

A Rellich's result revisited and sensitivity of solutions of parametrized linear systems

José Carlos Bellido^a, Luis Felipe Prieto-Martínez^b

^a*Departamento de Matemáticas, ETSI Industriales, INEI, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Campus Universitario S/N, E13071, Ciudad Real, Spain*

^b*Departamento de Matemática Aplicada, ETS Arquitectura, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Avd. Juan de Herrera 4, E28040, Madrid, Spain*

Abstract

In this paper we revisit a result due to Franz Rellich on smoothness of solutions of parametrized linear systems. With this result as a starting point, we obtain finer smoothness results in an elementary fashion and propose an efficient adjoint algorithm for computing sensitivities of $(n - 1)$ -deficient systems, being n the order of the system.

Keywords: Smoothness of solutions of linear systems with respect to parameters, Derivates of linear systems solutions with respect to paramaters
 2010 MSC: 65K99, 49K40, 90C31

1. Introduction

More than 50 years ago Franz Rellich pioneered the investigation on the problem of perturbation of eigenvalue problems with respect to matrix system parameters, both for finite and infinite dimensional systems [1]. In this paper we focus our attention on the following simple lemma from [1] in the finite dimensional framework, where smoothness with respect to a single parameter of solutions of homogeneous finite dimensional linear systems verifying a normalization constraint is established.

Theorem 1 (Rellich's Lemma). *Let $\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon) = [\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ be a $n \times n$ matrix whose coefficients, $\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)$, for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, are real analytic functions in a neighborhood of some ε_0 and such that for each ε in this neighborhood, $\det(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)) = 0$. Then, for some neighborhood of ε_0 , there exist analytic functions $\alpha_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \alpha_n(\varepsilon)$ such that the column vector $\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon) = [\alpha_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \alpha_n(\varepsilon)]^T$ satisfies:*

a) $\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{0}$, and

Email addresses: josecarlos.bellido@uclm.es (José Carlos Bellido),
 luisfelipe.prieto@upm.es (Luis Felipe Prieto-Martínez)

b) $\|\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\| = 1$.

In this paper we revisit this result, whose proof is elementary, exploring the generalization of this theorem to the multi-parameter case, i.e. when coefficient matrix \mathbf{D} depends on a vector of variables $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, for both for homogeneous and non-homogeneous linear systems. More concretely, we would like to provide answers to the following questions.

Problem 2. Let $\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = [\gamma_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$, for $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. If for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, $\gamma_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ is analytic (respectively in $C^l(U)$), decide:

- Given $\mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = [b_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, b_n(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})]^T$, with $b_i(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ analytic (resp. in $C^l(U)$) for $1 \leq i \leq n$, does the system

$$\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \tag{1}$$

admits analytic solutions?

- does the linear system

$$\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{0} \tag{2}$$

admits a solution $\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = [x_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, x_n(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})]^T$ satisfying

$$\|\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\| = 1. \tag{3}$$

and such that each $x_i(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ is analytic (resp. is in $C^1(U)$)?

A second step in the direction set in Problem 2 would be to devise an efficient way of computing derivatives or differentials of solutions of linear systems with respect to parameters. Thus, the second question we address in this investigation is the following.

Problem 3. Let $\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = [\gamma_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$, for $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. If, for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, the coefficients $\gamma_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ are analytic (resp. are in $C^1(U)$) for $1 \leq m \leq N$, determine the value of $\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \varepsilon_m}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0)$, where $\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ is one of the analytic solutions (resp. $C^1(U)$) of (2) satisfying (3), and such that $\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) = \mathbf{u}$ (with \mathbf{u} a fixed given unitary vector such that $\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$).

Both, studying smoothness of solutions and the effective computation of derivatives, usually referred as sensitivities, fit into the field of *sensitivity analysis*, which for this kind of linear problems goes back to the times of A. Turing, who in his influential paper [2], pointed out the interest on the problem of sensitivity of solutions of linear systems (in that paper, he also introduced the definition of condition number). The literature on the subject itself, or on intimately related topics, is really vast. Rellich's result that motivates this paper is contextualized as an auxiliary result in the infancy of the perturbation theory of eigenproblems [1]. [3] is a classical reference on the subject. Sensitivity

of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of linear problems is a matter of great practical interest in many engineering contexts, as for instance and just for citing one among many, structural design [4, 5]. Of course, the problems we study could be seen as particular cases of eigenvector sensitivity analysis, although our questions are even more elementary and our aim here is to check how far we can get pushing forward the elementary ideas in the proof of Theorem 1. Literature on this subject is really overwhelming both from the mathematical and engineering sides, and to include here an exhausting list of references is out of the scope of this paper. We additionally reference [6, 7].

Another very related subject is singular value decomposition of parametrized matrices, where both the smoothness of the decomposition and methods for computing it are addressed. The literature on this topic is also huge. We cite [8, 9, 10, 11].

Coming back to our very elementary problem on smoothness and sensitivity of solutions of parametrized linear systems, it is worth mentioning the highly cited survey [12]. See also [13]. The standard approach in these works is the following: starting from a system $Dx = b$, with D a non-singular matrix, consider the perturbed system $(D + \Delta D)x = b + \Delta b$, where ΔD and Δb are interpreted as perturbations or errors. Thus, these problems are usually studied from the Numerical Linear Algebra viewpoint and from what is called *interval analysis* in the literature. This viewpoint is mainly oriented to computing bounds for the uncertainty of the components of x rather than to compute derivatives.

On the contrary, we assume coefficients of D, b are *smooth* functions depending on a vector of parameters $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^N$, instead of considering perturbations. This is the natural framework in many applied situations, where the coefficients of the matrix sometimes depend on some parameters with some (physical, or economical, or engineering) meaning. Furthermore, in the case of homogeneous systems the constraint (3) is taken into consideration. Smoothness and explicit computation of so-called *frame solutions*, i.e. families of orthonormal solutions of the homogeneous system, has been studied intensively before [14, 15, 16]. In this paper, we will provide a simple proof for the existence of smooth frame solutions and an efficient method for computing sensitivities in the multi-parameter case for $(n - 1)$ -deficient systems (i.e. $\text{rank}(D(\varepsilon)) = n - 1$).

The existence of smooth solutions to linear systems with respect to parameters has received some recent attention due to its relationship with *Whitney's Extension Problem*. We highlight the recent articles [17, 18, 19], for the case $U = \mathbb{R}^N$, where a complete characterization of the linear systems admitting such a solution is obtained. We are not so interested in obtaining such characterizations, but simple and coarse criteria for the existence of smooth solutions, following the philosophy of [1], and to devise methods for sensitivity computation.

Outline of the paper is the following. In Section 2 we include an updated version of the proof of Theorem 1 and, after this, we discuss the questions in Problem 2 as generalizations of Theorem 1: the necessity of the analytic-

ity condition (Subsection 2.1), the multi-parameter case (Subsection 2.2) and finally the general non-homogeneous case (Subsection 2.3). In Section 3 we study the existence of smooth frame solutions when $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)) < n - 1$. Finally, Section 4 is devoted to the exposition of two sensitivities computation algorithms for the multi-parameter case and for $(n - 1)$ -deficient systems. We provide a direct method, inspired in Nelson's Method for simple eigenvector derivative calculation [20], and an adjoint method (more efficient for large values of N) inspired by [4, 5].

2. Rellich's Theorem

In this section, first, we include, for readers' convenience and to understand the new results in this paper, the proof of Theorem 1. In Subsections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 extensions and generalizations of Theorem 1 are given, partially answering Problem 2.

Proof of Theorem 1: Let us denote by U the neighborhood of ε_0 where the entries of matrix $\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)$ are analytic and such that $\det(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)) = 0$ for all $\varepsilon \in U$. Set $r = \max_{\varepsilon \in U}(\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)))$. We may assume that $\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)$ is not the trivial matrix in U . So $1 \leq r \leq n - 1$.

First we construct an analytic solution verifying Theorem 1, a). There is no loss in generality (performing a permutation of the equations and of the variables) in assuming that $\det([\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)]_{i,j=1}^r)$ is a minor which is not constantly equal to 0 in U .

For $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, denote by $\Gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)$ to the cofactor of $\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)$ in the submatrix $[\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)]_{i,j=1}^{r+1}$. Defining

$$f_k(\varepsilon) = \begin{cases} \Gamma_{r+1,k}(\varepsilon) & \text{for } k = 1, \dots, r+1 \\ 0 & \text{for } k = r+2, \dots, n, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

functions $f_k(\varepsilon)$ are analytic and not simultaneously constantly zero (because $f_{r+1}(\varepsilon) = \Gamma_{r+1,r+1}(\varepsilon) \neq 0$ for some $\varepsilon \in U$). Moreover, we have that for $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$[\gamma_{i1}(\varepsilon), \dots, \gamma_{in}(\varepsilon)] \begin{bmatrix} f_1(\varepsilon) \\ \vdots \\ f_n(\varepsilon) \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{k=1}^{r+1} \gamma_{ik}(\varepsilon) \Gamma_{r+1,k}(\varepsilon) = 0,$$

since the second term in the equality is the determinant of the $(r+1) \times (r+1)$ matrix obtained by replacing the $(r+1)$ -st row of $[\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)]_{i,j=1}^{r+1}$ by $[\gamma_{i1}(\varepsilon), \dots, \gamma_{i,r+1}(\varepsilon)]$ and therefore vanishes:

- for $1 \leq i < r$, since it is the determinant of a matrix with two equal rows;
- for $i = r$, since it is the determinant of matrix $[\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)]_{i,j=1}^{r+1}$;
- for $r < i \leq n$, since it is the determinant of a matrix such that its last row is linear combination of the rest of rows.

In order to complete the proof let us assume, for the shake of simplicity, that $\varepsilon_0 = 0$. There exist some $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, the power series $f_i(\varepsilon)$ is of order at least m . So we have:

$$(|f_1(\varepsilon)|^2 + \dots + |f_n(\varepsilon)|^2) = \varepsilon^{2m}(h_0 + h_1\varepsilon + \dots), \quad h_0 \neq 0 \quad (5)$$

where the power series $h_0 + h_1\varepsilon + \dots$ converges for sufficiently small $|\varepsilon|$. Consequently:

$$(|f_1(\varepsilon)|^2 + \dots + |f_n(\varepsilon)|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \varepsilon^m(\omega_0 + \omega_1\varepsilon + \dots), \quad \omega_0 \neq 0$$

where the power series $\omega_0 + \omega_1\varepsilon + \dots = \sqrt{h_0 + h_1\varepsilon + \dots}$ converges for small $|\varepsilon|$. Since, as we have established, the power series expansion of each $f_i(\varepsilon)$ are of order at least m , we can define

$$\alpha_i(\varepsilon) = \frac{f_i(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^m(\omega_0 + \omega_1\varepsilon + \dots)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

which is also a convergent power series for small $|\varepsilon|$ and, for some $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\alpha_i(\varepsilon) \neq 0$. □

In the second part of the proof, the following elementary property of the set of formal power series has been essential. This property will be recalled later.

Property 4. *If $f_1(\varepsilon), \dots, f_k(\varepsilon)$ are convergent power series in a neighborhood of $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, then there exists some $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, such that $\alpha_1(\varepsilon) = \frac{f_1(\varepsilon)}{(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0)^m}, \dots, \alpha_k(\varepsilon) = \frac{f_k(\varepsilon)}{(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_0)^m}$ are all of them convergent power series and for some i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\alpha_i(\varepsilon_0) \neq 0$.*

In the following subsections, we address generalizations of Theorem 1 in different directions.

2.1. Analyticity assumption in Rellich's Theorem

As was already pointed out by Rellich, and due to the important role played by Property 4 in the proof of Theorem 1, it is not possible to replace the analyticity condition in Theorem 1 by a weaker smoothness condition. That is, if the coefficients $\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon) \in C^l(U)$, $l \geq 1$, for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, in general it is not possible to find $\alpha_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \alpha_n(\varepsilon) \in C^l(U^*)$, with U^* being a neighborhood of ε_0 and satisfying the conditions a) and b) in Theorem 1. The following example is an adaptation of the one appearing in [1] (recall that in [1] the eigenproblem is addressed) illustrating this fact.

Example 5. For $n = 2$, consider the following matrix, which entries are continuous and have continuous derivatives of all orders in \mathbb{R} :

$$\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon) = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}}(1 - \cos\frac{2}{\varepsilon}) & -e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}}\sin\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \\ -e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}}\sin\frac{2}{\varepsilon} & e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}}(1 + \cos\frac{2}{\varepsilon}) \end{bmatrix} & \text{for } \varepsilon \neq 0 \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \text{for } \varepsilon = 0 \end{cases}$$

For $\varepsilon \neq 0$ and for some real function $\lambda(\varepsilon)$, any solution takes the form:

$$\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon) = \lambda(\varepsilon) \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \cos(1/\varepsilon) \\ \sin(1/\varepsilon) \end{bmatrix}$$

There is no neighborhood U^* of $\varepsilon_0 = 0$ with a vector $\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon) = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1(\varepsilon) \\ \alpha_2(\varepsilon) \end{bmatrix}$ such that $\alpha_1(\varepsilon), \alpha_2(\varepsilon)$ are continuous and such that for every $\varepsilon \in U^*$ they satisfy a) and b) in Theorem 1.

What is possible is, starting from a matrix with $C^l(U)$ coefficients, to obtain a vector $\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon)$ which components are also in $C^l(U)$ and such that satisfy a) in Theorem 1 and different o zero in some neighborhood of ε_0 , but not Condition b). Example 5 also illustrates this situation. Starting from a matrix whose coefficients are $C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, there exist a column vector $\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon)$ (which is not, in general, unique) satisfying a) and such that its components are also $C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Take, for instance,

$$\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon) = e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \cos(1/\varepsilon) \\ \sin(1/\varepsilon) \end{bmatrix}.$$

In other words, it is possible to obtain the following result in the spirit of Theorem 1 for weaker smoothness conditions.

Theorem 6. Let $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and let U be a neighborhood of ε_0 . Let $\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon) = [\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ a matrix such that each $\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon) \in C^l(U)$, for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, and such that $\det(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)) = 0$ for all $\varepsilon \in U$. Then:

1. There exist functions $f_1(\varepsilon), \dots, f_n(\varepsilon)$ in $C^l(U)$ such that the column vector

$$\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon) = \begin{bmatrix} f_1(\varepsilon) \\ \vdots \\ f_n(\varepsilon) \end{bmatrix}$$

satisfies

$$\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{0}$$

for any $\varepsilon \in U$;

2. Let $r = \max_{\varepsilon \in U}(\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)))$ and assume that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon_0)) = r$. Then, there exists a neighborhood U^* of ε_0 such that for $\varepsilon \in U^*$, $\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon) \neq \mathbf{0}$, and consequently, there exist functions $\alpha_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \alpha_n(\varepsilon)$ in $C^l(U^*)$ such that the column vector

$$\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon) = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1(\varepsilon) \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_n(\varepsilon) \end{bmatrix}$$

satisfies conditions a) and b) in Theorem 1, for any $\varepsilon \in U^*$.

Proof: The proof follows the lines of that of Theorem 1. Assume, again, that $0 < r < n$. There is no loss in generality assuming, also, that $\det([\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)]_{i,j=1}^r)$ is a minor which is non trivial in some neighborhood $U^* \subset U$ of ε_0 . The proof of part (1) is the same as the one of Theorem 1 (with the obvious modifications) and will not be repeated here. For the proof of Part 2, recovering the previous notation, we just notice that since $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon_0)) = r$, therefore constant and maximal in the whole neighborhood U^* ,

$$|f_1(\varepsilon)|^2 + \dots + |f_n(\varepsilon)|^2$$

is a $C^l(U^*)$ function, which does not vanish for $\varepsilon \in U^*$. So does

$$(|f_1(\varepsilon)|^2 + \dots + |f_n(\varepsilon)|^2)^{1/2}$$

and so, for $1 \leq i \leq n$

$$\alpha_i(\varepsilon) = \frac{f_i(\varepsilon)}{(|f_1(\varepsilon)|^2 + \dots + |f_n(\varepsilon)|^2)^{1/2}}$$

is in $C^l(U^*)$. □

The solutions constructed in the proof fail to have smoothness at the points ε_0 such that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon_0))$ is not maximal (is less than r). This is the reason of the problems appearing in the smoothness of the eigenvectors when two or more eigenvalues coalesce in the eigenproblem context.

2.2. Multi-parameter case

Now let us consider the several variables case of the second part of Problem 2, that is, now $\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = [\gamma_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ denotes a $n \times n$ matrix such that each entry γ_{ij} depends on a vector of variables $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $N > 1$, and solutions are vectors $\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$.

The natural analogue of Theorem 1 for this case is false, as we can see in the following example. Again, this is a consequence of the fact that analytic functions in several variables do not satisfy an analogue of Property 4.

Example 7. For $n = 2, N = 2$, consider the following matrix, which entries depend on a vector of variables $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ and are analytic functions for every $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$:

$$D(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) = \begin{bmatrix} 2\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2 & \varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Any solution of system

$$D(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) = \mathbf{0}$$

verifies

$$\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) = \lambda(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_1^2 - \varepsilon_2^2 \\ 2\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

for some real function $\lambda(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$.

Now if we impose $\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ to satisfy Equation (2), we obtain

$$\|[\varepsilon_1^2 - \varepsilon_2^2, 2\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2]^T\| = \sqrt{(\varepsilon_1^2 - \varepsilon_2^2)^2 + (2\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2)^2} = \varepsilon_1^2 + \varepsilon_2^2$$

so the solution $\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ such that $\|\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)\| = 1$ for $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \neq (0, 0)$ is (up to sign)

$$\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\varepsilon_1^2 - \varepsilon_2^2}{\varepsilon_1^2 + \varepsilon_2^2} \\ \frac{2\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2}{\varepsilon_1^2 + \varepsilon_2^2} \end{bmatrix}$$

It is not possible to extend such a solution to be continuous at $(0, 0)$.

In a similar fashion to what happened in the previous section, for a matrix $D(\varepsilon)$ which entries are smooth (analytic or in $C^l(U)$), it is possible to find a vector which entries are also smooth (analytic or in $C^l(U)$) and such that it satisfies (2), but not (3), in general, that is, it is possible to prove an analogue to Theorem 6 for several variables, but not of Theorem 1.

Theorem 8. Let $D(\varepsilon) = [\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ such that, for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, $\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)$ is analytic (resp. $C^l(U)$) in a neighborhood U of some $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and such that for each $\varepsilon \in U$, $\det(D(\varepsilon)) = 0$. Then:

1. There exist functions $f_1(\varepsilon), \dots, f_n(\varepsilon)$ which are analytic (resp. $C^l(U)$) and such that the column vector

$$\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon) = \begin{bmatrix} f_1(\varepsilon) \\ \vdots \\ f_n(\varepsilon) \end{bmatrix}$$

satisfies (2);

2. Let $r = \max_{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in U} (\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})))$. Assume that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0)) = r$. Then, there exists a neighborhood U^* of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0$, such that there exists functions $\alpha_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, \alpha_n(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ which are analytic (resp. $C^l(U^*)$) and the column vector

$$\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_n(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) \end{bmatrix}$$

satisfies conditions (2) and (3) for $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in U^*$.

The proof follows completely the lines to the one of Theorem 6 and will not be repeated.

2.3. Extension to non-homogeneous linear systems

Now we deal with the first question raised in Problem 2. In this case, the corresponding result has a direct and elementary proof and unifies the one-parameter and the multi-parameter cases:

Theorem 9. Let $\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = [\gamma_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$, $\mathbf{b} = [b_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, b_n(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})]^T$ such that their entries are analytic (resp. $C^l(U)$) in a neighborhood U of some $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 1$. If $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0)) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) \mid \mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0)) = r$ and for every $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in U$ $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) \mid \mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})) \leq r$ (*), there exists some neighborhood U^* of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0$ such that there exist functions $g_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, g_m(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ which are analytic (resp. $C^l(U^*)$) and such that $\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = [g_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, g_n(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})]^T$ satisfies (1) for $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in U^*$.

Proof: There is no loss in generality assuming that $\det([\gamma_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq r})$ is a non-trivial minor. There is a neighborhood U^* of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0$ contained in U such that for every $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in U^*$, $\det([\gamma_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq r}) \neq 0$. Consider the matrix :

$$\tilde{\mathbf{D}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} \gamma_{11}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) & \dots & \gamma_{1r}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) & \gamma_{1,r+1}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) & \dots & \gamma_{1n}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \gamma_{r1}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) & \dots & \gamma_{rr}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) & \gamma_{r,r+1}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) & \dots & \gamma_{rn}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) \\ \hline 0 & \dots & 0 & & & \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & & \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & & & \mathbf{I}_{n-r} \end{array} \right]$$

where \mathbf{I}_{n-r} denotes the identity matrix of size $(n-r) \times (n-r)$.

The unique solution of $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ is a solution of $\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$. So the result is a direct consequence of Cramer's rule applied to the system $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$. □

Condition (*) holds automatically if $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}))$ is constant in U and equal to n .

3. System of smooth linearly independent solutions to Problem 2

Let us begin by introducing some notation. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. For us a *vector field* is a map $x : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ (indeed, this has already appeared above). We say that it is analytic (resp. is $C^1(U)$) if so are its components. The following definition clarifies the term *frame field*, which appears in the literature with more than one meaning.

Definition 10. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, a *frame field* is a map $F : U \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$

$$\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_N) \mapsto (x_1(\varepsilon), \dots, x_k(\varepsilon))$$

such that, for every $\varepsilon \in U$, $x_i(\varepsilon) \cdot x_j(\varepsilon) = \delta_{ij}$ (so $k \leq n$). Note that each x_i is a n -dimensional vector field in U . We say that it is analytic (resp. in $C^1(U)$) if so are each vector field x_i , for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

3.1. Frame fields of solutions of homogeneous linear systems

In the context of the second case of Problem 2, in this subsection we prove, in some cases, the existence of not only a vector field corresponding to a solution, but a frame field $(x_1(\varepsilon), \dots, x_k(\varepsilon))$ consisting on k solutions.

The process used in this section generalizes an analogue construction done, again, in [1] for eigenvalue problems. Let us start with the following simple observation.

Lemma 11. Let D be a constant matrix of size $n \times n$ and rank $r \geq 1$. Let $k = n - r$ and x_1, \dots, x_k be any orthonormal basis of solutions of the linear system $Dx = 0$. Then the matrix

$$B = D + x_k x_k^T$$

of size $n \times n$ has rank $r + 1$ and satisfies

$$Bx_i \begin{cases} = 0 & \text{for } i = 1, \dots, k-1 \\ \neq 0 & \text{for } i = k \end{cases}$$

Proof: For $i = 1, \dots, k-1$, taking into account that x_1, \dots, x_k are in the kernel of D and constitute an orthogonal system we get

$$Bx_i = (D + x_k x_k^T)x_i = 0$$

and analogously, having in mind, this time, that $x_k x_k = 1$

$$Bx_k = (D + x_k x_k^T)x_k = x_k \neq 0$$

Since $Bx = 0$ has at least $k-1$ solutions, $\text{rank}(B) \leq r+1$. To see the equality, we have to check that there is no more than $k-1$ linearly independent solutions of this system. Suppose that we have a vector x_0 such that $\{x_0, \dots, x_k\}$ is orthonormal. Then

$$Bx_0 = (D + x_k x_k^T)x_0 = Dx_0$$

So, if $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ then $\mathbf{D}\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ which leads to a contradiction with $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}) = r$. □

This idea allow us to prove the following theorem, which is an improved statement of Theorem 1 (in the one-parameter case). This result does not appear explicitly in [1].

Theorem 12. *Let U be a neighborhood of $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon) = [\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ be such that each $\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)$, for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, is analytic in U and such that for each $\varepsilon \in U$, $\det(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)) = 0$. Suppose that $r = \max_{\varepsilon \in U} \{\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon))\}$ and let $k = n - r$. Then there exist an analytic frame field $(\mathbf{x}_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k(\varepsilon))$ such that for each ε in a neighborhood of ε_0 , for $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)\mathbf{x}_i(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{0}$.*

Proof: We proceed by induction. The case $k = 1$ is a trivial consequence of Theorem 1.

For $k > 1$, using, again, this result we can obtain a vector that will be denoted by $\mathbf{x}_k(\varepsilon)$ such that $\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)\mathbf{x}_k(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\|\mathbf{x}_k(\varepsilon)\| = 1$. For each $\varepsilon \in U$ consider any orthonormal set of solutions $\{\mathbf{y}_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \mathbf{y}_{k-1}(\varepsilon), \mathbf{x}_k(\varepsilon)\}$ of the system $\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ containing the one above. Now define $\mathbf{B}(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{D}(\varepsilon) + \mathbf{x}_k(\varepsilon)\mathbf{x}_k^T(\varepsilon)$. $\mathbf{B}(\varepsilon)$ also satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem, with $\text{rank}(\mathbf{B}) \leq r + 1$. So we can apply the induction hypothesis to obtain a frame field of $k - 1$ vectors $(\mathbf{x}_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \mathbf{x}_{k-1}(\varepsilon))$ satisfying the requirements in the theorem. And since, for each $\varepsilon \in U$ they belong to the subspace spanned by $\mathbf{y}_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \mathbf{y}_{k-1}(\varepsilon)$, the set $\{\mathbf{x}_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \mathbf{x}_{k-1}(\varepsilon), \mathbf{x}_k(\varepsilon)\}$ is an orthonormal set. □

In a similar fashion, we can obtain a similar result replacing analyticity by $C^l(U)$ smoothness in the one-parameter case ($N = 1$) and in the multi-parameter case ($N > 1$).

Theorem 13. *Let $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and let U be a neighborhood of this ε_0 . Let $\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon) = [\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ be such that each $\gamma_{ij}(\varepsilon)$, for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, is in $C^l(U)$ and such that for each $\varepsilon \in U$, $\det(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)) = 0$. Suppose that $r = \max_{\varepsilon \in U} \{\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon))\}$ and let $k = n - r$. Then there exist k vector fields $\mathbf{x}_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k(\varepsilon)$ which are $C^l(U)$ such that for each $\varepsilon \in U$, for each $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, $i \neq j$, $\mathbf{x}_i(\varepsilon)^T \mathbf{x}_j(\varepsilon) = 0$ and $\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)\mathbf{x}_i(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{0}$. Moreover, if $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon_0)) = r$, then there exists a neighborhood U^* of ε_0 such that, for $\varepsilon \in U^*$, it is possible to choose these vectors in such a way that $(\mathbf{x}_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k(\varepsilon))$ is a frame field.*

The proof follows the lines of the previous one.

Let us remark that, although Theorems 12 and 13 are stated as purely existence result, the method exhibited in the proof of Theorem 12 is constructive, as shown in the following example, that we hope it helps to clarify the algorithm. Anyway, to compute the frame field using this method is not computationally efficient, since it requires to compute too many determinants.

Example 14. In the case $n = 3, N = 1$, consider the matrix $\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon) = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$.

For $U = \mathbb{R}$, this matrix satisfies

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \varepsilon \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \varepsilon = 0 \end{cases}$$

so we expect to obtain a frame field of solutions consisting in 2 vector, defined in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$.

The proof of Theorem 1 explains how to obtain one of the solutions, using certain cofactors. This solution is

$$\mathbf{x}_1(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\|[0, \varepsilon, 0]^T\|} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \varepsilon \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now, following the idea in Theorem 13 we repeat the same process, but for the matrix

$$\mathbf{B}(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{D}(\varepsilon) + \mathbf{x}_1(\varepsilon)\mathbf{x}_1(\varepsilon)^T = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

obtaining the solution

$$\mathbf{x}_2(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\left\| \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} 0 & 0 & \\ \hline 1 & 0 & \\ \hline \end{array} \right] , \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} \varepsilon & 0 & \\ \hline 0 & 0 & \\ \hline \end{array} \right] , \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} \varepsilon & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \right\|^T} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \\ \hline \varepsilon & 0 & \\ \hline 0 & 0 & \\ \hline \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that, in this case, the frame field can be extended to the whole open set U , although this may not happen in general.

Finally, note that this analytic frame field $(\mathbf{x}_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k(\varepsilon))$ obtained with this method, is not the only possible one satisfying the conditions.

Remark 15. Using Gram-Schmidt Method it is possible to find analytic (resp. in $C^l(U)$) vector fields $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}(\varepsilon), \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_n(\varepsilon)$ in such a way that

$$\{\mathbf{x}_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k(\varepsilon), \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1}(\varepsilon), \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_n(\varepsilon)\} \quad (6)$$

is an orthonormal basis.

Let $(\mathbf{y}_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \mathbf{y}_k(\varepsilon))$ be a frame field. Then it satisfies the conditions if and only if, there exists a matrix $\mathbf{K}(\varepsilon)$ that maps the elements in the basis $(\mathbf{x}_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k(\varepsilon))$ into elements in the basis $(\mathbf{y}_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \mathbf{y}_k(\varepsilon))$ of the form

$$\mathbf{K}(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{P}(\varepsilon) \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{T}(\varepsilon) & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_{n-k} \end{array} \right] \mathbf{P}(\varepsilon)^{-1} \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ is the matrix whose columns are the vectors in the base (6), $\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ is a matrix whose entries are analytic (resp. are in $C^1(U)$) and such that for each $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in U$ belongs to the orthogonal group $\mathcal{O}(k)$ and finally \mathbf{I}_{n-k} is the $(n-k) \times (n-k)$ identity matrix. Note that the entries of $\mathbf{y}_i(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ are analytic (resp. are in $C^1(U)$).

A matrix whose entries depend on some variables and belongs to $\mathcal{O}(n)$ for each value of these variables, such as $\mathbf{K}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$, is sometimes called kinematic matrix. In fact, we can view the frame field $(\mathbf{y}_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, \mathbf{y}_k(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}))$ as the result of applying a rigid motion to the original frame field $(\mathbf{x}_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}))$ in such a way that the entries in the matrix of this rigid motion have the adequate smoothness with respect to the variables in $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$.

3.2. Linearly independent solutions for non-homogeneous linear systems

From Theorem 9 and the results in the previous subsection, it is easy to prove the following:

Theorem 16. Let $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and let U be a neighborhood of this ε_0 . Let $\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = [\gamma_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$, $\mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = (b_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, b_n(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}))^T$ be such that, for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, $\gamma_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$, $b_i(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$, are analytic for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Suppose that $r = \text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon_0)) = \text{rank}([\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon_0) \mid \mathbf{b}(\varepsilon_0)])$ and that for every $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in U$, $\text{rank}([\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) \mid \mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})]) \leq r$. Let $k = n - r$. Then there exist a neighborhood U^* of ε_0 , an analytic vector field $\mathbf{x}_p(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ and an analytic frame field $(\mathbf{x}_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}))$ such that any analytic vector field $\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ satisfying Equation (1) can be written as:

$$\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{x}_p(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) + \lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\mathbf{x}_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) + \dots + \lambda_k(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\mathbf{x}_k(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$$

for some analytic functions $\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, \lambda_n(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$.

Theorem 17. Let $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, for $N \geq 1$, and let U be a neighborhood of this ε_0 . Let $\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = [\gamma_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$, $\mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = (b_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, b_n(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}))^T$ be such that, for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, $\gamma_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$, $b_i(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ are in $C^1(U)$, for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Suppose that $r = \text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon_0)) = \text{rank}([\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon_0) \mid \mathbf{b}(\varepsilon_0)])$ and that for every $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in U$, $\text{rank}([\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) \mid \mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})]) \leq r$. Let $k = n - r$. Then there exist a neighborhood U^* of ε_0 , a $C^1(U^*)$ vector field $\mathbf{x}_p(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ and a $C^1(U^*)$ frame field $(\mathbf{x}_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}))$ such that any $C^1(U^*)$ vector field $\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ satisfying Equation (1) can be written as:

$$\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{x}_p(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) + \lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\mathbf{x}_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) + \dots + \lambda_k(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\mathbf{x}_k(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$$

for some functions $\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, \lambda_n(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ in $C^1(U^*)$.

The existence of \mathbf{x}_p (the particular solution) is ensured by Theorem 9 and the existence of the frame fields (homogeneous solutions) by Theorems 12 and 13.

4. Sensitivity Analysis

In this section we study Problem 3. The first two subsections deal with the case in which $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0)) = n - 1$ and $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})) \leq n - 1$ for $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ in some neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0$. In the first one, we present a direct method to solve Problem 3. In the second one, an adjoint method is provided to perform this same task. This second type of methods are, computationally, more efficient for large values of N . Finally, in Subsection 4.3 we discuss the difficulties for computation of sensitivities in the case $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0)) < n - 1$.

4.1. Direct Method

Let us begin with the following straightforward observation. Recall that we are considering solutions verifying $\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) = \mathbf{u}$, for a given unitary vector \mathbf{u} , as in the formulation of Problem 3.

Lemma 18. *Let $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and U be a open neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0$. Let $\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ be a $C^1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ vector field. Suppose that $\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ is a solution of the system $\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ for $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in U$, where the entries in $\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ and $\mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ are in $C^1(U)$. Then:*

$$\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{b}}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) - \frac{\partial \mathbf{D}}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) \mathbf{u}. \quad (8)$$

Proof: Equation (8) is obtained taking derivatives from $\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$. □

Lemma 19. *Let $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and let U be a open neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0$. Let $\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ be a $C^1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ vector field. If $\|\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\| = 1$ for $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in U$, then, for $1 \leq i \leq N$:*

$$\mathbf{u}^T \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) = 0. \quad (9)$$

Proof: Equation (9) is obtained taking derivatives in $\mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})^T \mathbf{x}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = 1$. □

Combining Equations (8) and (9) we can obtain a way to compute the derivatives inspired in Nelson's method (that was originally developed for eigenvector sensitivity, see [4, 5, 22]). Note that the general solution of Equation (8) must be of the form

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) = \mathbf{v} + c\mathbf{u} \quad (10)$$

for \mathbf{v} being a particular solution of the system (8) and c a constant to be determined. From the fact that $\mathbf{u}^T \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) = 0$ we obtain that:

$$c = -\mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{u} \quad (11)$$

So finally we get:

<p>Direct Method for the homogeneous system $D(\varepsilon)x(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{0}$ such that $x(\varepsilon_0) = \mathbf{u}$ and $\text{rank}(D(\varepsilon)) = n - 1$ is a neighborhood of ε_0.</p>
<p>1.- We look for a particular solution \mathbf{v} of the singular linear system $D(\varepsilon_0)\mathbf{v} = -\frac{\partial D}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\varepsilon_0)\mathbf{u}$.</p>
<p>2.- Set $c = -\mathbf{v}^T\mathbf{u}$.</p>
<p>3.- Finally, $\frac{\partial x}{\partial \varepsilon_j}(\varepsilon_0) = \mathbf{v} + c\mathbf{u}$.</p>

4.2. Adjoint Method

Suppose that, for some $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, for some $1 \leq j \leq n$, we want to compute $\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j}(F(x(\varepsilon_0)))$ where $x(\varepsilon)$ satisfies Equations (2) and (3). Using this function F we obtain some notational advantages, we study (effortlessly) a more general problem and we can easily particularize this problem (taking $F(x(\varepsilon)) = x_i$) to recover $\frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \varepsilon_j}(\varepsilon_0)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

For some $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ that do not depend on the variables in ε , consider the trivial equation:

$$F(x(\varepsilon)) = F(x(\varepsilon)) + \underbrace{\mathbf{p}^T D(\varepsilon)x(\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda(x^T(\varepsilon)x(\varepsilon) - 1)}_{=0}$$

Taking derivatives we get:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j}(F(x(\varepsilon_0))) = \nabla F(x(\varepsilon_0)) \frac{\partial x}{\partial \varepsilon_j}(\varepsilon_0) + \mathbf{p}^T \left[\frac{\partial D}{\partial \varepsilon_j}(\varepsilon_0)x(\varepsilon_0) + D(\varepsilon_0) \frac{\partial x}{\partial \varepsilon_j}(\varepsilon_0) \right] + \lambda \left[x^T(\varepsilon) \frac{\partial x}{\partial \varepsilon_j}(\varepsilon) \right]$$

and re-organizing:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j}(F(x(\varepsilon_0))) = \mathbf{p}^T \frac{\partial D}{\partial \varepsilon_j}(\varepsilon_0)x(\varepsilon_0) + \underbrace{\left[\nabla F(x(\varepsilon_0)) + \mathbf{p}^T D(\varepsilon_0) + \lambda x^T(\varepsilon) \right]}_{(**)} \frac{\partial x}{\partial \varepsilon_j}(\varepsilon_0)$$

To simplify the expression above, we can choose \mathbf{p}^T and λ in such a way that $(**) = 0$. To achieve this, we choose $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ to be the (unique) real number such that the following linear system has a solution (at this point is where we need that $\text{rank}(D(\varepsilon)) = n - 1$) and then we solve it to find \mathbf{p} .

$$D(\varepsilon_0)^T \mathbf{p} = -\lambda x(\varepsilon_0) - \nabla F(x(\varepsilon_0))^T \quad (12)$$

Putting these ideas together we obtain:

<p>Adjoint Method for the homogeneous system to compute partial derivatives of $F(x(\varepsilon))$ at ε_0, where $D(\varepsilon)x(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{0}$ and $x(\varepsilon_0) = \mathbf{u}$.</p>
<p>1.- Find λ, \mathbf{p} such that: $D(\varepsilon_0)^T \mathbf{p} = -\lambda \mathbf{u} - \nabla F(\mathbf{u})^T$.</p>
<p>2.- $\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j}(F(x(\varepsilon_0))) = \mathbf{p}^T \frac{\partial D}{\partial \varepsilon_j}(\varepsilon_0)\mathbf{u}$.</p>

Note that, \mathbf{p} is not unique, that is, we can find two different solutions $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2$ satisfying (12) and so

$$(\mathbf{p}_1^T - \mathbf{p}_2^T)\mathbf{D} = 0 \quad (13)$$

But the value of $\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_j}(F(\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon_0)))$ does not vary. To check this, let us see that this invariance is equivalent to:

$$(\mathbf{p}_1^T - \mathbf{p}_2^T)\frac{\partial \mathbf{D}}{\partial \varepsilon_j}\mathbf{x} = 0$$

and this equation is true as a consequence of Equations (8) and (13).

If we want to compute several partial derivatives $\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \varepsilon_{j_1}}(\varepsilon_0), \dots, \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \varepsilon_{j_r}}(\varepsilon)$ the first part of the method is common to all of them and the second one just requires the computation of the corresponding derivative of \mathbf{D} and a multiplication.

4.3. Cases in which the solution of Problem 3 is not determined

If for all $\varepsilon \in U$, $\text{rank}(\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)) = n - k$, for $k > 1$, then Problem 3 cannot be solved unless more information is provided. Let us see the following clarifying example:

Example 20. For the case $N = 1, n = 4, U = \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon_0 = 0$. Consider the matrix

$$\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon) = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Consider some vector field $\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon)$ such that, for all $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbf{D}(\varepsilon)\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{x}(0) = (0, 1, 0, 0)^T$$

This information is not sufficient to determine $\mathbf{x}'(0)$. To check this, just see that for every vector $(0, 0, a, b)^T$ in the linear space spanned by $\{(0, 0, 1, 0)^T, (0, 0, 0, 1)^T\}$, the solution $\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon) = (0, \cos \varepsilon, \sin a\varepsilon, \sin b\varepsilon)$ satisfies $\mathbf{x}'(\varepsilon_0) = (0, 0, a, b)$.

In the case of eigenproblems this feature is well known. It corresponds to the case in which $\lambda(\varepsilon)$ is an eigenvalue of constant multiplicity $h > 1$.

Suppose that we have guaranteed the existence of a frame field $(\mathbf{x}_1(\varepsilon), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k(\varepsilon))$ consisting of k vector fields which are solutions of (2) and that some orthonormal vectors $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_k$ are provided, so that it is prescribed that $\mathbf{x}_j(\varepsilon_0) = \mathbf{u}_j$ for $j = 1 \dots, k$. In this case, the derivative of the solutions must satisfy some extra conditions. For $1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq k, j_1 \neq j_2$:

$$\mathbf{x}_{j_1}(\varepsilon)\mathbf{x}_{j_2}(\varepsilon) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{u}_{j_1}^T \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\varepsilon_0) + \mathbf{u}_{j_2}^T \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\varepsilon_0) = 0$$

Even with this extra conditions, the solution to Problem (3) is not determined. It can be proved in a straightforward manner, studying the corresponding linear system, that has $\binom{k}{2}$ degrees of freedom, or just noting the following:

Remark 21. *In the notation of Remark 15, see that for the frame field $(\mathbf{x}_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}))$ obtained following the method in the proof of Theorems 12 and 13 any other frame field $(\mathbf{y}_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \dots, \mathbf{y}_k(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}))$ satisfies the corresponding conditions if and only if*

$$\text{for } 1 \leq i \leq j, \mathbf{y}_i(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{K}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\mathbf{x}_i(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) \quad (14)$$

Now, if we impose that, for $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\mathbf{x}_i(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) = \mathbf{y}_i(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) = \mathbf{u}_i$ for some prescribed vector \mathbf{u}_i , then $\mathbf{K}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) = \mathbf{I}_n$ and so $\mathbf{K}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ is in $SO(n)$. Taking derivatives in Equation (14) we have that

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{y}_i}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{K}}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0)\mathbf{u}_i + \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_i}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$$

If we want $\mathbf{K}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ to be of the type explained in Equation (7) and to satisfy $\mathbf{K}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0) = \mathbf{I}_n$ we still have $\binom{k}{2}$ free parameters since $\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0)$ can be any skew-symmetric matrix of size $k \times k$ (see [23]).

Acknowledgements

This work has been supported by the Spanish Agencia Estatal de Investigación through project PID2020-116207GB-I00 and Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha through project SBPLY/19/180501/000110.

References

References

- [1] F. Rellich, Perturbation Theory of Eigenvalues Problems, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York-London-Paris, Berlin, 1969.
- [2] A. M. Turing, Rounding-off errors in matrix processes, The Quarterly Journal of Mechanics and Applied Mathematics 1 (1) (1948) 287–308.
- [3] T. Kato, Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators, Springer-Verlag, 1966.
- [4] A. D. D. Ruiz, J. C. Bellido, Eigenvector sensitivity when tracking modes with repeated eigenvalues, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 326 (2017) 338–357.
- [5] G. H. Yoon, A. Donoso, J. C. Bellido, D. Ruiz, Highly efficient general method for sensitivity analysis of eigenvectors with repeated eigenvalues without passing through adjacent eigenvectors, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering 121 (20) (2020) 4473–4492.

- [6] A. L. Andrew, K.-w. E. Chu, P. Lancaster, Derivatives of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of matrix functions, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* 14 (4) (1993) 903–926. doi:10.1137/0614061. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/0614061>
- [7] A. P. Seyranian, Sensitivity analysis of multiple eigenvalues*, *Mechanics of Structures and Machines* 21 (2) (1993) 261–284. arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1080/08905459308905189>, doi:10.1080/08905459308905189. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/08905459308905189>
- [8] A. Bunse-Gerstner, R. Byers, V. Mehrmann, N. K. Nichols, Numerical computation of an analytic singular value decomposition of a matrix valued function, *Numer. Math.* 60 (1) (1991) 1–39. doi:10.1007/BF01385712. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01385712>
- [9] V. Mehrmann, W. Rath, Numerical methods for the computation of analytic singular value decompositions, *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.* 1 (Dec.) (1993) 72–88 (electronic only).
- [10] J. G. Sun, A note on simple nonzero singular values, *J. Comput. Math.* 6 (3) (1988) 258–266.
- [11] J. G. Sun, Sensitivity analysis of zero singular values and multiple singular values, *J. Comput. Math.* 6 (4) (1988) 325–335.
- [12] A. Deif, *Sensitivity analysis in linear systems*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [13] J. Rohn, Systems of linear interval equations, *Linear algebra and its applications* 126 (1989) 39–78.
- [14] T. F. Coleman, D. C. Sorensen, A note on the computation of an orthonormal basis for the null space of A , *Math. Programming* 29 (2) (1984) 234–242. doi:10.1007/BF02592223. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02592223>
- [15] W. C. Rheinboldt, On the computation of multidimensional solution manifolds of parametrized equations, *Numer. Math.* 53 (1-2) (1988) 165–181. doi:10.1007/BF01395883. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01395883>
- [16] W. C. Rheinboldt, On the sensitivity of solutions of parameterized equations, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 30 (2) (1993) 305–320. doi:10.1137/0730015. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/0730015>
- [17] J. K. C. Fefferman, *Continuous solutions of linear equations, From Fourier analysis and number theory to Randon transforms and geometry*, Springer, New York (2013) 233–282.
- [18] G. K. L. C. Fefferman, The brenner–hochster–kollár and whitney problems for vector-valued functions and jets, *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana* 30 (3) (2014) 875–892.

- [19] G. K. L. C. Fefferman, Solutions to a system of equations for c^m functions, *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana* 37 (3) (2020) 911–963.
- [20] R. B. Nelson, Simplified calculation of eigenvector derivatives, *AIAA Journal* 14 (9) (1976) 1201 – 1205, cited by: 800. doi:10.2514/3.7211.
URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-0016993544&doi=10.2514%2f3.7211>
- [21] T. Romanowicz, Sensitivity analysis of linear systems—a structural approach, *International Journal of Systems Science* 18 (1) (1987) 91–96.
- [22] R. B. Nelson, Simplified calculation of eigenvector derivatives, *AIAA Journal* 14 (9) (1976) 1201–1205.
- [23] A. Baker, *Matrix groups: An introduction to Lie group theory*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.