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \|\hat{r}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\delta_D^{\varepsilon,N}\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq \tilde{C} \left(\left(2 + \sqrt{\frac{c_0}{\varepsilon}} \right) \underbrace{\|\delta_D^{\varepsilon,N+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)}}_{O(\varepsilon^N)} + \sum_{\sigma=\{+,-\}} \underbrace{\|\delta_{N,\sigma}^{\varepsilon,N+1}\|_{L^2(\Gamma_\sigma^\varepsilon)}}_{O(\varepsilon^{N-\frac{1}{2}})} + \underbrace{\|\delta_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)}}_{O(\varepsilon^{N-\frac{1}{2}})} \right) \leq C \varepsilon^{N-\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

with $C > 0$ a constant independent of ε . Moreover, by definition (32)

$$r^{\varepsilon,N+1} = \varepsilon^{N+1} u^{N+1} + \varepsilon^{N+2} u^{N+2} + r^{\varepsilon,N+3}. \quad (50)$$

Using the fact that for every integer i , $\|u^i\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon)} = O(1)$ and $\|u^i\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)} = O(\varepsilon^{-1/2})$, inserting (49) into (50) and applying the triangle inequality we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| r_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon,N+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon)} &\leq \varepsilon^{N+1} \|u_{\text{ext}}^{N+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon^{N+2} \|u_{\text{ext}}^{N+2}\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon)} + \left\| r_{\text{ext}}^{\varepsilon,N+3} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{ext}}^\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq C_1 \varepsilon^{N+1} + C_2 \varepsilon^{N+2} + C_3 \varepsilon^{N+3/2} \leq C \varepsilon^{N+1}, \\ \left\| r_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+1} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)} &\leq \varepsilon^{N+1} \|u_{\text{int}}^{N+1}\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon^{N+2} \|u_{\text{int}}^{N+2}\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)} + \left\| r_{\text{int}}^{\varepsilon,N+3} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq C_1 \varepsilon^{N+1/2} + C_2 \varepsilon^{N+3/2} + C_3 \varepsilon^{N+3/2} \leq C \varepsilon^{N+1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

6. The first three orders

In Section 4, the external function u_{ext}^i and the internal function U_{int}^i were defined by a coupled problem, see (23). We could use a finite element method for the approximation on two meshes – a first one for Ω_{ext}^0 and a second one for $\hat{\Omega}$. Since this formulation is not common, we propose an equivalent definition of the internal and external functions by uncoupled problems, whose solutions will be much easier to approximate numerically.

More precisely, we elaborate a procedure that allows to compute the exterior functions of order 0, 1, and 2, with no need of the interior functions. This factorisation leads to three problems defining u_{ext}^0 , u_{ext}^1 and u_{ext}^2 involving only exterior fields of lower order, see (57), (63) and (65). The details for the second order will not be given.

6.1. Preliminary results: replacing higher normal derivatives on the mid-line

The asymptotic expansion models (23) involve derivatives of high order with respect to the normal direction. Because it is from a practical point of view easier to handle tangential derivatives than normal derivatives of the same order we intend to replace these higher normal derivatives. Due to the absence of a source term f in $\Omega_{\text{int}}^\varepsilon$ for all ε smaller than ε_0 , *i. e.*

$$-\Delta u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, s) = 0, \quad s \in \left[-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right], \quad (51)$$

it is possible to replace the normal derivatives by derivatives in t .

Taking the two limits of the expression (10) of the Laplace operator for $s \rightarrow \pm 0$ we obtain

$$\Delta = \partial_n^2 + \kappa(t) \partial_n + \partial_t^2$$

and inserting the above expression into (51) yields

$$\partial_n^2 u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0) = -\kappa(t) \partial_n u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0) - \partial_t^2 u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0). \quad (52)$$

Applying the normal derivative ∂_s to (10) we get the expression

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \partial_s \Delta = \partial_s^3 - \frac{\kappa^2(t)}{(1 + s\kappa(t))^2} \partial_s^2 + \frac{\kappa(t)}{1 + s\kappa(t)} \partial_s^2 - \frac{\kappa(t)}{(1 + s\kappa(t))^2} \partial_t \left(\frac{1}{1 + s\kappa(t)} \partial_t \right) \\ + \frac{1}{1 + s\kappa(t)} \partial_t \left(-\frac{\kappa(t)}{(1 + s\kappa(t))^2} \partial_t + \frac{1}{1 + s\kappa(t)} \partial_s \partial_t \right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the two limits for $s \rightarrow \pm 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_n^3 u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0) &= -\kappa(t) \partial_n^2 u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0) + (\kappa^2(t) - \partial_t^2) \partial_n u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0) + (2\kappa(t) \partial_t^2 + \kappa'(t) \partial_t) u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0) \\ &\stackrel{(52)}{=} (2\kappa^2(t) - \partial_t^2) \partial_n u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0) + (3\kappa(t) \partial_t^2 + \kappa'(t) \partial_t) u_{\text{ext}}^i(t, \pm 0). \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Such expressions hold also for the jump and for the mean value of higher order derivatives

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} [\partial_n^2 u_{\text{ext}}^i](t) \\ \{\partial_n^2 u_{\text{ext}}^i\}(t) \end{array} \right\} = -\kappa(t) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} [\partial_n u_{\text{ext}}^i](t) \\ \{\partial_n u_{\text{ext}}^i\}(t) \end{array} \right\} - \partial_t^2 \left\{ \begin{array}{l} [u_{\text{ext}}^i](t) \\ \{u_{\text{ext}}^i\}(t) \end{array} \right\}, \quad (54)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} [\partial_n^3 u_{\text{ext}}^i](t) \\ \{\partial_n^3 u_{\text{ext}}^i\}(t) \end{array} \right\} = (2\kappa^2(t) - \partial_t^2) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} [\partial_n u_{\text{ext}}^i](t) \\ \{\partial_n u_{\text{ext}}^i\}(t) \end{array} \right\} + (3\kappa(t) \partial_t^2 + \kappa'(t) \partial_t) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} [u_{\text{ext}}^i](t) \\ \{u_{\text{ext}}^i\}(t) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (55)$$

6.2. Order 0

First, we express the internal function U_{int}^0 as expression of u_{ext}^0 . Then, inserting this expression into (23b) leads to an uncoupled problem for u_{ext}^0 .

6.2.1. Internal function. The internal function is given as the sum of the mean value $\{U_{\text{int}}^0\}(t)$ and of the function $\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^0(t, S)$, which are defined in (23a) and (23c), respectively. By evaluating these equations we find

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \partial_S^2 \tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^0(t, S) = 0 \\ \partial_S \tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^0(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) = 0 \\ \{\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^0\}(t) = 0 \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow \tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^0(t, S) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \{U_{\text{int}}^0\}(t) = \{u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t).$$

Consequently, the internal function is given by

$$U_{\text{int}}^0(t, S) = U_{\text{int}}^0(t) = \{u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t). \quad (56)$$

6.2.2. External function. Inserting $\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^0 = 0$ into (23b) yields the completely uncoupled problem for the external function u_{ext}^0

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\Delta u_{\text{ext}}^0(\underline{x}) = f(\underline{x}) & \text{in } \Omega_{\text{ext}}^0, \\ u_{\text{ext}}^0(\underline{x}) = g(\underline{x}) & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ [u_{\text{ext}}^0](t) = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_m, \\ [\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^0](t) - c_0 \{u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_m. \end{array} \right. \quad (57)$$

Note that u_{ext}^0 is uniquely defined by Lemma 4.2. As u_{ext}^0 has no jump over Γ_m we denote $u_{\text{ext}}^0(t) := u_{\text{ext}}^0(t, \pm 0) = \{u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t)$. Thus, we can write the last equation of (57) as

$$[\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^0](t) - c_0 u_{\text{ext}}^0(t) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_m. \quad (58)$$

6.3. Order 1

In the same way as for order 0 we express $\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^1$ in terms of u_{ext}^0 and u_{ext}^1 and derive the uncoupled problem defining u_{ext}^1 . Then, we replace a second normal derivative by a second tangential and a simple normal derivative. The resulting model for u_{ext}^1 depends only on the external function of order 0.

6.3.1. Internal function. The internal function $U_{\text{int}}^1(t, S)$ is given as the sum of the mean value $\{U_{\text{int}}^1\}(t)$ and the function $\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^1(t, S)$, which are defined in (23a) and (23c), respectively. For $i = 1$, the problem (23a) takes the form

$$\begin{cases} \partial_S^2 \tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^1(t, S) = c_0 U_{\text{int}}^0(t) - \kappa(t) \underbrace{\partial_S U_{\text{int}}^0(t)}_0 = c_0 u_{\text{ext}}^0(t) \\ \partial_S \tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^1(t, \pm \frac{1}{2}) = \partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^0(t, \pm 0) \\ \{\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^1\}(t) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (59)$$

Consequently, we can assert that

$$\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^1(t, S) = \frac{c_0}{2} u_{\text{ext}}^0(t) (S^2 - \frac{1}{4}) + \{\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) S. \quad (60)$$

From (23c) the mean value of the internal function is given by

$$\{U_{\text{int}}^1\}(t) = \{u_{\text{ext}}^1\}(t) + \frac{1}{4} [\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^0](t) \stackrel{(57)}{=} \{u_{\text{ext}}^1\}(t) + \frac{c_0}{4} u_{\text{ext}}^0(t), \quad (61)$$

and we can re-compose the internal function to

$$U_{\text{int}}^1(t, S) = \frac{c_0}{2} u_{\text{ext}}^0(t) (S^2 + \frac{1}{4}) + \{\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) S + \{u_{\text{ext}}^1\}(t). \quad (62)$$

6.3.2. External function. Inserting (60) into (23b) we obtain a vanishing Dirichlet jump

$$[u_{\text{ext}}^1](t) = [\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^1](t) - \{\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) = \{\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) - \{\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) = 0,$$

and for the Neumann jump

$$\begin{aligned} [\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^1](t) - c_0 \{u_{\text{ext}}^1\}(t) &= \underbrace{\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} c_0 \tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^1(t, S) dS}_{-\frac{c_0^2}{12} u_{\text{ext}}^0(t) \text{ by (60)}} - \kappa(t) \underbrace{[\tilde{U}_{\text{int}}^1](t)}_{\{\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) \text{ by (60)}} + \frac{c_0}{4} \underbrace{[\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^0](t)}_{c_0 u_{\text{ext}}^0(t) \text{ by (58)}} \\ &\quad - \{\partial_S^2 u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) - \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \partial_t^2 \underbrace{U_{\text{int}}^0(t, S)}_{u_{\text{ext}}^0(t) \text{ by (56)}} - \kappa^2(t) S \underbrace{\partial_S U_{\text{int}}^0(t, S)}_{0 \text{ by (56)}} dS. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (54) we can replace the mean value of the second normal derivative by

$$\{\partial_S^2 u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) = -\kappa(t) \{\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) - \partial_t^2 \{u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t).$$

Summarising, we have, after mutual cancellation of most of the terms,

$$\begin{aligned} [\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^1](t) - c_0 \{u_{\text{ext}}^1\}(t) &= -\frac{c_0^2}{12} u_{\text{ext}}^0(t) - \kappa(t) \{\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) + \frac{c_0^2}{4} u_{\text{ext}}^0(t) \\ &\quad + \kappa(t) \{\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) + \partial_t^2 \{u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) - \partial_t^2 \{u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) = \frac{c_0^2}{6} u_{\text{ext}}^0(t). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, u_{ext}^1 is uniquely defined, see Lemma 4.2, as solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_{\text{ext}}^1(\underline{x}) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega_{\text{ext}}^0, \\ u_{\text{ext}}^1(\underline{x}) = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ [u_{\text{ext}}^1](t) = 0, & \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{m}}, \\ [\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^1](t) - c_0 \{u_{\text{ext}}^1\}(t) = \frac{c_0^2}{6} u_{\text{ext}}^0(t), & \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{m}}. \end{cases} \quad (63)$$

As $u_{\text{ext}}^1(\underline{x})$ has no jump over Γ_{m} we denote $u_{\text{ext}}^1(t) := u_{\text{ext}}^1(t, \pm 0) = \{u_{\text{ext}}^1\}(t)$. Thus, we can write the last equation of (63) as

$$[\partial_S u_{\text{ext}}^1](t) - c_0 u_{\text{ext}}^1(t) = \frac{c_0^2}{6} u_{\text{ext}}^0(t) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{m}}. \quad (64)$$




FIGURE 3. (a) Geometrical setting with elliptic mid-line (dashed line) with the semi-major axis a and semi-minor axis b . The boundary is a circle of radius R ($R = 2$, $a = \sqrt{0.4}$, $b = 0.4$). (b) Mesh $\mathcal{M}^0$ for the finite element solution of the asymptotic expansion models. The mid-line Γ_m is labelled. (c) Associate mesh $\mathcal{M}^\varepsilon$ for the finite element solution of the exact model with the cells in the sheet, here of thickness $\varepsilon = 1/16$.

6.4. Order 2

6.4.1. External function. In the same way, one can obtain that the second order term u_{ext}^2 is uniquely defined by (see Lemma 4.2)

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \Delta u_{\text{ext}}^2(\underline{x}) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_{\text{ext}}^0, \\ [u_{\text{ext}}^2](t) = -\frac{c_0}{24}\kappa(t)u_{\text{ext}}^0(t,0) - \frac{c_0}{12}\{\partial_n u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) & \text{on } \Gamma_m, \\ [\partial_n u_{\text{ext}}^2](t) - c_0\{u_{\text{ext}}^2\}(t) = \frac{c_0^2}{6}u_{\text{ext}}^1(t) + \frac{c_0}{24}\kappa(t)\{\partial_n u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) & \\ \quad + c_0\left(\frac{7}{240}c_0^2 - \frac{\partial_t^2}{12}\right)u_{\text{ext}}^0(t,0) & \text{on } \Gamma_m, \\ u_{\text{ext}}^2(\underline{x}) = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{array} \right. \quad (65)$$

whose Dirichlet and Neumann traces are both discontinuous over the mid-line of the sheet in general. The transmission conditions depend on the solutions of order 0 and 1 and include even a second tangential derivative of u_{ext}^0 . Once again no boundary data or source term is involved.

6.4.2. Internal function. The internal expansion function of order 2 is the fourth order polynomial

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\text{int}}^2(t, S) = & \frac{c_0^2}{24}u_{\text{ext}}^0(t)\left(S^2 + \frac{3}{4}\right)^2 + \frac{c_0}{6}\{\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t)\left(S^3 - \frac{3}{4}S\right) - \frac{c_0}{6}\kappa(t)u_{\text{ext}}^0(t)\left(S^3 + \frac{3}{4}S\right) \\ & + \frac{c_0}{2}u_{\text{ext}}^1(t)\left(S^2 + \frac{1}{4}\right) - \frac{1}{2}\left(\kappa(t)\{\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^0\}(t) + \partial_t^2 u_{\text{ext}}^0(t)\right)S^2 + \{\partial_s u_{\text{ext}}^1\}(t)S + \{u_{\text{ext}}^2\}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

which involves the curvature of the sheet and a second tangential derivative of the external function of order 0.

7. Numerical examples

In this section, we numerically investigate the rate of convergence of the approximate asymptotic models with the numerical C++ library *Concepts* [10, 12]. We consider a domain with an ellipsoidal sheet as an example for varying curvature (see Figure 3(a)).

We discretise both, the exact model and the asymptotic expansion models, by means of high-order finite elements. The smooth shape is taken into account by curved elements of high-order so




FIGURE 4. High order Finite element approximation of the solution u^ε of the exact model for two values of ε for Dirichlet data $g = 1$, source term $f = 0$ and relative conductivity $c_0 = 1$.




FIGURE 5. Numerical approximation of the asymptotic expansion coefficient $u_{\text{ext}}^i(\underline{x})$ for the geometry with an ellipsoidal thin sheet ($a = \sqrt{0.4}$, $b = 0.4$), $c_0 = 1$, $g = 1$, and $f = 0$, computed by high order finite elements.

that the discretisation error does not dominate the modelling error. The meshes for the exact model are denoted by $\mathcal{M}^\varepsilon$ (see Figure 3(c)) whereas $\mathcal{M}^0$ denotes the mesh for asymptotic expansion models (see Figure 3(b)). For the computation of the modelling errors in the L^2 -norm and the H^1 -seminorm we represent the asymptotic expansion functions $u^i(\underline{x})$ and $U^i(t, S)$ after their computation on the meshes $\mathcal{M}^\varepsilon$.

The numerical simulations are performed with Dirichlet boundary data $g = 1$, a vanishing source term $f = 0$ and a relative conductivity $c_0 = 1$. We use linear trunk spaces with a uniform polynomial degree $p = 15$ and at least 17^2 Gauß-Jacobi-quadrature points per cell to highly resolve the solution of the exact (3380 degrees of freedom) and the asymptotic model (2738 degrees of freedom). For the exact model these high polynomial degrees are also applied in the cells inside the sheet.

The solutions $u^\varepsilon(\underline{x})$ of the exact model are shown in Figure 4 for two values of ε . The area, which is enclosed by the sheet, is apparently shielded. The according expansion functions $u_{\text{ext}}^0(\underline{x})$, $u_{\text{ext}}^1(\underline{x})$ and $u_{\text{ext}}^2(\underline{x})$ are shown in Figure 5.

In Figure 6 the modelling error in the H^1 -seminorm evaluated first inside the sheet and secondly in the exterior is shown, both in dependence of ε . The convergence rate is 0.5, 1.5 and 2.5 in the sheet and 1, 2 and 3 in the exterior area for the asymptotic expansion models of order 0, 1 or 2, respectively. This validates the sharpness of the a-priori estimates of Lemma 5.1. The corresponding L^2 -errors are shown in Figure 7. We observe rates of convergence in the thin sheet of 1.5, 2.5 and




FIGURE 6. The modelling error in the H^1 -seminorm for ellipsoid sheets of varying thicknesses ε and a constant relative conductivity $c_0 = 1$, computed by high-order FEM.




FIGURE 7. The modelling error in the L^2 -norm for ellipsoid sheets of varying thicknesses ε and a constant relative conductivity $c_0 = 1$, computed by high-order FEM.

3.5 and of 1, 2 and 3 in the exterior for the three models. The improved rates inside the sheet in comparison to the H^1 -seminorm results due to the different scaling with changing thickness ε .

Conclusion

In the context of eddy current modelling, we derived the asymptotic expansion at any order of the solution of a model problem with a dissipative thin sheet, see (3). For the three first orders, we obtained formulations, see Section 6, that are easy to implement, do not require to mesh the sheet and do not lead to ill-conditioned matrices. This asymptotic expansion is not only formal but justified by error estimates. The theoretical results have been validated through numerical simulations which also demonstrate the numerical feasibility.

Like it was achieved for IBCs, this approach can be generalised to 3D (where one has to take care of the geometry of the sheet) and to other systems of equations including non exclusively the Helmholtz equation, the Maxwell equations, or the wave equation in time domain (for IBCs see respectively [3], [15] and [4] for example).

References

- [1] ANTOINE, X., BARUCQ, H., AND VERNHET, L. High-frequency asymptotic analysis of a dissipative transmission problem resulting in generalized impedance boundary conditions. *Asymptot. Anal.* 26, 3-4 (2001), 257–283.
- [2] BARTOLI, N., AND BENDALI, A. Robust and high-order effective boundary conditions for perfectly conducting scatterers coated by a thin dielectric layer. *IMA J. Appl. Math.* 67 (2002), 479–508.
- [3] BENDALI, A., AND LEMRABET, K. The effect of a thin coating on the scattering of a time-harmonic wave for the Helmholtz equation. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 6 (1996), 1664–1693.
- [4] BENDALI, A., AND LEMRABET, K. Asymptotic analysis of the scattering of a time-harmonic electromagnetic wave by a perfectly conducting metal coated with a thin dielectric shell. *Asymptot. Anal.* 57, 3-4 (2008), 199–227.
- [5] BIRO, O., PREIS, K., RICHTER, K., HELLER, R., KOMAREK, P., AND MAURER, W. FEM calculation of eddy current losses and forces in thin conducting sheets of test facilities for fusion reactor components. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* 28, 2 (1992), 1509–1512.
- [6] BOTTAUSCIO, O., CHIAMPI, M., AND MANZIN, A. Transient analysis of thin layers for the magnetic field shielding. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* 42, 4 (April 2006), 871–874.
- [7] BRAESS, D. *Finite Elements: Theory, Fast Solvers, and Applications in Solid Mechanics*, 3th ed. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [8] CALOZ, G., COSTABEL, M., DAUGE, M., AND VIAL, G. Asymptotic expansion of the solution of an interface problem in a polygonal domain with thin layer. *Asymptot. Anal.* 50, 1 (2006), 121–173.
- [9] CHECHURIN, V., KALIMOV, A., MINEVICH, L., SVEDENTSOV, M., AND REPETTO, M. A simulation of magneto-hydrostatic phenomena in thin liquid layers of an aluminum electrolytic cell. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* 36, 4 (2000), 1309–1312.
- [10] CONCEPTS DEVELOPMENT TEAM. *Webpage of Numerical C++ Library Concepts 2*. <http://www.concepts.math.ethz.ch>, 2008.
- [11] DURUFLÉ, M., HADDAR, H., AND JOLY, P. Higher order generalized impedance boundary conditions in electromagnetic scattering problems. *C. R. Physique* 7, 5 (2006), 533–542.
- [12] FRAUENFELDER, P., AND LAGE, C. Concepts – an object-oriented software package for partial differential equations. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.* 36, 5 (September 2002), 937–951.
- [13] GUÉRIN, C., TANNEAU, G., MEUNIER, G., LABIE, P., NGNEGUEU, T., AND SACOTTE, M. A shell element for computing 3D eddy currents – Application to transformers. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* 31, 3 (1995), 1360–1363.
- [14] GYSELINCK, J., SABARIEGO, R. V., DULAR, P., AND GEUZAINÉHIN, C. Time-domain finite-element modeling of thin electromagnetic shells. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* (2008). to appear.
- [15] HADDAR, H., JOLY, P., AND NGUYEN, H.-M. Generalized impedance boundary conditions for scattering by strongly absorbing obstacles: the scalar case. *Math. Models Meth. Appl. Sci.* 15, 8 (2005), 1273–1300.
- [16] IGARASHI, H., KOST, A., AND HONMA, T. A boundary element analysis of magnetic shielding for electron microscopes. *COMPEL* 17, 5/6 (1998), 585–594.
- [17] IGARASHI, H., KOST, A., AND HONMA, T. Impedance boundary condition for vector potentials on thin layers and its application to integral equations. *Eur. Phys. J. AP* 1 (1998), 103–109.
- [18] KRÄHENBÜHL, L., AND MULLER, D. Thin layers in electrical engineering. Example of shell models in analysing eddy-currents by boundary and finite element methods. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* 29 (1993), 1450–1455.
- [19] LEONTOVICH, M. A. On approximate boundary conditions for electromagnetic fields on the surface of highly conducting bodies (in russian). *Research in the propagation of radio waves* (1948), 5–12. Moscow, Academy of Sciences.
- [20] MAYERGOYZ, I. D., AND BEDROSIAN, G. On calculation of 3-D eddy currents in conducting and magnetic shells. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* 31, 3 (1995), 1319–1324.
- [21] MIRI, A. M., RIEGEL, N. A., AND MEINECKE, C. FE calculation of transient eddy currents in thin conductive sheets using dynamic boundary conditions. *j-int-j-numer-model* 11 (1998), 307–316.
- [22] NAKATA, T., TAKAHASHI, N., FUJIWARA, K., AND SHIRAKI, Y. 3D magnetic field analysis using special elements. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* 26, 5 (1990), 2379–2381.
- [23] PÉRON, V., AND POIGNARD, C. Approximate transmission conditions for time-harmonic Maxwell equations in a domain with thin layer. Research Report RR-6775, INRIA, 2008.

- [24] POIGNARD, C. Approximate transmission conditions through a weakly oscillating thin layer. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences* 32, 4 (2009).
- [25] SAFA, Y., FLUECK, M., AND RAPPAZ, J. Numerical simulation of thermal problems coupled with magnetohydrodynamic effects in aluminium cell. *Appl. Math. Modell.* (2008).
- [26] SAUTER, S., AND SCHWAB, C. *Randelementmethoden*. B.G. Teubner-Verlag, 2004.
- [27] SCHMIDT, K. *High-order numerical modelling of highly conductive thin sheets*. PhD thesis, ETH Zürich, 2008. To appear.
- [28] SENIOR, T., AND VOLAKIS, J. *Approximate Boundary Conditions in Electromagnetics*. Institution of Electrical Engineers, 1995.
- [29] SHCHUKIN, A. N. *Propagation of Radio Waves (in russian)*. Svyazizdat, Moscow, 1940.
- [30] YOSIDA, K. *Lectures on Differential and Integral Equations*. Dover, 1991.

Kersten Schmidt
Hausdorff Center for Mathematics
University of Bonn
Endenicher Alle 62
53115 Bonn
Germany
e-mail: `kersten.schmidt@hcm.uni-bonn.de`

Sébastien Tordeux
Dpartement de Gnie Mathmatique et Modlisation
INSA Toulouse
135 avenue de Rangueil
31077 Toulouse cedex 4
France
e-mail: `sebastien.tordeux@insa-toulouse.fr`