

THE COMPLETENESS OF THE GENERALIZED EIGENFUNCTIONS AND AN UPPER BOUND FOR THE COUNTING FUNCTION OF THE TRANSMISSION EIGENVALUE PROBLEM FOR MAXWELL EQUATIONS

JEAN FORNEROD AND HOAI-MINH NGUYEN

ABSTRACT. Cakoni and Nguyen recently proposed very general conditions on the coefficients of Maxwell equations for which they established the discreteness of the set of eigenvalues of the transmission problem and studied their locations. In this paper, we establish the completeness of the generalized eigenfunctions and derive an optimal upper bound for the counting function under these conditions, assuming additionally that the coefficients are twice continuously differentiable. The approach is based on the spectral theory of Hilbert-Schmidt operators.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a bounded domain of class C^3 . Let $\varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\mu}, \hat{\varepsilon} \in [L^\infty(\Omega)]^{3 \times 3}$ be symmetric and uniformly elliptic. A complex number $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$ is called a *transmission eigenvalue* if there exists a non-zero solution $(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{12}$ of the following Cauchy problem

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \times E = i\omega\mu H & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \times H = -i\omega\varepsilon E & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \times \hat{E} = i\omega\hat{\mu}\hat{H} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \times \hat{H} = -i\omega\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{E} & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

$$(1.2) \quad (\hat{E} - E) \times \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad \text{and} \quad (\hat{H} - H) \times \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Here and in what follows, ν denotes the unit, outward, normal vector to $\partial\Omega$.

The transmission eigenvalue problem, proposed by Kirsch [16] and Colton and Monk [11], has been an active research topic in the inverse scattering theory for inhomogeneous media. It has a connection with the injectivity of the relative scattering operator. Transmission eigenvalues are related to interrogating frequencies for which there is an incident field that does not scatterer by the medium. We refer the reader to [6] for a recent and self-contained introduction to the topic.

Cakoni and Nguyen [9] have recently studied the transmission problem for Maxwell equations in a very general setting. Under the assumption $\varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu}$ are of class C^1 in a neighborhood of the boundary, they proposed the following condition:

$$(1.3) \quad \varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu} \text{ are isotropic on } \partial\Omega, \text{ and } \varepsilon \neq \hat{\varepsilon}, \mu \neq \hat{\mu}, \varepsilon/\mu \neq \hat{\varepsilon}/\hat{\mu} \text{ on } \partial\Omega$$

(see Remark 3 for the convention used in (1.3)). Under this assumption, Cakoni and Nguyen showed that the set of eigenvalues λ_j of system (1.1)-(1.2) is discrete. They also studied the location of the eigenvalues under this condition. More precisely, they showed that, for every $\gamma > 0$, there exists $\omega_0 > 0$ such that if $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\Im(\omega^2)| \geq \gamma|\omega|^2$ and $|\omega| \geq \omega_0$, then ω is not a transmission eigenvalue. Their analysis is inspired and guided by the famous work of Agmon, Douglis, and Nirenberg [2, 3] on complementing boundary conditions.

In this paper, we study further spectral properties of the transmission problem under assumption (1.3) given above. More precisely, we establish the completeness of the generalized eigenfunctions and derive an optimal upper bound for the counting function of the transmission eigenvalues.

Before stating our results, as in [9], we denote

$$(1.4) \quad \mathbf{H}(\Omega) := \left\{ (u, v, \hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{12} : \operatorname{div}(\varepsilon u) = \operatorname{div}(\mu v) = \operatorname{div}(\hat{\varepsilon} \hat{u}) = \operatorname{div}(\hat{\mu} \hat{v}) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \hat{\varepsilon} \hat{u} \cdot \nu - \varepsilon u \cdot \nu = \hat{\mu} \hat{v} \cdot \nu - \mu v \cdot \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \right\}.$$

The functional space $\mathbf{H}(\Omega)$, which plays a role in the analysis in [9] as well as in this paper, is a Hilbert space with the standard $[L^2(\Omega)]^{12}$ -scalar product. One of the motivations for the definition of $\mathbf{H}(\Omega)$ is the fact that if $(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{12}$ is an eigenfunction of the transmission problem, i.e., a solution of (1.1) and (1.2) for some $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$, then $(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \in \mathbf{H}(\Omega)$ except for $\omega = 0$. The other motivation is on the compactness of \mathcal{T}_k defined below.

The first main result of this paper is on the completeness of the generalized eigenfunctions. We have

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $\varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu} \in [C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^{3 \times 3}$ and (1.3) holds. The space spanned by the generalized eigenfunctions is complete in $\mathbf{H}(\Omega)$, i.e., the space spanned by them is dense in $\mathbf{H}(\Omega)$.*

Remark 1. See also Remark 6 for a discussion on another version of Theorem 1.1.

The second main result of this paper is on an upper bound for the counting function \mathcal{N} . This function is defined by, for $t > 0$,

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{N}(t) := \#\{j : |\lambda_j| \leq t\}.$$

Concerning the behavior of $\mathcal{N}(t)$ for large t , we have

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that $\varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu} \in [C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^{3 \times 3}$ and (1.3) holds. There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that, for $t > 1$,*

$$(1.6) \quad \mathcal{N}(t) \leq ct^3.$$

As a consequence of Theorem 1.1, the set of the transmission eigenvalues is infinite. This fact is new as far as we know. Theorem 1.2, complement to Theorem 1.1, gives an upper bound for the density of the distribution of the transmission eigenvalues. This upper bound is optimal in the sense that it has the same order as the standard Weyl laws for the Maxwell equations [35, 30].

Some comments on Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 are in order. The generalized eigenfunctions associated with λ_j , considered in Theorem 1.1, are understood as the generalized eigenfunctions of the operator \mathcal{T}_k , defined in (1.13) below, corresponding to the eigenvalue $(i\lambda_j - k)^{-1}$ of \mathcal{T}_k . One can show that it is independent of k as long as \mathcal{T}_k is well-defined (and compact). In the conclusion of Theorem 1.2, the multiplicity of eigenvalues is taken into account. The meaning of the multiplicity λ_j is understood as the multiplicity of the eigenvalue $(i\lambda_j - k)^{-1}$ of the operator \mathcal{T}_k . Again, this is independent of k . These facts follow from [1, Theorem 12.4] after using Lemma 3.1 on the modified resolvent of \mathcal{T}_k . The multiplicity and the generalized eigenfunctions corresponding to λ_j are then understood as the multiplicity of $(i\lambda_j - k)^{-1}$ and the generalized eigenfunctions corresponding to $(i\lambda_j - k)^{-1}$ both corresponding to \mathcal{T}_k from now on.

We recall here the definition of a generalized eigenfunction and the multiplicity of its corresponding eigenvalue, see e.g. [1, Definition 12.5], for the convenience of the reader.

Definition 1.1. Let $A : H \rightarrow H$ be a linear and bounded operator on a Hilbert space H . Let λ be an eigenvalue of A . An element $v \in H \setminus \{0\}$ is called a generalized eigenfunction of T if there exists a positive integer m such that

$$(1.7) \quad (\lambda - A)^m v = 0.$$

The multiplicity of the eigenvalue λ is defined as the dimension of the set $\bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}_*} \text{Ker}(\lambda - A)^m$.

The study of the transmission eigenvalue problem for Maxwell's equations is not as complete as for the scalar case, which is discussed briefly below. Before [9], the discreteness results can be found in [14, 8] (see also [10]) where the case of $\mu = \hat{\varepsilon} = \hat{\mu} = I$, and $\varepsilon - I$ invertible in a neighborhood $\partial\Omega$ was considered. Concerning the other aspects, Cakoni, Gintides, and Haddar [7] studied the existence of real transmission eigenvalues, and Haddar and Meng [15] studied the completeness of eigenfunctions for the setting related to the one in [8] mentioned above. In the isotropic case, under the assumption $\mu = \hat{\mu}$ and $\varepsilon\mu \neq \hat{\varepsilon}\hat{\mu}$, Vodev recently derived a parabolic eigenvalue-free region [34].

The structure of spectrum of the transmission eigenvalue problem is better understood in the case of scalar inhomogeneous Helmholtz equations. In this case, the transmission eigenvalue problem can be stated as follows. Let $d \geq 2$ and Ω be an open, bounded Lipschitz subset of \mathbb{R}^d . Let A_1 and A_2 be two $(d \times d)$ symmetric, uniformly elliptic, matrix-valued functions and Σ_1 and Σ_2 be two bounded positive functions both defined on Ω . A complex number ω is called an eigenvalue of the transmission eigenvalue problem, or a transmission eigenvalue, if there exists a non-zero solution $(u_1, u_2) \in [H^1(\Omega)]^2$ of the system

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(A_1 \nabla u_1) + \omega^2 \Sigma_1 u_1 = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div}(A_2 \nabla u_2) + \omega^2 \Sigma_2 u_2 = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

$$(1.9) \quad u_1 = u_2, \quad A_1 \nabla u_1 \cdot \nu = A_2 \nabla u_2 \cdot \nu \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

The discreteness of transmission eigenvalues for the Helmholtz equation has been investigated extensively in the literature. The state-of-the-art results on the discreteness of transmission eigenvalues are given in [24]. More specifically, it was shown in [24] that the transmission eigenvalue problem has a discrete spectrum if the coefficients are smooth only near the boundary, and

- i) $A_1(x), A_2(x)$ satisfy the complementing boundary condition with respect to $\nu(x)$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega$, i.e., for all $x \in \partial\Omega$ and for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ with $\xi \cdot \nu = 0$, we have

$$(A_2 \nu \cdot \nu)(A_2 \xi \cdot \xi) - (A_2 \nu \cdot \xi)^2 \neq (A_1 \nu \cdot \nu)(A_1 \xi \cdot \xi) - (A_1 \nu \cdot \xi)^2,$$

- ii) $(A_1 \nu \cdot \nu) \Sigma_1 \neq (A_2 \nu \cdot \nu) \Sigma_2$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega$.

Additional results in [24] also include various combinations of the sign of contrasts $A_1 - A_2$ and $\Sigma_1 - \Sigma_2$ on the boundary. Assume i) and ii) and $A_1, A_2, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2$ are continuous in $\bar{\Omega}$, the Weyl laws for eigenvalues and the completeness of the generalized eigenfunctions in $[L^2(\Omega)]^2$ were recently established by Nguyen and (Q. H.) Nguyen [25]. Previous results on discreteness can be found in [4, 17, 31] and references therein. Completeness of transmission eigenfunctions and estimates on the counting function were studied by Robbiano [28, 29] for C^∞ boundary and coefficients, and for the case $A_1 = A_2 = I$. Again in C^∞ isotropic setting, Vodev [32], [33] proved the sharpest known results on eigenvalue free zones and Weyl's law with an estimate for the remainder.

The Cauchy problem also naturally appears in the context of negative index materials after using reflections as initiated in [18] (see also [20]). The well-posedness and the limiting absorption principle for the Helmholtz equation with sign-changing coefficients were developed by Nguyen [19] using the Fourier and multiplier approach. Similar problems for the Maxwell equations were

studied by Nguyen and Sil [26]. Both papers [19], [26] deal with the stability question of negative index materials, and are the starting point for the analysis of the transmission eigenvalue problems in [24, 25, 9]. Other aspects and applications of negative index materials as well as the stability and instability the Cauchy problem (1.1) and (1.2) are discussed in [20, 22, 23, 21] and the references therein.

The key and the starting point of the analysis in [9] is the following result [9, Propositions 4.1 and 4.2]:

Theorem 1.3 (Cakoni & Nguyen). *Assume that $\varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu} \in [C^1(\bar{\Omega})]^{3 \times 3}$ and (1.3) holds, and let $\gamma > 0$. There exist two constants $k_0 \geq 1$ and $C > 0$ such that for $k \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\Im(k^2)| \geq \gamma|k|^2$ and $|k| \geq k_0$, for every $(J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m) \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{12}$, there exists a unique solution $(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{12}$ of*

$$(1.10) \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \times E = k\mu H + J_e & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \times H = -k\varepsilon E + J_m & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \times \hat{E} = k\hat{\mu}\hat{H} + \hat{J}_e & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \times \hat{H} = -k\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{E} + \hat{J}_m & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

$$(1.11) \quad (\hat{E} - E) \times \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad \text{and} \quad (\hat{H} - H) \times \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Moreover, if $(J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m) \in [H(\operatorname{div}, \Omega)]^4$ with $(J_e \cdot \nu - \hat{J}_e \cdot \nu, J_m \cdot \nu - \hat{J}_m \cdot \nu) \in [H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)]^2$, then

$$(1.12) \quad |k| \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|(J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ + \frac{C}{|k|} \|(\operatorname{div} J_e, \operatorname{div} J_m, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_e, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_m)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{C}{|k|} \|(J_e \cdot \nu - \hat{J}_e \cdot \nu, J_m \cdot \nu - \hat{J}_m \cdot \nu)\|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)}.$$

Remark 2. In [9], the coefficients are only assumed to be of class C^1 near the boundary and a variant of (1.12), where the $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ is replaced by $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(D \cap \Omega)}$ for some neighborhood D of $\partial\Omega$ (see [9, (4.4) of Proposition 4.1]), was established. Nevertheless, under the smoothness assumption considered here, (1.12) follows immediately by the same analysis.

Fix $k \in \mathbb{C}$ such that the conclusions in Theorem 1.3 hold. One can then define the operator \mathcal{T}_k as follows

$$(1.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_k : \quad & \mathbf{H}(\Omega) && \rightarrow && \mathbf{H}(\Omega) \\ & (\mathcal{J}_e, \mathcal{J}_m, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_e, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_m) && \mapsto && (E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}), \end{aligned}$$

where (E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) is the unique solution of, with $(J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m) = (\mu\mathcal{J}_m, -\varepsilon\mathcal{J}_e, \hat{\mu}\hat{\mathcal{J}}_m, -\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{\mathcal{J}}_e)$,

$$(1.14) \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \times E = k\mu H + J_e & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \times H = -k\varepsilon E + J_m & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \times \hat{E} = k\hat{\mu}\hat{H} + \hat{J}_e & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \times \hat{H} = -k\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{E} + \hat{J}_m & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

$$(1.15) \quad (\hat{E} - E) \times \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad \text{and} \quad (\hat{H} - H) \times \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

From (1.12) and the compactness criterion related to the Maxwell equations, one can derive that \mathcal{T}_k is compact. It is easy to check that ω is an eigenvalue of the transmission problem if and only if $(i\omega - k)^{-1}$ is an eigenvalue of \mathcal{T}_k . The discreteness of the eigenvalues of the transmission problem then follows from the discreteness of the eigenvalues of \mathcal{T}_k .

In this paper, to derive further spectral properties of the transmission problem, we develop the analysis in [9] in order to be able to apply the spectral theory of Hilbert-Schmidt operators. This strategy was previously used in the acoustic setting [25]. To this end, we establish a regularity result (see Theorem 2.1) for solutions given in Theorem 1.3. In addition to this, one of the main

ingredients in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is the density of the range of the map \mathcal{T}_k in $\mathbf{H}(\Omega)$ with respect to the $[L^2(\Omega)]^{12}$ -norm (see Proposition 3.2). The proof of Theorem 1.1 is also given in a way which does not involve any extra topological property of Ω than its connectivity (see Step 2 of the proof of Proposition 3.2).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we establish the regularity result on the transmission problem. The last two sections are devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, respectively.

2. A REGULARITY RESULT FOR THE TRANSMISSION PROBLEM

The following regularity result for the Maxwell transmission problem is the main result of this section (compare with Theorem 1.3).

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu} \in [C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^{3 \times 3}$ be symmetric, and let $\gamma > 0$. Assume that there exist $\Lambda \geq 1$ and $\Lambda_1 > 0$ such that*

$$(2.1) \quad \Lambda^{-1} \leq \varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu} \leq \Lambda \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \|(\varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu})\|_{C^2(\bar{\Omega})} \leq \Lambda,$$

$$(2.2) \quad \varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu} \text{ are isotropic on } \partial\Omega,$$

and, for $x \in \partial\Omega$,

$$(2.3) \quad |\varepsilon(x) - \hat{\varepsilon}(x)| \geq \Lambda_1, \quad |\mu(x) - \hat{\mu}(x)| \geq \Lambda_1, \quad |\varepsilon(x)/\mu(x) - \hat{\varepsilon}(x)/\hat{\mu}(x)| \geq \Lambda_1.$$

There exist two constants $k_0 \geq 1$ and $C > 0$ such that, for $k \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\Im(k^2)| \geq \gamma|k|^2$ and $|k| \geq k_0$, the conclusion of Theorem 1.3 holds for $(J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m) \in [L^2(\Omega)]^{12}$. Moreover, for $J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m \in [H^1(\Omega)]^3$ with $\operatorname{div} J_e, \operatorname{div} J_m, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_e, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_m \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $J_e \cdot \nu - \hat{J}_e \cdot \nu, J_m \cdot \nu - \hat{J}_m \cdot \nu \in H^{3/2}(\partial\Omega)$, we have

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & \| (E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \|_{H^2(\Omega)} + |k| \| (E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \|_{H^1(\Omega)} + |k|^2 \| (E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C|k| \| (J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m) \|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C \| (J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m) \|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ & + C \| (\operatorname{div} J_e, \operatorname{div} J_m, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_e, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_m) \|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{C}{|k|} \| (\operatorname{div} J_e, \operatorname{div} J_m, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_e, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_m) \|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ & + C \| (J_e \cdot \nu - \hat{J}_e \cdot \nu, J_m \cdot \nu - \hat{J}_m \cdot \nu) \|_{H^{1/2}(\partial\Omega)} + \frac{C}{|k|} \| (J_e \cdot \nu - \hat{J}_e \cdot \nu, J_m \cdot \nu - \hat{J}_m \cdot \nu) \|_{H^{3/2}(\partial\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant C depending only on $\Omega, \Lambda, \Lambda_1$, and γ .

Remark 3. The convention used in (1.3), and in (2.3) are as follows. A 3×3 matrix-valued function M defined in a subset $O \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is called isotropic at $x \in O$ if it is proportional to the identity matrix at x , i.e., $M(x) = mI$ for some scalar $m = m(x)$ where I denotes the 3×3 identity matrix. In this case, for the notational ease, we also denote $m(x)$ by $M(x)$. If M is isotropic for $x \in O$, then M is said to be isotropic in O . Condition (1.3) and (2.3) are understood under the convention $m(x) = M(x)$.

Denote

$$\mathbb{R}_+^3 = \left\{ x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3; x_3 > 0 \right\}$$

and

$$\mathbb{R}_0^3 = \left\{ x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3; x_3 = 0 \right\}.$$

One of the main ingredients of the proof of Theorem 2.1 is the following lemma, which is a variant of [9, Corollary 3.1] (see also Remark 4).

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\gamma > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\Im(k^2)| \geq \gamma|k|^2$, and $|k| \geq 1$, and let $\varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu} \in [C^1(\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^3)]^{3 \times 3}$ be symmetric, uniformly elliptic. Let $\Lambda \geq 1$ be such that*

$$\Lambda^{-1} \leq \varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu} \leq \Lambda \text{ in } B_1 \cap \mathbb{R}_+^3 \quad \text{and} \quad \|(\varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu})\|_{C^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3 \cap B_1)} \leq \Lambda.$$

Assume that $\varepsilon(0), \hat{\varepsilon}(0), \mu(0), \hat{\mu}(0)$ are isotropic, and for some $\Lambda_1 \geq 0$

$$|\varepsilon(0) - \hat{\varepsilon}(0)| \geq \Lambda_1, \quad |\mu(0) - \hat{\mu}(0)| \geq \Lambda_1, \quad \text{and} \quad |\varepsilon(0)/\mu(0) - \hat{\varepsilon}(0)/\hat{\mu}(0)| \geq \Lambda_1.$$

Let $J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)]^3$ and assume that $(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)]^{12}$ be a solution of the system¹

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \times E = k\mu H + J_e \text{ in } \mathbb{R}_+^3, \\ \nabla \times H = -k\varepsilon E + J_m \text{ in } \mathbb{R}_+^3, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \times \hat{E} = k\hat{\mu}\hat{H} + \hat{J}_e \text{ in } \mathbb{R}_+^3, \\ \nabla \times \hat{H} = -k\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{E} + \hat{J}_m \text{ in } \mathbb{R}_+^3, \end{cases}$$

$$(2.6) \quad (\hat{E} - E) \times e_3 = 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}_0^3, \quad \text{and} \quad (\hat{H} - H) \times e_3 = 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}_0^3.$$

There exist $0 < r_0 < 1$ and $k_0 > 1$ depending only on γ, Λ , and Λ_1 such that if the supports of E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H} are in $B_{r_0} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^3$, then, for $|k| > k_0$,

i)

$$(2.7) \quad |k| \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} \leq C \|(J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)}.$$

ii) if $J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m \in H(\operatorname{div}, \mathbb{R}_+^3)$ and $J_{e,3} - \hat{J}_{e,3}, J_{m,3} - \hat{J}_{m,3} \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}_0^3)$, then

$$(2.8) \quad \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + |k| \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} \leq C \left(\|(J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{|k|} \|(\operatorname{div} J_e, \operatorname{div} J_m, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_e, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_m)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + \frac{1}{|k|} \|(J_{e,3} - \hat{J}_{e,3}, J_{m,3} - \hat{J}_{m,3})\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}_0^3)} \right).$$

iii) assume in addition that $\varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu} \in [C^2(\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^3)]^{3 \times 3}$ and

$$\|(\varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu})\|_{C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3 \cap B_1)} \leq \Lambda.$$

Then, if $J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m \in [H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3)]^3$, $\operatorname{div} J_e, \operatorname{div} J_m, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_e, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_m \in H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$, and $J_{e,3} - \hat{J}_{e,3}, J_{m,3} - \hat{J}_{m,3} \in H^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}_0^3)$, we have

$$(2.9) \quad \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + |k| \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + |k|^2 \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} \\ \leq C|k| \|(J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + C \|(J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} \\ + C \|(\operatorname{div} J_e, \operatorname{div} J_m, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_e, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_m)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + \frac{C}{|k|} \|(\operatorname{div} J_e, \operatorname{div} J_m, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_e, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_m)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} \\ + C \|(J_{e,3} - \hat{J}_{e,3}, J_{m,3} - \hat{J}_{m,3})\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}_0^3)} + \frac{C}{|k|} \|(J_{e,3} - \hat{J}_{e,3}, J_{m,3} - \hat{J}_{m,3})\|_{H^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}_0^3)}.$$

Here C denotes a positive constant depending only on γ, Λ and Λ_1 .

¹Here and in what follows $e_3 = (0, 0, 1)$.

Remark 4. Parts *i*) and *ii*) are from [9, Corollary 3.1], which are restated here for the convenience of the reader. The new material is part *iii*).

Proof. We only prove *iii*) (see Remark 4). The idea of the proof is as follows. To derive (2.9), we first differentiate the system with respect to x_j for $j = 1, 2$ and then derive the corresponding estimates for $(\partial_{x_j} E, \partial_{x_j} H, \partial_{x_j} \hat{E}, \partial_{x_j} \hat{H})$ using *i*) and *ii*). After that, we use the system of (E, H) and (\hat{E}, \hat{H}) to obtain similar estimates for $(\partial_{x_3} E, \partial_{x_3} H, \partial_{x_3} \hat{E}, \partial_{x_3} \hat{H})$. This strategy is quite standard at least in the regularity theory of second elliptic equations, see e.g. [5]. The main goal of the process is to keep track the dependence on $|k|$. The details are now given.

Fix k_0 and r_0 such that *i*) and *ii*) hold. By *ii*), we have

$$(2.10) \quad \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + |k| \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} \\ \leq C \left(\|(J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + \frac{1}{|k|} \|(\operatorname{div} J_e, \operatorname{div} J_m, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_e, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_m)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{|k|} \|(J_{e,3} - \hat{J}_{e,3}, J_{m,3} - \hat{J}_{m,3})\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}_0^3)} \right).$$

Let $j = 1, 2$. Differentiating (2.5) and (2.6) with respect to x_j , we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \times \partial_{x_j} E = k\mu \partial_{x_j} H + \mathbf{J}_e \text{ in } \mathbb{R}_+^3, \\ \nabla \times \partial_{x_j} H = -k\varepsilon \partial_{x_j} E + \mathbf{J}_m \text{ in } \mathbb{R}_+^3, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \times \partial_{x_j} \hat{E} = k\hat{\mu} \partial_{x_j} \hat{H} + \hat{\mathbf{J}}_e \text{ in } \mathbb{R}_+^3, \\ \nabla \times \partial_{x_j} \hat{H} = -k\hat{\varepsilon} \partial_{x_j} \hat{E} + \hat{\mathbf{J}}_m \text{ in } \mathbb{R}_+^3, \end{cases} \\ (\partial_{x_j} \hat{E} - \partial_{x_j} E) \times e_3 = 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}_0^3, \quad \text{and} \quad (\partial_{x_j} \hat{H} - \partial_{x_j} H) \times e_3 = 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{R}_0^3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}_e &= \partial_{x_j} J_e + k(\partial_{x_j} \mu)H, & \mathbf{J}_m &= \partial_{x_j} J_m - k(\partial_{x_j} \varepsilon)E, \\ \hat{\mathbf{J}}_e &= \partial_{x_j} \hat{J}_e + k(\partial_{x_j} \hat{\mu})\hat{H}, & \hat{\mathbf{J}}_m &= \partial_{x_j} \hat{J}_m - k(\partial_{x_j} \hat{\varepsilon})\hat{E}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying *ii*) to $(\partial_{x_j} E, \partial_{x_j} H, \partial_{x_j} \hat{E}, \partial_{x_j} \hat{H})$, we deduce that

$$(2.11) \quad \|(\partial_{x_j} E, \partial_{x_j} H, \partial_{x_j} \hat{E}, \partial_{x_j} \hat{H})\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + |k| \|(\partial_{x_j} E, \partial_{x_j} H, \partial_{x_j} \hat{E}, \partial_{x_j} \hat{H})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} \leq C(R_1 + R_2),$$

where

$$(2.12) \quad R_1 = \|(\partial_{x_j} J_e, \partial_{x_j} J_m, \partial_{x_j} \hat{J}_e, \partial_{x_j} \hat{J}_m)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} \\ + \frac{1}{|k|} \|(\operatorname{div} \partial_{x_j} J_e, \operatorname{div} \partial_{x_j} J_m, \operatorname{div} \partial_{x_j} \hat{J}_e, \operatorname{div} \partial_{x_j} \hat{J}_m)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} \\ + \frac{1}{|k|} \|(\partial_{x_j} J_{e,3} - \partial_{x_j} \hat{J}_{e,3}, \partial_{x_j} J_{m,3} - \partial_{x_j} \hat{J}_{m,3})\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}_0^3)},$$

and

$$(2.13) \quad R_2 = |k| \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}_0^3)}.$$

Combing (2.10), (2.12), and (2.13), we derive from (2.11) that

$$(2.14) \quad \|(\partial_{x_j} E, \partial_{x_j} H, \partial_{x_j} \hat{E}, \partial_{x_j} \hat{H})\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + |k| \|(\partial_{x_j} E, \partial_{x_j} H, \partial_{x_j} \hat{E}, \partial_{x_j} \hat{H})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} \\ \leq \text{the RHS of (2.9)}.$$

On the other hand, from the system of (E, H) , we have, in \mathbb{R}_+^3 ,

$$(2.15) \quad \partial_{x_3} E_2 = \partial_{x_2} E_3 - k(\mu H)_1 - J_{e,1}, \quad \partial_{x_3} E_1 = \partial_{x_1} E_3 + k(\mu H)_2 + J_{e,2} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\partial_{x_3} \left(\sum_{j=1}^3 \varepsilon_{3j} E_j \right) = - \sum_{\ell=1}^2 \sum_{j=1}^3 \partial_{x_\ell} \varepsilon_{\ell j} E_j + \frac{1}{k} \operatorname{div}(J_m).$$

Combining (2.10), (2.14), and (2.15), and using the fact that $\varepsilon_{33} \geq \Lambda^{-1}$, one has

$$(2.16) \quad \|E\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + |k| \|E\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + |k|^2 \|E\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} \leq \text{the RHS of (2.9)}.$$

Similarly, one obtains

$$(2.17) \quad \|(H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + |k| \|(H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} + |k|^2 \|(H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+^3)} \leq \text{the RHS of (2.9)}.$$

The conclusion of Lemma 2.1 follows from (2.14), (2.16), and (2.17). \square

We are ready to give

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let K be a compact subset of Ω . Fix $\varphi \in C_c^2(\Omega)$ such that $\varphi = 1$ in K . Set

$$(E_\varphi, H_\varphi, \hat{E}_\varphi, \hat{H}_\varphi) = \varphi(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \text{ in } \Omega.$$

From the system of (E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) , we have

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \times E_\varphi = k\mu H_\varphi + J_{\varphi,e} \text{ in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \times H_\varphi = -k\varepsilon E_\varphi + J_{\varphi,m} \text{ in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \nabla \times \hat{E}_\varphi = k\hat{\mu}\hat{H}_\varphi + \hat{J}_{\varphi,e} \text{ in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \times \hat{H}_\varphi = -k\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{E}_\varphi + \hat{J}_{\varphi,m} \text{ in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

$$(2.19) \quad (\hat{E}_\varphi - E_\varphi) \times \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad \text{and} \quad (\hat{H}_\varphi - H_\varphi) \times \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Here, in Ω ,

$$J_{\varphi,e} = \nabla\varphi \times E + \varphi J_e, \quad J_{\varphi,m} = \nabla\varphi \times H + \varphi J_m, \quad \hat{J}_{\varphi,e} = \nabla\varphi \times \hat{E} + \varphi \hat{J}_e, \quad \hat{J}_{\varphi,m} = \nabla\varphi \times \hat{H} + \varphi \hat{J}_m.$$

Differentiating the system of $(E_\varphi, H_\varphi, \hat{E}_\varphi, \hat{H}_\varphi)$ with respect to x_j ($1 \leq j \leq 3$) and applying Theorem 1.3, we obtain, as in the proof of Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(E_\varphi, H_\varphi, \hat{E}_\varphi, \hat{H}_\varphi)\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C|k| \|(J_{\varphi,e}, J_{\varphi,m}, \hat{J}_{\varphi,e}, \hat{J}_{\varphi,m})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C \|(J_{\varphi,e}, J_{\varphi,m}, \hat{J}_{\varphi,e}, \hat{J}_{\varphi,m})\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ & + C \|(\operatorname{div} J_{\varphi,e}, \operatorname{div} J_{\varphi,m}, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_{\varphi,e}, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_{\varphi,m})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{C}{|k|} \|(\operatorname{div} J_{\varphi,e}, \operatorname{div} J_{\varphi,m}, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_{\varphi,e}, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_{\varphi,m})\|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$(2.20) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|(E_\varphi, H_\varphi, \hat{E}_\varphi, \hat{H}_\varphi)\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C|k| \|(J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C \|(J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ & + C \|(\operatorname{div} J_e, \operatorname{div} J_m, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_e, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_m)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{C}{|k|} \|(\operatorname{div} J_e, \operatorname{div} J_m, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_e, \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_m)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ & + C|k| \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C \|(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H})\|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Theorem 1.3 again, we derive from (2.20) that

$$(2.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|(E_\varphi, H_\varphi, \hat{E}_\varphi, \hat{H}_\varphi)\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + |k| \|(E_\varphi, H_\varphi, \hat{E}_\varphi, \hat{H}_\varphi)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ & + |k|^2 \|(E_\varphi, H_\varphi, \hat{E}_\varphi, \hat{H}_\varphi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \text{the RHS of (2.4)}. \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion of Theorem 2.1 now follows from (2.21) and Lemma 2.1 via local charts. The proof is complete. \square

3. COMPLETENESS OF THE GENERALIZED EIGENFUNCTIONS - PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

To establish the completeness of the generalized eigenfunctions, we use Theorem 2.1 and apply the theory of Hilbert-Schmidt operators. To this end, we first recall

Definition 3.1. *Let H be a separable Hilbert space and let $(\phi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ be an orthogonal basis. A bounded linear operator $\mathbf{T} : H \rightarrow H$ is Hilbert-Schmidt if its finite double norm*

$$\|\mathbf{T}\| := \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{T}(\phi_k)\|_H^2 \right)^{1/2} < +\infty.$$

Remark 5. The definition of $\|\mathbf{T}\|$ does not depend on the choice of (ϕ_k) , see e.g. [1, Chapter 12].

Using Theorem 2.1, we can establish the following result.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that $\varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu} \in [C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^{3 \times 3}$ and (1.3) holds, and let $\gamma > 0$. Let $k_0 \geq 1$ and $C > 0$ be constants such that for $k \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\Im(k^2)| \geq \gamma|k|^2$ and $|k| \geq k_0$, the conclusions of Theorem 2.1 hold. Then, for such a complex number k ,*

$$(3.1) \quad \|\mathcal{T}_k^2(\mathcal{J})\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + |k| \|\mathcal{T}_k^2(\mathcal{J})\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + |k|^2 \|\mathcal{T}_k^2(\mathcal{J})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ \leq C \|\mathcal{J}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall \mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{J}_e, \mathcal{J}_m, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_e, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_m) \in \mathbf{H}(\Omega).$$

Consequently,

i) \mathcal{T}_k^2 is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator defined on $\mathbf{H}(\Omega)$; moreover,

$$(3.2) \quad \|\mathcal{T}_k^2\| \leq \frac{C}{|k|^{1/2}},$$

for some positive constant C , independent of k .

ii) For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\Im(e^{2i\theta})| > 0$, $e^{i\theta}$ is a direction of minimal growth of the modified resolvent of \mathcal{T}_k^2 .

For the convenience of the reader, we recall briefly here some notions associated to the concept of the minimal growth. Let A be a continuous, linear transformation from a Hilbert space H into itself. The modified resolvent set $\rho_m(A)$ of A is the set of all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $I - \lambda A$ is bijective (and continuous). If $\lambda \in \rho_m(A)$, then the map $A_\lambda := A(I - \lambda A)^{-1}$ is the modified resolvent of A (see [1, Definition 12.3]). For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, $e^{i\theta}$ is a direction of minimal growth of the modified resolvent of A if for some $a > 0$, the following two facts hold for all $r > a$: i) $re^{i\theta}$ is in the modified resolvent set $\rho_m(A)$ of A and ii) $\|A_{re^{i\theta}}\| \leq C/r$ (see [1, Definition 12.6]).

Another key ingredient of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is:

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that $\varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu} \in [C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^{3 \times 3}$ and (1.3) holds. Let $k \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that the conclusion of Theorem 2.1 holds. We have*

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}_k(\mathbf{H}(\Omega))}^{L^2(\Omega)} = \mathbf{H}(\Omega).$$

The rest of this section containing three subsections is organized as follows. In the first subsection, we give the proof of Proposition 3.1. The proofs of Proposition 3.2 and Theorem 1.1 are given in the last two subsections, respectively.

3.1. Proof of Proposition 3.1. We first state and prove a simple useful lemma used in the proof of Proposition 3.1.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $k, s \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $\mathcal{T}_k, \mathcal{T}_{k+s} : \mathbf{H}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}(\Omega)$ are bounded. We have*

- i) If \mathcal{T}_k is compact, then $s \in \rho_m(\mathcal{T}_k)$.*
- ii) Assume $s \in \rho_m(\mathcal{T}_k)$. Then*

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{T}_k(I - s\mathcal{T}_k)^{-1} = (I - s\mathcal{T}_k)^{-1}\mathcal{T}_k = \mathcal{T}_{k+s}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1. We begin with assertion *i*). Since \mathcal{T}_k is compact, it suffices to prove that $I - s\mathcal{T}_k$ is injective. Indeed, let $(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \in \mathbf{H}(\Omega)$ be a solution of the equation $I - s\mathcal{T}_k = 0$. One can check that $(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) = \mathcal{T}_{k+s}(0) = 0$. Assertion *i*) follows.

We next establish *ii*). Let $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{J}_e, \mathcal{J}_m, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_e, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_m) \in \mathbf{H}(\Omega)$ be arbitrary. Set

$$(3.4) \quad (E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) = \mathcal{T}_{k+s}(\mathcal{J}),$$

$$(3.5) \quad \mathcal{J}^1 = (\mathcal{J}_e^1, \mathcal{J}_m^1, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_e^1, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_m^1) = (I - s\mathcal{T}_k)^{-1}(\mathcal{J}),$$

$$(3.6) \quad (E^1, H^1, \hat{E}^1, \hat{H}^1) = \mathcal{T}_k(\mathcal{J}^1).$$

We claim that

$$(E^1, H^1, \hat{E}^1, \hat{H}^1) = (E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}),$$

which implies $\mathcal{T}_k(I - s\mathcal{T}_k)^{-1} = \mathcal{T}_{k+s}$ since \mathcal{J} is arbitrary.

To prove the claim, we will show that $(E^1, H^1, \hat{E}^1, \hat{H}^1)$ and (E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) satisfy the same Cauchy problem. We have

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \nabla \times E &\stackrel{(3.4)}{=} (k+s)\mu H + \mu \mathcal{J}_m, \\ \nabla \times E^1 &\stackrel{(3.6)}{=} k\mu H^1 + \mu \mathcal{J}_m^1, \\ \mathcal{J}^1 - \mathcal{J} &\stackrel{(3.5)}{=} s\mathcal{T}_k(\mathcal{J}_1) \stackrel{(3.6)}{=} s(E^1, H^1, \hat{E}^1, \hat{H}^1). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\nabla \times E^1 = (k+s)\mu H^1 + \mu \mathcal{J}_m,$$

(compare with (3.7)). Similarly, we can derive that $(E^1, H^1, \hat{E}^1, \hat{H}^1)$ and (E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) satisfy the same system since it is clear that, on $\partial\Omega$,

$$(\hat{E}_1 - E_1) \times \nu = (\hat{H}_1 - H_1) \times \nu = 0 = (\hat{E} - E) \times \nu = (\hat{H} - H) \times \nu.$$

The claim is proved.

Since

$$(I - s\mathcal{T}_k)(I - s\mathcal{T}_k)^{-1} = I = (I - s\mathcal{T}_k)^{-1}(I - s\mathcal{T}_k),$$

and $s \neq 0$ by the definition of $\rho_m(\mathcal{T}_k)$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{T}_k(I - s\mathcal{T}_k)^{-1} = (I - s\mathcal{T}_k)^{-1}\mathcal{T}_k.$$

The proof is complete. □

We are ready to give

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Assertion (3.1) is just a consequence of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 2.1. As a consequence of (3.1) and Gagliardo-Nirenberg's inequality see [12, 27], we derive, for $\mathcal{J} \in \mathbf{H}(\Omega)$, that $\mathcal{T}_k^2(\mathcal{J}) \in [C(\bar{\Omega})]^{12}$, and

$$\|\mathcal{T}_k^2(\mathcal{J})\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C \|\mathcal{T}_k^2(\mathcal{J})\|_{H^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{3}{4}} \|\mathcal{T}_k^2(\mathcal{J})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq \frac{C}{|k|^{1/2}} \|\mathcal{J}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

It follows from the theory of Hilbert-Schmidt operators, see e.g. [25, Lemma 3]², that \mathcal{T}_k^2 is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator defined on $\mathbf{H}(\Omega)$ and

$$\|\mathcal{T}_k^2\| \leq \frac{C}{|k|^{1/2}}.$$

We next check the assertion on the minimal growth of the modified resolvent of \mathcal{T}_k . We have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} |\Im((k + re^{i\theta})^2)| / |k + re^{i\theta}|^2 = |\Im(e^{2i\theta})| \geq 2\gamma,$$

for some $\gamma > 0$. It follows, for a large enough, that $k + re^{i\theta}$ satisfies the conclusion of Theorem 2.1 for $r > a$. On the other hand, let $(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \in \mathbf{H}(\Omega)$. We first note that, for $s \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$(I - s\mathcal{T}_k)(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) = 0 \text{ if and only if } (E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) = \mathcal{T}_{k+s}(0) = 0,$$

provided that \mathcal{T}_{k+s} is well-defined. Since \mathcal{T}_k is compact, it follows that $re^{i\theta} \in \rho_m(\mathcal{T}_k)$ for $r > a$. By Lemma 3.1, we also have, with $s = re^{i\theta}$,

$$\mathcal{T}_k(I - s\mathcal{T}_k)^{-1} = (I - s\mathcal{T}_k)^{-1}\mathcal{T}_k = \mathcal{T}_{k+s}.$$

Let $s_1 = ir^{1/2}e^{i\theta/2}$ and $s_2 = -ir^{1/2}e^{i\theta/2}$. Thus $(t - s_1)(t - s_2) = t^2 - s$ for $t \in \mathbb{C}$. One then can check that

$$\mathcal{T}_k^2(I - s\mathcal{T}_k^2)^{-1} = \mathcal{T}_k^2(I - s_1\mathcal{T}_k)^{-1}(I - s_2\mathcal{T}_k)^{-1} \stackrel{\text{Lemma 3.1}}{=} \mathcal{T}_k(I - s_1\mathcal{T}_k)^{-1}\mathcal{T}_k(I - s_2\mathcal{T}_k)^{-1} = \mathcal{T}_{k+s_1}\mathcal{T}_{k+s_2}.$$

It follows from Theorem 1.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}_k^2(I - s\mathcal{T}_k^2)^{-1}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}(\Omega)} &= \|\mathcal{T}_{k+s_1}\mathcal{T}_{k+s_2}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{T}_{k+s_1}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}(\Omega)} \|\mathcal{T}_{k+s_2}\|_{\mathbf{H}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{|s_1|} \frac{1}{|s_2|} = \frac{C}{|s|}. \end{aligned}$$

The assertion on the minimal growth of the modified resolvent of \mathcal{T}_k^2 follows. \square

3.2. Proof of Proposition 3.2. We first state and prove the following technical result which is used in the proof of Proposition 3.2.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{M} \in [C^1(\bar{\Omega})]^{3 \times 3}$ be symmetric and uniformly elliptic. Let $U \in [H^1(\Omega)]^3$ be such that $\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{M}U) = 0$ in Ω . There exists a sequence $(U_n)_n \subset [H^1(\Omega)]^3$ such that*

$$(3.8) \quad \operatorname{div}(\mathcal{M}U_n) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega,$$

$$(3.9) \quad \mathcal{M}U_n \cdot \nu = \mathcal{M}U \cdot \nu \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad U_n \times \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

and

$$(3.10) \quad U_n \rightarrow U \text{ in } [L^2(\Omega)]^3 \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

²In [25, Lemma 3], the statement is on $[L^2(\Omega)]^m$ for some $m \geq 1$, nevertheless, the proof also gives the result for $\mathbf{H}(\Omega)$ since $\mathbf{H}(\Omega)$ is equipped with the $[L^2(\Omega)]^{12}$ -norm.

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Since Ω is connected, $U \in [H^1(\Omega)]^3$ and $\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{M}U) = 0$ in Ω , by [13, lemma 2.2], there exists $\tilde{V} \in [H^1(\Omega)]^3$ such that

$$(3.11) \quad \operatorname{div} \tilde{V} = 0 \text{ in } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{V} = \frac{\mathcal{M}U \cdot \nu}{\mathcal{M}\nu \cdot \nu} \mathcal{M}\nu \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Set $V = \mathcal{M}^{-1}\tilde{V}$ in Ω . One can easily check from the definition of V and (3.11) that

$$(3.12) \quad \operatorname{div}(\mathcal{M}V) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \mathcal{M}V \cdot \nu = \mathcal{M}U \cdot \nu \text{ on } \partial\Omega \quad \text{and} \quad V \times \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Set $\tilde{U} = U - V$ in Ω . Since $\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{M}U) = 0$ in Ω , we derive from (3.12) that $\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{M}\tilde{U}) = 0$ in Ω and $\mathcal{M}\tilde{U} \cdot \nu = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. It follows from [13, Theorem 2.8] that there exists a sequence $(\tilde{U}_n)_n \subset [C_c^1(\Omega)]^3$ such that

$$(3.13) \quad \operatorname{div}(\tilde{U}_n) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega$$

and

$$(3.14) \quad \tilde{U}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\tilde{U} \text{ in } [L^2(\Omega)]^3 \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Set

$$U_n = \mathcal{M}^{-1}\tilde{U}_n + V.$$

We claim that the sequence $(U_n)_n$ has the required properties. Indeed,

$$\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{M}U_n) = \operatorname{div}(\tilde{U}_n) + \operatorname{div}(\mathcal{M}V) \stackrel{(3.12),(3.13)}{=} 0 \text{ in } \Omega$$

and, since $\tilde{U}_n \in [C_c^1(\Omega)]^3$, we also have

$$\mathcal{M}U_n \cdot \nu = \tilde{U}_n \cdot \nu + \mathcal{M}V \cdot \nu \stackrel{(3.12)}{=} \mathcal{M}U \cdot \nu \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

and

$$U_n \times \nu = \mathcal{M}^{-1}\tilde{U}_n \times \nu + V \times \nu \stackrel{(3.12)}{=} 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Moreover, since $V \in [H^1(\Omega)]^3$, it follows that $U_n \in [H^1(\Omega)]^3$ and by (3.14) we obtain

$$U_n \rightarrow \tilde{U} + V = U \text{ in } [L^2(\Omega)]^3 \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

The proof is complete. \square

We are ready to give

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Since \mathcal{T}_k is a map from $\mathbf{H}(\Omega)$ into $\mathbf{H}(\Omega)$, it suffices to prove the following two facts

$$(3.15) \quad [H^1(\Omega)]^{12} \cap \mathbf{H}(\Omega) \subset \overline{\mathcal{T}_k(\mathbf{H}(\Omega))}^{L^2(\Omega)},$$

and

$$(3.16) \quad [H^1(\Omega)]^{12} \cap \mathbf{H}(\Omega) \text{ is dense in } \mathbf{H}(\Omega) \text{ with respect to } [L^2(\Omega)]^{12} \text{ - norm.}$$

These will be proved in Steps 1 and 2 below.

Step 1: Proof of (3.15). Let $(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \in [H^1(\Omega)]^{12} \cap \mathbf{H}(\Omega)$. By applying Lemma 3.2 with (\mathcal{M}, U) equal to (ε, E) , (μ, H) , $(\hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{E})$, and $(\hat{\mu}, \hat{H})$, there exists a sequence $((E^n, H^n, \hat{E}^n, \hat{H}^n))_n \subset [H^1(\Omega)]^{12} \cap \mathbf{H}(\Omega)$ such that

$$(3.17) \quad E^n \times \nu = H^n \times \nu = \hat{E}^n \times \nu = \hat{H}^n \times \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

and

$$(3.18) \quad (E^n, H^n, \hat{E}^n, \hat{H}^n) \rightarrow (E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \text{ in } [L^2(\Omega)]^{12} \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Set, in Ω ,

$$(3.19) \quad J_e^n = \nabla \times E^n - k\mu H^n, \quad J_m^n = \nabla \times H^n + k\varepsilon H^n,$$

$$(3.20) \quad \hat{J}_e^n = \nabla \times \hat{E}^n - k\hat{\mu}\hat{H}^n, \quad \hat{J}_m^n = \nabla \times \hat{H}^n + k\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{H}^n,$$

and define $(\mathcal{J}_e^n, \mathcal{J}_m^n, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_e^n, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_m^n)$ in Ω via $(J_e^n, J_m^n, \hat{J}_e^n, \hat{J}_m^n) = (\mu\mathcal{J}_m^n, -\varepsilon\mathcal{J}_e^n, \hat{\mu}\hat{\mathcal{J}}_m^n, -\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{\mathcal{J}}_e^n)$.

It follows that (1.14) holds with (E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) and $(J_e, J_m, \hat{J}_e, \hat{J}_m)$ replaced by $(E^n, H^n, \hat{E}^n, \hat{H}^n)$ and $(J_e^n, J_m^n, \hat{J}_e^n, \hat{J}_m^n)$. Since $(E^n, H^n, \hat{E}^n, \hat{H}^n) \in \mathbf{H}(\Omega)$, it follows that

$$(3.21) \quad \operatorname{div} J_e^n = \operatorname{div} J_m^n = \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_e^n = \operatorname{div} \hat{J}_m^n = 0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

On the other hand, from (3.19) and (3.20), we have, on $\partial\Omega$,

$$(\hat{J}_e^n - J_e^n) \cdot \nu = (\nabla \times \hat{E}^n - \nabla \times E^n) \cdot \nu - k(\hat{\mu}\hat{H}^n - \mu H^n) \cdot \nu.$$

This implies

$$(3.22) \quad (\hat{J}_e^n - J_e^n) \cdot \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

since $(\hat{\mu}\hat{H}^n - \mu H^n) \cdot \nu = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\operatorname{div}_{\partial\Omega} \left((\hat{E}^n - E^n) \times \nu \right) = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ by (3.17). Similarly, we have

$$(3.23) \quad (\hat{J}_m^n - J_m^n) \cdot \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Combining (3.21), (3.22), and (3.23) yields that $(\mathcal{J}_e^n, \mathcal{J}_m^n, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_e^n, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_m^n) \in \mathbf{H}(\Omega)$. Consequently,

$$(E^n, H^n, \hat{E}^n, \hat{H}^n) \in \mathcal{T}_k(\mathbf{H}(\Omega)).$$

The conclusion of Step 1 now follows from (3.18).

Step 2: Proof of (3.16). Fix $(E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \in \mathbf{H}(\Omega)$ arbitrary. There exist sequences $(\mathcal{E}^n)_n, (\mathcal{H}^n)_n \subset [H^2(\Omega)]^3$ such that

$$(3.24) \quad (\varepsilon\mathcal{E}^n, \mu\mathcal{H}^n) \rightarrow (\varepsilon E, \mu H) \text{ in } [H(\operatorname{div}, \Omega)]^2.$$

Since

$$\operatorname{div}(\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{E} - \varepsilon E) = \operatorname{div}(\hat{\mu}\hat{H} - \mu H) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad (\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{E} - \varepsilon E) \cdot \nu = (\hat{\mu}\hat{H} - \mu H) \cdot \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

by [13, Theorem 2.8], there exist sequences $(U_e^n)_n, (U_m^n)_n \subset [H^2(\Omega)]^3$ such that

$$(3.25) \quad \operatorname{div} U_e^n = \operatorname{div} U_m^n = 0 \text{ in } \Omega,$$

and

$$(3.26) \quad (U_e^n, U_m^n) \rightarrow (\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{E} - \varepsilon E, \hat{\mu}\hat{H} - \mu H) \text{ in } [L^2(\Omega)]^6 \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Define $\hat{\mathcal{E}}^n, \hat{\mathcal{H}}^n \in [L^2(\Omega)]^3$ via

$$(3.27) \quad \hat{\varepsilon}\hat{\mathcal{E}}^n = U_e^n + \varepsilon\mathcal{E}^n \text{ in } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mu}\hat{\mathcal{H}}^n = U_m^n + \mu\mathcal{H}^n \text{ in } \Omega.$$

From (3.24), (3.25), and (3.26), we have

$$(3.28) \quad (\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{\mathcal{E}}^n, \hat{\mu}\hat{\mathcal{H}}^n) \rightarrow (\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{E}, \hat{\mu}\hat{H}) \text{ in } [H(\operatorname{div}, \Omega)]^2.$$

Using (3.24) and (3.28), we derive from the trace theory that, as $n \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$(3.29) \quad (\varepsilon\mathcal{E}^n - \varepsilon E) \cdot \nu, (\mu\mathcal{H}^n - \mu H) \cdot \nu, (\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{\mathcal{E}}^n - \hat{\varepsilon}\hat{E}) \cdot \nu, (\hat{\mu}\hat{\mathcal{H}}^n - \hat{\mu}\hat{H}) \cdot \nu \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega).$$

Since $(\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{E} - \varepsilon E) \cdot \nu = (\hat{\mu}\hat{H} - \mu H) \cdot \nu = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we obtain

$$(3.30) \quad (\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{\mathcal{E}}^n - \varepsilon\mathcal{E}^n) \cdot \nu, (\hat{\mu}\hat{\mathcal{H}}^n - \mu\mathcal{H}^n) \cdot \nu \rightarrow 0, \text{ in } H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Set

$$(3.31) \quad \alpha_e^n = \frac{1}{|\partial\Omega|} \int_{\partial\Omega} \varepsilon \mathcal{E}^n \cdot \nu \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_m^n = \frac{1}{|\partial\Omega|} \int_{\partial\Omega} \mu \mathcal{H}^n \cdot \nu,$$

where $|\partial\Omega|$ denotes the 2-Hausdorff measure of $\partial\Omega$. We derive that

$$(3.32) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha_e^n \stackrel{(3.29)}{=} \frac{1}{|\partial\Omega|} \int_{\partial\Omega} \varepsilon E \cdot \nu = \frac{1}{|\partial\Omega|} \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}(\varepsilon E) = 0.$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$(3.33) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha_m^n = 0.$$

Denote

$$H_{\sharp}^1(\Omega) = \left\{ u \in H^1(\Omega) : \int_{\Omega} u = 0 \right\}.$$

Let $\xi_e^n, \xi_m^n, \hat{\xi}_e^n, \hat{\xi}_m^n \in H_{\sharp}^1(\Omega)$ be a solution of

$$(3.34) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\varepsilon \nabla \xi_e^n) = -\operatorname{div}(\varepsilon \mathcal{E}^n) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \varepsilon \nabla \xi_e^n \cdot \nu = \alpha_e^n & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\mu \nabla \xi_m^n) = -\operatorname{div}(\mu \mathcal{H}^n) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mu \nabla \xi_m^n \cdot \nu = \alpha_m^n & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

$$(3.35) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\varepsilon \nabla \hat{\xi}_e^n) = -\operatorname{div}(\varepsilon \hat{\mathcal{E}}^n) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \varepsilon \nabla \hat{\xi}_e^n \cdot \nu = (\varepsilon \hat{\mathcal{E}}^n - \varepsilon \mathcal{E}^n) \cdot \nu + \alpha_e^n & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(\mu \nabla \hat{\xi}_m^n) = -\operatorname{div}(\mu \hat{\mathcal{H}}^n) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mu \nabla \hat{\xi}_m^n \cdot \nu = (\mu \hat{\mathcal{H}}^n - \mu \mathcal{H}^n) \cdot \nu + \alpha_m^n & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

By the definition of α_e^n and α_m^n (3.31), we have

$$(3.36) \quad \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}(\varepsilon \mathcal{E}^n) = \int_{\partial\Omega} \alpha_e^n \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}(\mu \mathcal{H}^n) = \int_{\partial\Omega} \alpha_m^n.$$

It follows that ξ_e^n and ξ_m^n are well-defined and uniquely determined. We also have

$$\int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}(\varepsilon \hat{\mathcal{E}}^n) - \int_{\partial\Omega} \left((\varepsilon \hat{\mathcal{E}}^n - \varepsilon \mathcal{E}^n) \cdot \nu + \alpha_e^n \right) \stackrel{(3.31)}{=} 0$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} \operatorname{div}(\mu \hat{\mathcal{H}}^n) - \int_{\partial\Omega} \left((\mu \hat{\mathcal{H}}^n - \mu \mathcal{H}^n) \cdot \nu + \alpha_m^n \right) \stackrel{(3.31)}{=} 0.$$

Hence $\hat{\xi}_e^n$ and $\hat{\xi}_m^n$ are well-defined and uniquely determined as well. From the regularity theory of elliptic equations it follows that

$$(3.37) \quad (\xi_e^n, \xi_m^n, \hat{\xi}_e^n, \hat{\xi}_m^n) \in [H^2(\Omega)]^4.$$

Using (3.30), (3.32), and (3.33), we derive that

$$(3.38) \quad \xi_e^n, \xi_m^n, \hat{\xi}_e^n, \hat{\xi}_m^n \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } H^1(\Omega) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Set

$$(3.39) \quad (E_n, H_n, \hat{E}_n, \hat{H}_n) = (\mathcal{E}^n - \nabla \xi_e^n, \mathcal{H}^n - \nabla \xi_m^n, \hat{\mathcal{E}}^n - \nabla \hat{\xi}_e^n, \hat{\mathcal{H}}^n - \nabla \hat{\xi}_m^n) \text{ in } \Omega.$$

We have, by (3.24), and (3.28), and (3.38),

$$(3.40) \quad (E_n, H_n, \hat{E}_n, \hat{H}_n) \rightarrow (E, H, \hat{E}, \hat{H}) \text{ in } [L^2(\Omega)]^{12}.$$

From the definition of $\xi_e^n, \xi_m^n, \hat{\xi}_e^n, \hat{\xi}_m^n$, we have

$$(3.41) \quad \operatorname{div}(\varepsilon E^n) = \operatorname{div}(\varepsilon \hat{E}^n) = \operatorname{div}(\mu H^n) = \operatorname{div}(\mu \hat{H}^n) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega,$$

and, on $\partial\Omega$,

$$(3.42) \quad (\hat{\varepsilon}\hat{E}^n - \varepsilon E^n) \cdot \nu = (\hat{\mu}\hat{H}^n - \mu H^n) \cdot \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Combining (3.37), (3.41), and (3.42) yields

$$(3.43) \quad (E^n, H^n, \hat{E}^n, \hat{H}^n) \in \mathbf{H}(\Omega) \cap [H^1(\Omega)]^{12}.$$

The conclusion of Step 2 now follows from (3.40).

The proof is complete. \square

Remark 6. One can rewrite (1.1) and (1.2) under the following form

$$(3.44) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \nabla \times (\mu^{-1}(\nabla \times E)) - \omega^2 \varepsilon E = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ \nabla \times (\hat{\mu}^{-1}(\nabla \times \hat{E})) - \omega^2 \hat{\varepsilon} \hat{E} = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ \hat{E} \times \nu = E \times \nu \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \\ (\hat{\mu}^{-1}(\nabla \times \hat{E})) \times \nu = (\mu^{-1}(\nabla \times E)) \times \nu \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{array} \right.$$

Then a complex number $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$ is called a *transmission eigenvalue* if there exists a non-zero solution $(E, \hat{E}) \in [L^2(\Omega)]^6$ of (3.44). Theorem 1.1 might be translated as follows:

Completeness: Assume that $\varepsilon, \mu, \hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\mu} \in [C^2(\bar{\Omega})]^{3 \times 3}$ and (1.3) holds. The space spanned by the generalized eigenfunctions is complete in $\mathbf{G}(\Omega)$, i.e., the space spanned by them is dense in $\mathbf{G}(\Omega)$, where

$$(3.45) \quad \mathbf{G}(\Omega) = \left\{ (u, \hat{u}) \in [H(\text{curl}, \Omega)]^2; \text{div}(\varepsilon u) = \text{div}(\hat{\varepsilon} \hat{u}) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \right. \\ \left. (\hat{u} - u) \times \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, (\hat{\mu}^{-1}(\nabla \times \hat{u})) \times \nu - (\mu^{-1}(\nabla \times u)) \times \nu = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \right\}$$

Remark 7. In [15], the authors studied the completeness of generalized eigenfunctions in the isotropic case under the assumption that

$$\varepsilon = \mu = \hat{\mu} = I \text{ in } \Omega,$$

$$\hat{\varepsilon} \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}) \text{ and } \hat{\varepsilon} \text{ is constant different from } 1 \text{ in a neighborhood of } \partial\Omega.$$

They considered the system under the form (3.44). Since $\varepsilon = \mu = I$, their settings and ours are disjoint. Nevertheless, it seems that the boundary conditions given in the definition of $\mathbf{G}(\Omega)$ are missing in [15].

3.3. Proof of Theorem 1.1. Applying Proposition 3.1, one has

- $\mathcal{T}_k^2 : \mathbf{H}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}(\Omega)$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator.
- for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\Im(e^{2i\theta})| > 0$, $e^{i\theta}$ is a direction of minimal growth of the modified resolvent of \mathcal{T}_k^2 .

Applying the theory of Hilbert-Schmidt operators, see e.g. [1, Theorem 16.4], one derives that

1) the closure of the space spanned by all generalized eigenfunctions of \mathcal{T}_k^2 is equal to $\overline{\mathcal{T}_k^2(\mathbf{H}(\Omega))}$ (the closures are taken with respect to the $[L^2(\Omega)]^{12}$ -norm).

On the other hand, we have

2) $\overline{\mathcal{T}_k^2(\mathbf{H}(\Omega))} = \mathbf{H}(\Omega)$ since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}(\Omega) &= \overline{\mathcal{T}_k(\mathbf{H}(\Omega))} && \text{(by Proposition 3.2)} \\ &= \overline{\mathcal{T}_k \overline{\mathcal{T}_k(\mathbf{H}(\Omega))}} && \text{(by Proposition 3.2)} \\ &= \overline{\mathcal{T}_k^2(\mathbf{H}(\Omega))} && \text{(by the continuity of } \mathcal{T}_k \text{)}. \end{aligned}$$

3) The space spanned by the generalized eigenfunctions of \mathcal{T}_k^2 associated to the non-zero eigenvalues of \mathcal{T}_k^2 is equal to the space spanned by the generalized eigenfunctions of \mathcal{T}_k associated to the non-zero eigenvalues of \mathcal{T}_k . This can be done as in the last part of the proof of [1, Theorem 16.5]. Consequently, the space spanned by all generalized eigenfunctions of \mathcal{T}_k^2 is equal to the space spanned by all generalized eigenfunctions of \mathcal{T}_k .

The conclusion now follows from 1), 2), and 3). \square

4. AN UPPER BOUND FOR THE COUNTING FUNCTION - PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Let $\tilde{\lambda}_j$ be the non-zero eigenvalues of \mathcal{T}_k . Note that the non-zero eigenvalue values of \mathcal{T}_k^2 , counted according to multiplicity, are $\tilde{\lambda}_j^2$ (this can be proved as in the last part of the proof of [1, Theorem 16.5]). Applying the spectral theory of Hilbert-Schmidt operators, see e.g. [1, Theorem 12.14] to \mathcal{T}_k^2 , we have

$$(4.1) \quad \sum_j |\tilde{\lambda}_j|^4 \leq \|\mathcal{T}_k^2\|^2.$$

Applying *i*) of Proposition 3.1, we obtain

$$\sum_j |\tilde{\lambda}_j|^4 \leq C|k|^{-1}.$$

Note that λ_j is a transmission eigenvalue if and only if $(i\lambda_j - k)^{-1}$ is an eigenvalue of \mathcal{T}_k , and they have the same multiplicity. It follows that

$$(4.2) \quad \sum_j \frac{1}{|i\lambda_j - k|^4} \leq C|k|^{-1}.$$

Note that if $|\lambda_j| \leq |k|$, then $|i\lambda_j - k| \leq 2|k|$. We then derive from (4.2) that

$$\frac{1}{|k|^4} \sum_{j: |\lambda_j| \leq |k|} 1 \leq C|k|^{-1}.$$

This implies

$$\mathcal{N}(|k|) \leq C|k|^3.$$

The proof is complete. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Shmuel Agmon, *Lectures on elliptic boundary value problems*, Prepared for publication by B. Frank Jones, Jr. with the assistance of George W. Batten, Jr. Van Nostrand Mathematical Studies, No. 2, D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., Princeton, N.J.-Toronto-London, 1965. MR 0178246
- [2] Shmuel Agmon, Avron Douglis, and Louis Nirenberg, *Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions. I*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **12** (1959), 623–727. MR 125307

- [3] Shmuel Agmon, Avron Douglis, and Louis Nirenberg, *Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions. II.*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **17** (1964), 35–92.
- [4] Anne-Sophie Bonnet-Ben Dhia, Lucas Chesnel, and Housseem Haddar, *On the use of T -coercivity to study the interior transmission eigenvalue problem*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **349** (2011), no. 11-12, 647–651. MR 2817384
- [5] Haim Brezis, *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*, Universitext, Springer, New York, 2011. MR 2759829
- [6] Fioralba Cakoni, David Colton, and Housseem Haddar, *Inverse scattering theory and transmission eigenvalues*, CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics, vol. 88, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2016. MR 3601119
- [7] Fioralba Cakoni, Drossos Gintides, and Housseem Haddar, *The existence of an infinite discrete set of transmission eigenvalues*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **42** (2010), no. 1, 237–255. MR 2596553
- [8] Fioralba Cakoni, Housseem Haddar, and Shixu Meng, *Boundary integral equations for the transmission eigenvalue problem for Maxwell's equations*, J. Integral Equations Appl. **27** (2015), no. 3, 375–406. MR 3435806
- [9] Fioralba Cakoni and Hoai-Minh Nguyen, *On the Discreteness of Transmission Eigenvalues for the Maxwell Equations*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **53** (2021), no. 1, 888–913. MR 4209665
- [10] Lucas Chesnel, *Interior transmission eigenvalue problem for Maxwell's equations: the T -coercivity as an alternative approach*, Inverse Problems **28** (2012), no. 6, 065005, 14. MR 2924302
- [11] David Colton and Peter Monk, *The inverse scattering problem for time-harmonic acoustic waves in an inhomogeneous medium*, Quart. J. Mech. Appl. Math. **41** (1988), no. 1, 97–125. MR 934695
- [12] Emilio Gagliardo, *Ulteriori proprietà di alcune classi di funzioni in più variabili*, Ricerche Mat. **8** (1959), 24–51. MR 109295
- [13] Vivette Girault and Pierre-Arnaud Raviart, *Finite element methods for Navier-Stokes equations*, Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, vol. 5, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986, Theory and algorithms. MR 851383
- [14] Housseem Haddar, *The interior transmission problem for anisotropic Maxwell's equations and its applications to the inverse problem*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **27** (2004), no. 18, 2111–2129. MR 2102315
- [15] Housseem Haddar and Shixu Meng, *The spectral analysis of the interior transmission eigenvalue problem for Maxwell's equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **120** (2018), 1–32. MR 3906154
- [16] Andreas Kirsch, *The denseness of the far field patterns for the transmission problem*, IMA J. Appl. Math. **37** (1986), no. 3, 213–225. MR 983987
- [17] Evgeny Lakshtanov and Boris Vainberg, *Ellipticity in the interior transmission problem in anisotropic media*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **44** (2012), no. 2, 1165–1174. MR 2914264
- [18] Hoai-Minh Nguyen, *Asymptotic behavior of solutions to the Helmholtz equations with sign changing coefficients*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **367** (2015), no. 9, 6581–6595. MR 3356948
- [19] Hoai-Minh Nguyen, *Limiting absorption principle and well-posedness for the Helmholtz equation with sign changing coefficients*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **106** (2016), no. 2, 342–374. MR 3515306
- [20] Hoai-Minh Nguyen, *Superlensing using complementary media and reflecting complementary media for electromagnetic waves*, Adv. Nonlinear Anal. **7** (2018), no. 4, 449–467. MR 3871415
- [21] Hoai-Minh Nguyen, *Cloaking property of a plasmonic structure in doubly complementary media and three-sphere inequalities with partial data*, (2019), preprint, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.09098>.
- [22] Hoai-Minh Nguyen, *Cloaking using complementary media for electromagnetic waves*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **25** (2019), Art. 29, 19. MR 3990650
- [23] Hoai-Minh Nguyen, *The invisibility via anomalous localized resonance of a source for electromagnetic waves*, Res. Math. Sci. **6** (2019), no. 4, Paper No. 32, 22. MR 4011564
- [24] Hoai-Minh Nguyen and Quoc-Hung Nguyen, *Discreteness of interior transmission eigenvalues revisited*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **56** (2017), no. 2, Paper No. 51, 38. MR 3626617
- [25] Hoai-Minh Nguyen and Quoc-Hung Nguyen, *The Weyl law of transmission eigenvalues and the completeness of generalized transmission eigenfunctions*, (2020), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.08540>.
- [26] Hoai-Minh Nguyen and Swarnendu Sil, *Limiting Absorption Principle and Well-Posedness for the Time-Harmonic Maxwell Equations with Anisotropic Sign-Changing Coefficients*, Comm. Math. Phys. **379** (2020), no. 1, 145–176. MR 4152269
- [27] Louis Nirenberg, *On elliptic partial differential equations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3) **13** (1959), 115–162. MR 109940

- [28] Luc Robbiano, *Spectral analysis of the interior transmission eigenvalue problem*, Inverse Problems **29** (2013), no. 10, 104001, 28. MR 3116196
- [29] Luc Robbiano, *Counting function for interior transmission eigenvalues*, Math. Control Relat. Fields **6** (2016), no. 1, 167–183. MR 3448675
- [30] Mikhail Shlëmovich and Nikolai D. Filonov, *Weyl asymptotics of the spectrum of the Maxwell operator with non-smooth coefficients in Lipschitz domains*, Nonlinear equations and spectral theory, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, vol. 220, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007, pp. 27–44. MR 2343605
- [31] John Sylvester, *Discreteness of transmission eigenvalues via upper triangular compact operators*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **44** (2012), no. 1, 341–354. MR 2888291
- [32] Georgi Vodev, *Transmission eigenvalue-free regions*, Comm. Math. Phys. **336** (2015), no. 3, 1141–1166. MR 3324140
- [33] Georgi Vodev, *High-frequency approximation of the interior Dirichlet-to-Neumann map and applications to the transmission eigenvalues*, Anal. PDE **11** (2018), no. 1, 213–236. MR 3707296
- [34] Georgi Vodev, *Semiclassical parametrix for the Maxwell equation and applications to the electromagnetic transmission eigenvalues*, (2021), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.08662>.
- [35] H. Weyl, *Über das Spektrum der Hohlraumstrahlung*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **141** (1912), 163–181. MR 1580849

(Jean Fornerod) ECOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE, EPFL, SB, CAMA,
STATION 8, CH-1015 LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND.

Email address: `jean.fornerod@epfl.ch`

(Hoai-Minh Nguyen) ECOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE, EPFL, SB, CAMA,
STATION 8, CH-1015 LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND.

Email address: `hoai-minh.nguyen@epfl.ch`