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Abstract. We describe an efficient framework for multiscale PDE problems that uses random sampling to capture low-rank local solution spaces arising in a domain decomposition framework. In contrast to existing techniques, our method does not rely on detailed analytical understanding of specific multiscale PDEs, in particular, their asymptotic limits. Our framework is applied to two specific problems—a linear kinetic equation and an elliptic equation with oscillatory media—for which recover the asymptotic preserving scheme and numerical homogenization, respectively. Numerical results confirm the efficacy of our approach.

1. Introduction

Partial differential equations (PDEs) that involve multiple temporal and spatial scales are numerically challenging to solve. The current generation of efficient solvers exploits the analytic solution structures that are intrinsic to each specific multiscale problem. In this work, we exploit instead the “low-rank” property of the solution spaces that is common to all multiscale problems, and design a general framework in which analytic structures of solutions are discovered automatically by the algorithms without the need for any problem-specific analysis.

We consider the following boundary value problem:

\[ L_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon = 0, \quad \text{with} \quad B u_\varepsilon = f, \]

where \( L_\varepsilon \) is a linear PDE operator with multiscale structure, with \( \varepsilon \) representing the small scale. \( B \) is the boundary operator and \( f \) is the boundary condition. The solution \( u_\varepsilon \) contains information at both coarse scale \( x \) and fine scale \( x/\varepsilon \). A naive numerical scheme for (1) would require a fine discretization: The mesh size \( h \) must resolve \( \varepsilon \) (that is, \( h \ll \varepsilon \)), and thus the number of grid points (the degrees of freedom) \( N_\varepsilon \) is of the order of \( \varepsilon^{-d} \), with \( d \) being the dimension of the problem. For small \( \varepsilon \), the computational cost is prohibitive. These observations have motivated research into algorithms for multiscale PDE problems that are much more efficient than such naive schemes.

One strategy commonly used by efficient algorithms is to exploit the asymptotic behavior of the multiscale problems as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \). In particular, the “effective equations” that capture the behavior of the solution as \( \varepsilon \) approaches zero have been derived for several specific multiscale problems. Specifically, we seek a homogenized operator \( L^* \), with no dependence on \( \varepsilon \), such that the solution \( u^* \) of the “effective equation”

\[ L^* u^* = 0, \quad \text{with} \quad B u^* = f \]
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satisfies

\[ \| u^\varepsilon - u^* \| \to 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0. \]

Since \( u^* \) is asymptotically equivalent to \( u^\varepsilon \) and no small-scale oscillation is present, solving \((3)\) can typically be done much more efficiently than solving \((1)\) for small \( \varepsilon \).

It is sometimes nontrivial, however, to identify the effective operator \( L^* \). Different techniques are needed for different equations. The hydrodynamic limit of kinetic equations is based on moment expansions and entropic closures; the homogenization of elliptic equations with oscillatory media is based on corrector equations and two-scale convergence analysis; and the semiclassical limit of Schrödinger equations is based on WKB expansion and Wigner transformations. Each of these analytical tools leads to a different algorithmic approach, so there is a wide variation in algorithms for different multiscale problems.

We describe in this paper a general approach to designing efficient algorithms for multiscale PDE problems that does not make use of detailed analytical knowledge of the PDE and applies to a wide variety of problems. Our approach not only has the advantage of a uniform treatment, but it also applies to cases in which the asymptotic limit is not known, or is too complicated to derive (for example, when the problem has multiple small parameters).

Our framework is based on domain decomposition together with random sampling to characterize the local solution space on each patch in the decomposition. We make use of the fact that most multiscale PDEs that have asymptotic limits independent of small scales also have local solution spaces of low dimension.

Figure 1 illustrates the relationships between the multiscale PDE, its discretization, and its asymptotic limits. The key points of this diagram are as follows.

1. Both \( u^* \) and \( u^\varepsilon \), the solutions to \( L^* \) and \( L^\varepsilon \), respectively, are convolutions of Green’s functions \( G^\varepsilon/\varepsilon^* \) with the boundary conditions.
2. In the discrete setting, with \( L^* \) and \( L^\varepsilon \) denoting the discrete operators and \( G^* \) and \( G^\varepsilon \) the corresponding Green’s matrices, the numerical solutions \( U^* \) and \( U^\varepsilon \) are in the column space spanned by the respective Green’s matrices.
3. As discussed above, accurate discretization of \( L^\varepsilon \) requires \( N_\varepsilon \sim \varepsilon^{-d} \) degrees of freedom, while discretization of \( L^* \) usually requires a modest number \( N \) of degrees of freedom, independent of \( \varepsilon \), with \( N \ll N_\varepsilon \) for interesting values of \( \varepsilon \).

Figure 1 suggests that if \( U^* \) and \( U^\varepsilon \) are good numerical approximations to \( u^* \) and \( u^\varepsilon \), respectively, and since \( u^* \) and \( u^\varepsilon \) are close when \( \varepsilon \) is small, then \( U^* \) and \( U^\varepsilon \) should also be close to each other. Since \( U^\varepsilon \) and \( U^* \) lie in the column spaces of \( G^\varepsilon \) and \( G^* \) respectively, the two matrices should therefore have similar column spaces. Without knowing the effective equations, it may not be possible to identify \( G^* \) explicitly, but we can still obtain essential information contained in \( G^* \) from \( G^\varepsilon \). For this task, we need to determine, first, how much column-space information is contained in \( G^\varepsilon \) and, second, how to extract this information.

Regarding the first question, we define “numerical rank” to be the minimum number of degrees of freedom required to capture the solution space of a PDE to within a preset error tolerance. The concept is closely connected to Kolmogorov \( N \)-width. To address the second question, we employ random sampling: The range of a matrix with low numerical rank can be captured by

\footnote{With slight danger of confusion, we adopt a generalized notion of “Green’s function” in this work, which might vary from conventional terminology for specific PDEs. For example, for elliptic PDEs with Dirichlet boundary condition, the “Green’s function” would be given by the Poisson kernel, that is, the derivative of the usual Green’s function (Newtonian kernel).}
Figure 1. Green’s function superposition in discrete and continuous setting, for both \( \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon \) and the asymptotic limit \( \mathcal{L}^* \). The column space of \( G^\varepsilon \), which typically has high dimension, can be well approximated well by the (lower-dimensional) column space of \( G^* \).

Multiplying the matrix by a set of random vectors. We adapt this strategy to sketch the local solution space of the PDE via random sampling.

Random sampling for numerical PDEs has been explored in previous works, mainly for multiscale elliptic equations. Random sampling has been used to construct local basis functions for the generalized finite element method; see \[15, 50, 14, 29, 57\] and our previous work \[16\], in which we report on numerical experiments to determine optimal sampling strategies. In particular, the connection to randomized linear algebra has been made in \[14, 16\]. From another perspective, in \[53, 49\], randomized linear algebra algorithms are used to compress the Green’s matrix of elliptic equations based on the framework of hierarchical matrices \[27\]. These works focus on global solution of the elliptic equation, rather than the local solution spaces of the current work. Most of the works cited here consider only elliptic equations with oscillatory media, while the method we propose in this paper applies to more general situations.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we review two representative case studies of multiscale PDEs: the linear kinetic equation with small Knudsen number and an elliptic PDE with oscillatory media. Motivated by the essential similarity of these multiscale problems, we define in Section 3 the notion of numerical rank and design a general framework for efficient algorithms based on domain decomposition and random sampling of local solution space. Sections 4 and 5 describe details of the application of our framework to the two problems introduced in Section 2. Numerical results demonstrate that the general methodology...
yields competitive algorithms, without the need for detailed analytical knowledge of the specific structure of the multiscale problems at hand.

2. Asymptotic preserving scheme and numerical homogenization

In this section we briefly summarize the asymptotic preserving scheme and numerical homogenization. These approaches were developed for two rather different multiscale problems, but they share the similar philosophy of finding a set of “effective equations” that are numerically simpler than the original PDE in some sense, and utilizing these equations in efficient numerical solvers. These approaches are closely related to our randomized methodology and will serve to motivate our approach.

2.1. Asymptotic preserving scheme for kinetic equations. The asymptotic preserving (AP) scheme was developed originally in the context of numerical methods for kinetic theory. We will explain the idea using the radiative transfer equation, a particular linear Boltzmann equation that is a model problem in kinetic theory.

In radiative transfer, we seek a function \( u^\varepsilon(x, v) \), defined on the phase space \((x, v) \in \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{V}\), that represents the density of photons at location \( x \) with speed \( v \). The equation is

\[
- v \cdot \nabla_x u^\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} S[u^\varepsilon] = f(x), \quad (x, v) \in \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{V},
\]

where the linear collision operator \( S \) is defined as follows:

\[
S u(x, v) = \int_{\mathcal{V}} k(x, v, v') u(x, v') dv' - \int_{\mathcal{V}} k(x, v', v) u(x, v) dv'.
\]

In Eq. (4), the evolution of photon density is governed by the transport term \( v \cdot \nabla_x u^\varepsilon \), that describes the photons free streaming with speed \( v \) in direction \( x \), and the collision term \( S \) that characterizes the interaction of the particles with the background media. The first term in \( S \) represents particles with velocity \( v' \) that are scattered off to obtain \( v \), while the second term indicates the particles whose velocity changes from \( v \) to \( v' \). The specific form of \( k(x, v, v') \) depends on the media. When the scattering is homogeneous in velocity, we can write \( k(x, v, v') = \sigma(x) \) for some \( \sigma \), so that (6) becomes

\[
S u(x, v) = \sigma(x) \int_{\mathcal{V}} (u(x, v') - u(x, v)) dv'.
\]

In the radiative transfer equation (4), the quantity \( \varepsilon \), which captures the strength of the collision term, is called the Knudsen number. When \( \varepsilon \) is small, the collision term dominates the transport term, and we have \( S[u^\varepsilon] = 0 \), to leading order. In this case, the solution is close to lying in the null space of \( S \), that is, the solution profile nearly achieves local equilibrium for every \( x \). Via asymptotic expansion, we have that \( u^\varepsilon(x, v) \to M(v)u^*(x) \), where \( u^*(x) \) solves the heat equation and \( M(v) \) (called the local equilibrium or the Maxwellian) spans \( \text{Null} S \). More specifically, we have the following result \[10, 40, 59\] for homogeneous collision (6).

**Theorem 1.** Suppose that \( u^\varepsilon \) solves (4) with collision term (6) in \( \mathcal{K} \), which is a bounded domain in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) with \( C^1 \) boundary, with \( \mathcal{V} = S^2 \), and with boundary condition

\[
u^\varepsilon(x, v) = \phi(x, v) \quad \text{on} \quad x \in \partial \mathcal{K}, \quad v \cdot n_x < 0.
\]

Then \( M(v) = 1 \) and

\[
\|u^\varepsilon(x, v) - u^*(x)\|_{L^2(dx dv)} \to 0,
\]
where $u^*(x)$ solves

$$
\frac{1}{3} \nabla_x \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\sigma} \nabla_x u^* \right) = f(x), \quad x \in \mathcal{K},
$$

with the boundary condition

$$
u^*(x) = \xi\phi(x), \quad \text{on} \quad x \in \partial\mathcal{K},
$$

where $\xi\phi(x)$ is obtained by solving the boundary layer equation [59].

This result indicates that the limiting operator as $\varepsilon \to 0$ is $L^* := (1/3) \nabla_x \cdot (1/\sigma) \nabla_x$, which is independent of the velocity variable. The constant changes with the dimension of $v$; $1/3$ is the appropriate value for $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.

**Remark 1.** Here we only present the least complicated case where the collision is homogeneous (6), and we do not specify the convergence rate in (7). If the collision operator $S$ is not homogeneous in $v$, the Maxwellian $M(v)$ could have a complicated form, and the theorem will need to be modified accordingly. It was longly believed that with the correct boundary layer equation introduced in [59] to translate the boundary conditions from that of $u^\varepsilon$ to that of $u^*$, the convergence rate is first order, meaning $u^\varepsilon - u^* = O(\varepsilon)$. But it was recently revealed not true, see [64, 43, 45], in which it was shown that the boundary layer corrector could reduce the convergence order to less than 1, but the sharpest bound is still unknown now.

AP, both as a term and a concept, was coined in [35], although the development of AP in the context of the radiative transfer equation dates back to earlier works [36, 41]. The fundamental idea is that a good numerical method, besides being consistent and stable, should also (for fixed discretization) preserve the asymptotic limit of the original equation. As shown in Diagram 2, one designs a method $F_h^\varepsilon$ for a system $F_\varepsilon$, and asks (1) whether the discrete system, with fixed $h$, converges when $\varepsilon$ shrinks; and (2) if it does converge, whether the limit as $h \to 0$ correctly discretizes $F^*$, the limiting system on the continuous level. If $F_h^\varepsilon$ satisfies both properties, it is said to be asymptotic preserving.

![Figure 2. Commuting diagram of asymptotic preserving schemes. An AP solver $F_h^\varepsilon$ should, in the zero limit of $\varepsilon$ for fixed $h$, capture the solution to $F^*$.](image)

This AP property is not easy to satisfy in general. For conventional schemes, we need $h \ll \varepsilon$ for accuracy, so we cannot in practice fix $h$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. AP schemes have to be designed carefully by using analytic knowledge about the limiting operator $F^*$. Much progress has been made in the past decade, however. For linear equations, an even-odd decomposition approach has been designed, with the even part capturing the limit and the odd part capturing the second
order expansion \cite{39, 37, 42, 26}. Another approach uses a preconditioned conjugate gradient that exploits the structure of the discrete matrix \cite{3, 47}. In the nonlinear setting, the BGK penalization method was developed in \cite{22, 12} and methods based on the Wild sum \cite{62} were described in \cite{18, 46}. (See also \cite{17, 32}.) Most of these methods are designed for time-dependent problems. Because of the limited analytic knowledge about kinetic boundary layers, there are very few AP solvers for time-independent problems (see \cite{44, 24, 43}).

2.2. Numerical homogenization. Consider elliptic equations in divergence form with highly oscillatory media:

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \left( a(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} u^{\varepsilon} \right) = 0,$$

where $\varepsilon \ll 1$, so that $x$ is the “slow variable” and $x/\varepsilon$ is the “fast variable”. With $a$ being 1-periodic in its second argument, the media is highly oscillatory. As $\varepsilon$ goes to zero, the solution $u^{\varepsilon}$ converges to that of a homogenized equation

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (a^*(x) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} u^*) = 0,$$

in the sense that

$$\|u^{\varepsilon} - u^*\|_2 = O(\varepsilon).$$

Here $a^*$ is termed the effective media \cite{13, 4, 54}.

**Theorem 2.** Assume $u^{\varepsilon}$ is the solution to

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \left( a \left( x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} u^{\varepsilon} \right) = f, \quad x \in K,$$

with zero boundary condition. And denote $u^*$ the solution to the effective equation with zero boundary condition

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (a^* \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} u^*) = f.$$

Then we have the strong convergence in $L^2$:

$$\left\| u^{\varepsilon} \left( x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) - u^* \right\|_2 \lesssim \varepsilon \|u^*\|_{H_2}.$$

**Remark 2.** Elliptic equation with highly oscillatory media in a bounded domain also has boundary layers emerging along $\partial K$. However, the boundary layer correction does not enter $L^2$ convergence argument. For the convergence in $H^1$, a boundary layer corrector is necessary. More details are seen in \cite{54}.

The aim of numerical homogenization, which has a long history, is to develop efficient solvers with two key properties:

1. the discretization is independent of $\varepsilon$;
2. the numerical solutions capture the correct limiting solutions on the discrete level.

Many methods have been developed for elliptic equations, including the multiscale Finite Element Method (MsFEM) \cite{21, 30, 31}, the heterogeneous multiscale method (HMM) \cite{20, 19, 3}, the reduced basis type method \cite{1, 2}, local orthogonal decomposition \cite{52}, local basis construction methods \cite{8, 6, 58, 56}, and the global-local approach \cite{55, 7, 33}, to name just a few. These methods typically exploit the analytical understanding of the homogenized equation.
3. General solution framework based on domain decomposition and random sampling

The asymptotic preserving and numerical homogenization schemes reviewed in the previous section are two efficient schemes for solving multiscale problems with highly oscillatory solutions. Although these schemes tackle different problems in different ways, both schemes achieve efficiency by exploiting the fact that the solutions are close to their asymptotic limits, which lie in a low-dimensional subspace. The design of these schemes relies heavily on a sophisticated understanding of the equation and its asymptotic limit. For many PDEs, this level of understanding is not available. Our goal in this work is to propose a general numerical framework that can be applied to various multiscale problems, capturing the efficient representation of the solutions and leading to efficient algorithms without an explicit reliance on analytical understanding of the PDE system.

A first step in developing our framework is to relate the AP and numerical homogenization schemes to the numerical linear algebra concept of low rank. When the matrix operator in a linear algebra problem has low rank, the solution lies in a subspace of low dimension; there are efficient numerical schemes, based on random sampling, that exploit this property. Drawing on these ideas from linear algebra, we propose a general framework for numerical methods with domain decomposition, in which random sampling is used to search for efficient representation of the local solution space.

3.1. Numerical rank. In this section, we tackle the questions of low-rankness of a PDE operator and low dimensionality of the solution space in a general setting, and estimate the rank and dimension for several problems of interest. In this way, we aim to unify the AP and numerical homogenization schemes, and develop numerical schemes for more general multiscale problems.

We consider a bounded linear operator $A$:

$$
A : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y} \\
f \mapsto u
$$

that maps $f \in \mathcal{X}$ to a Hilbert space $\mathcal{Y}$. In the PDE setting, $A$ maps the boundary conditions and/or source term to the solution of the problem. We define the following neighborhood of $A$ that is parametrized by a positive scalar $\tau$:

$$
S_\tau := \{ \tilde{A} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) : \| A - \tilde{A} \|_{\mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}} \leq \tau \}.
$$

The set $S_\tau$ is the collection of all operators whose operator norm is within distance $\tau$ of $A$. When the context is clear, we suppress the subscript in the operator norm $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}}$.

**Definition 1** (Numerical rank). The numerical $\tau$-rank of $A$ is the rank of the lowest-rank operator in $S_\tau$, that is,

$$
k_\tau(A) := \dim \text{ran } A_\tau; \quad A_\tau := \arg \min \{ \dim \text{ran } \tilde{A} : \tilde{A} \in S_\tau \}.
$$

That is, $A_\tau$ is the operator within distance $\tau$ of $A$ whose range space has the smallest dimension, and $k_\tau(A)$ is this dimension. We set $k_\tau(A)$ to $\infty$ if all $\tilde{A} \in S_\tau$ have range spaces of infinite dimension.

The definition of numerical rank is closely related to Kolmogorov $N$-width, which we define here.
Definition 2 (Kolmogorov $N$-width). Given the linear operator in (12), the Kolmogorov $N$-width $d_N(A)$ is the shortest distance to an $N$-dimensional space, that is,

$$d_N(A) := \min_{S: \dim S = N} d(A, S) = \min_{S: \dim S = N} \sup_{f \in S} \frac{\|Af - v\|_Y}{\|f\|_X}.$$

Definitions 1 and 2 are connected through the following proposition:

Proposition 1. For the operator $A$ specified in (12), the following are true.

(a) If the numerical $\tau$-rank is $N$, then $d_N(A) \leq \tau$.

(b) If $d_N(A) \leq \tau < d_{N-1}(A)$, then the numerical $\tau$-rank is $N$.

Proof. We use $P_S$ to denote the projection operator onto a finite dimensional subspace $S$. Note that the Kolmogorov $N$-width is a non-increasing function of $N$.

For (a), let $A_\tau \in S_\tau$ be the operator that achieves the numerical $\tau$-rank of $N$, and denote by $S$ the range of $A_\tau$. We then have

$$\tau \geq \|A - A_\tau\| = \sup_f \frac{\|Af - A_\tau f\|_Y}{\|f\|_X} \geq \sup_{v \in S} \min_f \frac{\|Af - v\|_Y}{\|f\|_X} \geq d_N(A),$$

where the last inequality is from Definition 2.

For (b), suppose that $d_N \leq \tau < d_{N-1}(A)$. First, for an arbitrary $(N-1)$-dimensional subspace $S$, we have

$$\tau < d_{N-1}(A) \leq \sup_{v \in S} \frac{\|Af - v\|_Y}{\|f\|_X} \leq \sup_f \frac{\|Af - P_S A f\|_Y}{\|f\|_X} = \|A - P_S A\|,$$

then according to Definition 1 there is no $(N-1)$-dimensional operator that achieves $\tau$ accuracy, so we must have $k_\tau(A) \geq N$. Second, since $d_N(A) \leq \tau$, then there exists a $N$-dimensional subspace $S$ such that

$$d_N(A) = \sup_{v \in S} \min_f \frac{\|Af - v\|_Y}{\|f\|_X} = \sup_f \frac{\|Af - P_S A f\|_Y}{\|f\|_X} = \|A - P_S A\| \leq \tau.$$ Defining $A_\tau = P_S A$, we see that the numerical $\tau$-rank is $N$. \qed

The numerical rank and the Kolmogorov $N$-width both depend on optimal approximations, which typically require basis set construction that is adaptive to the given problem. The pre-defined basis sets conventionally used in numerical discretization, such as local polynomials and global Fourier functions (as used in finite difference/element methods and spectral methods), are not optimal, except in very special cases. In fact, there are counterexamples that show them to be arbitrarily bad; see [61] for the spectral method and [9] for finite elements.

It is important to distinguish between numerical rank and degrees of freedom (DOF). The DOF is the number of variables needed to represent the solutions (to a certain specified error tolerance), when the basis functions are given. Each numerical method utilizes a certain set of pre-specified basis functions, and the DOF changes according to the method used. The numerical rank, however, depends on the optimal representation, so is the minimum DOF across all possible methods. We study two examples and give rough computation of DOF using standard finite element methods, thus yielding upper bound of the respective numerical ranks.
3.1.1. **Numerical rank of the radiative transfer equation.** To estimate the numerical rank of the radiative transfer equation (4), (5) and its diffusion limit, we consider the following cases.

a) Let \( \varepsilon = 1 \) in (4). If we use the upwind method for \( \partial_x \) and the trapezoidal rule for \( S \), the method is first-order in \( x \) and second-order in \( v \). By equating the numerical error estimate to the accuracy required, we have
\[
O(N_x^{-1} + N_v^{-2}) = \tau \quad \Rightarrow \quad N_x = O(1/\tau), \quad N_v = O(1/\sqrt{\tau}).
\]
For \( \tau \)-accuracy, we thus obtain the following DOF:
\[
N_{\varepsilon=1} = N_x N_v = O(1/\tau^{3/2}).
\]

b) Suppose that \( \varepsilon \) is extremely small in (4) and we use the same method as shown above. Then, defining \( C_{\varepsilon} = \| \partial_x^2 u^\varepsilon \|_{\infty} = O(1/\varepsilon^2) \), we have that
\[
O(C_{\varepsilon} N_x^{-1} + N_v^{-2}) = \tau \quad \Rightarrow \quad N_x = O(C_{\varepsilon}/\tau) = O\left(\frac{1}{\tau \varepsilon^2}\right), \quad N_v = O(1/\sqrt{\tau}).
\]
Note that \( C_{\varepsilon} \) blows up for small \( \varepsilon \), since \( u^\varepsilon \) has sharp transitions. For \( \tau \)-accuracy, the DOF is
\[
N_{\varepsilon}(\tau) = N_x N_v = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 \tau^{3/2}}\right).
\]

c) If hat functions are used to construct the finite element basis for the limiting Poisson equation (8), the method is second-order convergent in \( x \), and we obtain
\[
O(N_x^{-2}) = \tau \quad \Rightarrow \quad N_x = O\left(1/\sqrt{\tau}\right).
\]
The DOF in this case is thus:
\[
N_{\varepsilon} = N_x = O(1/\sqrt{\tau}).
\]
d) If we make use of the diffusion limit, the triangle inequality yields
\[
\|u^\varepsilon - U\| \leq \|u^\varepsilon - u^*\| + \|u^* - U\| \leq O(\varepsilon) + O(N_x^{-2}),
\]
with \( U \) being the numerical solution to \( u^* \). By comparing with the tolerance \( \tau \) and taking the zero limit of \( \varepsilon \), we obtain for the DOF that
\[
N_{\varepsilon,Ap} = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|\tau - \varepsilon|}}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{\tau^{1/2}}\right) \quad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \to 0.
\]
This is the approximation used by the AP method, hence our notation \( N_{\varepsilon,Ap} \).

We see by comparing (14) and (13) that different schemes produce vastly different DOF. Numerical rank, bounded by the smallest DOF, is thus controlled by \( N_{\varepsilon,Ap} \). The homogenization scheme gives a much sharper bound on numerical rank than the brute-force finite difference method.

3.1.2. **Numerical rank of elliptic equation with oscillatory coefficients.** A similar analysis to the previous subsection can be conducted for the diffusion equation (9) with rough media.

a) Let \( \varepsilon = 1 \) in (9). If one uses the classical finite element method with piecewise hat functions as basis functions for \( \nabla_x \cdot (a(x,x/\varepsilon) \nabla_x) \), the method is second-order convergent. By equating the numerical error to the required accuracy \( \tau \), we obtain
\[
O(N_x^{-2}) = \tau \quad \Rightarrow \quad N_x = O(1/\sqrt{\tau})\),
\]
so that the DOF \( \tau \)-accuracy is \( N_{\varepsilon=1} = N_x = O(1/\tau^{1/2}) \).
b) Suppose that $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ in (9). If we use the classical finite element method with hat functions, as above, the discretization needs to resolve the oscillations, leading to the estimate

$$O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} N_x^{-2}\right) = \tau \Rightarrow N_x = O(1/\sqrt{\varepsilon \tau}),$$

where the factor $1/\varepsilon$ arises from $\|\partial^2_x u^\varepsilon\|$. We thus have

$$N_\varepsilon = N_x = O(1/\sqrt{\varepsilon \tau}). \quad (15)$$

c) If the finite element method with hat-function basis is applied to the limiting effective equation with smooth media [10], the solution is smooth and the derivative is order one. Since the method is second-order, we obtain

$$O(N_x^{-2}) = \tau \Rightarrow N_x = O(1/\sqrt{\tau}),$$

which leads to a DOF of $N_\varepsilon = N_x = O(1/\tau^{1/2})$.

d) The homogenization route and the triangle inequality leads to

$$\|u^\varepsilon - U\| \leq \|u^\varepsilon - u^*\| + \|u^* - U\| \leq O(\varepsilon) + O(N_x^{-2}) \leq \tau,$$

so that

$$N_\varepsilon^{\text{hom}} = N_x \geq O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|\tau - \varepsilon|}}\right) \to O\left(\frac{1}{\tau^{1/2}}\right) \quad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \to 0. \quad (16)$$

By comparing (15) and (16), we see that the DOF obtained from homogenization gives a much sharper bound on the numerical rank. Moreover, the numerical rank is finite, even in the zero limit of $\varepsilon$.

The discussions above show that the DOF depends on both the approximate solution space and the choice of basis functions, and that numerical rank is the quantity that truly reflects the computational cost required by an efficient algorithm. If DOF for a particular method is significantly larger than numerical rank, the basis functions for that method are a poor approximation to the solution space, or else the basis is excessively large given the dimension of the solution space. The key to efficiency is to find finite dimensional spaces that approximate the solution space well and economically. Our work provides a general methodology for this task, motivated largely by randomized algorithms in numerical linear algebra.

3.2. Random sampling in numerical linear algebra. Random sampling algorithms have a long history in numerical linear algebra [34, 25, 23, 60, 51, 28, 38]; we will focus here on those related to low-rank approximations of a matrix. Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ that is known to be approximately low rank, a standard way to obtain the most important modes in its range is via the singular value decomposition (SVD). Without loss of generality, we assume $m \geq n$ and write the singular value decomposition as

$$A = U \Sigma V^\top = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i u_i v_i^\top, \quad (17)$$

where $U = [u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ contains the left singular vectors, $V = [v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ contains the right singular vectors and $\Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_n)$ contains the singular values in descending order: $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \ldots \sigma_n \geq 0$. $U$ and $V$ are orthogonal matrices. It is well
known that the best $k$-rank approximation to $A$ (in spectral norm) is given by thresholding the singular value decomposition at $k$-th order, termed $A_k$ here:

$$A_k = U_k \Sigma_k V_k = \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i u_i v_i^T,$$

where $U_k$ and $V_k$ contain the first $k$ columns in $U$ and $V$. We say the matrix is approximately rank-$k$ if $\|A - A_k\| = \sigma_{k+1} \ll \sigma_1$. In this case, we have

$$\|A - A_k\| = \|A - U_k U_k^T A\| = \sigma_{k+1} \ll \sigma_1 = \|A\|.$$

In terms of the discussion in the previous subsection, the range space of $A$ is approximately the same as the range space of $A_k$, which equals the span of the columns of $U_k$, which is the subspace we seek. Computation of the SVD (17) is a classical problem in numerical linear algebra, requiring $O(mn^2)$ operations.

Randomized SVD efficiently computes the low-rank approximation of a given matrix by means of random sampling of its column space. The particular version of the algorithm we describe here was developed in [48, 63]; see [28] for a review.

The idea behind the algorithm is simple: if an $m \times n$ matrix $A$ is of approximate low rank $k$, the matrix maps an $n$-dimensional sphere to an $m$-dimensional ellipsoid that is “skinny:” $k$ of its axes are significantly larger than the rest. With high probability, vectors that are randomly sampled vector on the $n$-dimensional sphere are mapped by $A$ to vectors that lie mostly in a $k$-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^m$, which is the range of $A$. An approximation to $A_k$ can be obtained by projecting onto this subspace.

The precise statement of the randomized SVD algorithm and its error estimates are recalled in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3** (Theorems 10.6 and 10.8 of [28]). Let $A$ be defined as in (17) and let the target rank $k$ be at least 2. Define

(18)

$$Y = A \Omega,$$

where $\Omega = [\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{k+p}]$ is a matrix of size $n \times (k+p)$ with its entries randomly drawn from i.i.d. normal distribution, where $p$ is an oversampling parameter. If $A$ is approximately $k$-rank, then with large probability, $P_Y(A)$, the projection of $A$ onto the space spanned by $Y$, defined by

$$P_Y(A) = Y(Y^T)^{-1}Y^T A,$$

yields the following error bounds.

a) Average spectral error:

$$\mathbb{E} \|A - P_Y(A)\| \leq \left(1 + \frac{k}{p-1}\right) \sigma_{k+1} + \frac{e\sqrt{k+p}}{p} \left(\sum_{j>k} \sigma_j^2\right)^{1/2} \ll \sigma_1.$$

b) Deviation bound:

$$\|A - P_Y(A)\| \leq \left[1 + t \sqrt{\frac{3k}{p+1}}\right] \sigma_{k+1} + t \frac{e\sqrt{k+p}}{p+1} \left(\sum_{j>k} \sigma_j^2\right)^{1/2} + ut \frac{e\sqrt{k+p}}{p+1} \sigma_{k+1} \ll \sigma_1,$$

with failure probability at most $2t^{-p} + e^{-u^2/2}$, for all $u, t > 1$. 
We emphasize two advantages of the algorithm: It captures the approximate range within $n(k + p)$ operations ($p$ is fixed and small), and it does not require full knowledge of $A$, only the ability to evaluate the matrix-vector product $A\Omega$.

3.3. General solution framework for multiscale problems. Finding a low-rank representation of solution space is the key to reducing complexity. In this section, we adapt the low-rank approximation scheme from numerical linear algebra into a general methodology for solving multiscale PDEs. The method requires limited knowledge on the specific structure of the solution spaces, so the solvers are expected to be applicable to a large class of multiscale problems. Our framework uses domain decomposition to sketch the local solution space via randomized sampling, in an offline step. This is followed by an online step, in which the solution is patched together by imposing continuity conditions across the domains.

We wish to solve the problem (1), that is,

$$
\begin{cases}
(L^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon)(x) = 0, & x \in \mathcal{K}, \\
B u(x) = \phi(x), & x \in \Gamma,
\end{cases}
$$

where $B$ is the boundary condition operator, $\Gamma$ the boundary associated with domain $\mathcal{K}$ and $f$ the boundary data. We adopt the domain decomposition approach, partitioning $\mathcal{K}$ into $M$ non-overlapping subdomains, as follows:

$$
\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{m=1}^{M} \mathcal{K}_m, \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{K}_m \cap \mathcal{K}_n = \emptyset \quad (m \neq n),
$$

where $\mathcal{K}_m$ denotes the $m$-th local patch. Accordingly, we denote by $\Gamma_m$ the boundary associated with $\mathcal{K}_m$. Different types of equations require various kinds of boundary conditions, as we will make explicit in Sections 4 and 5. Each subdomain is further discretized with fine spacing $h$ for which $h \ll \varepsilon$. The number of subdomains $M$ does not depend on $\varepsilon$.

Domain decomposition approach consists of two stages, as follows.

(1) **Offline stage**: Prepare local solution space. Denote by $G_m$ the collection of local solutions in each local patch $\mathcal{K}_m$, $m = 1, 2, \ldots, M$, that is,

$$
G_m = [b_{m,1}, b_{m,2}, \ldots],
$$

where each local function $b_{m,n}$ is one solution to the equation on the subdomain $\mathcal{K}_m$, that is,

$$
L^\varepsilon b_{m,n} = 0, \quad x \in \mathcal{K}_m,
$$

with boundary condition on $\Gamma_m$. These solutions are computed on fine grids with discretization $h$.

(2) **Online stage**: The global solution is written as

$$
u = \sum_{m=1}^{M} u_m = \sum_{m=1}^{M} G_m c_m,
$$

with $u_m$ being $u$ confined on $\mathcal{K}_m$. $c_m$ is a vector of coefficients determined by the boundary conditions $\phi$ and conditions that enforce continuity across patches.

The online stage is a standard step in domain decomposition. Its cost is governed by the number of basis functions chosen in the offline step. In the offline stage, there are many ways to construct the local solution space $G_m$. Since this space contains all possible local solutions, it can be regarded as a full library of all Green’s functions. One possible way to define $G_m$ is to
define the boundary conditions on the $m$th patch to be delta functions defined over a grid on the boundary $\Gamma_m$, that is,
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon b_{m,n} &= 0, \quad x \in K_m \\
b_{m,n} &= \delta_{m,n}, \quad x \in \Gamma_m,
\end{align*}
\]
where $\delta_{m,n}$ is the Kronecker delta function that takes the value 1 at the $n$-th grid point on $\Gamma_m$ and zero on the other grid points on $\partial K_m$. Since $h \ll \varepsilon$, the number of functions $n_m$ in $G_m$ grows as $\varepsilon$ shrinks. This strategy, summarized in Algorithm DetLocalSolu, is referred to as the full-basis approach.

An alternative way to construct basis functions for each patch also makes use of a grid defined on the boundary $\Gamma_m$, but takes the boundary conditions for each function $b_{m,n}$ to be a set of random values on the grid points, rather than a $\delta$ function. Specifically, we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon r_{m,n} &= 0, \quad x \in K_m \\
r_{m,n} &= \omega_{m,n}, \quad x \in \Gamma_m,
\end{align*}
\]
where $\omega_{m,n}$ is defined to have a random value drawn i.i.d. from a normal distribution at each grid point in $\Gamma_m$. Since the local solution space is homogenizable and low rank, we expect that the number of basis functions $k_m$ required to represent it adequately will be much smaller than $n_m$ defined above, and independent of $\varepsilon$. This strategy, which we refer to as the randomized reduced-basis approach, is summarized in Algorithm RandLocalSolu.

Denote by $G^b_m$ the collection of full basis $\{b_{m,n}\}$ and $G^r_m$ the collection of random reduced basis $\{r_{m,n}\}$, we have the following relationship:
\[
G^r_m = G^b_m \Omega,
\]
where $\Omega$ is a random i.i.d. matrix with entries $\omega_{m,n}$.

The complete scheme, which includes the two alternative implementations of the offline stage described above, is specified as Algorithm 1.

In practice, for RandLocalSolu, we often use a slightly larger patch $\tilde{K}_m \supset \supset K_m$ that augments $K_m$ by a buffer zone. The local solution is obtain on $\tilde{K}_m$, with random boundary conditions on its associated boundary $\tilde{\Gamma}_m$, and then restricted on $K_m$, as follows:
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \tilde{b}_{m,n} &= 0, \quad x \in \tilde{K}_m \\
\tilde{b}_{m,n} &= \omega_{m,n}, \quad x \in \tilde{\Gamma}_m.
\end{align*}
\]
Use of the buffer zone helps to remove boundary layer effects and the effect of the singularity at the boundary. This technique will be discussed further for the particular PDEs considered in the next two sections.

4. Example 1: Radiative transfer equation

We now describe the application of our framework to the radiative transfer equation with zero source, which is
\[
\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon u^\varepsilon = v \partial_x u^\varepsilon(x,v) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} S[u^\varepsilon] = 0, \quad (x,v) \in K = \Omega \times V = [0,1] \times [-1,1],
\]
where the collision term $S$ is given by
\[
S u(x,v) = \int_{-1}^{1} k(x,v,v') u(x,v') dv' - \int_{-1}^{1} k(x,v',v) dv' u(x,v).
\]
We use the Henyey-Greenstein model, in which the scattering coefficient is defined by

\[ k(x, v, v') = \frac{1 - g^2}{2(1 + g^2 + 2g(vv'))}, \]

where \( g \in (-1, 1) \) is a specified constant. To impose boundary conditions properly for radiative transfer equations, we denote by \( \Gamma_\pm \) the outgoing / incoming part of the boundary:

\[ \Gamma_\pm = \left\{ (x, v) : x \in \partial \Omega, \pm v \cdot n_x > 0 \right\}, \]

where \( n_x \) is the exterior normal direction at \( x \in \partial \Omega \). In particular, for the problem (20) on the spatial domain \( \Omega = [0, 1] \), we have

\[ \Gamma_- = \{(x = 0, v > 0)\} \cup \{(x = 1, v < 0)\}, \quad \Gamma_+ = \{(x = 0, v < 0)\} \cup \{(x = 1, v > 0)\}. \]

The equation (20) is well-posed if a Dirichlet boundary condition is imposed on the incoming boundary, also known as the incoming boundary condition: \( u^\varepsilon|_{\Gamma_-} = \phi \).
To implement domain decomposition, we partition the domain as follows:

\[
K = [0, 1] \times [-1, 1] = \bigcup_{m=1}^{M} K_m, \quad \text{with} \quad K_m = [x_{m-1}, x_m] \times [-1, 1],
\]

where \( x_m = m/M \) forms a set of \((M + 1)\) equi-spaced grid points on \([0, 1]\) and \( K_m \) is the \( m \)-th patch of the domain. The incoming / outgoing parts of the boundary of each patch are

\[
\Gamma_{m,-} = \{(x_{m-1}, v > 0)\} \cup \{(x_m, v < 0)\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_{m,+} = \{(x_{m-1}, v < 0)\} \cup \{(x_m, v > 0)\}.
\]

We denote by \( L_{m,m+1} = K_m \cap K_{m+1} = \{(x_m, v) : v \in [-1, 1]\} \) the line segment that separates \( K_m \) and \( K_{m+1} \). The geometry of the domain and the patches is plotted in Figure 3.

\[\text{Figure 3. Domain decomposition for RTE and the boundaries of the local patch.}\]

As described in Section 3, the domain decomposition approach prepares the local solution space in the offline step and patches together solutions via continuity and boundary conditions in the online step. We describe the two options for constructing the basis functions — the full-basis approach and the randomized reduced-basis approach — in the following two subsections.

4.1. **Full basis approach.**

**Offline step.** We prepare a full basis of the local solution space by enumerating all possible boundary conditions, up to a discretization. Since the problem (20) is linear, we can obtain each basis function by solving a problem over a patch with a Dirichlet boundary condition that is nonzero at only one grid point. Specifically, for the patch \( K_m \), each basis function \( b_{m,i} \) is obtained by solving

\[
\begin{align*}
\varepsilon \Delta b_{m,i} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{S}[b_{m,i}] &= 0, & (x, v) \in K_m, \\
b_{m,i}|_{\Gamma_{m,-}} &= \delta_{m,i},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \delta_{m,i} \) is a numerical delta function supported on a grid point on \( \Gamma_{m,-} \) and the index \( i \) enumerates all grid points on the incoming boundary. The full basis for the local solution space
is then given by

\begin{equation}
G_m^\varepsilon = [b_{m,1}, \ldots, b_{m,n_m}],
\end{equation}

where \( G_m^\varepsilon \) is a Green’s matrix whose columns are the basis functions \( b_{m,i} \). Here, \( n_m \) is the total number of grid points on the incoming boundary \( \Gamma_{m,-} \) of \( \mathcal{K}_m \).

**Online step.** The online step obtains the global solution as a linear combination of all local basis functions, as follows:

\begin{equation}
\hat{u}^\varepsilon = \sum_m u_m\varepsilon = \sum_m \sum_i c_{m,i} b_{m,i},
\end{equation}

where the coefficients \( c_{m,i} \) are chosen to satisfy the following conditions:

- Continuity condition: \( u_m(L_{m,m+1}) = u_{m+1}(L_{m,m+1}) \), which can be stated in more detail as

\begin{equation}
\begin{cases}
u_m(\Gamma_{m,+} \cap L_{m,m+1}) = u_{m+1}(\Gamma_{m,+} \cap L_{m,m+1}) = u_{m+1}(\Gamma_{m,+} \cap L_{m,m+1}), \\
u_m(\Gamma_{m,-} \cap L_{m,m+1}) = u_{m+1}(\Gamma_{m,-} \cap L_{m,m+1}) = u_{m+1}(\Gamma_{m,+} \cap L_{m,m+1}).
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

In both equations, the first equality comes from the continuity condition and the second equality follows from \( \Gamma_{m,\pm} \cap L_{m,m+1} = \Gamma_{m+1,\pm} \cap L_{m,m+1} \), as illustrated in Figure 3.

- Boundary condition:

\begin{equation}
u|_{\Gamma_-} = \phi.
\end{equation}

Algebraically, we denote by \( M_m \) the matrix that maps inflow boundary condition \( c_m = u_m(\Gamma_{m,-}) \) to outflow data \( u_m(\Gamma_{m,+}) \), and denote by \( l_m^r \) (resp. \( l_m^l \)) the restriction operator on the left edge \( L_{m-1,m} \) (resp. the right edge \( L_{m,m+1} \)) of patch \( \mathcal{K}_m \). Using this notation, \( \text{(26)} \) and \( \text{(27)} \) can be written as follows:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
l_m^r M_m & -l_{m+1}^r \\
-l_m^l & l_{m+1}^l M_{m+1}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
c_m \\
c_{m+1}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix},
\begin{bmatrix}
l_m^r \\
l_{m}^r
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
c_1 \\
c_2
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
l_m^r \phi \\
0
\end{bmatrix},
\begin{bmatrix}
l_{m+1}^l \\
l_{m+1}^l
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
c_M \\
c_{M+1}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
l_{m+1}^l \phi \\
0
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Assembling these conditions over all patches, we obtain

\begin{equation}
P c = d,
\end{equation}

where

\[
P = \begin{bmatrix}
l_1^r & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
l_2^r M_1 & -l_2^r & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
l_2^r & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & -l_{M-1}^r M_{M-1} & -l_{M-1}^r \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & -l_{M-1}^r & l_{M}^r M_M \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & l_{M}^r 
\end{bmatrix},
\begin{bmatrix}
c_1 \\
c_2 \\
\vdots \\
c_M \\
c_{M+1}
\end{bmatrix},
\begin{bmatrix}
l_1^r \phi \\
0 \\
\vdots \\
0 \\
l_{M}^r \phi
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

We obtain the solution by substituting the coefficients \( \{c_{m,i} : i = 1, \ldots, n_m, m = 1, \ldots, M\} \) from \( \text{(28)} \) into \( \text{(25)} \).
4.2. Reduced basis approach. An approximation to the local solution space for a patch $K_m$ starts by defining the larger “buffered” patch $\tilde{K}_m \supseteq K_m$. The buffered patch has boundaries $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\pm,m}$, as illustrated in Figure 4. We denote by $\tilde{G}_m^\epsilon$ the Green’s matrix obtained by solving the local equation on the buffered patch $\tilde{K}_m$ with all possible boundary conditions, as in the construction of (24), but restricted to the domain $K_m$. More precisely, we can obtain $\tilde{b}_{m,i}$ by solving
\[
\begin{align*}
\left\{ v_\partial_x \tilde{b}_{m,i} - \frac{1}{\epsilon} S [\tilde{b}_{m,i}] = 0 \right\} & \quad (x,v) \in \tilde{K}_m, \\
\tilde{b}_{m,i}|\tilde{\Gamma}_{m,-} &= \delta_i,
\end{align*}
\]
where $\tilde{\Gamma}_{m,-}$ is the incoming portion of the boundary of $\partial \tilde{K}_m$, and then define
\[
\tilde{G}_m^\epsilon = \left[ \tilde{b}_{m,1}|_{K_m}, \ldots, \tilde{b}_{m,\tilde{n}_m}|_{K_m} \right],
\]
where $\tilde{n}_m$ is the number of incoming boundary grid points. It is clear that each column of $\tilde{G}_m^\epsilon$ solves (23) inside $K_m$, and thus is in span $G_m^\epsilon$ (since the latter consists of all possible local solutions). Moreover, the solution to the global equation restricted to $K_m$ also lies in span $\tilde{G}_m^\epsilon$.

Due to the diffusion limit, as discussed in Section 2.1, the Green’s matrix $\tilde{G}_m^\epsilon$ is approximately low-rank and can be compressed through random sampling. As in Section 3.3, we solve the following system with randomized boundary conditions to obtain each basis function $\tilde{r}_{m,i}$:
\[
\begin{align*}
\left\{ v_\partial_x \tilde{r}_{m,i} - \frac{1}{\epsilon} S [\tilde{r}_{m,i}] = 0 \right\} & \quad (x,v) \in \tilde{K}_m, \\
\tilde{r}_{m,i}|\tilde{\Gamma}_{m,-} &= \omega_{m,i},
\end{align*}
\]
where $\omega_{m,i}$ takes i.i.d. standard Gaussian at all grid points on the boundary $\tilde{\Gamma}_{m,-}$ and $i$ is the index of random samples corresponds to different realizations of the boundary data. We then take restrictions $r_{m,i} = \tilde{r}_{m,i}|_{K_m}$ and assemble them into local reduced Green’s matrix:
\[
G_m^{\epsilon,r} = \left[ r_{m,1}, \ldots, r_{m,k_m} \right] = \tilde{G}_m^\epsilon \left[ \omega_{m,1}, \ldots, \omega_{m,k_m} \right].
\]
Because of the approximate low-rank property, we can take $k_m \ll n_m$, thus reducing significantly the dimension of the local solution space (and also the dimension of the global linear system in the online step). For $m = 1$ and $m = M$ (for which the patch $K_m$ is at the boundary of full domain), we use the full basis matrix $G_m^{\epsilon,r} = G_m^\epsilon$, so that we can capture the boundary conditions that are imposed on the full domain.

In the online step, we write the solution as
\[
u^\epsilon = \sum_m u^\epsilon_m \approx \sum_m \sum_i \tilde{c}_{m,i} r_{m,i},
\]
with $\{\tilde{c}_{m,i}, m = 1,2,\ldots,M, i = 1,2,\ldots,k_m \}$ being the coefficients for the reduced basis. We denote by $M_m$ and $W_m$ the matrix that maps $\tilde{c}_m$ to outflow data $\sum_i \tilde{c}_{m,i} r_{m,i}(\Gamma_{m,+})$ and inflow data $\sum_i \tilde{c}_{m,i} r_{m,i}(\Gamma_{m,-})$ respectively. Note that the analogous $W$ would become identity in the full basis approach. By imposing the continuity condition and exterior boundary condition, we obtain
\[
\left[ \begin{array}{cc}
I_m & M_m \\
-W_m & I_{m+1}
\end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\tilde{c}_m \\
\tilde{c}_{m+1}
\end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{c}
0 \\
1
\end{array} \right], \quad \left[ \begin{array}{ccc}
W_1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & W_M & 0
\end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\tilde{c}_1 \\
\tilde{c}_M
\end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{c}
I_1 \phi \\
I_M \phi
\end{array} \right].
\]

\(^\text{2}\)We do not directly approximate $G_m^\epsilon$, which is not low-rank due to the singularity near $\partial K_m$ caused by the incoming Dirichlet boundary condition at $\Gamma_{m,-}$. For $G_m^\epsilon$, because of the presence of the buffer, this singularity does not appear in $K_m$, causing $\tilde{G}_m^\epsilon$ to be approximately low-rank. The use of a buffer is similar to the oversampling approach in the multiscale finite element method [30].
Assembling these equations, we obtain

$$\bar{P}\bar{c} = d,$$

where

$$\bar{P} = \begin{bmatrix}
I_l^{1} \tilde{W}_1 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
I_r^{1} \tilde{M}_1 & -I_l^{1} \tilde{W}_2 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
-I_l^{1} \tilde{W}_1 & I_r^{1} \tilde{M}_2 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
0 & \ldots & 0 & I_r^{M-1} \tilde{M}_{M-1} & -I_l^{M} \tilde{W}_M \\
0 & \ldots & 0 & -I_l^{M-1} \tilde{W}_{M-1} & I_r^{M} \tilde{M}_M \\
0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 & I_r^{M} \tilde{W}_M
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{c} = \begin{bmatrix}
\bar{c}_1 \\
\bar{c}_2 \\
\vdots \\
\bar{c}_M \\
0 \\
I_1^{M} \phi
\end{bmatrix}, \quad d = \begin{bmatrix}
I_1^{1} \phi \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}.$$}

Since we are working in an approximate local solution space due to the random sampling, this global linear system constraint is overdetermined and cannot be solved exactly in general. Instead, we use the least-squares solution defined by

$$\bar{c} = \arg \min_{\bar{c}} \| \bar{P}\bar{c} - d \|_2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \bar{c} = (\bar{P}\bar{P}^\top)^{-1}\bar{P}^\top d.$$}

4.3. **Numerical test.** We set $g = 1/2$ in (21), and decompose the domain as in (22) with $M = 10$. In the velocity domain, we use the grid points $v_j = -1 + \frac{j}{N_v}$ with $N_v = 120$ so that the mesh size in the velocity domain is $\Delta v = \frac{1}{60}$. We define the buffered patches $\tilde{K}_m$ to be twice as large as the original patches $K_m$, with equal margins on each side. When solving the local problems, we use spatial discretization with fine mesh size $\Delta x = 0.01$. The setup is shown in Figure 4.

4.3.1. **Local test.** In Figure 5, we show the *normalized* singular values (that is the ratio $\sigma_j/\sigma_1$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots$) of Green’s matrix $G_2^ε$ and $\tilde{G}_2^ε$ for the second local patch and the buffered patch, with Knudsen number $\varepsilon = 2^{-6}$. Note that singular values enjoy fast decay when $\varepsilon$ is small and
that the use of a buffer induces faster decay. In Figure 6, we plot a measure of relative error for different values of $k_m$ and $\varepsilon$. The quantity plotted is defined by

$$\text{error} = \frac{\|G_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon,r} - QQ^\top G_\varepsilon\|_2}{\|G_\varepsilon\|_2}, \quad \text{with} \quad G_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon,r} = QR,$$

that is, $Q$ is obtained from a $QR$ decomposition of $G_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon,r}$, for which the number of columns increases as $k_m$ increases. As $k_m$ increases, the range of $G_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon,r}$ captures the range of $\tilde{G}_\varepsilon$ more and more accurately, and that the approximation is satisfactory only for small values of $\varepsilon$.

In Figure 7, we construct random local solution space $\text{span}\{G_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon,r}\}$ with $k_2 = 50$ and show how well this random solution space can capture the first 3 left singular modes of $G_\varepsilon^{\varepsilon,r}$ with $\varepsilon = 2^{-6}$.

4.3.2. **Global test.** In the global test, we consider solving (20) with boundary data

$$\phi(v) = \begin{cases} 3 + \sin(2\pi v), & (x = 0, v > 0) \\ 2 + \sin(2\pi v), & (x = 1, v < 0) \end{cases},$$

and compare the numerical solutions of the full-basis and randomized reduced-basis approaches. Figure 8 shows three solutions: reference solution, the solution obtained from the reduced basis with $k_m = 10$, and the solution obtained from the reduced basis with $k_m = 50$. Results are given for $\varepsilon = 2^0$ and $\varepsilon = 2^{-6}$. We see that the information contained in $n_m = 120$ bases is largely captured by the random bases with $k_m = 10$ (for all $m$) when $\varepsilon = 2^{-6}$, at considerably lower computational cost. The quantitative error-decay as a function of $k_m$ is plotted in Figure 9.
Figure 6. Effectiveness of the random sampling for different Knudsen number: $\varepsilon = 2^0, 2^{-2}, 2^{-4}, 2^{-6}$ on buffered domain $\tilde{K}_2$. For each $\varepsilon$, the approximate range captured by $G_{\varepsilon}^{r \varepsilon}$ improves as the number of random modes $k_m$ increases. Much better approximations are obtained for smaller $\varepsilon$ than for larger values.

Figure 7. For small Knudsen number $\varepsilon = 2^{-6}$, the first row shows the first three singular vectors of $G_{\varepsilon}^2$ and the second row shows their projection into $\text{span}\{G_{\varepsilon}^{r \varepsilon}\}$ with $k_2 = 50$. 
Figure 8. The two rows of plots are for $\varepsilon = 1$ and $\varepsilon = 2^{-6}$ respectively. The leftmost column shows a reference solution obtained with fine grids. The middle column and the rightmost column are solutions obtained from randomized reduced bases with $k_m = 10$ and $k_m = 50$ (for all $m$), respectively.

Figure 9. The global error as a function of $k_m$. As $k_m$, the number of random modes per patch increases, the relative error decreases. For fixed number of random modes, the relative error is better for small $\varepsilon$.

5. Example 2: elliptic equation with highly oscillatory media

We now consider elliptic equations with oscillatory media on the domain $\mathcal{K} = [0, 1]^2$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions. The problem is

\begin{align}
\nabla_x \cdot \left( a \left( x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) \nabla_x u^{\varepsilon} \right) &= 0, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{K} = [0, 1]^2, \\

u^{\varepsilon} &= \phi(x), \quad \text{on } \Gamma = \partial \mathcal{K},
\end{align}
where the coefficient field $a = a(x, x/\varepsilon)$ is oscillatory because of its explicit dependence on the fast variable $x/\varepsilon$. ($\varepsilon$ indicates the scale of oscillation in the coefficient field.)

We solve (33) on a coarse mesh $\{(x_{m_1}, y_{m_2}) \mid x_{m_1} = m_1 H, \ y_{m_2} = m_2 H\}$ with $H = 1/M$. The coarse mesh size $H$ is chosen independent of the small parameter $\varepsilon$. The domain $K$ is decomposed into patches defined by

$$K_m = \bigcup K_{m,1,m_2},$$

where $m = (m_1, m_2)$ is a multi-index. Two patches $K_m$ and $K_n$ share boundaries if they are adjacent, and we define the shared edge as follows:

$$L_{mn} = K_m \cap K_n.$$ 

Thus $L_{mn}$ is nontrivial only if $(m_1, m_2) = (n_1 \pm 1, n_2)$ or $(m_1, m_2) = (n_1, n_2 \pm 1)$; see Figure 10. Note too that $L_{mn} = L_{nm}$.

5.1. Full basis approach.

Offline. In the full-basis scheme, we prepare the local solution space functions $b_{m,i}$ in the offline step by solving (33) in every patch $K_m$ with boundary conditions that are non-vanishing at one just grid point $i$ on the boundary of the patch:

$$\begin{align*}
\nabla_x \cdot \left(a (x, x/\varepsilon) \nabla_x b_{m,i}\right) &= 0, & x \in K_m, \\
b_{m,i} &= \delta_i, & x \in \Gamma_m = \partial K_m,
\end{align*}$$

(36)

where $\delta_i = 1$ at the $i$-th boundary grid point of $\Gamma_m$ and is zero at all other grid points in $\Gamma_m$. The solutions $\{b_{m,i}, i = 1, \ldots, n_m\}$ span the space of local solutions with all possible boundary conditions, and we assemble them into the local Green’s matrix for $K_m$:

$$G_m^\varepsilon = [b_{m,1}, \ldots, b_{m,n_m}].$$

(37)
Note that \( n_m = \mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon) \), since the number of boundary grid points depends on the microscopic mesh size, which scales as \( 1/\varepsilon \). (Details of the fine mesh are discussed in the Section 5.3.)

**Online.** We write the global solution as a linear combination of all local basis functions, with coefficients \( c_{m,i} \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{u}^\varepsilon &= \sum_m u_m^\varepsilon = \sum_m \sum_{i=1}^{n_m} c_{m,i} b_{m,i} .
\end{align*}
\]

The coefficients are determined by enforcing the following constraints:

* Continuity across edges \( L_{mn} \):
  \[
  u_m(L_{mn}) = u_n(L_{mn}) \quad \text{and} \quad a\partial_n u_m(L_{mn}) = -a\partial_n u_n(L_{mn}) \quad \text{if} \quad L_{mn} \neq \emptyset ,
  \]
  where \( \partial_n \) denotes the outer normal derivative on the boundary;

* Boundary condition on \( \partial K \):
  \[
  u_{|\partial K} = \phi .
  \]

Denote by \( M_{m,n} \) the matrix that maps \( c_m \) to \( u_m(L_{mn}) \), and by \( W_{m,n} \) the matrix that maps \( c_m \) to \( a\partial_n u_m(L_{mn}) \), that is,

\[
\begin{align*}
M_{m,n} c_m &= u_m(L_{mn}) , \\
W_{m,n} c_m &= a\partial_n u_m(L_{mn}) .
\end{align*}
\]

(Note that \( M_{m,n} \) is a submatrix of \( G^\varepsilon_m \).) From the continuity condition, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
M_{m,n} c_m - M_{n,m} c_n = 0 , & x \in L_{mn} \\
W_{m,n} c_m + W_{n,m} c_n = 0 , & x \in L_{mn} .
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly, we define by \( M_{m,\text{ext}} \) the matrix that maps \( c_m \) to the intersection of \( \partial K_m \) with \( \partial K \).

From the boundary condition, we have

\[
M_{m,\text{ext}} c_m = \phi , \quad x \in \partial K_m \cap \partial K .
\]

By assembling the conditions (39) and (40) for all \( m \) and \( n \), and solving for the coefficients \( \{ c_{m,i} , m = 1, \ldots, M , i = 1, \ldots, n_m \} \), we obtain \( \bar{u}^\varepsilon \) from (38). The linear system has the form

\[
P c = d ,
\]

with \( d = [\phi, 0] \), \( c = [c_{m,i}] \) and \( P \) is formed by the collection of \( M_{m,n} \), \( W_{m,n} \), and \( M_{m,\text{ext}} \).

### 5.2. Reduced basis approach.

As in Section 4.2, we define buffered patches \( \tilde{K}_m \) such that \( K_m \subset \subset \tilde{K}_m \), and solve a local problem on each buffered patch. When we restrict the local solutions to \( K_m \), we find that (as before) these solutions lie approximately in a lower-dimensional space. Similarly to Equation (36), we define the local problems as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\nabla_x \cdot \left( a(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}) \nabla \tilde{b}_{m,i} \right) &= 0 , \\
\tilde{b}_{m,i} |_{\tilde{K}_m} &= \delta_i ,
\end{align*}
\]

then define the local solution space via the following Green’s matrix:

\[
\tilde{G}^\varepsilon_m = \left[ \tilde{b}_{m,1} |_{\kappa_m} , \ldots , \tilde{b}_{m,n_{\tilde{m}}} |_{\kappa_m} \right] ,
\]

Since \( \text{span} \tilde{G}^\varepsilon_m \) contains all local solutions, we seek a good approximation to \( \text{span} \tilde{G}^\varepsilon_m \) for the interior cells during the offline stage. As shown in [11], and similarly to Section 4.2, the matrix \( \tilde{G}^\varepsilon_m \) is low rank and can be compressed through random sampling. We solve (42) with the
boundary condition \( \delta_i \) replaced by a function \( w_i \) which takes on random values (specifically, i.i.d. normal random variables) at the grid points of the boundary \( \partial \mathcal{K}_m \), that is,

\[
\begin{aligned}
\begin{cases}
\nabla_x \cdot \left( a(x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}) \nabla x \tilde{r}_{m,i} \right) = 0, & x \in \mathcal{K}_m, \\
\tilde{r}_{m,i}|_{\partial \mathcal{K}_m} = \omega_i.
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
\]

(44)

We do this for \( k_m \) choices of random boundary function \( w_i \) and assemble the local reduced Green’s matrix from the restricted solutions \( r_{m,i} = \tilde{r}_{m,i}|_{\mathcal{K}_m} \), \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, k_m \):

\[
G^{\varepsilon,x}_m = [r_{m,1}, \ldots, r_{m,k_m}] = \tilde{G}^{\varepsilon}_m [\omega_{m,1}, \ldots, \omega_{m,k_m}] |_{\mathcal{K}_m}.
\]

As done in the full basis approach, the coefficients are determined in the online step, namely, we express the solution as

\[
u^\varepsilon = \sum_m \tilde{u}_m^\varepsilon \approx \sum_m \sum_{i=1}^{k_m} \tilde{c}_{m,i} r_{m,i}.
\]

and determine the coefficients \( \tilde{c}_{m,i} \) by imposing the continuity conditions in the interior boundaries and and boundary conditions on the exterior boundary.

Similar to the full basis approach, denote \( \tilde{M}_{m,n} \) and \( \tilde{W}_{m,n} \) the matrices that map \( \tilde{c}_m \) to \( u_m(L_{mn}) \) and \( a \partial_n u_n(L_{mn}) \) respectively, that is,

\[
\tilde{M}_{m,n} \tilde{c}_m = u_m(L_{mn}), \quad \tilde{W}_{m,n} \tilde{c}_m = a \partial_n u_m(L_{mn}).
\]

By imposing the continuity condition and the exterior boundary condition, we obtain

\[
\begin{aligned}
\begin{cases}
\tilde{M}_{m,n} \tilde{c}_m - \tilde{M}_{m,n} \tilde{c}_n = 0, & x \in L_{mn} \\
\tilde{W}_{m,n} \tilde{c}_m + \tilde{W}_{n,m} \tilde{c}_n = 0, & x \in L_{mn},
\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
\]

(45)

and \( \tilde{M}_{m,ext} \tilde{c}_m = \phi, \quad x \in \partial \mathcal{K}_m \cap \partial \mathcal{K} \).

Assembling the equations, we obtain:

\[
\tilde{P} \tilde{c} = d.
\]

However, since the number of coefficients in the reduced basis approach is significantly smaller than that in the full basis approach \( (k_m \ll n_m \text{ in every patch } \mathcal{K}_m) \), while the number of continuity condition and the boundary condition is not changed, the system is overdetermined. We thus consider the least-squares solution, that is:

\[
\tilde{c} = \arg\min \| \tilde{P} \tilde{c} - d \|_2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \tilde{c} = (\tilde{P} \tilde{P}^\top)^{-1} \tilde{P}^\top d.
\]

(46)

Alternatively, we could enforce the boundary conditions exactly and relax only the continuity condition, as in the following constrained least-squares formulation: such that:

\[
\min_{\tilde{c}} \sum_{m,n} \| \tilde{M}_{m,n} \tilde{c}_m - \tilde{M}_{n,m} \tilde{c}_n \|^2_{2,mn} + \| \tilde{W}_{m,n} \tilde{c}_m + \tilde{W}_{n,m} \tilde{c}_n \|^2_{2,mn}, \quad \text{such that } \tilde{M}_{m,ext} \tilde{c}_m = \phi.
\]

Here \( \| \cdot \|_{2,mn} \) denotes \( L_2 \) norm confined on \( x \in L_{mn} \). Numerically, we obtain satisfactory results from (46), and we present these in the next subsection.

5.3. Numerical test. We set the domain to be \( \mathcal{K} = [0, 1]^2 \) and define the media as follows, for \( x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{K} \):

\[
a \left( x, \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right) = 2 + \sin(2\pi x_1) \cos(2\pi x_2) + \frac{2 + 1.8 \sin(\frac{2\pi x_1}{\varepsilon})}{2 + 1.8 \cos(\frac{2\pi x_2}{\varepsilon})} + \frac{2 + \sin(\frac{2\pi x_2}{\varepsilon})}{2 + 1.8 \cos(\frac{2\pi x_2}{\varepsilon})}.
\]

For the domain decomposition we set \( M = 5 \) (for a total of 25 patches), and each local patch is further divided into a 20 by 20 fine mesh so that the mesh parameter \( \Delta x = 0.01 \) can resolve smallest scales \( \varepsilon = 2^{-4} \). Locally on each patch, \( n_m = 80 \) bases functions form a complete bases
Figure 11. Left: Media used in elliptic equation (33). Right: illustration of buffered domain decomposition.

Figure 12. The plot on the left shows the singular values of $G_{2,2}$ (from (37)) and $\tilde{G}_{2,2}$ (from (43)), with $\varepsilon = 2^{-4}$. Use of the buffer zone in the calculation of $\tilde{G}_{2,2}$ causes fast decay of singular values, making this matrix approximately low-rank. The plot on the right panel shows relative error between $G_{2,2}$ and $G_{2,2}$ as we increase the number of random modes $k_m$ from 1 to 50.

5.3.1. Local test. In Figure 12 we show the rank of the Green’s matrices $G_{2,2}$ and $\tilde{G}_{2,2}$ (defined by (37) and (43), respectively) for the $(2,2)$ patch, with $\varepsilon = 2^{-4}$. Use of buffers yields rapid decays in the singular values of $\tilde{G}_{2,2}$. We then define the relative error between $G_{2,2}^{\varepsilon,r}$ and $G_{2,2}^{\varepsilon}$ as follows:

$$\text{error} = \frac{\|G_{2,2}^{\varepsilon,r} - Q Q^\top G_{2,2}^{\varepsilon}\|_2}{\|G_{2,2}^{\varepsilon}\|_2}, \quad \text{with} \quad G_{2,2}^{\varepsilon,r} = QR,$$

where $Q$ is obtained from $QR$ decomposition of $G_{2,2}^{\varepsilon,r}$. We see in Figure 12 that the relative error decays exponentially fast as $k_m$ increases. In Figure 13 we plot the first three left singular vectors of $G_{2,2}^{\varepsilon}$ and their projections onto span$\{G_{2,2}^{\varepsilon,r}\}$ with $k_{2,2} = 6$. This plot shows that, visually, span$\{G_{2,2}^{\varepsilon,r}\}$ captures well the leading singular vectors of the full-basis Green’s matrix.
Figure 13. The first row shows the first three singular vectors of $\tilde{G}_{2,2}$ and the second row shows projection of them onto $\text{span}\{G_{2,2}^{r}\}$ with $k_{2,2} = 6$. Visually, six random sampled basis are enough to capture the leading modes from the full-basis Green’s matrix.

Figure 14. Computed solutions. Left panel shows the reference solution obtained with fine grids. Middle panel and right panel show solutions obtained from (29), (30), (31) with $k_{m} = 10$ and $k_{m} = 50$ (for all $m$), respectively.

5.3.2. Global test. In the global test, the boundary condition is the sine function over the boundary $\partial K$. Equation (41) is computed with $G_{m}$ for the reference solution $u_{\text{ref}}$, and (46) is computed for the approximate solution $u_{\text{approx}}$. Figure 14 shows the reference solution $u_{\text{ref}}$ along with the approximated solutions $u_{\text{approx}}$ obtained using $k_{m} = 10$ and $k_{m} = 50$, respectively. The decay in relative error

$$\text{relative error} = \frac{\|u_{\text{ref}} - u_{\text{approx}}\|_{2}}{\|u_{\text{ref}}\|_{2}}$$

as a function of $k_{m}$ is plotted in Figure 15.

5.4. Comparison to MsFEM. The MsFEM (multiscale Finite Element Method) is a very successful numerical homogenization method that is very well studied for elliptic equations with highly oscillatory media. A convergence result was presented in [31] for the case in which the media is periodic in the fast variable. We compare the method described above with MsFEM,
Figure 15. The global error as a function of number of random nodes per patch $k_m$. Note the rapid decay of error as $k_m$ increases.

Figure 16. High contrast media with yellow part indicating $a(x, \bar{z}) = 1000$ and blue part indicating $a(x, \bar{z}) = 1$. The green box shows local patch $K_{2,2}$.

Setting the media to be high contrast:

$$a = 1 + 1000 \mathbf{1}_S(x, y), \quad S = \{(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 : (x \cos(100\sqrt{(x - 0.5)^2 + (y - 0.5)^2})) \leq y - 0.5\},$$

as shown in Figure 16. Figure 17 shows that the random sampling method quickly captures the three leading basis functions and gives higher accuracy, compared with MsFEM.
Figure 17. Optimal basis functions and their projections onto the approximate spaces. First row plots the first three singular vectors of $\tilde{G}_{2,2}$. Second row plots their projection onto the space spanned by the random sampled basis with $k_{2,2} = 6$. Third row shows projection onto MsFEM space. The relative error of the three optical basis functions projected onto the random sampled basis is 0.1334, 0.2901 and 0.2717 respectively, while their error after projection onto MsFEM space is 0.2043, 0.5930, and 0.7581 respective. Random sampled basis provide much better accuracy.
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