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TWO-SIDED BOUNDS OF EIGENVALUES OF SECOND- AND FOURTH-ORDER ELLIPTIC OPERATORS
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Abstract. This article presents an idea in the finite element methods (FEMs) for obtaining two-sided bounds of exact eigenvalues. This approach is based on the combination of nonconforming methods giving lower bounds of the eigenvalues and a postprocessing technique using conforming finite elements. Our results hold for the second and fourth-order problems defined on two-dimensional domains.

First, we list analytic and experimental results concerning triangular and rectangular nonconforming elements which give at least asymptotically lower bounds of the exact eigenvalues. We present some new numerical experiments for the plate bending problem on a rectangular domain. The main result is that if we know an estimate from below by nonconforming FEM, then by using a postprocessing procedure we can obtain two-sided bounds of the first (essential) eigenvalue. For the other eigenvalues \( \lambda_l, l = 2, 3, \ldots \), we prove and give conditions when this method is applicable. Finally, the numerical results presented and discussed in the paper illustrate the efficiency of our method.
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1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

Let \( V \) and \( H \) be Hilbert spaces with functions defined on a polygonal domain \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \), where \( V \subset H \) with a compact embedding.

Let also \( a(\cdot, \cdot) \) be a symmetric, \( V \)-elliptic and continuous bilinear form on \( V \times V \), and \( b(\cdot, \cdot) \) a bilinear form on \( H \times H \) which is continuous, symmetric, and positive definite.

The research has been supported by the Bulgarian National Science Fund under grant DFNI-I01/5.
We define inner products and norms on $H$ by $b(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\|\cdot\|_b = \sqrt{b(\cdot, \cdot)}$ and on $V$ by $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\|\cdot\|_a = \sqrt{a(\cdot, \cdot)}$, respectively.

Consider the weak form of eigenvalue problems of the self-adjoint second- or fourth-order elliptic differential operator: Find a number $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and a function $u \in V$, $\|u\|_b = 1$, such that

\[(1.1) \quad a^{(i)}(u, v) = \lambda b(u, v), \quad \forall v \in V,\]

where $i = 1$ and $i = 2$ correspond to the second- and fourth-order problem, respectively. In (1.1) the form $b(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the usual $L_2$-inner product:

\[b(u, v) = (u, v) = \int_{\Omega} uv \, dx, \quad \|u\|_b = \|u\|_{0, \Omega}.\]

In the case of the second-order operator, we consider $V = H^1_0(\Omega)$ and $H = L^2(\Omega)$, where $H^1_0(\Omega) = \{v \in H^1(\Omega): v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}$, see e.g. ([10], p. 659), and

\[(1.2) \quad a^{(1)}(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx.\]

It is well known that problem (1.1), (1.2) has a countable sequence of real eigenvalues $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \ldots$, and the corresponding eigenfunctions $u_1, u_2, \ldots$ can be assumed to satisfy $\|u_i\|_b = 1$; $(u_i, u_j) = \delta_{ij}, i, j \geq 1$.

The eigenfunctions $u_j$ belong to the Besov space $B_2^{1+r, \infty}(\Omega)$, and in particular to the Sobolev space $H^{1+r-\varepsilon}(\Omega)$ for the small parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, where $r = 1$ if $\Omega$ is convex and $r = \pi/\omega$ (with $\omega$ being the largest inner angle of $\Omega$) otherwise [9].

As the fourth-order problem we consider the plate vibration problem, i.e. the eigenvalue problem (1.1) with $V = H^2_0(\Omega)$ and $H = L^2(\Omega)$, where $H^2_0(\Omega) = \{v \in H^2(\Omega): v|_{\partial\Omega} = \partial_\nu v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}$, see ([10], p. 660), and

\[(1.3) \quad a^{(2)}(u, v) = \int_{\Omega} (\sigma \Delta u \Delta v + (1 - \sigma)(2\partial_{12}u\partial_{12}v + \partial_{11}u\partial_{11}v + \partial_{22}u\partial_{22}v)) \, dx,\]

where $\sigma \in [0, 0.5)$ is the Poisson ratio. Clearly, the bilinear form $a^{(2)}(u, v)$ is symmetric and according to [13], it is also continuous and $H^2_0(\Omega)$-elliptic. The problem (1.1), (1.3) has an infinite number of eigenvalues $\lambda_j$, all being strictly positive, having finite multiplicity and showing no finite accumulation point [10]. We arrange them as $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \ldots \to \infty$.

For the second and fourth order elliptic eigenvalue problems it is well known that the eigenvalues computed by using the standard conforming FEM are always above the exact ones. This fact comes from the minimum-maximum characterization of
the eigenvalues (see for example [10], p. 699). Therefore, it is an important problem to find methods which give lower bounds of the eigenvalues. However, before the year 2000, only few results in this direction have been obtained and mainly for finite difference methods [15]. It seems natural to look among nonconforming methods ways for obtaining bounds from below and this will be our starting point. Indeed, if the finite element space is not contained in the Hilbert space where the continuous variational problem is formulated, it is not clear in advance whether the eigenvalues of the discretized problem approximate the eigenvalues of the continuous problem from below or from above.

Let us emphasize that it is valuable to find an interval as small as possible which the exact eigenvalue belongs to. But, obviously, it would be undesirably expensive to compute the eigenvalues twice—once using nonconforming FEM approximations and then by means of a conforming one.

Here, we propose a new procedure for determining bilateral finite element estimates for the eigenvalues. Our approach has two principal advantages:

(i) Usually, the exact eigenvalues are unknown. So, in numerical methods it is always valuable to obtain two-sided bound of any unknown quantity. Moreover, if the interval is small enough one could take the arithmetical mean or an extrapolation formula using the lower and upper bounds.

(ii) We use nonconforming FEM avoiding $C^0$- or $C^1$-continuity for the second- or fourth-order eigenvalue problem, respectively. Then we apply a simple postprocedure in order to obtain a bound from above.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we state the results concerning lower bounds of eigenvalues. They are divided into two subsections: a survey devoted to using nonconforming finite elements in eigenvalue problems of second- and fourth-order problems. Here we discuss some new numerical results. In Section 3 we prove the main result, namely, the proposed postprocessing giving an estimate from above of the eigenvalue. Finally, we illustrate the efficiency of the presented method by numerical results.

2. LOWER BOUNDS OF EIGENVALUES USING NONCONFORMING FEMs

Let $\tau_h$ be a regular mesh of the domain $\Omega$ (see [13], p. 131) such that any two triangles (or rectangles) in $\tau_h$ share at most a vertex or an edge. Let $h$ denote the mesh-size parameter, namely $h = \max_{K \in \tau_h} h_K$, with $h_K$ being the diameter of the triangle/rectangle $K$ and $K \in \tau_h$ being affine equivalent to a reference element $\hat{K}$. We suppose that the family of triangulations $\tau_h$ satisfies the usual shape regularity
condition, i.e., there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that $h_K/\varrho_K \leq \alpha$ where $\varrho_K$ is the diameter of the largest ball contained in $K$.

By $V_h$, $V_h \subset H$, $V_h \not\subset V$, we denote a nonconforming finite dimensional space.

The nonconforming finite element approximation of (1.1) states: Find a number $\lambda_h \in \mathbb{R}$ and a function $u_h \in V_h$, $\|u_h\|_b = 1$, such that

\begin{equation}
(2.1) \quad a_h^{(i)}(u_h, v_h) = \lambda_h b(u_h, v_h), \quad \forall v_h \in V_h,
\end{equation}

where $a_h^{(i)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the mesh-dependent bilinear form defined by

\[ a_h^{(i)}(u, v) = \sum_{K \in \tau_h} a_K^{(i)}(u, v), \quad i = 1, 2, \]

and $a_K^{(i)}$ denotes the restriction of $a^{(i)}$ on $K \in \tau_h$.

### 2.1. Second-order eigenvalue problem.

In this case the $a^{(1)}$-form in (2.1) is defined by (1.2). We will consider some nonconforming finite elements for which we will investigate whether and under which conditions they give lower bounds for computed eigenvalues.

**Piecewise linear finite element of Crouzeix-Raviart (C-R)** is a well-known triangular element, for which the degrees of freedom (interpolation conditions) are function values at the three midpoints of the edges. The nonconforming Crouzeix-Raviart element space, proposed by Crouzeix and Raviart [14], is defined by

\[ V_h^{C-R} = \{ v : v|_K \in P_1 \text{ is continuous at the midpoints of the edges of } K, \forall K \in \tau_h \text{ and } v = 0 \text{ at the midpoints of the edges } l \in \partial \Omega \}, \]

where $P_k$ denotes the space of polynomials of degree less than or equal to $k$, $k \geq 0$ is integer and $\tau_h$ is a triangular mesh.

Armentano and Durán [8] proved that the Crouzeix-Raviart element results in a lower bound in the singular eigenfunction case. In [38] it was established that the use of Crouzeix-Raviart element gives lower bounds not only in the singular eigenfunction case, but also in the smooth eigenfunction case. Some numerical experiments have been also carried out on both an $L$-shaped domain and the unit square.

The authors proved estimates from below of this element (Figure 1(a)) for the Laplace operator eigenvalues of problems defined on convex [4] and nonconvex [6] domains.

**Extension of Crouzeix-Raviart element (EC-R)**—this element (Figure 1(b)), introduced in [7], [23] (see also [5], [26]) is an extension of the previous one. The degrees
Figure 1. Nonconforming finite elements: (a) FE of Crouzeix-Raviart; (b) Extended FE of Crouzeix-Raviart; (c) $Q_1^{\text{rot}}$-element; (d) $E Q_1^{\text{rot}}$-element

of freedom of an $EC-R$ element are

$$\frac{1}{|l_j|} \int_{l_j} v \, ds, \quad j = 1, 2, 3 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{|K|} \int_{K} v \, dx,$$

for any test function $v$, and $l_j$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, being the edges of the triangle $K \in \tau_h$, where

$$|l_j| = \int_{l_j} ds \quad \text{and} \quad |K| = \int_{K} dx.$$  

The $EC-R$ finite element space is defined by (see [7], [23], [26])

$$V_h^{EC-R} = \{ v \in L_2(\Omega) : v|_K \in \text{span}\{1, x, y, x^2 + y^2\}, \ v \text{ is integrally continuous}$$

$$\text{on the edges of } K, \ \forall K \in \tau_h \ \text{and} \ \int_{l} v \, ds = 0 \ \text{for any edge } l \subset \partial \Omega \}.$$  

In [5] it is proved that the eigenvalues obtained by means of this element are always less than the eigenvalues obtained using an element of Crouzeix-Raviart (the so-called effect of the enriched variational spaces). From this fact it follows that the extension of the Crouzeix-Raviart element gives lower bounds for the exact eigenvalues in case for which it is valid for the Crouzeix-Raviart element. It is to be noted here that this fact is also proved in [26].

Rotated bilinear element ($Q_1^{\text{rot}}$) is a rectangular element proposed by Rannacher and Turek [31] (Figure 1(c)). For any test function $v$, the degrees of freedom could
be presented by
\[
\frac{1}{|l_j|} \int_{l_j} v \, ds,
\]
where \(l_j, j = 1, 2, 3, 4\), are the edges of any \(K \in \tau_h\).

The \(Q_1^{\text{rot}}\)-element space is defined by
\[
V_h^{Q_1^{\text{rot}}} = \{v \in L_2(\Omega) : v|_K \in \text{span}\{1, x, y, x^2 - y^2\}, \ v\text{ is integrally continuous on } \Omega\}.\]

In 2005 Liu and Yan [25] made the following numerical observation for the eigenvalue problem (1.1), (1.2) using a \(Q_1^{\text{rot}}\)-element:

- On the square domain, numerical eigenvalues \(\lambda_{1,h}\) and \(\lambda_{4,h}\) approximate the corresponding exact eigenvalues from below, while \(\lambda_{2,h}\) and \(\lambda_{3,h}\) approximate them from above.

- On the \(L\)-shaped domain, numerical eigenvalues \(\lambda_{1,h}\) and \(\lambda_{3,h}\) approximate the corresponding exact eigenvalues from below, while \(\lambda_{2,h}\) and \(\lambda_{4,h}\) approximate them from above.

Again in [25], Liu and Yan explained the phenomenon for the square domain. Until 2010, the phenomenon for the \(L\)-shaped domain [38] was not analyzed. Huang, Li, and Lin [17], [20] proposed a new expansion of approximated eigenvalues on the unit square under the uniform mesh and gave some numerical results.

**Extension of rotated bilinear element (\(EQ_1^{\text{rot}}\))**—this element represents an extension of the previous one. The degrees of freedom of \(EQ_1^{\text{rot}}\) are
\[
\frac{1}{|l_j|} \int_{l_j} v \, ds, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, 4 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{|K|} \int_K v \, dx,
\]
where \(v\) is a test function and \(K \in \tau_h\) (Figure 1(d)).

The \(EQ_1^{\text{rot}}\)-element space is defined by (see [19], [21])
\[
V_h^{EQ_1^{\text{rot}}} = \{v \in L_2(\Omega) : v|_K \in \text{span}\{1, x, y, x^2, y^2\}, \ v\text{ is integrally continuous on } \Omega\}.\]

The properties of an \(EQ_1^{\text{rot}}\)-element are under consideration in a number of works. In 2005, Liu and Yan [25] provided some numerical results for this element, which approximates eigenvalues of the Laplace operator from below. Lin and Lin proved in their book [19] (2006) that when \(\Omega\) is a rectangular domain and \(\tau_h\) is a uniform rectangular mesh, the \(EQ_1^{\text{rot}}\)-element eigenvalues give lower bounds of the exact eigenvalues for a mesh size small enough.

**2.2. Fourth-order eigenvalue problem.** For fourth-order elliptic problems, conforming FEMs require \(C^1\)-continuity, which usually leads to complicated element construction [12]. In order to avoid \(C^1\)-difficulty, nonconforming finite element
methods are often preferred. Besides, they provide the only way how to obtain finite element approximations from below for the exact eigenvalues.

*Adini element* $(A)$ is a $C^0$-rectangular plate element [1]. The degrees of freedom for this element are the values of the test function $v$ and its first-order derivatives $\partial_1 v, \partial_2 v$ at the four vertices $a_j, j = 1, 2, 3, 4$, of any rectangle $K \in \tau_h$ (Figure 2(a)).

![Figure 2](image)

**Figure 2.** Nonconforming FEs for plate bending problems: (a) Adini FE; (b) Morley FE; (c) Morley rectangular FE.

The Adini finite element space is

$$V_h^A = \{ v \in C^0(\Omega) : v|_K \in P_3 + \text{span}\{x^3 y, xy^3\}, K \in \tau_h, v, \partial_1 v \text{ and } \partial_2 v \text{ are continuous at element vertices and are equal to zero on boundary nodes} \},$$

where $\tau_h$ is a rectangular mesh.

Let us observe that $V_h^A \subset C^0, V_h^A \not\subset H^2(\Omega)$.

The numerical examples provided by Rannacher [30] in 1979 show that for the plate vibration problem on a rectangular domain, the Adini element approximates the exact eigenvalues from below. This fact was proved by Yang [37] in 2000 in case of uniform mesh.

However, there are some exceptions, e.g., the Adini element approximates from above under mixed boundary conditions ($u = \partial_\nu u = 0$ on one side and free boundary conditions on the other three sides) on a square domain.
For the special case of the biharmonic operator, Lin and Lin [19] proved in 2006 that the Adini element approximates exact eigenvalues from below. Numerical evidence for this case was provided by Rannacher [30].

The Morley Element \((M)\) is a triangular element proposed in [27] for the plate bending problem. The nodal parameters are the function values at the vertices \(a_j, j = 1, 2, 3\), of the triangle \(K \in \tau_h\) and the first derivatives in normal direction at the midside nodes (Figure 2(b)):

\[
v(a_j), \partial_v v\left(\frac{a_i + a_j}{2}\right), \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3, \quad i \neq j, \quad \text{for } v \in C^1(K), \ K \in \tau_h.
\]

The Morley finite element space is

\[
V_h^M = \{ v \in L_2(\Omega): v|_K \in P_2, \ K \in \tau_h, \ v \text{ is continuous at the vertices of } K, \ \\
\partial_v v \text{ is continuous at the midpoints of edges of } K, \ \\
v \text{ and } \partial_v v \text{ are equal to zero on the boundary nodes}\}.
\]

The values at the midside nodes could be replaced by

\[
\frac{1}{|l_j|} \int_{l_j} \partial_v v \, ds,
\]

where \(l_j\) is an edge of \(K\) which is opposite to the vertex \(a_j, j = 1, 2, 3\). Then \(v \in V_h^M\) should be integrally continuous on the edges of the elements from \(\tau_h\).

Among the nonconforming elements for plate bending problems, the triangular Morley element is the simplest one [27], [33]. It is particularly attractive for fourth order problems because of its low number of degrees of freedom and simple structure. The Morley element and its convergence can be found in [11], [12], [18], [32]. The continuity of this element is very weak—it is not even of class \(C^0\).

Rannacher [30] provided numerical results for plate vibration problems, which indicated that, beside the Adini element, the Morley element can be used to obtain lower bounds of eigenvalues. Recently, this theoretical result has been proved by Lin and Xie [22].

**Morley Rectangular Elements \((M^{\text{rect}})\):**

Recently, a number of rectangular analogues of Morley elements were introduced and studied (see, e.g. [34], [35], [39]).

Let \(\tau_h\) consist of rectangles with edges parallel to the coordinate axes and let \(K \in \tau_h\) be a rectangle with vertices \(a_j\) and edges \(l_j, j = 1, 2, 3, 4\). If we choose the set of degrees of freedom to consist of the function values at the vertices \(a_j\) of \(K \in \tau_h\) and the first derivatives in normal direction at the midside nodes \(b_j, j = 1, 2, 3, 4\), of \(l_j\) (Figure 2(c)):

\[
v(a_j), \partial_v v(b_j), \quad j = 1, 2, 3, 4,
\]
for $v \in C^1(K)$, $K \in \tau_h$, then the finite element space associated with the Morley 
rectangle is $[39]$

$$V^M_{\text{rect}} = \{ v \in L_2(\Omega) : v|_K \in P_K, \ K \in \tau_h, \ v \text{ is continuous at the vertices of } K, \ 
\partial_n v \text{ is continuous at the midpoints of edges of } K, \ 
v \text{ and } \partial_n v \text{ are equal to zero on the boundary nodes} \}.$$ 

It is easy to see that an interpolation-equivalent choice for degrees of freedom is (see [35])

$$v(a_j), \frac{1}{|l_j|} \int_{l_j} \partial_n v \, ds, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, 4.$$ 

There are two variants for the polynomial space $P_K$ reported in the literature:

- One way is to use (see, e.g. [34], [39])

  $$P^{(1)}_K = P_2 + \text{span}\{x^3, y^3\}.$$  

- Another variant for the polynomial space is [28]

  $$P^{(2)}_K = P_2 + \text{span}\{x^3 - 3xy^2, y^3 - 3yx^2\}.$$  

The latter choice is motivated by the fact that $\Delta v$ is constant on $K$ for any $v \in P_K$, 
since $x^3 - 3xy^2$ and $y^3 - 3yx^2$ are the unique polynomials of degree greater than or 
equal to 3 which are harmonic.

There are no theoretical results showing that the Morley rectangle approximates 
the exact eigenvalues from below. However, here we give numerical experiments 
which verify convincingly this fact.

Finally, for the fourth order eigenvalue problems, both Adini and Morley elements 
give one and the same order of convergence (see, for example [18]). Namely, let $u \in H^4(\Omega)$ be the exact eigenfunction and let $u_h$ be the corresponding approximate 
solution obtained by (2.1), (1.3), then

$$\|u - u_h\|_{2,h,\Omega} \leq Ch(|u|_{3,\Omega} + h|u|_{4,\Omega}),$$

where $\| \cdot \|_{2,h,\Omega}$ is the second-order mesh-dependent Sobolev norm.

Also (obviously $\| \cdot \|_{0,h,\Omega} = \| \cdot \|_{0,\Omega}$)

$$\|u - u_h\|_{0,\Omega} \leq Ch^2(|u|_{3,\Omega} + h|u|_{4,\Omega}).$$

In this case, the essential $H^2$-norm determines the eigenvalue estimates, i.e.

$$|\lambda - \lambda_h| = O(h^2).$$
This order of convergence is also valid for the Morley rectangle with the polynomial space (2.2) [39]. As far as we know, there are no theoretical investigations for the Morley rectangle with the polynomial space (2.3).

For Adini element applied to the uniform mesh, there is an improved accuracy result [18]:

\[
\|u - u_h\|_{2,h,\Omega} \leq C h^2 |u|_{4,\Omega}.
\]

As we mentioned above, here we present some new numerical results concerning estimates from below for Adini and Morley rectangles and their comparison. Moreover, the \(a\)-form (1.3) is used where different values of the Poisson ratio are taken.

Let \(\Omega\) be the unit square. We solve numerically the plate bending problem (2.1), (1.3) for \(\sigma = 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4\), respectively, as well as for the special case when \(\sigma = 0\).

The numerical experiments are implemented by means of the Adini element and the Morley rectangular element in its two versions (2.2) and (2.3) for the finite element space, which we will denote by numbers 1 and 2, respectively.

The domain is uniformly divided into \(n^2\) rectangles, where \(n = 4, 8, 12, 16\), respectively, so that it should be mentioned here that the estimate (2.4) is valid when the Adini element is used.

In Tables 1–5 we give results for the approximations of the first three eigenvalues. The results for any eigenvalue form an increasing sequence when the mesh parameter \(h = \sqrt{2}/n\) decreases. Our numerical results show that both the Morley rectangles give eigenvalues less than those obtained by the Adini element. According to (2.4) in case of a uniform mesh the Adini element approximates more accurately any eigenvalues \(\lambda_j\) than the Morley rectangle. The numerical test confirms that Morley rectangles give an approximation of the exact eigenvalues from below (see [22]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>(\lambda_{1,h})</th>
<th>(\lambda_{2,h})</th>
<th>(\lambda_{3,h})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1185.55</td>
<td>4944.32</td>
<td>4994.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1075.86</td>
<td>4481.46</td>
<td>4481.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1003.06</td>
<td>4107.34</td>
<td>4107.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1254.15</td>
<td>5164.79</td>
<td>5219.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1223.11</td>
<td>5017.69</td>
<td>5017.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1187.88</td>
<td>4770.16</td>
<td>4770.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1274.36</td>
<td>5258.87</td>
<td>5308.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1261.18</td>
<td>5205.06</td>
<td>5205.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1243.09</td>
<td>5068.72</td>
<td>5068.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1283.20</td>
<td>5307.71</td>
<td>5342.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1275.56</td>
<td>5280.65</td>
<td>5280.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1264.83</td>
<td>5197.49</td>
<td>5197.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Approximations of first three eigenvalues for plate bending problem when \(\sigma = 0\).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>$\lambda_{1,h}$</th>
<th>$\lambda_{2,h}$</th>
<th>$\lambda_{3,h}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1176.59</td>
<td>4906.11</td>
<td>4960.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1067.04</td>
<td>4441.57</td>
<td>4441.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>965.42</td>
<td>3880.74</td>
<td>3880.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1250.23</td>
<td>5143.91</td>
<td>5203.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1220.11</td>
<td>5002.25</td>
<td>5002.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1172.22</td>
<td>4667.86</td>
<td>4667.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1272.33</td>
<td>5246.43</td>
<td>5301.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1259.76</td>
<td>5197.45</td>
<td>5197.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1235.16</td>
<td>5014.04</td>
<td>5014.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1282.02</td>
<td>5299.82</td>
<td>5337.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1274.75</td>
<td>5276.20</td>
<td>5276.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1260.15</td>
<td>5164.37</td>
<td>5164.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Approximations of first three eigenvalues for plate bending problem when $\sigma = 0.1$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>$\lambda_{1,h}$</th>
<th>$\lambda_{2,h}$</th>
<th>$\lambda_{3,h}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1167.39</td>
<td>4866.17</td>
<td>4926.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1057.62</td>
<td>4398.95</td>
<td>4398.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>921.45</td>
<td>3627.59</td>
<td>3627.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1246.19</td>
<td>5122.27</td>
<td>5186.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1216.86</td>
<td>4985.49</td>
<td>4985.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1152.81</td>
<td>4544.04</td>
<td>4544.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1270.22</td>
<td>5233.34</td>
<td>5293.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1258.22</td>
<td>5189.14</td>
<td>5189.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1225.18</td>
<td>4946.15</td>
<td>4946.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1280.79</td>
<td>5291.42</td>
<td>5333.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1273.86</td>
<td>5271.34</td>
<td>5271.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1254.21</td>
<td>5122.82</td>
<td>5122.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Approximations of first three eigenvalues for plate bending problem when $\sigma = 0.2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>$\lambda_{1,h}$</th>
<th>$\lambda_{2,h}$</th>
<th>$\lambda_{3,h}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1157.92</td>
<td>4824.14</td>
<td>4891.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1047.63</td>
<td>4353.81</td>
<td>4353.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>869.87</td>
<td>3345.01</td>
<td>3345.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1242.00</td>
<td>5100.00</td>
<td>5169.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1213.35</td>
<td>4967.45</td>
<td>4967.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1128.38</td>
<td>4392.29</td>
<td>4392.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1268.00</td>
<td>5219.44</td>
<td>5285.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1256.55</td>
<td>5180.16</td>
<td>5180.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1212.33</td>
<td>4860.31</td>
<td>4860.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1279.50</td>
<td>5282.42</td>
<td>5328.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1272.89</td>
<td>5266.07</td>
<td>5266.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1246.50</td>
<td>5069.57</td>
<td>5069.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Approximations of first three eigenvalues for plate bending problem when $\sigma = 0.3$
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Table 5. Approximations of first three eigenvalues for plate bending problem when $\sigma = 0.4$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>$\lambda_{1,h}$</th>
<th>$\lambda_{2,h}$</th>
<th>$\lambda_{3,h}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1148.14</td>
<td>4779.92</td>
<td>4855.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1037.12</td>
<td>4306.33</td>
<td>4306.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>809.01</td>
<td>3029.47</td>
<td>3029.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1237.63</td>
<td>5076.06</td>
<td>5152.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1209.58</td>
<td>4948.14</td>
<td>4948.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1097.00</td>
<td>4203.31</td>
<td>4203.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1265.66</td>
<td>5204.56</td>
<td>5277.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1254.75</td>
<td>5170.50</td>
<td>5170.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1195.37</td>
<td>4749.13</td>
<td>4749.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adini</td>
<td>1278.11</td>
<td>5272.64</td>
<td>5324.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Morley Rect. 1</td>
<td>1271.86</td>
<td>5260.39</td>
<td>5260.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley Rect. 2</td>
<td>1236.20</td>
<td>4999.41</td>
<td>4999.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Main result

In this section, a method giving lower and upper bounds of exact eigenvalues is presented. Throughout the section we will drop the index $i = 1, 2$ and will use $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $a_h(\cdot, \cdot)$ instead of $a^{(i)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $a_h^{(i)}(\cdot, \cdot)$, respectively.

We look for $\lambda_h \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u_h \in V_h$ such that

\[(3.1)\]

\[a_h(u_h, v_h) = \lambda_h(u_h, v_h), \ \forall v_h \in V_h.\]

Let the eigenvalue problem (3.1) be solved by using nonconforming FEMs. Here $V_h \not\subset V$ and we adopt that mesh-dependent $a$-forms are determined by (1.2) or (1.3). Let $\lambda_h$ approximate the corresponding exact eigenvalue $\lambda$ from below, i.e. $\lambda_h < \lambda$. These cases were discussed in the previous section.

Now, we solve an additional elliptic problem with a solution $\tilde{w}_h \in \tilde{V}_h$ using the conforming FEM, in which the right-hand side is the approximate eigenfunction $u_h \in V_h$ obtained from (3.1):

\[(3.2)\]

\[a(\tilde{w}_h, \tilde{v}_h) = (u_h, \tilde{v}_h), \ \forall \tilde{v}_h \in \tilde{V}_h.\]

Here $\tilde{V}_h \subset V$ and consequently we replace the $a$-form $a_h(\cdot, \cdot)$ by $a(\cdot, \cdot)$.

If $\tilde{w}_h \in \tilde{V}_h$ is a solution of (3.2), we define the number

\[(3.3)\]

\[\tilde{\lambda}_h = \frac{1}{(u_h, \tilde{w}_h)}.\]

Since $\tilde{V}_h$ is the space corresponding to a conforming FEM, i.e. $\tilde{V}_h \subset V$, we could be able to determine the solution $\tilde{w} \in V$ of the (continuous) elliptic problem:

\[(3.4)\]

\[a(\tilde{w}, v) = (u_h, v), \ \forall v \in V.\]
Lemma 3.1. Let \((\lambda, u)\) be an eigenpair of problem (1.1), (1.2) \((m = 1)\) or (1.1), (1.3) \((m = 2)\) with \(b(u, v) = (u, v)\). Let also \((\lambda_h, u_h)\) be the corresponding solution of (3.1), the eigenfunctions being normalized: \((u, u) = (u_h, u_h) = 1\).

Then \(\tilde{\lambda}_h\) approximates the exact eigenvalue \(\lambda\). More precisely (here and further \(C > 0\) is independent of the mesh parameter \(h\)),

\[
|\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}_h| \leq C(\|u - u_h\|_{0, \Omega}^2 + \|\tilde{w} - \tilde{w}_h\|_{m, \Omega}^2), \quad m = 1, 2.
\]

Proof. Consider the solution operator for the boundary value problem \(\mathcal{T} : L_2(\Omega) \to V\), defined by \(u = \mathcal{T} f, \ u \in V\), for any \(f \in L_2(\Omega)\), where

\[
a(u, v) = (f, v), \quad \forall v \in V.
\]

Obviously, \(a(u, v)\) and \((u, v)\) are symmetric forms. Consequently (see, e.g. [10])

\[
a(\mathcal{T} u, v) = a(u, \mathcal{T} v), \quad \forall u, v \in H^m(\Omega), \ m = 1, 2,
\]

\[
(\mathcal{T} u, v) = (u, \mathcal{T} v), \quad \forall u, v \in L_2(\Omega).
\]

Thus, the operator \(\mathcal{T}\) is symmetric and positive. It immediately follows from the Ritz representation theorem (\(a(\cdot, \cdot)\) is an inner product on \(V\)) that \(\mathcal{T}\) is bounded.

By analogy with (3.3), from (3.4) we define

\[
\tilde{\lambda} = \frac{1}{(\tilde{w}, u_h)} = \frac{1}{(\mathcal{T} u_h, u_h)}.
\]

From the equality

\[
a(\mathcal{T} u, v) = (u, v), \quad \forall v \in V,
\]

it follows that \(a(\mathcal{T} u, u) = (u, u) = 1\) where \(u\) is an exact eigenfunction. On the other hand, this function is a solution of \(a(u, \mathcal{T} u) = \lambda(u, \mathcal{T} u)\). Consequently,

\[
\lambda = \frac{1}{(\mathcal{T} u, u)}
\]

in view of the fact that the operator \(\mathcal{T}\) is symmetric.

Therefore,

\[
\frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{1}{\lambda} = (\mathcal{T} u, u) - (\mathcal{T} u_h, u_h)
\]

\[
= (\mathcal{T} u, u) - (\mathcal{T} u_h, u_h) + (\mathcal{T} (u - u_h), u - u_h) - (\mathcal{T} (u - u_h), u - u_h)
\]

\[
= 2(\mathcal{T} u, u - u_h) - (\mathcal{T} (u - u_h), u - u_h).
\]
We estimate the last two terms:

\[(3.7) \quad 2(Tu, u - uh) = \frac{2}{\lambda} (1 - (u, uh)) \]

\[= \frac{1}{\lambda} ((u, u) - 2(u, uh) + (uh, uh)) \]

\[= \frac{1}{\lambda} (u - uh, u - uh) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \|u - uh\|^2_{0, \Omega}. \]

Since the operator \(T\) is bounded, we have

\[(3.8) \quad |(T(u - uh), u - uh)| \leq \|T\| \|u - uh\|_{0, \Omega}^2. \]

Finally, from (3.6), (3.7) and (3.8) we obtain

\[(3.9) \quad |\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}| \leq C \|u - uh\|_{0, \Omega}^2. \]

By the same argument, it follows that

\[\frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{1}{\lambda_h} = (\bar{w}, uh) - (\bar{w}_h, uh) = a(\bar{w}, \bar{w}) - a(\bar{w}_h, \bar{w}_h). \]

Since \(\bar{w}_h \in \bar{V}_h, \bar{w} \in V\) are solutions of the elliptic problems (3.2) and (3.4), respectively, we have \(a(\bar{w} - \bar{w}_h, \bar{w}_h) = 0\), because \(\bar{V}_h \subset V\).

Consequently,

\[\frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{1}{\lambda_h} = a(\bar{w}, \bar{w}) - a(\bar{w}_h, \bar{w}_h) - 2a(\bar{w} - \bar{w}_h, \bar{w}_h) \]

\[= a(\bar{w}, \bar{w}) - 2a(\bar{w}, \bar{w}_h) + a(\bar{w}_h, \bar{w}_h) \]

\[= a(\bar{w} - \bar{w}_h, \bar{w} - \bar{w}_h). \]

The continuity of the \(a\)-form on \(H^m(\Omega)\) leads to the inequality

\[|\tilde{\lambda} - \tilde{\lambda}_h| \leq C \|\bar{w} - \bar{w}_h\|^2_{m, \Omega}, \quad m = 1, 2. \]

This estimate and (3.9) prove the lemma. \(\square\)

Remark 3.1. It is important to emphasize that the estimate (3.5) could easily result in superconvergence order. Indeed, the optimal order of convergence of the eigenvalues is \(O(\|u - uh\|_{m, \Omega}^2)\), where \(u\) is the corresponding exact eigenfunction. Obviously \(\|u - uh\|_{0, \Omega}^2\) has higher order of accuracy and, moreover, it is easy to obtain the same high order of convergence for \(\|\bar{w} - \bar{w}_h\|_{m, \Omega}^2\) (see [2], [3], [29], [36]).

Now, we will present the final step of our idea described as nonconforming-conforming approach to eigenvalues approximation.
Theorem 3.1. Let the conditions of Lemma 3.1 be fulfilled. If $\lambda_{1,h}$ obtained by
the nonconforming FEM approximates the first (essential) eigenvalue $\lambda_1$ from below,
then $\tilde{\lambda}_{1,h}$ determined by (3.3) gives an upper bound of $\lambda_1$, i.e.

$$\lambda_{1,h} \leq \lambda_1 \leq \tilde{\lambda}_{1,h}. \tag{3.10}$$

Proof. First, we present results which concern any eigenpair $(\lambda, u)$. So we
drop the indices $1, 2, \ldots$. Let us introduce the function
$$\tilde{u}_h = \tilde{\lambda}_h \tilde{w}_h,$$
where $\tilde{w}_h$ is the solution of (3.2) and $\tilde{\lambda}_h$ is determined by (3.3). Then

$$(u_h, \tilde{u}_h) = \tilde{\lambda}_h (u_h, \tilde{w}_h) = 1. \tag{3.11}$$

Next, we have

$$a(\tilde{u}_h, \tilde{u}_h) = \tilde{\lambda}_h^2 a(\tilde{w}_h, \tilde{w}_h) = \tilde{\lambda}_h^2 (u_h, \tilde{w}_h) = \tilde{\lambda}_h. \tag{3.12}$$

Let us set

$$0 \leq \varepsilon(h) = \|u_h - \tilde{u}_h\|_{0,\Omega}^2 = (u_h, u_h) - 2(u_h, \tilde{u}_h) + (\tilde{u}_h, \tilde{u}_h).$$

Therefore, having in mind that $(u_h, u_h) = 1$, from (3.11) we get $(\tilde{u}_h, \tilde{u}_h) = 1 + \varepsilon(h)$. By virtue of (3.12), it follows that

$$\lambda_1 = \min_{v \in V, v \neq 0} \frac{a(v, v)}{(v, v)} \leq \frac{a(\tilde{u}_{1,h}, \tilde{u}_{1,h})}{(\tilde{u}_{1,h}, \tilde{u}_{1,h})} = \frac{a(\tilde{u}_{1,h}, \tilde{u}_{1,h})}{1 + \varepsilon(h)} \leq a(\tilde{u}_{1,h}, \tilde{u}_{1,h}) = \tilde{\lambda}_{1,h},$$

which proves the theorem. \qed

Theorem 3.2. Consider the second order eigenvalue problem (1.1), (1.2). Let
$(\lambda_{l,h}, u_{l,h}), l = 2, 3, \ldots$, be the solution of (3.1) obtained using some of the following
nonconforming finite elements: C-R, EC-R, $Q_{1,rot}$ and $EQ_{1,rot}$. Let for any integer $l \geq 2$
the eigenfunctions be normalized $(u_l, u_l) = (u_{l,h}, u_{l,h}) = 1$ and let the partitions be
quasiuniform. Then, if we solve the problem (3.2) using linear/bilinear conforming
finite elements,

$$\lambda_{l,h} \leq \lambda_l \leq \tilde{\lambda}_{l,h}, \quad l = 2, 3, \ldots \tag{3.13}$$

Proof. Let $R$ denote the Rayleigh quotient, let $u \in V$ be an eigenfunction
(corresponding to $\lambda$ and $\|w\|_a = \sqrt{a^{(1)}(w, w)}$). Then for any exact eigenvalue $\lambda$
and any function $w \in V$ we shall use the following equality (see [10], p. 701):

$$R(w) - \lambda = \frac{\|w - u\|_a^2}{\|w\|_{0,\Omega}^2} - \lambda \frac{\|w - u\|_{0,\Omega}^2}{\|w\|_{0,\Omega}^2}. \tag{3.14}$$
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For \( l = 2, 3, \ldots, N_h, N_h = \dim V_h \), from (3.12) and \((\tilde{u}_{l,h}, \tilde{u}_{l,h}) = 1 + \varepsilon(h)\) we obtain

\[
\tilde{\lambda}_{l,h} - \lambda_l = a^{(1)}(\tilde{u}_{l,h}, \tilde{u}_{l,h}) - \lambda_l \geq \frac{a^{(1)}(\tilde{u}_{l,h}, \tilde{u}_{l,h}) - \lambda_l}{(\tilde{u}_{l,h}, \tilde{u}_{l,h})}.
\]

Now, in (3.14) we take \( \lambda = \lambda_l, w = \tilde{u}_{l,h}, \) and \( u = u_l \). Then we get

\[
\tilde{\lambda}_{l,h} - \lambda_l \geq R(\tilde{u}_{l,h}) - \lambda_l = \frac{\|\tilde{u}_{l,h} - u_l\|_a^2}{\|\tilde{u}_{l,h}\|_{0, \Omega}^2} - \lambda_l \|\tilde{u}_{l,h} - u_l\|_{0, \Omega}^2.
\]

We have to estimate the first term on the right-hand side of (3.15) from below and the second from above.

Let us introduce the elliptic projection operator \( \tilde{R}_h : V \to \tilde{V}_h \) defined by

\[
a^{(1)}(u - \tilde{R}_h u, \tilde{v}_h) = 0, \quad \forall \tilde{v}_h \in \tilde{V}_h.
\]

Obviously, by Friedrichs’ inequality,

\[
\|\tilde{u}_{l,h} - u_l\|_{0, \Omega} \leq C\|\tilde{u}_{l,h} - \tilde{R}_h u_l\|_a + \|\tilde{R}_h u_l - u_l\|_{0, \Omega}.
\]

We consider both terms on the right-hand side of (3.16).

For the first we obtain

\[
\|\tilde{u}_{l,h} - \tilde{R}_h u_l\|_a^2 = a^{(1)}(\tilde{u}_{l,h} - \tilde{R}_h u_l, \tilde{u}_{l,h} - \tilde{R}_h u_l) = \|\tilde{u}_{l,h} - u_l\|_a^2 - \|\tilde{R}_h u_l - u_l\|_{0, \Omega}^2 - C\|\tilde{u}_{l,h} - \tilde{R}_h u_l\|_a^2 + \|\tilde{R}_h u_l - u_l\|_{0, \Omega}^2.
\]

Taking into account that (3.1) is solved by nonconforming finite elements specified by the conditions of the theorem, from (3.17) we conclude that [8], [16]

\[
\|\tilde{u}_{l,h} - \tilde{R}_h u_l\|_a \leq Ch^{2r}\|u_l\|_{1+r},
\]

where \( r = \pi/\omega \) if \( \Omega \) is a non-convex polygonal domain and \( \omega \) is its maximal interior angle \( (\frac{1}{2} < r < 1) \) and \( r = 1 \) when \( \Omega \) is a convex domain. It is worth noting that the last inequality gives an estimate of a superconvergent type.

For the second term on the right-hand side of (3.16) we take into account that \( \tilde{V}_h \) is constructed using linear/bilinear conforming finite elements, consequently for the elliptic projection operator \( \tilde{R}_h \) the following estimate is valid [16]:

\[
\|\tilde{R}_h u_l - u_l\|_{0, \Omega} \leq Ch^{2r}\|u_l\|_{1+r, \Omega}.
\]
The last inequality, (3.18) and (3.16) give the following estimate concerning the second term on the right-hand side of (3.15):

\[
\|\tilde{u}_{l,h} - u_l\|_{0,\Omega} \leq Ch^{2r} \|u_l\|_{1+r,\Omega}.
\]

On the other hand, with regard to the first term in the right-hand side of (3.15), we get

\[
\|\tilde{u}_{l,h} - u_l\|_a^2 = a^{(1)}(\tilde{u}_{l,h} - u_l, \tilde{u}_{l,h} - u_l) = a^{(1)}((\tilde{u}_{l,h} - \tilde{R}_h u_l) + (\tilde{R}_h u_l - u_l))
\]

\[
= a^{(1)}(\tilde{u}_{l,h} - \tilde{R}_h u_l, \tilde{u}_{l,h} - \tilde{R}_h u_l) + a^{(1)}(\tilde{R}_h u_l - u_l, \tilde{R}_h u_l - u_l)
\]

\[
+ 2a^{(1)}(\tilde{u}_{l,h} - \tilde{R}_h u_l, \tilde{R}_h u_l - u_l)
\]

\[
= \|\tilde{u}_{l,h} - \tilde{R}_h u_l\|_a^2 + \|\tilde{R}_h u_l - u_l\|_a^2 \geq \|\tilde{R}_h u_l - u_l\|_a^2.
\]

Finally, we use the estimate

\[
\|\tilde{R}_h u_l - u_l\|_a \geq Ch,
\]

which is valid for linear/bilinear conforming finite elements. This estimate is proved by Q. Lin, H. Xie, and J. Xu [24] for quasiuniform partitions of \(\Omega\).

So, we proved that

\[
\|\tilde{u}_{l,h} - u_l\|_{0,\Omega} \leq Ch^{2r}, \quad r \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1],
\]

and

\[
\|\tilde{u}_{l,h} - u_l\|_a \geq Ch,
\]

consequently, the first term in (3.15) is dominant and then \(\tilde{\lambda}_{l,h} \geq \lambda_l\). \(\square\)

Now we present a postprocessing algorithm which will give two-sided bounds of the exact eigenvalues.

**Algorithm.**

(i) Solve the eigenvalue problem (3.1) by nonconforming FEM for \((\lambda_h, u_h) \in \mathbb{R} \times V_h\) and \((u_h, u_h) = 1\) with \(\lambda_h\) giving lower bound of the exact eigenvalue;

(ii) Solve the elliptic problem (3.2) and find the solution \(\tilde{w}_h\);

(iii) Determine the approximate eigenvalue \(\tilde{\lambda}_h\) by means of (3.3).

As a result of the algorithm given above, it will follow that

\[
\lambda_l \in (\tilde{\lambda}_{l,h}, \tilde{\lambda}_{l,h}), \quad l = 1, 2, \ldots
\]
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Remark 3.2. The proposed algorithm gives a simple method for obtaining two-sided bounds of the exact eigenvalues (3.10) and (3.13). The main idea is to implement a postprocessing procedure based on solving an elliptic problem by a conforming FEM instead of employing a conforming eigenproblem solver.

Finally, let us illustrate the efficiency of the presented approach for obtaining two-sided bounds for the first eigenvalue. Consider the fourth-order problem with $\sigma = 0$ and $\sigma = 0.2$. Initially, we use the Adini finite element giving a lower bound of the eigenvalue (see Section 2). Then the conforming method will be applied with Bogner-Fox-Schmidt element.

The unit square is uniformly divided into $n^2$ rectangle elements. The numerical experiments are implemented for $n = 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16$.

In Table 6 the approach is demonstrated for the essential eigenvalues when $\sigma = 0.2$ and $\sigma = 0$. These results confirm the statement of Theorem 3.1. The sequence $\{\lambda_{1,h}\}$ increases, while $\{\tilde{\lambda}_{1,h}\}$ decreases. Here, the exact eigenvalues for $\sigma = 0.2$ are not known. Concerning the case $\sigma = 0$, the exact smallest eigenvalue is approximately $\lambda_1 = 1295$ (see [19], [30]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\sigma = 0.2$</th>
<th></th>
<th>$\sigma = 0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$\lambda_{1,h}$</td>
<td>$\tilde{\lambda}_{1,h}$</td>
<td>$\lambda_{1,h}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1167.392908</td>
<td>1632.978596</td>
<td>1185.550861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1215.208358</td>
<td>1539.581756</td>
<td>1227.814307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1246.188992</td>
<td>1481.631502</td>
<td>1254.152526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1263.205943</td>
<td>1430.888621</td>
<td>1268.538691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1270.220003</td>
<td>1395.200465</td>
<td>1274.357984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1276.904152</td>
<td>1361.499261</td>
<td>1279.910030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1280.793015</td>
<td>1331.814826</td>
<td>1283.199186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Results for the essential eigenvalue with $\sigma = 0.2$ and $\sigma = 0$
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