

EFFICIENT SOLUTION OF SYMMETRIC EIGENVALUE PROBLEMS FROM FAMILIES OF COUPLED SYSTEMS *

ANTTI HANNUKAINEN[†], JARMO MALINEN[†], AND ANTTI OJALAMMI[†]

Abstract. Efficient solution of the lowest eigenmodes is studied for a family of related eigenvalue problems with common 2×2 block structure. It is assumed that the upper diagonal block varies between different versions while the lower diagonal block and the range of the coupling blocks remains unchanged. Such block structure naturally arises when studying the effect of a subsystem to the eigenmodes of the full system. The proposed method is based on interpolation of the resolvent function after some of its singularities have been removed by a spectral projection. Singular value decomposition can be used to further reduce the dimension of the computational problem. Error analysis of the method indicates exponential convergence with respect to the number of interpolation points. Theoretical results are illustrated by two numerical examples related to finite element discretisation of the Laplace operator.

Key words. eigenvalue problem, subspace method, dimension reduction, acoustics

AMS subject classifications.

1. Introduction. There is often a need to study the effect of a subsystem to the vibration modes of the whole system. For example, consider the modal computations of a vocal tract constrained into a Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) scanner [17, 26]. In this case, the system consists of the vocal tract air volume (i.e., *the interior system*) that changes during speech, and the air volume of the MRI head coil (i.e., *the exterior system*) that stays unchanged, see Figure 1. For high resolution description of speech production, it is desirable to compute the resonances for a very large number of vocal tract shapes. In order to speed up these computations, there is a strong incentive to precompute the effect of the unchanging exterior system and use it efficiently.

Modal analysis of systems consisting of interior and exterior parts leads to an algebraic eigenvalue problem

$$(1.1) \quad A\mathbf{x} = \lambda M\mathbf{x} \quad \text{with the normalisation} \quad \mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x} = 1$$

that can accordingly be decomposed as

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \lambda \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here the matrix blocks A_{11} and A_{22} refer to interior and exterior systems, respectively, and the matrix blocks A_{12} and $A_{21} = A_{12}^T$ are related to the coupling between the two systems. The same descriptions hold for the matrix M . In the following, we assume that the matrices A and M are large, sparse, symmetric, and positive definite, implying the same properties for A_{ii} and M_{ii} for $i = 1, 2$. This assumption is satisfied, e.g., when problem (1.1) is related to the finite element discretisation of an elliptic PDE.

In this article, a novel method is proposed for efficiently solving a large number of different versions of problem (1.2) for the smallest eigenvalues $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda)$, $\Lambda > 0$,

*

Funding: The first author was partially supported by the Stenbäck foundation, the second author by the Magnus Ehrnrooth foundation, and the third author by the Väisälä foundation along with the Academy of Finland (312340).

[†]Department of Mathematics and Systems Analysis, Aalto University
(antti.hannukainen@aalto.fi, jarmo.malinen@aalto.fi, antti.ojalammii@aalto.fi)

together with the corresponding eigenvectors. In applications, the number of eigenvalues in $(0, \Lambda)$ is typically much smaller than the dimension of the full problem. It is assumed that the matrices A_{22}, M_{22} and subspaces $\text{range}(A_{21}), \text{range}(M_{21})$ remain unchanged while the matrix A_{11} varies between different versions of the problem (1.2). In the proposed method, the matrix blocks related to the exterior system are replaced by ones with considerably smaller dimension. As shown in Section 7, the time required to solve eigenvalues of interest for the acoustic system shown in Figure 1 is reduced from 25 to 5 seconds, not accounting for precomputation time. In a family of 1 000 different vocal tract samples this constitutes a saving of over five hours. After 40 eigensolves, the proposed method is faster even when the precomputational time is taken into account.

There exists a considerable amount of literature on the solution of large, sparse, symmetric and positive definite eigenvalue problems, see [29]. The state-of-the-art solution method for this class of problems is the Lanczos iteration, which is a Rayleigh–Ritz method based on solving the eigenvalue problem in a Krylov subspace. When the interest lies in the smallest eigenvalues, the convergence of the iteration is sped up by using the shift-and-invert strategy, i.e., considering the eigenvalue problem related to the matrix $(A + \sigma M)^{-1}$ for some $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ instead.

As such, the Lanczos iteration is not well suited for including precomputations involving the exterior system. Computing the lowest eigenmodes using shift-and-invert strategy requires the action of $(A + \sigma M)^{-1}$ in each iteration step. As several linear systems need to be solved, the matrix $(A + \sigma M)$ is typically factorised, e.g. using the LDL^T factorisation. Unfortunately, all factorisations have to be recomputed for different versions of Eq. (1.2). In doing so, the block structure of the problem should be taken into account; see Section 5 for an example in recycling information in computing block Cholesky factorisations. However, such a strategy does not easily allow for dimension reduction in (the exterior part of) the eigenvalue problem.

We propose a *condensed pole interpolation* (CPI) method that is based on the Rayleigh–Ritz procedure. In CPI, a subspace related to the exterior part of the problem is precomputed by a combination of a spectral projection, Chebyshev interpolation of the resolvent after removal of poles, and dimension reduction using singular value decomposition (SVD). This subspace is constructed only once, and it can be reused for different versions of A_{11} . For each version of Eq. (1.2), one solves a much smaller symmetric, positive definite eigenvalue problem using, e.g., the Lanczos iteration with the shift-and-invert strategy. Dimension reduction using SVD in the context of eigenvalue problems has been studied, e.g., in [19, 11, 16].

Our approach has some similarities with the component mode synthesis (CMS) introduced in the 1960’s as a substructuring method for engineering simulations [18, 3]. An error estimate for the original CMS is given in [13, 15], error indicator has been studied in [22, 7], and more efficient variants have been introduced, e.g., in [28, 23, 24, 4]. The CMS method has been further developed into automated multi-level substructuring (AMLS) method having a much smaller precomputational cost without loss of accuracy, see [5, 21]. The rational filtering domain decomposition eigenvalue solver (RF-DDES) has recently been proposed in [20] for computing eigenvalues in a spectral interval of interest by using a Neumann series approximation of the resolvent function. The underlying philosophy of CPI is similar to RF-DDES.

The outline of the work is as follows. The required background is reviewed in Section 2, and CPI is introduced together with its error analysis in Section 3. Eigenvalue error estimates are given in Section 4, and the optimal selection of the two parameter values, required by CPI, is discussed in Section 5. Further dimension reduction is

the matter of Section 6. Finally, the theoretical treatment is illustrated in numerical examples in Section 7.




FIG. 1. The domains considered in the article. Left: an acoustic system with a human vocal tract inside an MRI head coil. The interior domain Ω_1 is connected to the exterior domain Ω_2 via the interface Γ . The exterior domain is symmetric around the cross section. Right: two-dimensional rectangular domain with a non-symmetric diagonal interface marked by the dashed line.

2. Background. Let $A, M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be symmetric, positive definite matrices. Let $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, $\lambda > 0$, be a solution of the *full* symmetric eigenvalue problem $A\mathbf{x} = \lambda M\mathbf{x}$ such that $\mathbf{x}^T M\mathbf{x} = 1$. For such λ 's, we write

$$(2.1) \quad \lambda \in \sigma(A, M) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : A - zM \text{ is not invertible}\}.$$

From now on, denote $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_1 \ \mathbf{x}_2]^T$ where $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$, $\mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ with $n = n_1 + n_2$. We call this the *standard splitting* of \mathbb{R}^n where \mathbb{R}^{n_1} and \mathbb{R}^{n_2} are called *interior* and *exterior spaces*, respectively. Using the standard splitting, the full eigenvalue problem has the structure

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \lambda \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

where the blocks $A_{11}, M_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$, $A_{22}, M_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$, $A_{12}, M_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$, and $A_{21}, M_{21} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_1}$.

The topic of this work is the solution of different versions of the eigenvalue problem (2.2) where the matrices A_{11} , M_{11} are free to vary but the matrices A_{22} , M_{22} and subspaces $\text{range}(A_{21})$, $\text{range}(M_{21})$ stay the same. In this case, one can afford even expensive precomputations for the unchanging components as a part of the eigenvalue solution method.

As an example, consider the acoustic system shown in Figure 1. In this case, the eigenvalue problem (2.2) arises from finite element discretisation of the variational eigenvalue problem: Find $(\lambda', u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{V}$ such that

$$(2.3) \quad (\nabla u, \nabla v) = \lambda'(u, v) \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{V}$$

where (\cdot, \cdot) is the inner product of $L^2(\Omega)$, and the subspace $\mathcal{V} \subset H^1(\Omega)$ enforces the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition at least on a part of the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Then the resulting $A, M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are symmetric, positive definite stiffness and mass matrices, respectively.

The standard splitting in (2.3) arises from decomposition of the domain Ω into non-overlapping subdomains Ω_1 and Ω_2 , corresponding to varying and unchanging parts of the system, respectively. The interior interface between the two subdomains is denoted by $\Gamma = (\partial\Omega_1 \cup \partial\Omega_2) \setminus \partial\Omega$. The vectors $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ and $\mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ correspond to the degrees of freedom of the finite element space on Ω corresponding to Ω_1 and Ω_2 , respectively. In addition to n_1 and n_2 , we define a third characterising integer

$$(2.4) \quad n_\Gamma := \dim(\text{range}([M_{21} \quad A_{21}]))$$

which gives the number of degrees of freedom over which the interior and the exterior systems interact on the interface Γ . The FEM discretisation of the full domain Ω can be carried out in many ways, and the interface Γ need not be consistent with the FEM mesh. However, the three numbers n_1, n_2, n_Γ can always be extracted from the standard splitting.

2.1. Subspace Methods. Most solution methods for eigenvalue problems are of Rayleigh-Ritz type in which the eigenvalue problem is projected to a given subspace of \mathbb{R}^n [29]. For this purpose, let $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, $k \leq n$, be a *method matrix* with linearly independent column vectors that is used for defining the *method subspace* $V := \text{range}(Q)$. Poor conditioning in numerical realisations is avoided by choosing the column vectors of Q orthonormal in an appropriate inner product; see Section 6.

In the Rayleigh-Ritz procedure, the eigenvalue problem in V is posed as follows: find $(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ such that

$$(2.5) \quad Q^T A Q \tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \tilde{\lambda} Q^T M Q \tilde{\mathbf{x}}.$$

The set of approximate eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}$ is denoted by $\sigma_Q(A, M) := \sigma(Q^T A Q, Q^T M Q)$ as in Eq. (2.1). In fact, the set $\sigma_Q(A, M)$ depends only on the method subspace V :

LEMMA 2.1. *Let $A, M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be symmetric and positive definite. In addition, let $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, $k < n$ be such that $\text{range}(Q_1) = \text{range}(Q_2)$. Then*

$$(2.6) \quad \sigma_{Q_1}(A, M) = \sigma_{Q_2}(A, M).$$

Hence, we can write $\sigma_Q(A, M) = \sigma_V(A, M)$ where $V = \text{range}(Q)$. The aim is to find a low dimensional subspace V such that $\sigma_V(A, M)$ is a reasonable approximation for a relevant part of $\sigma(A, M)$. Those eigenvalues can be computed using, e.g., the shift-and-invert Lanczos iteration [14].

2.2. Estimate for the relative eigenvalue error. The relative error between corresponding eigenvalues in $\sigma(A, M)$ and $\sigma_V(A, M)$ is estimated by studying approximation of eigenvectors in the method subspace V :

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Let $A, M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be symmetric and positive definite matrices. Let $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) \in \sigma(A, M) \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ be an eigenpair of Eq. (1.1) corresponding to a simple eigenvalue λ such that $\mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x} = 1$. In addition, assume that the spectral gap condition in [25, Th.2.7] is satisfied. Then for any $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists $\tilde{\lambda} \in \sigma_V(A, M)$ and $C(\lambda) := C(\lambda; A, M, V)$ such that*

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{|\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}|}{\lambda} \leq C(\lambda) \min_{\mathbf{v} \in V} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}\|_A^2 \quad \text{where} \quad \|\mathbf{x}\|_A := \|A^{1/2} \mathbf{x}\|_2.$$

This proposition is a special case of a Hilbert space result in [25]; see also [2, 12, 6]. We normalise the eigenvectors \mathbf{x} as $\mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x} = 1$ instead of using $\mathbf{x}^T A \mathbf{x} = 1$ from [25]. Because

$$\min_{\mathbf{v} \in V} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}\|_A^2 = \lambda^{-1} \min_{\mathbf{v} \in V} \left\| \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|M^{1/2} \mathbf{x}\|_2} - \mathbf{v} \right\|_A^2$$

the different normalisations can be absorbed in $C(\lambda)$. Otherwise the multiplier λ^{-1} will appear in Eq. (4.9). The eigenvector error can be similarly related to the angle between the exact eigenvector and the method subspace, see [25]. Except for the term λ^{-1} due to normalisation, the dependency of $C(\lambda; A, M, V)$ on its parameters is explained in [25, Th.2.7].

Henceforth, the method subspace is required to satisfy

$$(2.8) \quad V = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \end{bmatrix} \mid \mathbf{v}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \text{ and } \mathbf{v}_2 \in V_2 \right\} \quad \text{where} \quad V_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_2}.$$

Let \mathbf{x} in Proposition 2.2 be decomposed as in equation (2.2), i.e., $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_1 \quad \mathbf{x}_2]^T$. Choosing \mathbf{v} in Eq. (2.7) so that $\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1$ and using Proposition 2.2 leads to

$$(2.9) \quad \frac{|\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}|}{\lambda} \leq C(\lambda) \min_{\mathbf{v}_2 \in V_2} \|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{v}_2\|_{A_{22}}^2.$$

We conclude that a subspace V_2 should accurately represent the \mathbf{x}_2 -component of eigenvectors \mathbf{x} for $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda)$. In the proposed method, this approximation is guaranteed by constructing V_2 using a combination of spectral projection and Chebyshev interpolation of the resolvent.

Remark 2.3. In the case of multiple eigenvalues, the relative error in eigenvalue λ is related to the maximum over the corresponding eigenspace E_λ :

$$\frac{|\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}|}{\lambda} \leq C(\lambda) \max_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in E_\lambda \\ \mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x} = 1}} \min_{\mathbf{v} \in V} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}\|_A^2.$$

All upcoming results generalise to multiple eigenvalues by replacing \mathbf{x} with $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ such that

$$\max_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in E_\lambda \\ \mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x} = 1}} \min_{\mathbf{v} \in V} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}\|_A = \min_{\mathbf{v} \in V} \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{v}\|_A.$$

For notational convenience, we assume in the following that all eigenvalues are simple.

2.3. Method matrix in Component Mode Synthesis. In CMS, the domain Ω is decomposed into several subdomains, and the matrix A is partitioned according to the degrees of freedom corresponding to the subdomains and the subdomain interfaces. After partitioning, the matrix A is block diagonalised using an appropriate elimination matrix. In the last step, the block corresponding to the subdomain degrees of freedom is truncated by using a select number of eigenvectors of each local eigenvalue problem.

It is straightforward to adapt CMS to deal with the standard splitting in Eq. (2.2) and to perform the dimension reduction only on the exterior domain. The method matrix Q is constructed as a product of an elimination matrix $G := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ -A_{22}^{-1} A_{21} & I \end{bmatrix}$

that block diagonalises the matrix A and a matrix containing eigenvectors related to the $K \ll n_2$ smallest eigenvalues of the subproblem $A_{22}\mathbf{x}_2 = \lambda M_{22}\mathbf{x}_2$. The resulting method matrix is

$$(2.10) \quad Q := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ -A_{22}^{-1}A_{21} & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_K] \end{bmatrix}.$$

When using Q in Eq. (2.10), numerical experiments in Section 7 indicate similar performance as reported in [13, 15] and larger computational effort compared to CPI.

3. Condensed pole interpolation method. Assume that A and M are now represented through the standard splitting as in Eq. (2.2). The topic of this section is the construction of the subspace V_2 in Eq. (2.8). Consider the eigenvalue $\lambda > 0$ as fixed, and define an additional bound $\tilde{\Lambda}$ satisfying

$$(3.1) \quad 0 < \lambda < \Lambda < \tilde{\Lambda} = \gamma\Lambda \quad \text{for } \gamma > 1$$

where $(0, \Lambda)$ is the spectral interval of interest.

3.1. Eigenvector basis for the exterior subspace. Let $(\mu_k, \mathbf{v}_k) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \setminus \{0\}$ be solutions of the symmetric *exterior* eigenvalue problem, such that

$$(3.2) \quad A_{22}\mathbf{v}_k = \mu_k M_{22}\mathbf{v}_k \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_j^T M_{22}\mathbf{v}_k = \delta_{j,k} \text{ such that } 1 \leq j, k \leq n_2.$$

(Note that M_{22} is positive definite since M is.) For $\tilde{\Lambda} > 0$, let $P_{\tilde{\Lambda}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$ be the M_{22} -orthogonal projection matrix

$$(3.3) \quad P_{\tilde{\Lambda}} := \sum_{\{k : \mu_k \in (0, \tilde{\Lambda})\}} \mathbf{v}_k \mathbf{v}_k^T M_{22} \quad \text{satisfying} \quad M_{22}P_{\tilde{\Lambda}} = P_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^T M_{22}.$$

We further restrict V_2 in Eq. (2.8) to subspaces of the type

$$(3.4) \quad V_2 = \text{range}(P_{\tilde{\Lambda}}) \oplus W_2$$

where the *complementing subspace* $W_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$, $W_2 \perp \text{range}(P_{\tilde{\Lambda}})$ in the A_{22} -inner product will be chosen so that the eigenvalue error given by Eq. (2.9) can be conveniently bounded from above.

3.2. Error estimate based on projection and interpolation. For $\lambda \in \sigma(A, M) \setminus \sigma(A_{22}, M_{22})$ and the corresponding eigenvector $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_1 \ \mathbf{x}_2]^T$, Eq. (2.2) gives

$$\mathbf{x}_2 = (A_{22} - \lambda M_{22})^{-1} Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1 \quad \text{where} \quad Z(\lambda) := \lambda M_{21} - A_{21}.$$

Clearly,

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{v}_2 \in V_2} \|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{v}_2\|_{A_{22}} &= \min_{\mathbf{v}_2 \in V_2} \|P_{\tilde{\Lambda}} \mathbf{x}_2 + (I - P_{\tilde{\Lambda}}) \mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{v}_2\|_{A_{22}} \\ &= \min_{\mathbf{v}_2 \in V_2} \|(I - P_{\tilde{\Lambda}})(A_{22} - \lambda M_{22})^{-1} Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2\|_{A_{22}}, \end{aligned}$$

since $P_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(A_{22} - \lambda M_{22})^{-1} Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1 \in \text{range}(P_{\tilde{\Lambda}}) \subset V_2$ by Eq. (3.4). Because also $W_2 \subset V_2$, it follows that

$$(3.6) \quad \min_{\mathbf{v}_2 \in V_2} \|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{v}_2\|_{A_{22}} \leq \min_{\mathbf{w}_2 \in W_2} \|(I - P_{\tilde{\Lambda}})(A_{22} - \lambda M_{22})^{-1} Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{w}_2\|_{A_{22}}.$$

So as to introduce the CPI method, we proceed to construct the complementing subspace W_2 for Eq. (3.6) depending on $\tilde{\Lambda}$, some distinct interpolation points $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset (0, \Lambda)$, and subspaces $\text{range}(M_{21})$ and $\text{range}(A_{21})$ related to the standard splitting of the original matrices A and M ; i.e.,

$$W_2 = W_2 \left(\tilde{\Lambda}, \{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^N, \text{range}([M_{21} \quad A_{21}]) \right).$$

Let

$$f_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\xi) := (I - P_{\tilde{\Lambda}})(A_{22} - \xi M_{22})^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2} \quad \text{for } \xi \in (0, \Lambda) \setminus \sigma(A_{22}, M_{22}).$$

Then $A_{22}\mathbf{v}_k - \xi M_{22}\mathbf{v}_k = (\mu_k - \xi)M_{22}\mathbf{v}_k$ where (μ_k, \mathbf{v}_k) , $k = 1, \dots, n_2$, are given by Eq. (3.2). This implies

$$(3.7) \quad (A_{22} - \xi M_{22})^{-1} M_{22}\mathbf{v}_k = (\mu_k - \xi)^{-1} \mathbf{v}_k.$$

Hence,

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\xi) M_{22}\mathbf{v}_k &= (I - P_{\tilde{\Lambda}})(A_{22} - \xi M_{22})^{-1} M_{22}\mathbf{v}_k \\ &= (\mu_k - \xi)^{-1} (I - P_{\tilde{\Lambda}})\mathbf{v}_k \\ &= (\mu_k - \xi)^{-1} \left(\mathbf{v}_k - \sum_{\{j : \mu_j \in (0, \tilde{\Lambda})\}} \mathbf{v}_j \mathbf{v}_j^T M_{22}\mathbf{v}_k \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} (\mu_k - \xi)^{-1} \mathbf{v}_k & \text{for } k \text{ satisfying } \mu_k > \tilde{\Lambda}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Because $\mathbb{R}^{n_2} = \text{span}_{k=1, \dots, n_2} \{M_{22}\mathbf{v}_k\}$, we conclude that $f_{\tilde{\Lambda}}$ is, in fact, an analytic function on the whole interval $(0, \tilde{\Lambda})$ that contains the original domain $(0, \Lambda) \setminus \sigma(A_{22}, M_{22})$. Hence, the assumption $\lambda \notin \sigma(A_{22}, M_{22})$ can be removed. As $f_{\tilde{\Lambda}}$ is analytic, it can be approximated in various ways such as series expansions or interpolation.

In the CPI method, the complementing subspace W_2 is chosen so that the right hand side of Eq. (3.6) can be bounded using interpolation error estimates. Let $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset (0, \Lambda)$ be a set of distinct interpolation points and

$$(3.9) \quad W_2 := \text{span}_{i=1, \dots, N} \{f_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\xi_i) [M_{21} \quad A_{21}]\}$$

In addition, let

$$(3.10) \quad K(l) := \#\{\mu_k \mid \mu_k < l\}.$$

The dimensions of the spaces W_2 and V_2 depend on the number of interpolation points N , the number $K(\tilde{\Lambda})$ of exterior eigenvalues μ_k smaller than $\tilde{\Lambda}$, and n_Γ defined in Eq. (2.4). Then $\dim(W_2) \leq Nn_\Gamma$ and $\dim(V_2) \leq Nn_\Gamma + K(\tilde{\Lambda})$.

3.3. Outline of the method. The CPI method introduced above is based on solving the original eigenvalue problem by restricting the exterior system to the space $V_2 = \text{range}(P_{\tilde{\Lambda}}) \oplus W_2$ where

$$W_2 = \text{span}_{i=1, \dots, N} \{f_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\xi_i) [M_{21} \quad A_{21}]\}, \quad f_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\xi) = (I - P_{\tilde{\Lambda}})(A_{22} - \xi M_{22})^{-1},$$

and $\xi_i \in (0, \Lambda)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, are the interpolation points chosen as in Eq. (4.5). Practical realisation of CPI requires a method matrix Q which, by Eq. (2.8), has the structure

$$(3.11) \quad Q = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & Q_{22} \end{bmatrix}$$

where $I \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$ is the identity matrix and $V_2 = \text{range}(Q_{22})$. The column vectors of Q_{22} form a basis of the space V_2 and are constructed with the aid of the *sample vectors* $\mathbf{q}_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$. Let $\{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_r\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ be a set of (possibly linearly dependent) vectors such that

$$(3.12) \quad \text{span}\{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_r\} = \text{range}([M_{21} \quad A_{21}]).$$

The sample vectors are computed by solving the linear systems

$$(3.13) \quad (A_{22} - \xi_i M_{22})\mathbf{q}_{ij} = \mathbf{p}_j,$$

and the complementing subspace W_2 is given by

$$W_2 = \text{span}\{(I - P_{\tilde{\Lambda}})\mathbf{q}_{ij} \mid i = 1, \dots, N \text{ and } j = 1, \dots, r\}.$$

Practical realisation of the CPI method consists of the following steps:

1. Compute the smallest eigenpairs (μ_k, \mathbf{v}_k) of the exterior system $A_{22}\mathbf{v}_k = \mu_k M_{22}\mathbf{v}_k$ satisfying $\mu_k \leq \tilde{\Lambda}$.
2. Compute sample vectors $\mathbf{q}_{11}, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{Nr}$ as solutions of $(A_{22} - \xi_i M_{22})\mathbf{q}_{ij} = \mathbf{p}_j$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $j = 1, \dots, r$.
3. Collect the eigenvectors from Step 1 and the sample vectors from Step 2 into matrix $B = [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_K, (I - P_{\tilde{\Lambda}})\mathbf{q}_{11}, \dots, (I - P_{\tilde{\Lambda}})\mathbf{q}_{Nr}]$. Use SVD to compute an orthonormal basis for V_2 from B . Use the basis vectors as columns of \tilde{Q} .
4. Solve the eigenvalue problem $\tilde{Q}^T A \tilde{Q} \tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \tilde{\lambda} \tilde{Q}^T M \tilde{Q} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ using, e.g., the Lanczos iteration.

Step 3 will be modified to include an additional dimension reduction of V_2 in Section 6, which leads to a considerably smaller eigenvalue problem while maintaining the desired accuracy.

4. Bound for the relative eigenvalue error. We proceed to give an upper bound for the relative error.

LEMMA 4.1. *Let V_2 be as defined in Eqs. (2.8), (3.3) and (3.9). Denote the Lagrange interpolating polynomials by*

$$\ell_i(\lambda) = \prod_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq N \\ j \neq i}} \frac{\lambda - \xi_j}{\xi_i - \xi_j} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, N$$

where $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset (0, \Lambda)$ are the interpolation points used to define W_2 . Then for any $\lambda \in \sigma(A, M) \cap (0, \Lambda)$ there exists $\tilde{\lambda} \in \sigma_V(A, M)$ such that

$$\frac{|\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}|}{\lambda} \leq C(\lambda) \sum_{\substack{k \\ \mu_k > \tilde{\Lambda}}} \mu_k c_k(\lambda)^2 \beta_k(\lambda)^2 \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\Lambda} > \Lambda$$

where the coefficients $\beta_k(\lambda)$ and $c_k(\xi)$ are defined by

$$(4.1) \quad Z(\lambda)\mathbf{x}_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} \beta_k(\lambda) M_{22} \mathbf{v}_k \quad \text{and} \quad c_k(\xi) := \left(\frac{1}{\mu_k - \xi} - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\ell_j(\xi)}{\mu_k - \xi_j} \right).$$

Observe that the coefficients $c_k(\xi)$ are the error functions in Lagrange interpolation at points $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ of the rational function $(\mu_k - \lambda)^{-1}$, and they are analytic functions for all $\xi \notin \sigma(A_{22}, M_{22})$. Note that if $\{k : \mu_k > \tilde{\Lambda}\} = \emptyset$, then Eq. (4.3) gives $\lambda = \tilde{\Lambda}$.

Proof. To obtain an upper bound for relative eigenvalue error in Eq. (2.9), we choose

$$(4.2) \quad \mathbf{w}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i(\lambda) f_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\xi_i) Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1 \in W_2.$$

in Eq. (3.6), giving

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{|\lambda - \tilde{\Lambda}|}{\lambda} \leq C(\lambda) \left\| \left(f_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\lambda) - \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i(\lambda) f_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\xi_i) \right) Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1 \right\|_{A_{22}}^2.$$

The term $Z(\lambda)\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ has the expansion

$$(4.4) \quad Z(\lambda)\mathbf{x}_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} \beta_k(\lambda) M_{22} \mathbf{v}_k$$

where \mathbf{v}_k are given by Eq. (3.2). Using Eq. (3.8) gives

$$\left(f_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\lambda) - \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i(\lambda) f_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\xi_i) \right) Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1 = \sum_{k, \mu_k > \tilde{\Lambda}} c_k(\lambda) \beta_k(\lambda) \mathbf{v}_k$$

where $\tilde{\Lambda} = \gamma\Lambda$ for $\gamma > 1$. By using the exterior eigenvector basis Eq. (3.2), we get

$$\left\| \sum_{\substack{k \\ \mu_k > \tilde{\Lambda}}} c_k(\lambda) \beta_k(\lambda) \mathbf{v}_k \right\|_{A_{22}}^2 = \sum_{\substack{k \\ \mu_k > \tilde{\Lambda}}} \mu_k c_k(\lambda)^2 \beta_k(\lambda)^2$$

which completes the proof. \square

To estimate the relative error from Eq. (4.3), it only remains to bound $c_k(\lambda)$ and $\beta_k(\lambda)$ from above. In order to obtain a good upper bound for the functions $c_k(\lambda)$, it is beneficial to choose the interpolation points as zeroes of the Chebyshev polynomials on the interval $(0, \Lambda)$

$$(4.5) \quad \xi_i = \frac{\Lambda}{2} \left[1 + \cos \left(\frac{2i-1}{2N} \pi \right) \right], \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Then the functions $c_k(\lambda)$ defined in Eq. (4.1) can be uniformly bounded on $(0, \Lambda)$ by the standard Lagrange error estimates

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{\lambda \in (0, \Lambda)} |c_k(\lambda)| &\leq \frac{\Lambda^N}{2^{2N-1} N!} \sup_{\xi \in (0, \Lambda)} \left| \frac{d^N}{d\xi^N} (\mu_k - \xi)^{-1} \right| \\ &= \frac{\Lambda^N}{2^{2N-1}} \sup_{\xi \in (0, \Lambda)} (\mu_k - \xi)^{-N-1} = \frac{\Lambda^N}{2^{2N-1} (\mu_k - \Lambda)^{N+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

To bound the coefficients $\beta_k(\lambda)$, we need a technical lemma:

LEMMA 4.2. *Let $M = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix}$ be a symmetric, positive definite matrix. Then*

$$C_M \mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x} \geq \|\mathbf{x}_2\|_{M_{22}}^2 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$(4.7) \quad C_M^{-1} := \min \left\{ \eta > 0 : \eta \in \sigma(I - M_{22}^{-1/2} M_{12}^T M_{11}^{-1} M_{12} M_{22}^{-1/2}) \right\}.$$

Proof. Since M is positive definite, so are M_{11} and M_{22} . Defining $M_k := \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & (1-k)M_{22} \end{bmatrix}$ for $k \geq 0$ we observe that $\mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x} \geq k \|\mathbf{x}_2\|_{M_{22}}^2$ for all \mathbf{x} if and only if $M_k \geq 0$. Since $M_0 = M$, the set $\{k > 0 : M_k \geq 0\}$ is nonempty by the continuity of the eigenvalues of the matrix elements and the fact that the set of invertible matrices is open. Hence, we can define $\tilde{C}_M := \max \{k > 0 : M_k \geq 0\}$. Similarly, we may reason that the matrix M_k for $k = \tilde{C}_M$ is not invertible but it satisfies $M_k \geq 0$.

For any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ the matrix M_η is not invertible if and only if $M_\eta \mathbf{x} = 0$ for some $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \in 1 - \sigma(M_{21} M_{11}^{-1} M_{12} M_{22}^{-1}) &\subset 1 - \sigma(M_{21} M_{11}^{-1} M_{12} M_{22}^{-1}) \cup \{0\} \\ &= \sigma(I - M_{22}^{-1/2} M_{12}^T M_{11}^{-1} M_{12} M_{22}^{-1/2}) \cup \{1\} \subset (-\infty, 1] \end{aligned}$$

since $M_{22}^{-1/2} M_{12}^T M_{11}^{-1} M_{12} M_{22}^{-1/2} \geq 0$. We used here the fact that $\sigma(AB) \cup \{0\} = \sigma(BA) \cup \{0\}$ for all square matrices A and B . Defining now C_M by Eq. (4.7), we observe that $C_M^{-1} \leq \tilde{C}_M$, and the proof is thus complete. \square

Remark 4.3. Note that if $M_{12} = 0$, then $C_M = 1$. We leave it to the reader to verify that the estimate in Lemma 4.2 is, in fact, sharp. This can be seen by checking that an equality $C_M^{-1} = \tilde{C}_M$ holds in the proof.

We have now completely specified the CPI method together with its error estimate, and we are in the position to state our first main result:

THEOREM 4.4. *Let A and M be as defined in Eq. (1.1), $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be the Chebyshev interpolation points of the interval $(0, \Lambda)$ given in Eq. (4.5), $V_2 = \text{range}(P_\Lambda) \oplus W_2$ where W_2 and P_Λ are as defined in Eqs. (3.3) and (3.9), respectively. Finally, let V be as defined in Eq. (2.8).*

Then for any $\lambda \in \sigma(A, M) \cap (0, \Lambda)$ there exists $\tilde{\lambda} \in \sigma_V(A, M)$ such that

$$(4.8) \quad \frac{|\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}|}{\lambda} \leq C_M C(\lambda) \Lambda (4\gamma)^3 \left(\frac{1}{4(\gamma - 1)} \right)^{2N+2} \quad \text{for any } \gamma > 1$$

where $C_M, C(\lambda)$ are positive constants defined in Lemma 4.2 and Proposition 2.2, respectively.

For a given Λ , parameters γ, N determine both the accuracy and the computational cost of the CPI method. Specifically, all exterior eigenpairs (μ_k, \mathbf{v}_k) satisfying $\mu_k \leq \gamma \Lambda$ together with $n_\Gamma N$ linear systems have to be solved. The spectra of $\sigma(A, M)$ and $\sigma(A_{22}, M_{22})$ do not restrict the choice of γ .

Proof. The claim follows by estimating the coefficients $\beta_k(\lambda)$ and $c_k(\lambda)$ in Eq. (4.1) using Lemma 4.1. Estimate for $c_k(\lambda)$ is given in Eq. (4.6). We proceed to estimate

the coefficients $\beta_k(\lambda)$. For $\lambda \in \sigma(A, M) \cap (0, \tilde{\Lambda})$ Eqs. (3.7) and (4.4) yield

$$(I - P_{\tilde{\Lambda}})\mathbf{x}_2 = f_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\lambda)Z(\lambda)\mathbf{x}_1 = \sum_{\substack{k \\ \mu_k > \tilde{\Lambda}}} \frac{\beta_k(\lambda)}{\mu_k - \lambda} \mathbf{v}_k.$$

By Lemma 4.2, properties of $P_{\tilde{\Lambda}}$, and normalisation of the eigenvectors of problem (1.1), we have

$$(4.9) \quad C_M = C_M \mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x} \geq \|\mathbf{x}\|_{M_{22}}^2 \geq \sum_{\substack{k \\ \mu_k > \tilde{\Lambda}}} \left(\frac{\beta_k(\lambda)}{\mu_k - \lambda} \right)^2.$$

Combining these with Eq. (4.6) gives the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{k \\ \mu_k > \tilde{\Lambda}}} \mu_k c_k(\lambda)^2 \beta_k(\lambda)^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{\substack{k \\ \mu_k > \tilde{\Lambda}}} \mu_k \left(\frac{\beta_k(\lambda)}{\mu_k - \lambda} \right)^2 \frac{\Lambda^{2N} (\mu_k - \lambda)^2}{4^{2N-1} (\mu_k - \Lambda)^{2N+2}} \\ & \leq 4 \left(\frac{\Lambda}{4} \right)^{2N} \max_{\substack{k \\ \mu_k > \tilde{\Lambda}}} \left(\frac{\mu_k (\mu_k - \lambda)^2}{(\mu_k - \Lambda)^{2N+2}} \right) \sum_{\substack{k \\ \mu_k > \tilde{\Lambda}}} \left(\frac{\beta_k(\lambda)}{\mu_k - \lambda} \right)^2 \\ & \leq 4C_M \left(\frac{\Lambda}{4} \right)^{2N} \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}(\tilde{\Lambda} - \lambda)^2}{(\tilde{\Lambda} - \Lambda)^{2N+2}} \leq \frac{4C_M \tilde{\Lambda}(\tilde{\Lambda} - \lambda)^2}{(\tilde{\Lambda} - \Lambda)^2} \cdot \left(\frac{L}{4(\tilde{\Lambda} - \Lambda)} \right)^{2N} \\ & \leq \frac{4C_M(\gamma\Lambda - \lambda)}{(1 - 1/\gamma)^2} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{4(\gamma - 1)} \right)^{2N} = \frac{4C_M\gamma^2(\gamma\Lambda - \lambda)}{(\gamma - 1)^2} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{4(\gamma - 1)} \right)^{2N}. \end{aligned}$$

We used here the fact that the function

$$x \mapsto \frac{x(x - \lambda)^2}{(x - \Lambda)^{2N+2}} \quad \text{for } x > 0, \quad x \neq \Lambda$$

is decreasing for $x > \Lambda$, and hence its maximum over $[\tilde{\Lambda}, \infty)$ is attained at $x = \tilde{\Lambda}$. Finally, we use $\lambda > 0$ to obtain the final estimate

$$\frac{|\lambda - \tilde{\Lambda}|}{\lambda} \leq \frac{4C_M C(\lambda) \Lambda \gamma^3}{(\gamma - 1)^2} \left(\frac{1}{4(\gamma - 1)} \right)^{2N} = C_M C(\lambda) \Lambda (4\gamma)^3 \left(\frac{1}{4(\gamma - 1)} \right)^{2N+2}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

If we fix $\gamma > 5/4$ in Theorem 4.4, the right hand side of Eq. (4.8) converges to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Observe that the set $\{k : \mu_k > \gamma\Lambda\} = \emptyset$ for γ large enough for any $\Lambda > 0$. Then the sum in inequality (4.9) vanishes, and again $\lambda = \tilde{\Lambda}$ follows.

5. Computational cost. The error estimate given in Theorem 4.4 allows one to choose the values for N and γ in an optimal way, depending on the target error level and a model for the computational cost required to solve the eigenvalue problem. Solving the smallest elements $\lambda \in \sigma_V(A, M)$ using the method matrix Q (as given in

Eq. (3.11)) amounts to solving $\hat{A}\mathbf{x} = \lambda\hat{M}\mathbf{x}$ in which

$$\hat{A} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12}Q_{22} \\ Q_{22}^T A_{12}^T & Q_{22}^T A_{22} Q_{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{M} = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12}Q_{22} \\ Q_{22}^T M_{12}^T & Q_{22}^T M_{22} Q_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Section 3.3, $Q_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times \dim(V_2)}$, and hence

$$Q_{22}^T A_{22} Q_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(V_2) \times \dim(V_2)} \quad \text{where} \quad \dim(V_2) \leq K(\gamma\Lambda) + n_\Gamma N.$$

Denote the Cholesky factorisations of the matrices \hat{A} , \hat{M} by $\hat{A} = R^T R$ and $\hat{M} = L^T L$, respectively. Eigenvalues $\lambda \in \sigma_V(A, M) \cap (0, \Lambda)$ can be solved, e.g., by applying the Lanczos iteration to

$$L\hat{A}^{-1}L^T \mathbf{y} = \tilde{\lambda}^{-1} \mathbf{y} \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{M} = L^T L \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{y} = L\mathbf{x}.$$

This requires repeated multiplications by $L\hat{A}^{-1}L^T$ which can be efficiently carried out using Cholesky factorisations. The factorisations should be computed by taking advantage of the block structure: for example, by writing $\hat{A} = R^T R$ so that

$$(5.1) \quad R = \begin{bmatrix} R_{11} & R_{11}^{-T} \hat{A}_{12} \\ 0 & R_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{A}_{11} = R_{11}^T R_{11}, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{A}_{22} - \hat{A}_{12}^T \hat{A}_{11}^{-1} \hat{A}_{12} = R_{22}^T R_{22}$$

where the Schur complement of \hat{A} with respect to A_{11} has also been Cholesky factorised. A similar formula can be used for \hat{M} to produce L in block form. The matrix R_{22} can be computed as a low-rank update to the factorisation of \hat{A}_{22} . This leads to

$$LR^{-1}R^{-T}L^T \mathbf{y} = \tilde{\lambda}^{-1} \mathbf{y}.$$

The cost of the matrix-vector multiplication by $LR^{-1}R^{-T}L^T$ is of lower order compared to computing the factorisations which we discuss next. The block structure can be used in the spirit of Eq. (5.1) to recycle the factorisation of A_{22} in the shift-and-invert Lanczos iteration.

For each version of problem (1.1), one has to recompute the Cholesky factorisations in Eq. (5.1). The cost of factorising A_{11} does not depend on the choice of V_2 . Hence, we only model the cost of computing the Cholesky factorisation for the Schur complement $\hat{A}_{22} - \hat{A}_{12}^T \hat{A}_{11}^{-1} \hat{A}_{12}$. Depending on the underlying problem, the Schur complement can be sparse or dense. Thus, the cost of computing the factorisation is modelled as proportional to the r th power of $\dim(V_2)$ as

$$(5.2) \quad \text{cost}(\gamma, N) := (K(\gamma\Lambda) + n_\Gamma N)^r$$

where $K(\ell)$ is as defined in Eq. (3.10) and the parameter $r \in [0, 3]$ depends on the sparsity of the Schur complement.

5.1. Optimisation of N and γ . A typical application for CPI is the solution of eigenvalues for the Dirichlet Laplacian in $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ using the finite element method. In this case, an asymptotically accurate description for $K(l)$ is given by the Weyl law [30, Ch. 8] as $K(l) \approx C(d) \text{vol}(\Omega_2) l^{d/2}$ where $C(d) = (2\pi)^{-d} \text{vol} B_d$ and B_d is a d -dimensional unit ball. Motivated by Theorem 4.4, we define a normalised tolerance function:

$$(5.3) \quad \text{ntol}(\gamma, N) := \gamma^3 \left(\frac{1}{4(\gamma - 1)} \right)^{2N+2}.$$

When γ and N are chosen such that $ntol(\gamma, N) \leq \eta$, the relative error in eigenvalues $\lambda \in (0, \Lambda)$ satisfies

$$\frac{|\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}|}{\lambda} \leq 64C_M \Lambda C(\lambda) \eta$$

by Theorem 4.4. An optimal value combination for parameters N and γ for a normalised error level η is obtained by minimising the cost function (5.2) under the constraint $ntol(\gamma, N) = \eta$.

THEOREM 5.1. *Let $\eta > 0$, and let $ntol(\gamma, N)$ be as given in Eq. (5.3). Define the computational cost model function as*

$$g(\gamma, N) := \left(C(d) \text{vol}(\Omega_2) (\gamma \Lambda)^{d/2} + n_\Gamma N \right)^r$$

where $C(d) = (2\pi)^{-d} \text{vol} B_d$, and B_d is a d -dimensional unit ball. Then the computational cost model function is minimised under the constraint $ntol(N, \gamma) = \eta$ by choosing $N(\gamma)$ and γ such that

$$(5.4) \quad N(\gamma) = \frac{dC(d)\Lambda^{d/2} \text{vol}(\Omega_2)}{2n_\Gamma} \gamma^{d/2-1} (\gamma - 1) \ln 4(\gamma - 1) - 2.$$

and

$$(5.5) \quad \gamma^3 \left(\frac{1}{4(\gamma - 1)} \right)^{2N(\gamma)+2} = \eta.$$

This theorem follows by minimising $C(d) \text{vol}(\Omega_2) (\gamma \Lambda)^{d/2} + n_\Gamma N$ under the constraint $ntol(\gamma, N) = \eta$ by using the method of Lagrange multipliers. Observe that Eqs. (5.4) and (5.5) do not depend on the exponent r in the approximate cost function $g(\gamma, N)$. ■

Remark 5.2. From Eqs. (5.4) and (5.5) one can numerically solve N and γ as a function of η . The resulting N is typically not an integer but it can be rounded up while preserving the desired normalised tolerance η . For $d = 2$, the graphical approximation given in Fig. 2 can be used. Denote

$$\tilde{\eta} := \eta^{\frac{2\pi n_\Gamma}{\Lambda}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{N}(\gamma) := (\gamma - 1) \ln 4(\gamma - 1).$$

Since $27/64 \leq \gamma^3(4(\gamma - 1))^{-2} \leq 1/2$ for $\gamma \in [2, 5]$ we have

$$\tilde{\eta}(\gamma) \approx 2 \left(\frac{1}{4(\gamma - 1)} \right)^{\tilde{N}(\gamma)}.$$

Using this approximation to determine γ eliminates n_Γ and Λ from the graphical procedure. The value for $N(\gamma)$ is recovered from $N(\gamma) = \frac{\Lambda}{2\pi n_\Gamma} \tilde{N}(\gamma)$ and rounded up.

6. Dimension reduction. It usually turns out that the space V_2 is excessively large for the chosen error level, and it can be replaced by $\tilde{V}_2 \subset V_2$ of considerably smaller dimension while maintaining desired accuracy. We proceed to discuss how such \tilde{V}_2 can be constructed.

For ease of presentation, assume now that the eigenvalues $\{\mu_k\}$ in Eq. (3.2) are given in non-decreasing order, and write $K = K(\tilde{\Lambda})$ as in Eq. (3.10). Recall the definition of B from Section 3.3

$$(6.1) \quad B = [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_K, (I - P_{\tilde{\Lambda}})\mathbf{q}_{11}, \dots, (I - P_{\tilde{\Lambda}})\mathbf{q}_{N_r}]$$




FIG. 2. Graphical tool for finding the auxiliary parameter value $\tilde{N}(\gamma)$ for a given $\tilde{\eta}$ in the case $d = 2$ for the Laplace equation.

which satisfies $V_2 = \text{range}(B)$. Note that the matrix B may have a non-trivial null space. Hence, the Q_{22} -block in the method matrix Q defined by Eq. (3.11) is obtained by computing a basis for $\text{range}(B)$ using, e.g., SVD of B .

Denoting a low-rank approximation of B by \tilde{B} with $\tilde{V}_2 := \text{range}(\tilde{B})$, the corresponding method matrix for the *dimension reduced version of CPI* is given by

$$(6.2) \quad \tilde{Q} := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{Q}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \text{ where } \ker(\tilde{Q}_{22}) = \{0\} \text{ and } \text{range}(\tilde{Q}_{22}) = \text{range}(\tilde{B}).$$

Further, let $\tilde{V} := \text{range}(\tilde{Q})$. We proceed to give an error estimate for the dimension reduced version of CPI.

LEMMA 6.1. *Let $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) \in (0, \Lambda) \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ be an eigenpair of Eq. (1.1) with $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_1 \ \mathbf{x}_2]^T$ according to the standard splitting. Let $\{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_r\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ be vectors satisfying Eq. (3.12). Let $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times (K+N_r)}$ be as defined in Eq. (6.1) and*

$$(6.3) \quad \mathbf{u}_2 := P_{\tilde{\Lambda}} \mathbf{x}_2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i(\lambda) f_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\xi_i) Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1 \quad \text{where} \quad Z(\lambda) = \lambda M_{21} - A_{21}.$$

Define the dimension reduced method matrix and the corresponding subspace by Eq. (6.2). Then there exists $\tilde{\lambda} \in \sigma_{\tilde{V}}(A, M)$ such that

$$(6.4) \quad \frac{|\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}|}{\lambda} \leq 2C_M C(\lambda) \Lambda (4\gamma)^3 \left(\frac{1}{4(\gamma-1)} \right)^{2N+2} + 2 \left\| R(B - \tilde{B}) \right\|_{\min_{B\hat{\alpha}=\mathbf{u}_2}}^2 \|\hat{\alpha}\|^2$$

where $A_{22} = R^T R$ is the Cholesky factorisation of A_{22} , and the constants N, γ, C_M , and $C(\lambda)$ are as in Theorem 4.4.

In computations, one would choose an optimal combination of N and γ as described in Section 5 for the untruncated version of CPI.

Proof. The original error estimate (4.8) in Theorem 4.4 was derived by implicitly constructing \mathbf{u}_2 in Eqs. (3.5) and (4.2) in order to bound the right hand side of Eq. (2.9), i.e.,

$$\min_{\mathbf{v}_2 \in V_2} \|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{v}_2\|_{A_{22}} \leq \|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_{A_{22}}.$$

In that theorem, the latter term is further estimated by

$$\|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_{A_{22}}^2 \leq C_M \Lambda (4\gamma)^3 \left(\frac{1}{4(\gamma-1)} \right)^{2N+2}.$$

The proof of the current claim follows from this by a perturbation argument. Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ be such that $\mathbf{u}_2 = B\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. Since $\tilde{V}_2 = \text{range}(\tilde{B})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{v}_2 \in \tilde{V}_2} \|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{v}_2\|_{A_{22}} &\leq \|\mathbf{x}_2 - \tilde{B}\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_{A_{22}} = \|\mathbf{x}_2 - B\boldsymbol{\alpha} + (B - \tilde{B})\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_{A_{22}} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_{A_{22}} + \|(B - \tilde{B})\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_{A_{22}} \leq \|\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{u}_2\|_{A_{22}} + \|R(B - \tilde{B})\| \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|. \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows by squaring this estimate and applying Proposition 2.2 with \tilde{V} in place of V . \square

To make practical use of Lemma 6.1 to achieve a given target level for the relative eigenvalue error, we start by bounding the first term in Eq. (6.4) by choosing the parameter value combination N, γ using Eqs. (5.4) and (5.5). It remains to bound the second term in Eq. (6.4) so that

$$\left\| R(B - \tilde{B}) \right\| \min_{B\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \mathbf{u}_2} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\| \leq \|R(B - \tilde{B})\| \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\| < \sqrt{\text{tol}}$$

for a given truncation error level $\text{tol} > 0$. A vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ satisfying $Q_{22}\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathbf{u}_2$ and upper bound for $\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|$ are given below. Given such $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, we then use the SVD $RB = \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{w}_i^T$ (where σ_i are ordered in non-increasing order) to construct the lowest rank \tilde{B} satisfying $\|R(B - \tilde{B})\| \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\| < \sqrt{\text{tol}}$ as

$$\tilde{B} = R^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{K_c} \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{w}_i^T \quad \text{where} \quad K_c := \max\{i \mid \sigma_i > \sqrt{\text{tol}}/\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|\}.$$

The method matrix block \tilde{Q}_{22} for the dimension reduced CPI, defined in Eq. (6.2), is obtained as

$$(6.5) \quad \tilde{Q}_{22} := R^{-1} [\mathbf{u}_1 \quad \mathbf{u}_2 \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{u}_{K_c}]$$

where the column vectors of \tilde{Q}_{22} are orthonormal in the A_{22} -inner product. Because $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \neq \mathbf{0}$, the number $K_c = K_c(\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|, \text{tol})$ is always defined, and the truncation error level $\text{tol} > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small.

We make use of the Lebesgue constant Λ_N for Chebyshev interpolation points of $(0, \tilde{\Lambda})$ (see, e.g., [10]), given by

$$(6.6) \quad \Lambda_N := \max_{t \in (0, \tilde{\Lambda})} \sum_{i=1}^N |\ell_i(t)| \quad \text{that satisfy} \quad \Lambda_N = \frac{2}{\pi} \log N + \mathcal{O}(1).$$

LEMMA 6.2. *Make the same assumptions and use the same notation as in Lemma 6.1. ■ Then there exists $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ satisfying $\mathbf{u}_2 = Q_{22}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, such that*

$$(6.7) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2 \leq 1 + \Lambda_N^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2$$

where the coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} := [\theta_1 \quad \theta_2 \quad \dots \quad \theta_r]^T$ satisfies

$$(6.8) \quad Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^r \theta_j \mathbf{p}_j.$$

Proof. Define the coefficients τ_k by the expansion

$$(6.9) \quad P_{\tilde{\Lambda}} \mathbf{x}_2 = \sum_{k=1}^K \tau_k \mathbf{v}_k \quad \text{so that} \quad \|P_{\tilde{\Lambda}} \mathbf{x}_2\|_{M_{22}}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K \tau_k^2 \leq 1.$$

Indeed, this holds by the M_{22} -orthogonality of $\{\mathbf{v}_k\}$ (see Eq. (3.3)) and the normalisation $\mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x} = 1$ implying $\|\mathbf{x}_2\|_{M_{22}} \leq 1$ and hence $\|P_{\tilde{\Lambda}} \mathbf{x}_2\|_{M_{22}} \leq 1$.

Define $\alpha_{i,j} := \ell_i(\lambda) \theta_j$ where $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $i = j, \dots, r$. Then \mathbf{u}_2 in Eq. (6.3) can be written in the form

$$\mathbf{u}_2 = Q_{22} \boldsymbol{\alpha} = \sum_{k=1}^K \tau_k \mathbf{v}_k + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^r \alpha_{i,j} (I - P_{\tilde{\Lambda}}) \mathbf{q}_{i,j}$$

by Eqs. (3.13)–(6.1). So, we can choose

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} := [\tau_1 \quad \dots \quad \tau_K \quad \alpha_{1,1} \quad \dots \quad \alpha_{N,1} \quad \dots \quad \alpha_{1,r} \quad \dots \quad \alpha_{N,r}]^T.$$

By Eq. (6.9) and the definition of $\alpha_{i,j}$ we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K \tau_k^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^r \alpha_{i,j}^2 \leq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i(\lambda)^2 \sum_{j=1}^r \theta_j^2.$$

Observing that $\sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i(\lambda)^2 \leq \Lambda_N^2$ completes the proof. \square

The magnitude of $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|$ in Eq. (6.7) is estimated by choosing the vectors $\{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_r\}$ in a way that θ_j 's can be explicitly solved from the Eq. (6.8):

LEMMA 6.3. *Make the same assumptions and use the same notation as in Lemma 6.1. Assume that the matrices A_{21} , M_{21} are ordered so that only their first r_1 , r_2 column vectors are nonvanishing, respectively. Let*

$$(6.10) \quad \{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_r\} = \{A_{21} \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, A_{21} \mathbf{e}_{r_1}, M_{21} \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, M_{21} \mathbf{e}_{r_2}\}.$$

Then there exists a coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} := [\theta_1 \quad \theta_2 \quad \dots \quad \theta_r]^T$ such that $Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^r \theta_j \mathbf{p}_j$ and

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2 \leq (1 + \lambda^2) \|M^{-1}\|.$$

Proof. Since $Z(\lambda) = \lambda M_{21} - A_{21}$ holds, it follows from Eq. (6.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1 &= \sum_{j=1}^{r_1} \lambda x_{1,j} M_{21} \mathbf{e}_j - \sum_{j=1}^{r_2} x_{1,j} A_{21} \mathbf{e}_j \quad \text{and} \\ \sum_{j=1}^r \theta_j \mathbf{p}_j &= \sum_{j=1}^{r_1} \theta_j M_{21} \mathbf{e}_j + \sum_{j=r_1+1}^{r_2} \theta_j A_{21} \mathbf{e}_j. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, one solution of Eq. (6.8) is $\boldsymbol{\theta} = [\lambda x_{1,1} \quad \dots \quad \lambda x_{1,r_1} \quad -x_{1,1} \quad \dots \quad -x_{1,r_2}]$, and

it satisfies the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2 &= \lambda^2 \sum_{j=1}^{r_1} x_{1,j}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{r_2} x_{1,j}^2 \leq (1 + \lambda^2) \|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2 \\
 (6.11) \quad &\leq (1 + \lambda^2) \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 = (1 + \lambda^2) \frac{\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x}} \\
 &\leq (1 + \lambda^2) \max_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{v} \neq 0} \frac{\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{v}^T M \mathbf{v}} = (1 + \lambda^2) \|M^{-1}\|
 \end{aligned}$$

because $\mathbf{x}^T M \mathbf{x} = 1$. The proof is now complete. \square

The combination of Lemmas 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3 yields the following result:

THEOREM 6.4. *Let $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) \in (0, \Lambda) \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ be an eigenpair of Eq. (1.1). Let the vectors $\{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_r\}$ be defined by Eq. (6.10) and the matrix $Q_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times (K+Nr)}$ as in Eq. (6.1). Define R by the Cholesky factorisation $A_{22} = R^T R$, and let $\sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{w}_i^T$ be the SVD of RQ_{22} . For any truncation error level $tol > 0$, define*

$$K_c(tol) := \max\{i \mid \sigma_i^2 (1 + \Lambda_N^2 (1 + \lambda^2) \|M^{-1}\|) > tol\},$$

where Λ_N is given by Eq. (6.6). Define the method matrix \tilde{Q} and the subspace \tilde{V} by Eqs. (6.2) and (6.5).

Then there exists $\tilde{\lambda} \in \sigma_{\tilde{V}}(A, M)$ such that

$$\frac{|\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}|}{\lambda} \leq 2C_M C(\lambda) \Lambda (4\gamma)^3 \left(\frac{1}{4(\gamma - 1)} \right)^{2N+2} + 2tol$$

for any parameter value combination N, γ where the constants C_M and $C(\lambda)$ are as in Theorem 4.4.

A typical application of CPI is the solution of the lowest eigenmodes of the Laplace operator in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ using the finite element method. When piecewise linear basis functions are used on quasi-uniform simplicial meshes, it is known that $\|M^{-1}\| \leq Ch^{-d}$ where the constant C is independent on the mesh size h , see [9, Section 6]. A reasonable value for the cut-off index in Theorem 6.4 can be computed with the help of this estimate.

7. Model problems. We proceed to illustrate theoretical results by two numerical examples. Both examples involve the eigenpairs $(\lambda', u) \in (0, \Lambda) \times \mathcal{V}$ of the variational eigenvalue problem

$$(7.1) \quad (\nabla u, \nabla v) = \lambda'(u, v) \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{V}$$

of the Laplace operator where $\mathcal{V} \subset H^1(\Omega)$ is a subspace where the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition holds at least on a part of the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Problem (7.1) is discretised using finite element method with piecewise linear basis functions leading to the algebraic eigenvalue problem (1.1) that is the subject matter of this article.

7.1. Computational considerations. Let us begin by describing an implementation of CPI. The problem data consists of the spectral interval of interest $(0, \Lambda)$, the specified upper bound for the relative eigenvalue error, and the symmetric positive definite stiffness and mass matrices A and M . Without loss of generality, the basis

functions can be assumed to be ordered so that A and M obey the standard splitting given in Eq. (2.2) corresponding to the interior and the exterior systems. The purpose is to compute spectral approximations

$$\sigma_V(A, M) \cap (0, \Lambda) \approx \sigma(A, M) \cap (0, \Lambda)$$

for several versions of Eq. (1.1) sharing the same exterior system. Note that the dimension of the eigenvalue problem may vary between different versions as long as $\text{range}(A_{21})$ and $\text{range}(M_{21})$ remain fixed. Thus, the finite element mesh of the exterior part stays constant while mesh of the interior part may vary.

As discussed in Section 5, an effective choice of γ and N requires *a priori* information on the eigenvalue distribution of problem (7.1) that is encoded in the function $K(l)$ in Eq. (3.10). We model $K(l)$ by the Weyl law as in Section 5. Values for γ and N are then chosen using Theorem 5.1. For practical reasons, we set $C(\lambda) = C_M = 1$ in Eq. (4.8). For a given finite element mesh size $h > 0$, the term $\|\alpha\|$ is approximated by setting $\|M^{-1}\| = h^{-d}$ and applying Lemmas 6.2 and 6.3.

CPI consists of the following steps:

1. Using the target relative error level, determine N and γ using, e.g., Eqs. (5.4) and (5.5). Compute the Chebyshev points $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ using Eq. (4.5).
2. Compute the $K = K(\gamma\Lambda)$ smallest eigenpairs (μ_k, \mathbf{v}_k) of the exterior system $A_{22}\mathbf{v}_k = \mu_k M_{22}\mathbf{v}_k$.
3. Let \mathbf{p}_j , $j = 1, \dots, r_1$, and \mathbf{p}_j , $j = r_1 + 1, \dots, r$ with $r = r_1 + r_2$, be the nonzero columns of M_{21} and A_{21} , respectively. Compute the sample vectors $\mathbf{q}_{11}, \dots, \mathbf{q}_{Nr}$ as solutions of $(A_{22} - \xi_i M_{22})\mathbf{q}_{ij} = \mathbf{p}_j$.
4. Collect eigenvectors from Step 1 and sample vectors from Step 2 into matrix $B = [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_K, (I - P_\Lambda)\mathbf{q}_{11}, \dots, (I - P_\Lambda)\mathbf{q}_{Nr}]$. Compute the SVD $RB = \sum_i \sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{w}_i^T$ where σ_i are ordered in non-increasing order and $R^T R = A_{22}$.
5. Choose the cut-off index as $K_c = \max\{i \mid \sigma_i \geq \|\alpha\|^{-1} \text{tol}\}$. Construct the method matrix using vectors $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{K_c}$ from step 3 as

$$\tilde{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{Q}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{Q}_{22} = R^{-1} [\mathbf{u}_1 \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{u}_{K_c}].$$

6. Solve the eigenvalue problem $\tilde{Q}^T A \tilde{Q} \tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \tilde{\lambda} \tilde{Q}^T M \tilde{Q} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$, e.g., using the Lanczos iteration.

In Step 2, one has to determine a tolerance for computing the exterior eigenvectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_K$. We proceed to analyse the effect of exterior eigenvector error to the accuracy of the eigenvalues computed using the CPI method. Our analysis relies on perturbation argument identical to one used in Lemma 6.1. When the exterior eigenvectors are incorrectly computed, the space V_2 is replaced by \hat{V}_2 defined as

$$(7.2) \quad \hat{V}_2 = \text{range}(\hat{P}_\Lambda) \oplus \hat{W}_2 \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{W}_2 = \text{span}_{i=1, \dots, N} \{ \hat{f}_\Lambda(\xi_i) [M_{21} \quad A_{21}] \}.$$

The matrix \hat{P}_Λ is the A_{22} -orthogonal projection onto $\text{span}_{k=1, \dots, K} \{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_k\}$ and $\hat{f}_\Lambda(\xi) = (I - \hat{P}_\Lambda)(A_{22} - \xi M_{22})^{-1}$. Note that P_Λ defined in Eq. (3.3) is also an A_{22} -orthogonal projection. Following [6], the eigenvector error is measured using the gap, i.e., the maximum angle between the exact and the approximate eigenspace in the A_{22} -norm

as

$$(7.3) \quad d_H := \max \left(\max_{\substack{\mathbf{u} \in \text{range}(P_{\hat{\Lambda}}) \\ \|\mathbf{u}\|_{A_{22}}=1}} \|(I - \hat{P}_{\hat{\Lambda}})\mathbf{u}\|_{A_{22}}, \max_{\substack{\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in \text{range}(\hat{P}_{\hat{\Lambda}}) \\ \|\hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{A_{22}}=1}} \|(I - P_{\hat{\Lambda}})\hat{\mathbf{u}}\|_{A_{22}} \right).$$

COROLLARY 7.1. *Let $(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) \in (0, \Lambda) \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ be an eigenpair of Eq. (1.1) with $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_1 \ \mathbf{x}_2]^T$ according to the standard splitting. By $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_K$ denote the set of approximate exterior eigenvectors, and by $\hat{P}_{\hat{\Lambda}}$ the A_{22} -orthogonal projection onto $\text{span}_{k=1, \dots, K} \{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_k\}$. Let the method subspace \hat{V} and \hat{V}_2 in Eq. (7.2) be related as V and V_2 in Eq. (2.8). Then there exists $\hat{\lambda} \in \sigma_{\hat{V}}(A, M)$ such that*

$$\frac{|\lambda - \hat{\lambda}|}{\lambda} \leq 2C_M C(\lambda) \Lambda (4\gamma)^3 \left(\frac{1}{4(\gamma - 1)} \right)^{2N+2} + C' \max_{\substack{k=1, \dots, n_2 \\ i=1, \dots, N}} \left(\frac{\mu_k - \lambda}{\mu_k - \xi_i} \right)^2 d_H^2$$

for any parameter value combination N, γ with $C' := 2(1 + \Lambda_N)^2 \|\mathbf{x}_2\|_{A_{22}}^2$. The constants C_M and $C(\lambda)$ are as in Theorem 4.4, d_H is the maximal angle defined by Eq. (7.3), and Λ_N is defined in Eq. (6.6).

The contribution of inaccurate exterior eigenvectors to relative error in eigenvalues depends inversely on $\text{dist}(\{\xi_i\}, \{\mu_k\})$. As Chebyshev interpolation points are not nested and μ_k 's have been determined in Step 2, one may be able to adjust the number of interpolation points N so that $\text{dist}(\{\xi_i\}, \{\mu_k\})$ increases.

Proof. Let $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_2 = \hat{P}_{\hat{\Lambda}} \mathbf{x}_2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i(\lambda) \hat{f}_{\hat{\Lambda}}(\xi_i) Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1$ and \mathbf{u}_2 be as in Lemma 6.1. Then

$$\mathbf{u}_2 - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_2 = (\hat{P}_{\hat{\Lambda}} - P_{\hat{\Lambda}}) \mathbf{x}_2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i(\lambda) (P_{\hat{\Lambda}} - \hat{P}_{\hat{\Lambda}}) (A_{22} - \xi_i M_{22})^{-1} Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1.$$

Since $\|\hat{P}_{\hat{\Lambda}} - P_{\hat{\Lambda}}\|_{A_{22}} = d_H$ by [8], we have

$$\|\mathbf{u}_2 - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_2\|_{A_{22}} \leq d_H \|\mathbf{x}_2\|_{A_{22}} + d_H \sum_{i=1}^N |\ell_i(\lambda)| \|(A_{22} - \xi_i M_{22})^{-1} Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1\|_{A_{22}}$$

and further,

$$\|\mathbf{u}_2 - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_2\|_{A_{22}} \leq d_H \|\mathbf{x}_2\|_{A_{22}} + d_H \Lambda_N \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \|(A_{22} - \xi_i M_{22})^{-1} Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1\|_{A_{22}}.$$

It now follows from a similar argument that was used to derive Eq. (4.9) that

$$\|(A_{22} - \xi_i M_{22})^{-1} Z(\lambda) \mathbf{x}_1\|_{A_{22}}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} \mu_k \frac{\beta_k^2(\lambda)}{(\mu_k - \xi_i)^2} = \max_{k=1, \dots, n_2} \left(\frac{\mu_k - \lambda}{\mu_k - \xi_i} \right)^2 \|\mathbf{x}_2\|_{A_{22}}^2.$$

The claim follows by a perturbation argument as in Lemma 6.1. \square

Remark 7.2. An alternative approach for Step 3 is to directly solve for $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}_{ij} := (I - P_{\hat{\Lambda}}) \mathbf{q}_{ij}$ using the saddle point formulation

$$\begin{bmatrix} (A_{22} - \xi_i M_{22}) & M_{22} B_1 \\ B_1^T M_{22} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{q}}_{ij} \\ \boldsymbol{\nu} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_j \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $B_1 = [\mathbf{v}_1 \ \dots \ \mathbf{v}_K]$ and \mathbf{v}_k 's are computed in Step 2. This formulation preserves most of the sparse structure of the linear systems (3.13) and is numerically stable when an interpolation point ξ_i is close to μ_k . All numerical experiments were performed without paying attention to this issue.

Due to memory constraints, it is not always feasible to store vectors \mathbf{q}_{ij} in Step 3 or to explicitly construct $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times (K+Nr)}$ in Step 4 when n_2 or $K+Nr$ is prohibitively large. In the construction of the method matrix, Step 5, only vectors $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{K_c}$ corresponding to the largest singular values of RB are needed. Steps 3 and 4 can be combined into an iterative solution of the largest singular values of RB and the corresponding vectors \mathbf{u}_i using action of $(RB)(RB)^T$ without storing \mathbf{q}_{ij} .

7.2. 2D Rectangle. We consider numerical solution of Eq. (7.1) in the rectangular domain shown in Fig. 1. The homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition is used. The domain is uniformly discretised with 67 872 triangular elements and 34 241 nodes. With the boundary conditions, this resulted in $n = 33\,633$ degrees of freedom with $n_\Gamma = 163$, $n_1 = 14\,638$, and $n_2 = 18\,995$ in Eq. (2.2). The spectral interval of interest $(0, \Lambda)$ with $\Lambda = 135$ allows us to compute 15 of the lowest eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots$ in non-decreasing order. The numerically obtained largest relative eigenvalue errors (without using the SVD-based dimension reduction process of Section 6) and its upper bound from Eq. (4.8) are shown in Fig. 3.




FIG. 3. Numerical and theoretical maximal relative errors of eigenvalues $\lambda \in (0, 135)$ for $\gamma = 2.5$ (left) and $N = 3$ (right).

The largest relative eigenvalue errors with several values of γ and N are compared to the theoretical estimate (Eq. (4.8)) in Fig. 4. For validation of the cost model in Eq. (5.2), the computational time to solve Eq. (2.5) with several N and γ is illustrated in Fig. 5.

The effect of the SVD-based dimension reduction of Section 6 is demonstrated in Fig. 6. The relative eigenvalue error and $\dim(\tilde{V}_2)$ are given as a function of the truncation error level $tol > 0$.

Finally, the CPI method was benchmarked against the CMS implementation detailed in Section 2.3. Values for N and γ were chosen from Eqs. (5.4) and (5.5) given a list of target error levels. The value of tol was adjusted for each target error level. The comparison is illustrated in Fig. 7.




FIG. 4. Largest relative eigenvalue errors for 15 lowest eigenvalues of the 2D rectangle using several values of N and γ from the theoretical estimate Eq. (4.8) (left) and from numerical experiments (right). The value of $K(\gamma\Lambda)$ varies from $K = 18$ when $\gamma = 2$ to $K = 48$ for $\gamma = 5$.




FIG. 5. The computation time (in seconds) required by Matlab R2017a `eigs` to solve the 15 smallest eigenvalues of Eq. (2.5) for several values of N and γ . The time is averaged from 50 computations. Intel Xeon E5-1630 CPU with 32GB of RAM was used.

7.3. 3D Acoustic example. The computational domain shown in Fig. 1 consists of a human vocal tract geometry Ω_1 and a mock up model of the MRI head coil Ω_2 . The vocal tract geometries were automatically extracted from MRI data as explained in [1, 27], and the interface Γ was attached. The vocal tract was embedded into a head model purchased from Turbosquid [31].

Homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition was posed on the areas marked in Fig. 8, and the Neumann condition was used on other parts of the boundary. The interface Γ is a spherical surface separating Ω_1 and Ω_2 . We use three versions of the vocal tract geometry corresponding to Finnish vowels [a], [i], and [u] as visualised in Fig. 9. The domain Ω_2 contains 522 517 tetrahedral elements and 101 222 nodes, and the interface has $n_\Gamma = 950$ degrees of freedom. Having set the boundary conditions, we have $n_2 = 97 375$.

The eigenvalues λ in Eq. (7.1) and resonant frequencies satisfy $2\pi f = c\lambda^{1/2}$ where $c = 344 \frac{\text{m}}{\text{s}}$ is the speed of sound at temperature 294K. Setting the target relative eigenvalue error to 10^{-6} corresponds to relative error of 10^{-3} for resonant frequencies. The spectral interval of interest $\lambda \in (0, 3000)$ matches frequencies up to




FIG. 6. The effect of the cut-off threshold σ in SVD to the relative error and the size of the method matrix Q . The parameter values $\gamma = 4$ and $N = 6$ were used.




FIG. 7. The CPI method compared with CMS in the 2D rectangular domain. The x -axis corresponds to the amount of degrees of freedom related to Ω_2 .




FIG. 8. A visualisation of the special degrees of freedom for the acoustic example. Dirichlet boundary condition is posed on the red area, and the interface Γ is marked by the yellow faces.

3 kHz. Eqs. (5.4) and (5.5) give $N = 3$, $\gamma = 8$ for a relative eigenvalue error level 10^{-6} .

Writing

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12}\tilde{Q}_{22} \\ A_{21}\tilde{Q}_{22} & \tilde{Q}_{22}^T A_{22} \tilde{Q}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \tilde{x} = \tilde{\lambda} \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12}\tilde{Q}_{22} \\ M_{21}\tilde{Q}_{22} & \tilde{Q}_{22}^T M_{22} \tilde{Q}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \tilde{x}$$

for a given a method matrix \tilde{Q} , we can use the same blocks $\tilde{Q}_{22}^T A_{22} \tilde{Q}_{22}$ and $\tilde{Q}_{22}^T M_{22} \tilde{Q}_{22}$ for different versions, and only the off-diagonal blocks have to be updated.


A conservative choice for truncation index K_c was made according to target relative error 10^{-6} resulting into subspace \tilde{V}_2 with $\dim(\tilde{V}_2) = 1601$. Forty lowest resonant frequencies could be computed to the given tolerance. The computation times and maximum relative eigenvalue errors are listed in Table 1. The sample vectors in Step 3 were solved in parallel for each sample point using different cores of the CPU. The precomputations needed to form the CPI method matrix took 13 minutes and 15

vowel	n_1	CPI	original	max. rel. error
[a]	16 293	4.44	26.05	$7.05 \cdot 10^{-8}$
[i]	13 939	4.57	28.49	$7.28 \cdot 10^{-8}$
[u]	15 139	4.66	25.66	$7.36 \cdot 10^{-8}$

TABLE 1

The computation time (in seconds) required by Matlab `eigs` to solve the original eigenvalue problem Eq. (1.1) vs. to solve Eq. (2.5) where \tilde{Q} is constructed by dimension reduced CPI. Forty lowest eigenvalues were solved, and their maximum relative eigenvalue error is given. The same software and hardware were used as specified in Fig. 5.

seconds. As shown in Table 1, the time difference between solving the original and the reduced eigenvalue problem is around 20 seconds. Thus, 40 different versions of the acoustic eigenvalue problems need to be solved in order to break even in terms of computational time.

FIG. 9. The three vocal tract geometries ([a], [i], [u]) together with the fixed exterior domain Ω_2 .

A comparison between CPI and CMS was also performed in the 3D example. The values $\gamma = 8$, $N = 3$ were used in CPI with a varying cut-off threshold σ in order to produce comparable dimensions for the subspace V_2 . The largest relative eigenvalue error for both methods was measured using different subspace dimensions. Additionally, the relative eigenvalue error for each of the 40 smallest eigenvalues was compared when the subspace dimension was 1 600. For comparison, Matlab `eigs` uses by default a subspace of dimension at most $2k$, where k is the number of eigenvalues to be computed. The results are shown in Fig. 10. Computing this many eigenvalues of the exterior system for the CMS method required 27 minutes and 41 seconds, which is approximately twice the time required by the CPI method. With CPI and the parameters used, 550 eigenvalues needed to be used for the exterior system.

8. Conclusions. We have presented a Condensed Pole Interpolation (CPI) method for efficient solution of symmetric structured eigenvalue problems by constructing a particular method subspace V . Error analysis for the CPI method shows convergence of relative eigenvalue error at rate $C\rho^N$ where N is the number of interpolation points in the spectral interval of interest $(0, \Lambda)$, and $\rho < 1$ depends of the oversampling parameter $\gamma > 5/4$. Optimal parameter values for γ and N are chosen based on a




FIG. 10. CPI compared to CMS in the 3D acoustic example. Left: largest relative eigenvalue error for 40 of the smallest eigenvalues. Right: relative eigenvalue errors for each eigenvalue with $\dim(V_2) = 1600$ in both methods.

cost model. A dimension reduced version of the CPI method with convergence analysis is given. Numerical experiments on finite element discretised Laplace operator ($d = 2, 3$) show that the method has practical value and indicate faster convergence in comparison to the convergence estimate Eq. (4.8). Authors have observed that the CPI method becomes increasingly competitive against Matlab `eigs` for large values of Λ , excluding precomputations. In addition, the performance is improved for families of matrices where n_Γ and n_1/n_2 are small.

The CPI method requires precomputation of a basis for the method subspace V . This involves solution of exterior eigenvectors (μ_k, \mathbf{v}_k) satisfying $\mu_k \leq \gamma\Lambda$ and the solution of $n_\Gamma N$ linear systems. Additional precomputation cost is produced by SVD in dimension reduction. The cost model used for optimising γ and N does not account for any precomputation costs. In the acoustic eigenvalue problem used for benchmarking, the CPI method becomes competitive in comparison to `eigs` after 40 eigensolves if precomputation time is taken into account. Even costly precomputations are justified in processes where eigensolution must be repeated several times by the designer.

The computational speed of the CPI method comes at a price; the algorithm is memory intensive compared to `eigs`. In the acoustic eigenvalue problem involving the 40 lowest eigenvalues, the method subspace is of dimension 1601, whereas the subspace used by `eigs` is of dimension 80. The feasibility of precomputations may be limited by storage more severely than by computation time, in particular, if dimension reduction is not used.

Application of the CPI method to domain decomposition in the finite element context presents a topic for future work. In fact, the presented analysis already extends to the setting where A_{22} and M_{22} are block diagonal matrices as is the case when multiple subdomains are treated.

9. Acknowledgements. The geometry for the exterior model in Section 7.3 is loosely based on the MRI head coil design provided by Siemens Healthineers. The authors are grateful for the comments of the reviewers.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. AALTO, O. AALTONEN, R.-P. HAPPONEN, P. JÄÄSAARI, A. KIVELÄ, J. KUORTTI, J.-M. LUUKINEN, J. MALINEN, T. MURTOLA, R. PARKKOLA, J. SAUNAVAARA, T. SOUKKA, AND M. VAINIO, *Large scale data acquisition of simultaneous MRI and speech*, Applied Acoustics, 83 (2014), pp. 64–75.
- [2] I. BABUSKA AND J. E. OSBORN, *Finite Element-Galerkin Approximation of the Eigenvalues and Eigenvectors of Selfadjoint Problems*, MATH-COMP, 52 (1989), pp. 275–297.
- [3] M. C. C. BAMPTON AND R. R. CRAIG, *Coupling of substructures for dynamic analyses*, AIAA Journal, 6 (1968), pp. 1313–1319.
- [4] C. BEKAS AND Y. SAAD, *Computation of Smallest Eigenvalues using Spectral Schur Complements*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 27 (2005), pp. 458–481.
- [5] J. BENNIGHOF AND R. LEHOUCQ, *An automated multilevel substructuring method for eigenspace computation in linear elastodynamics*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 25 (2004), pp. 2084–2106.
- [6] D. BOFFI, *Finite element approximation of eigenvalue problems*, Acta Numerica, 19 (2010), pp. 1–120.
- [7] S.-H. BOO, J.-G. KIM, AND P.-S. LEE, *Error estimation for the automated multi-level substructuring method*, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering, 106 (2016), pp. 927–950.
- [8] A. BÖTTCHER AND I. SPITKOVSKY, *A gentle guide to the basics of two projections theory*, Linear Algebra and its Applications, 432 (2010), pp. 1412 – 1459.
- [9] D. BRAESS, *Finite Elements: Theory, Fast Solvers, and Applications in Solid Mechanics*, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [10] L. BRUTMAN, *On the Lebesgue Function for Polynomial Interpolation*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 15 (1978), pp. 694–704.
- [11] A. G. BUCHAN, C. C. PAIN, F. FANG, AND I. M. NAVON, *A POD reduced-order model for eigenvalue problems with application to reactor physics*, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering, 95 (2013), pp. 1011–1032.
- [12] F. CHATELIN AND M. J. LEMORDANT, *La méthode de Rayleigh–Ritz appliquée à des opérateurs différentielles elliptiques — ordres de convergence des éléments propres*, NUM-MATH, 23 (1975), pp. 215–222.
- [13] K. ELSSEL AND H. VOSS, *An A Priori Bound for Automated Multilevel Substructuring*, SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications, 28 (2006), pp. 386–397.
- [14] T. ERICSSON AND A. RUHE, *The Spectral Transformation Lanczos Method for the Numerical Solution of Large Sparse Generalized Symmetric Eigenvalue Problems*, Mathematics of Computation, 35 (1980), pp. 1251–1268.
- [15] F. BOURQUIN, *Component mode synthesis and eigenvalues of second order operators: discretization and algorithm*, ESAIM: M2AN, 26 (1992), pp. 385–423.
- [16] N. GRÄBNER, V. MEHRMANN, S. QURAISHI, C. SCHRÖDER, AND U. WAGNER, *Numerical methods for parametric model reduction in the simulation of disk brake squeal*, ZAMM - Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics / Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik, 96 (2016), pp. 1388–1405.
- [17] A. HANNUKAINEN, T. LUKKARI, J. MALINEN, AND P. PALO, *Vowel formants from the wave equation*, The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 122 (2007), pp. EL1–EL7.
- [18] W. C. HURTY, *Vibrations of structural systems by component mode synthesis*, Journal of the Engineering Mechanics Division, 86 (1960), pp. 51–70.
- [19] I. FUMAGALLI, A. MANZONI, N. PAROLINI, AND M. VERANI, *Reduced basis approximation and a posteriori error estimates for parametrized elliptic eigenvalue problems*, ESAIM: M2AN, 50 (2016), pp. 1857–1885.
- [20] V. KALANTZIS, Y. XI, AND Y. SAAD, *Beyond automated multilevel substructuring: Domain decomposition with rational filtering*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 40 (2018), pp. C477–C502.
- [21] J.-G. KIM, S.-H. BOO, AND P.-S. LEE, *An enhanced amls method and its performance*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 287 (2015), pp. 90 – 111.
- [22] J.-G. KIM, K.-H. LEE, AND P.-S. LEE, *Estimating relative eigenvalue errors in the craigbampton method*, Computers & Structures, 139 (2014), p. 5464.
- [23] J.-G. KIM AND P.-S. LEE, *An enhanced craigbampton method*, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering, 103 (2015), pp. 79–93.
- [24] J.-G. KIM, Y.-J. PARK, G. H. LEE, AND D.-N. KIM, *A general model reduction with primal assembly in structural dynamics*, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering, 324 (2017), pp. 1 – 28.
- [25] A. V. KNYAZEV AND J. E. OSBORN, *New a priori FEM error estimates for eigenvalues*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 43 (2006), pp. 2647–2667.

- [26] J. KUORTTI, J. MALINEN, AND A. OJALAMMI, *Post-processing speech recordings during MRI*, Biomedical Signal Processing and Control, 39 (2018), pp. 11 – 22.
- [27] A. OJALAMMI AND J. MALINEN, *Automated Segmentation of Upper Airways from MRI: Vocal Tract Geometry Extraction*, in BIOIMAGING 2017, Porto, Portugal, 2017, pp. 77–84.
- [28] K. PARK AND Y. H. PARK, *Partitioned component mode synthesis via a flexibility approach*, AIAA journal, 42 (2004), pp. 1236–1245.
- [29] B. N. PARLETT, *The Symmetric Eigenvalue Problem*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1998.
- [30] J. ROE, *Elliptic operators, topology, and asymptotic methods*, Pitman research notes in mathematics series, Longman Scientific & Technical, 1988.
- [31] TURBOSQUID, *Head + morph targets 3D model*, 2005, <http://www.turbosquid.com/3d-models/3d-model-male-head-morph-targets/261694>. (Last viewed 6 June 2018).