

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE RAYLEIGH–RITZ AND REFINED
RAYLEIGH–RITZ METHODS FOR NONLINEAR EIGENVALUE
PROBLEMS**

ZHONGXIAO JIA AND QINGQING ZHENG

ABSTRACT. We analyze the Rayleigh–Ritz method and the refined Rayleigh–Ritz method for computing an approximation of a simple eigenpair (λ_*, x_*) of a given nonlinear eigenvalue problem. For a given subspace \mathcal{W} that contains a sufficiently accurate approximation to x_* , we establish convergence results on the Ritz value, the Ritz vector and the refined Ritz vector as the deviation ε of x_* from \mathcal{W} approaches zero. We also derive lower and upper bounds for the error of the refined Ritz vector and the Ritz vector as well as for that of the corresponding residual norms. These results extend the convergence results of these two methods for the linear eigenvalue problem to the nonlinear case. We construct examples to illustrate some of the results.

1. INTRODUCTION

Given the nonlinear eigenvalue problem (NEP)

$$(1.1) \quad T(\lambda)x = 0,$$

where $T(\cdot) : \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is a nonlinear analytic matrix-valued function with respect to the complex number $\lambda \in \Omega$ with Ω a connected open set, the spectrum of $T(\cdot)$ is defined by the set [8, 28]:

$$(1.2) \quad \Lambda(T(\cdot)) := \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \det(T(\lambda)) = 0 \right\}.$$

We call $\lambda \in \Lambda(T(\cdot))$ an eigenvalue of $T(\cdot)$ and the corresponding x a right eigenvector corresponding to λ . Throughout the paper, we normalize x so that $\|x\| = 1$ with $\|\cdot\|$ the 2-norm of a matrix or vector. Assume that $T(\lambda)$ is regular, that is, $T(\lambda)$ does not have identically zero determinant for all $\lambda \in \Omega$. Then every eigenvalue λ is isolated, that is, there exists an open neighborhood $\mathcal{B} \subset \Omega$ of λ so that λ is the unique eigenvalue of $T(\cdot)$ in \mathcal{B} (cf. [32] and Theorem 2.1 of [8]). There are many differences between NEP (1.1) and the regular linear eigenvalue problem $(A - \lambda B)x = 0$. For example, the number of eigenvalues of NEP can be arbitrary, and eigenvectors associated with distinct eigenvalues may be linearly dependent. More theoretical background on NEP can be found in [8].

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 65F15, 15A18, 15A22, 93B20, 93B40, 93B60.

The first author was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12171273).

The second author was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China Grant (No. 12001311) and the Science Foundation of China University of Petroleum, Beijing (No. 2462021YJRC025).

NEP (1.1) arises in many applications, such as dynamic analysis of damped structural systems [22], nonlinear ordinary differential eigenvalue problems [40], stability analysis of linear delayed systems [12], acoustic problems with absorbing boundary conditions [5], electronic structure calculation for quantum dots [1] and stability analysis in fluid mechanics [4]. More NEPs can be found in, e.g., [2, 8, 9, 29, 30, 31] and the references therein. Notice that (1.1) can be written as

$$(1.3) \quad T(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^k f_i(\lambda)A_i$$

for some $k \leq n^2$. where $f_i : \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are nonlinear analytic functions with Ω being an open set, $A_i \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are constant coefficient matrices. The polynomial eigenvalue problem (PEP) [33, 35, 44] corresponds to $f_i(\lambda) = \lambda^i$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$, in which the quadratic eigenvalue problem (QEP) for $k = 2$ is a special case. The QEP has very wide applications and has been intensively studied [10, 24, 25, 27, 30, 41]. Another common class of (1.3) is the rational eigenvalue problem (REP), where the functions $f_i(\lambda)$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$ are rational functions of λ . Very importantly, from both perspectives of mathematics and numerical computations, NEPs of (1.1) on a given subset $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ can be approximated by rational matrix functions accurately [6, 7, 8, 37], so that one can solve the eigenvalue problems of PEPs and REPs and obtains their eigenvalues and eigenvectors.

Suppose that we are interested in finding a simple eigenpair (λ_*, x_*) of NEP (1.1), that is, $\det(T(\lambda)) = 0$ has a simple root at $\lambda = \lambda_*$. Several methods have been presented to solve NEP (1.3) for small and medium sized NEPs. For instance, Newton's methods [14, 23, 36] are popular choices for NEPs, and the QR or QZ method is used when NEPs are transformed into linear eigenvalue problems [6, 37]. For large-scale NEPs, projection methods are most commonly used numerical methods, which include the nonlinear Lanczos method, the nonlinear Arnoldi method, the nonlinear Jacobi–Davidson method, and some others [3, 8, 45]. We will focus on some popular projection methods and establish their general convergence theory in this paper.

A general projection method for (1.1) is to generate a sequence of m -dimensional subspaces $\mathcal{W}_m \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ that contain increasingly accurate approximations to x_* , and projects NEP (1.1) onto \mathcal{W}_m 's to obtain small projected NEPs, solving which for obtaining approximations to the desired (λ_*, x_*) . The Rayleigh–Ritz method is a widely used projection method for extracting approximations to λ_* and x_* with respect to \mathcal{W}_m . We describe one iteration of the method as Algorithm 1, where the subscript m is omitted for brevity, the superscript H denotes the conjugate transpose of a matrix or vector. μ and \tilde{x} are called a Ritz value and Ritz vector of $T(\lambda)$ with respect to \mathcal{W} , respectively.

We point out that, for NEP (1.3), we can always compute $B(\lambda)$ accurately in exact arithmetic. We may solve the projected NEP $B(\lambda)z = 0$ by a method for small to medium sized problems, e.g., the afore-mentioned Newton's methods or the more robust QZ algorithm for the matrix pencils resulting from PEPs, REPs themselves and REP approximations of NEPs [6, 7, 37, 42].

Regarding the choice of μ defined by (1.4) in computations, since λ_* is to be sought and unknown, for a specified λ_* , such as the the largest one in magnitude and the one with the largest (or smallest) real part or the one closest to a given target, we label all the Ritz values in the corresponding prescribed order, and pick

Algorithm 1 The Rayleigh–Ritz method

Compute an orthonormal basis W of \mathcal{W} .

Form $B(\lambda) = W^H T(\lambda) W \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$.

Solve $B(\lambda)z = 0$, and let (μ, z) be an eigenpair of $B(\cdot)$ with $\|z\| = 1$ satisfying

$$(1.4) \quad \mu = \operatorname{argmin}_{\zeta} \{|\zeta - \lambda_*| : \zeta \in \Lambda(B(\cdot))\}.$$

Take $(\mu, \tilde{x}) = (\mu, Wz)$ as an approximation to (λ_*, x_*) .

up the Ritz value μ as approximation to λ_* according to the labeling rule. It is exactly the way that the method does for eigenvalue problems in computations.

How to construct \mathcal{W} effectively is not our concern in this paper. Instead, we focus on the convergence of the Ritz pair (μ, \hat{x}) under the hypothesis that \mathcal{W} is sufficiently accurate for computing the desired eigenpair (λ_*, x_*) . To this end, we define the distance between the desired normalized x_* and \mathcal{W} or the deviation of x_* from \mathcal{W} by the quantity

$$(1.5) \quad \varepsilon = \sin \angle(x_*, \mathcal{W}) = \|W_{\perp}^H x_*\| = \|(I - P_{\mathcal{W}})x_*\|,$$

where the columns of W_{\perp} form an orthonormal basis for the orthogonal complement of \mathcal{W} with respect to \mathbb{C}^n and $P_{\mathcal{W}}$ is the orthogonal projector onto \mathcal{W} . Since $\sin \angle(x_*, y) \geq \varepsilon$ for any $y \in \mathcal{W}$, any projection method, e.g., the above Rayleigh–Ritz method, definitely cannot find an accurate approximation to x_* if ε does not tend to zero. In other words, $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ is a necessary condition for $\tilde{x} \rightarrow x_*$. Therefore, in the sequel we naturally assume that $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, only under which it is meaningful to speak of the convergence of the Rayleigh–Ritz method and the refined Rayleigh–Ritz method to be introduced later.

For the linear eigenvalue problem $(A - \lambda I)x = 0$, Jia [15] and Jia and Stewart [20, 21] prove that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the Rayleigh quotient $W^H A W$ contains a Ritz value that converges to λ_* but the Ritz vector may fail to converge even when $x_* \in \mathcal{W}$, i.e., $\varepsilon = 0$. The refined Rayleigh–Ritz method extracts a normalized refined Ritz vector or refined eigenvector approximation \hat{x} that minimizes the residual formed with μ over \mathcal{W} and uses it to approximate x_* [16, 20, 17, 18]. It is shown in [20, 21] that the convergence of \hat{x} is ensured provided that $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$; see also [39, 43]. Numerous theoretical comparisons of refined Ritz vectors and Ritz vectors for linear eigenvalue problems are made in [19]. Huang, Jia and Lin [13] generalize the Rayleigh–Ritz method and the refined Rayleigh–Ritz method to the QEP. By transforming the QEP into a generalized linear eigenvalue problem, they extend the main convergence results in [20, 21] on the Rayleigh–Ritz method and the refined Rayleigh–Ritz method to the QEP case. Hochstenbach and Sleijpen [11] generalize the harmonic and refined Rayleigh–Ritz methods to the PEP. Schwetlick and Schreiber [38] study the nonlinear Rayleigh functionals for NEP (1.1). They estimate the quality of the Rayleigh functional, i.e., the error of the Ritz value, in terms of the angle between the desired eigenvector and the Ritz vector, and present a number of results. For NEP (1.1) derived from finite element analysis of Maxwell’s equation with waveguide boundary conditions, Liao et al. [26] propose a nonlinear Rayleigh–Ritz method, but they do not analyze the convergence of Ritz values and Ritz vectors.

In this paper, we propose a refined Rayleigh–Ritz method that solves NEP (1.1). For a given m -dimensional subspace $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, the method seeks for a unit-length vector $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{W}$ such that

$$(1.6) \quad \|T(\mu)\hat{x}\| = \min_{v \in \mathcal{W}, \|v\|=1} \|T(\mu)v\|$$

with μ being the Ritz value defined by (1.4). We call \hat{x} a refined eigenvector approximation to x_* or simply the refined Ritz vector corresponding to μ . By definition, $\hat{x} = Wy$, where y is the right singular vector of $T(\mu)W$ associated with its smallest singular value.

We will study the convergence of Ritz values and Ritz vectors obtained by Algorithm 1 and that of refined Ritz vectors defined by (1.6) under the hypothesis that $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We will extend the main convergence results in [19, 20] to the NEP case and get insight into similarities and dissimilarities of the Rayleigh–Ritz method and the refined Rayleigh–Ritz method for the linear eigenvalue problem and NEP.

We will show that, unlike the linear eigenvalue problem, the hypothesis $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ cannot unconditionally ensure that $\mu \rightarrow \lambda_*$. We will present a sufficient condition that ensures the convergence. Similarly to the linear case, we will prove that the Ritz vector \tilde{x} may fail to converge to x_* even if μ converges. We will present an approach to identify the convergence of \tilde{x} associated with the converging μ . For the refined Rayleigh–Ritz method, we prove that the refined Ritz vector \hat{x} converges unconditionally as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We also prove that \hat{x} is unique as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, an important property that is different from that of \tilde{x} . Furthermore, we establish lower and upper bounds for the error of \hat{x} and \tilde{x} , and study the residual norms $\|T(\mu)\tilde{x}\|$ and $\|T(\mu)\hat{x}\|$, showing that the latter is strictly smaller and can be much smaller than that of the former whenever the Ritz pair $(\mu, \tilde{x}) \neq (\lambda_*, x_*)$. This indicates that the refined Ritz vector \hat{x} is generally more accurate and can be much more accurate than the Ritz vector \tilde{x} .

In Section 2, we study the convergence of μ . In Section 3, we consider the convergence of \tilde{x} and \hat{x} . In Section 4, we derive lower and upper bounds for $\sin \angle(\tilde{x}, \hat{x})$, and construct examples to illustrate our results. In Section 5, we conclude the paper.

2. CONVERGENCE OF THE RITZ VALUE

In this section, we study the convergence of the Ritz values obtained by Algorithm 1. The following result shows that λ_* is an exact eigenvalue of $\tilde{B}(\cdot)$ that is a slight perturbation of $B(\cdot)$ in Algorithm 1, which extends Theorem 4.1 of [21] to the Rayleigh–Ritz method for NEP (1.1).

Theorem 2.1. *For a given subspace \mathcal{W} , let ε be defined by (1.5). Then for the projected matrix-valued function $B(\lambda) = W^H T(\lambda)W$, there exists a matrix-valued function $E(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ satisfying*

$$(2.1) \quad \|E(\lambda_*)\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}} \|T(\lambda_*)\|$$

such that λ_ is an eigenvalue of the perturbed $B(\lambda) + E(\lambda)$.*

Proof. Recall that the columns of W and W_\perp form orthonormal bases of \mathcal{W} and its orthogonal complement with respect to \mathbb{C}^n . Let $u = W^H x_*$ and $u_\perp = W_\perp^H x_*$.

Then $\|u_\perp\| = \varepsilon$. Notice that

$$1 = \|x_*\|^2 = x_*^H(WW^H + W_\perp W_\perp^H)x_* = \|u\|^2 + \|u_\perp\|^2.$$

We have $\|u\| = \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}$. Since $T(\lambda_*)x_* = 0$, we obtain

$$W^H T(\lambda_*)(WW^H + W_\perp W_\perp^H)x_* = 0.$$

Hence

$$(2.2) \quad B(\lambda_*)u + W^H T(\lambda_*)W_\perp u_\perp = 0.$$

Let the normalized $\hat{u} = \frac{u}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}}$, and denote $r = B(\lambda_*)\hat{u}$, which is the residual of (λ_*, \hat{u}) as an approximate eigenpair of $B(\mu)z = 0$. Then we have

$$(2.3) \quad \|r\| = \left\| -\frac{W^H T(\lambda_*)W_\perp u_\perp}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}} \right\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}} \|T(\lambda_*)\|.$$

Define $E(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}} W^H T(\lambda)W_\perp u_\perp \hat{u}^H$. Then (2.1) holds, and it is from (2.2) that $(B(\lambda_*) + E(\lambda_*))\hat{u} = 0$. \square

Theorem 2.1 shows that $B(\lambda_*) + E(\lambda_*)$ is singular and $E(\lambda_*) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, $B(\lambda_*)$ tends to the changing singular matrix $B(\mu)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ for μ defined in Algorithm 1. It is, therefore, expected that $\mu \rightarrow \lambda_*$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Later on, we will investigate if and when this is true.

We present the following result, which, in terms of ε , establishes an upper bound for the smallest singular value $\sigma_{\min}(B(\lambda_*))$ of $B(\lambda_*)$ and quantitatively shows how near $B(\lambda_*)$ is to singularity.

Theorem 2.2. *The smallest singular value $\sigma_{\min}(B(\lambda_*))$ of $B(\lambda_*)$ satisfies*

$$(2.4) \quad \sigma_{\min}(B(\lambda_*)) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}} \|T(\lambda_*)\|.$$

Proof. By definition and (2.3), we have

$$\sigma_{\min}(B(\lambda_*)) = \min_{\|u\|=1} \|B(\lambda_*)u\| \leq \|B(\lambda_*)\hat{u}\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}} \|T(\lambda_*)\|.$$

\square

Theorem 2.2 shows that the distance of $B(\lambda_*)$ to the singularity is no more than the upper bound (2.4). Furthermore, by the analyticity of $B(\cdot)$ and the continuity argument, there must be some eigenvalue μ of $B(\cdot)$, defined in Algorithm 1, that converges to λ_* as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In order to establish a quantitative convergence result on μ , we need the following lemma [39, pp.208], which gives the first-order expansion of a simple singular value of a matrix and trivially extends to a complex matrix.

Lemma 2.3. *Let (σ, u, v) be a simple singular triplet of $X \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, and $\tilde{\sigma}$ be the corresponding singular value of the perturbed matrix $\tilde{X} = X + E$. Then*

$$\tilde{\sigma} = \sigma + u^H E v + O(\|E\|^2).$$

Theorem 2.4. *Assume that $(\sigma(B(\lambda_*)), u_{\lambda_*}, v_{\lambda_*})$ be a simple triplet of $B(\lambda_*)$, and let $\sigma(B(\lambda))$ be the corresponding singular value of the perturbed analytic matrix $B(\lambda) = B(\lambda_*) + E(\lambda)$. Then $\sigma(B(\lambda))$ is analytic at λ_* and*

$$(2.5) \quad \sigma'(B(\lambda_*)) = u_{\lambda_*}^H B'(\lambda_*) v_{\lambda_*}.$$

Proof. Let $\Delta\lambda = \lambda - \lambda_*$. By the definition of $B(\lambda)$, we have $E(\lambda_*) = 0$. Therefore,

$$(2.6) \quad \lim_{\Delta\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{E(\lambda)}{\Delta\lambda} = \lim_{\Delta\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{E(\lambda) - E(\lambda_*)}{\Delta\lambda} = \lim_{\Delta\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{B(\lambda) - B(\lambda_*)}{\Delta\lambda} = B'(\lambda_*).$$

Since $\sigma(B(\lambda_*))$ is simple, it follows from Lemma 2.3 that

$$(2.7) \quad \sigma(B(\lambda)) = \sigma(B(\lambda_*)) + u_{\lambda_*}^H E(\lambda) v_{\lambda_*} + O(\|E(\lambda)\|^2).$$

From (2.6) and (2.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma'(B(\lambda_*)) &= \lim_{\Delta\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sigma(B(\lambda)) - \sigma(B(\lambda_*))}{\Delta\lambda} \\ &= \lim_{\Delta\lambda \rightarrow 0} u_{\lambda_*}^H \frac{E(\lambda)}{\Delta\lambda} v_{\lambda_*} + \lim_{\Delta\lambda \rightarrow 0} O\left(\frac{\|E(\lambda)\|^2}{\Delta\lambda}\right) \\ &= u_{\lambda_*}^H B'(\lambda_*) v_{\lambda_*}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used

$$\lim_{\Delta\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|E(\lambda)\|^2}{|\Delta\lambda|} = \|B'(\lambda_*)\| \lim_{\Delta\lambda \rightarrow 0} \|E(\lambda)\| = \|B'(\lambda_*)\| \|E(\lambda_*)\| = 0.$$

Hence, (2.5) holds. \square

By Theorem 2.4, we can now give a sufficient condition for the convergence of the Ritz value μ .

Theorem 2.5. *Assume that $B(\lambda)$ by Algorithm 1 is analytic for $\lambda \in \Omega$ and $\sigma_{\min}(B(\lambda_*))$ is simple. Then the smallest singular value $\sigma_{\min}(B(\lambda))$ is simple for λ lying in a sufficiently small disc $\mathcal{B} = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda - \lambda_*| \leq |\mu - \lambda_*|\} \subset \Omega$, and there exists a positive constant $\alpha > 0$ such that $|\sigma'_{\min}(B(\lambda))| > \alpha$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$ and*

$$(2.8) \quad |\mu - \lambda_*| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}\alpha} \|T(\lambda_*)\|.$$

Proof. By Theorem 2.4, $\sigma_{\min}(B(\lambda))$ is analytic for $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$. By the assumption that $\sigma_{\min}(B(\lambda_*))$ is simple, we have $\sigma'_{\min}(B(\lambda_*)) \neq 0$. For λ lying in a sufficiently small disc \mathcal{B} , we have $\sigma'_{\min}(B(\lambda)) \neq 0$, and there exists a positive constant α such that $|\sigma'_{\min}(B(\lambda))| > \alpha$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$.

Since $\sigma_{\min}(B(\mu))$ is real-valued and differentiable in Ω , it is from [34] that

$$\sigma_{\min}(B(\mu)) - \sigma_{\min}(B(\lambda_*)) = \sigma'_{\min}(B(\xi))(\mu - \lambda_*)$$

for some ξ in the segment connecting λ_* and μ . Notice that $\xi \in \mathcal{B} \subset \Omega$. By (2.4) and $\sigma_{\min}(B(\mu)) = 0$, we obtain

$$|\mu - \lambda_*| = \frac{|\sigma_{\min}(B(\lambda_*))|}{|\sigma'_{\min}(B(\xi))|} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}\alpha} \|T(\lambda_*)\|.$$

\square

This theorem shows that, under the assumptions described, $\mu \rightarrow \lambda_*$ as fast as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

3. CONVERGENCE OF THE RITZ VECTOR AND THE REFINED RITZ VECTOR

In this section, we consider the convergence of the Ritz vector \tilde{x} and the refined Ritz vector \hat{x} . Let X_\perp be an orthonormal basis for the orthogonal complement of $\text{span}\{x_*\}$ with respect to \mathbb{C}^n , and define $L(\lambda_*) = X_\perp^H T(\lambda_*) X_\perp$. Then from $T(\lambda_*)x_* = 0$ we obtain the Schur-like decomposition

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{pmatrix} x_*^H \\ X_\perp^H \end{pmatrix} T(\lambda_*) \begin{pmatrix} x_* & X_\perp \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_*^H T(\lambda_*) X_\perp \\ 0 & L(\lambda_*) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since λ_* is a simple eigenvalue of $T(\cdot)$, Proposition 1 in [32] shows that $\text{rank}(T(\lambda_*)) = n - 1$. As a result, $L(\lambda_*)$ is nonsingular, and $\sigma_{\min}(L(\lambda_*)) > 0$.

In terms of the computable residual norm, the following theorem derives an error bound for a general approximate eigenpair (μ, \tilde{x}) , which is not necessarily a Ritz pair. The theorem extends Theorem 3.1 of [20] and Theorem 6.1 of [21] to the NEP case and applies to the Rayleigh–Ritz method and the refined Rayleigh–Ritz method.

Theorem 3.1. *Let (μ, \tilde{x}) with $\|\tilde{x}\| = 1$ be an approximate eigenpair of $T(\lambda)x = 0$, and denote the corresponding residual norm by*

$$\rho = \|T(\mu)\tilde{x}\|.$$

Denote $L(\mu) = X_\perp^H T(\mu) X_\perp$. If $\sigma_{\min}(L(\mu)) > 0$, then

$$(3.2) \quad \sin \angle(x_*, \tilde{x}) \leq \frac{\rho}{\sigma_{\min}(L(\mu))} + O(|\mu - \lambda_*|).$$

Proof. By the unitary invariance of 2-norm, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \left\| \begin{pmatrix} x_*^H \\ X_\perp^H \end{pmatrix} T(\mu)\tilde{x} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \begin{pmatrix} x_*^H T(\mu)\tilde{x} \\ X_\perp^H T(\mu)(x_* x_*^H \tilde{x} + X_\perp X_\perp^H \tilde{x}) \end{pmatrix} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \begin{pmatrix} x_*^H T(\mu)\tilde{x} \\ X_\perp^H T(\mu)x_* x_*^H \tilde{x} + L(\mu)X_\perp^H \tilde{x} \end{pmatrix} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &\geq \|X_\perp^H T(\mu)x_* x_*^H \tilde{x} + L(\mu)X_\perp^H \tilde{x}\| \\ &\geq \|L(\mu)X_\perp^H \tilde{x}\| - \|X_\perp^H T(\mu)x_* x_*^H \tilde{x}\|, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$(3.3) \quad \|L(\mu)X_\perp^H \tilde{x}\| \leq \rho + \|X_\perp^H T(\mu)x_* x_*^H \tilde{x}\|.$$

Since $T(\lambda)$ is analytic with respect to λ , we have

$$(3.4) \quad T(\mu) = T(\lambda_*) + T'(\lambda_*)(\mu - \lambda_*) + O((\mu - \lambda_*)^2).$$

Therefore,

$$T(\mu)x_* = (\mu - \lambda_*)T'(\lambda_*)x_* + O((\mu - \lambda_*)^2),$$

which proves

$$(3.5) \quad \|X_\perp^H T(\mu)x_* x_*^H \tilde{x}\| = O(|\mu - \lambda_*|).$$

Notice that $\sin \angle(x_*, \tilde{x}) = \|X_\perp^H \tilde{x}\|$ and $\|L(\mu)X_\perp^H \tilde{x}\| \geq \sigma_{\min}(L(\mu))\|X_\perp^H \tilde{x}\|$. Therefore, from (3.3) and (3.5), we obtain

$$\sin \angle(x_*, \tilde{x})\sigma_{\min}(L(\mu)) \leq \rho + O(|\mu - \lambda_*|),$$

proving that

$$\sin \angle(x_*, \tilde{x}) \leq \frac{\rho + O(|\mu - \lambda_*|)}{\sigma_{\min}(L(\mu))} \leq \frac{\rho}{\sigma_{\min}(L(\mu))} + O(|\mu - \lambda_*|).$$

□

We remark that the second term in the right-hand side of (3.3) vanishes for the linear eigenvalue problem $T(\lambda)x = (A - \lambda I)x = 0$ since $X_{\perp}^H T(\mu)x_* = (\lambda - \mu)X_{\perp}^H x_* = 0$. In this case, the term $O(|\mu - \lambda_*|)$ disappears in (3.2), and the theorem reduces to Theorem 3.1 of [20].

The smallest singular value $\sigma_{\min}(L(\mu)) > 0$ is ensured, provided that λ_* is a simple eigenvalue of $T(\lambda)$ and μ is sufficiently close to λ_* . We will investigate more on $\sigma_{\min}(L(\mu))$ later. Theorem 3.1 indicates that if the residual associated with a converging Ritz value μ converges to zero then the corresponding Ritz vector converges to x_* . This residual norm can be used to check if the approximate eigenpair converges.

The following result gives an upper bound for the error of the Ritz vector \tilde{x} in terms of ε . We will show that \tilde{x} converges conditionally and reveal why \tilde{x} may fail to converge to x_* even though $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and even $\varepsilon = 0$. Recall that $B(\mu)z = 0$, and let (z, Z_{\perp}) be unitary. Then

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{pmatrix} z^H \\ Z_{\perp}^H \end{pmatrix} B(\mu) \begin{pmatrix} z & Z_{\perp} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & z^H B(\mu) Z_{\perp} \\ 0 & C(\mu) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $C(\mu) = Z_{\perp}^H B(\mu) Z_{\perp}$. If μ is a simple eigenvalue of $B(\cdot)$, then $C(\mu)$ is non-singular. However, once μ is a multiple one or is close to some other eigenvalues of $B(\cdot)$, then $C(\mu)$ is singular or approximately singular. In these two cases, since $\sigma_{\min}(C(\mu))$ is zero or close to zero, the eigenvector z may not be unique or \tilde{x} is unique but may have very poor and even have no accuracy, as shown below. In either case, by the continuity argument, $\sigma_{\min}(C(\lambda_*))$ is arbitrarily close to zero as $\mu \rightarrow \lambda_*$.

The following theorem shows that the Ritz vector \tilde{x} converges conditionally, and extends Theorem 3.2 of [20] to the NEP, in which the term $O(|\mu - \lambda_*|)$ vanishes when the NEP becomes a linear one.

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that μ is simple. Then \tilde{x} is unique; if $\sigma_{\min}(C(\lambda_*)) > 0$, we have*

$$(3.7) \quad \sin \angle(x_*, \tilde{x}) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\|T(\lambda_*)\|}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2} \sigma_{\min}(C(\lambda_*))} \right) \varepsilon + O(|\mu - \lambda_*|).$$

Proof. Note that the residual $r = B(\lambda_*)\hat{u}$ in (2.3) satisfies

$$\|r\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}} \|T(\lambda_*)\|.$$

Then applying Theorem 3.1 to $B(\mu)z = 0$ and the residual norm $\|r\| = \|B(\lambda_*)\hat{u}\|$ with (λ_*, \hat{u}) being an approximate eigenpair of $B(\cdot)$, we obtain

$$\sin \angle(z, \hat{u}) \leq \frac{\|T(\lambda_*)\| \varepsilon}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2} \sigma_{\min}(C(\lambda_*))} + O(|\mu - \lambda_*|).$$

Since $\tilde{x} = Wz$, $\hat{u} = W^H x_*/\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}$ and $P_W = WW^H$, the above relation means

$$\sin \angle(\tilde{x}, P_W x_*) \leq \frac{\|T(\lambda_*)\| \varepsilon}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2} \sigma_{\min}(C(\lambda_*))} + O(|\mu - \lambda_*|)$$

due to the orthonormality of W . Since

$$\angle(x_*, \tilde{x}) \leq \angle(x_*, P_{\mathcal{W}}x_*) + \angle(P_{\mathcal{W}}x_*, \tilde{x}) = \angle(x_*, \mathcal{W}) + \angle(P_{\mathcal{W}}x_*, \tilde{x}),$$

by (1.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sin \angle(x_*, \tilde{x}) &\leq \sin \angle(x_*, \mathcal{W}) + \sin \angle(P_{\mathcal{W}}x_*, \tilde{x}) \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\|T(\lambda_*)\|}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2} \sigma_{\min}(C(\mu))}\right) \varepsilon + O(|\mu - \lambda_*|). \end{aligned}$$

□

This theorem provides sufficient conditions for the convergence of the Ritz vector \tilde{x} , which require that (i) the Ritz value $\mu \rightarrow \lambda_*$ and (ii) $\sigma_{\min}(C(\lambda_*))$ be uniformly bounded away from zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. As we have commented before the theorem, theoretically there is no guarantee that condition (ii) is satisfied. If $\sigma_{\min}(C(\lambda_*))$ is small and no larger than $O(\varepsilon)$, then \tilde{x} may have no accuracy.

Next we investigate the convergence of the refined Ritz vector \hat{x} , and prove that it unconditionally converges to x provided that $\mu \rightarrow \lambda_*$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

For a converging Ritz value μ , we make a Schur-like decomposition of $T(\mu)$ similar to (3.1), where the entry of $(1, 1)$ -position is small but not zero, the $(2, 2)$ -position is written as $L(\mu)$, and the first column of the unitary similarity transformation is \hat{x} and $L(\mu) \rightarrow L(\lambda_*)$. Since $T(\lambda)$ is supposed to be analytic with respect to $\lambda \in \Omega$, the matrix $L(\lambda)$ is analytic with respect to λ too. Therefore, for μ sufficiently close to λ_* , by the Taylor expansion we obtain

$$(3.8) \quad L(\mu) = L(\lambda_*) + L'(\lambda_*)(\mu - \lambda_*) + (\mu - \lambda_*)^2 R_1(\mu, \lambda_*),$$

where $R_1(\mu, \lambda_*)$ is a matrix whose norm is uniformly bounded with respect to μ : $\|R_1(\mu, \lambda_*)\| \leq \beta$ with $\beta > 0$ being a constant.

Theorem 3.3. *Assume that $|\mu - \lambda_*|$ is small such that*

$$(3.9) \quad \sigma_{\min}(L(\lambda_*)) - \|L'(\lambda_*)\| |\mu - \lambda_*| - \beta |\mu - \lambda_*|^2 > 0.$$

Then

$$(3.10) \quad \|T(\mu)\hat{x}\| \leq \frac{\|T(\mu)\|\varepsilon + \|T'(\lambda_*)\||\mu - \lambda_*|}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}} + O(|\mu - \lambda_*|^2),$$

$$(3.11) \quad \sin \angle(x_*, \hat{x}) \leq \frac{\|T(\mu)\|\varepsilon + \|T'(\lambda_*)\||\mu - \lambda_*|}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2} \sigma_{\min}(L(\mu))} + O(|\mu - \lambda_*|^2).$$

Proof. Decompose x_* as the orthogonal direct sum:

$$x_* = \frac{P_{\mathcal{W}}x_*}{\|P_{\mathcal{W}}x_*\|} \cos \angle(x_*, \mathcal{W}) + \frac{(I - P_{\mathcal{W}})x_*}{\|(I - P_{\mathcal{W}})x_*\|} \sin \angle(x_*, \mathcal{W}),$$

and note that $\sin \angle(x_*, \mathcal{W}) = \varepsilon$ and $\cos \angle(x_*, \mathcal{W}) = \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| T(\mu) \frac{P_{\mathcal{W}}x_*}{\|P_{\mathcal{W}}x_*\|} \right\| &= \left\| \frac{T(\mu)}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}} \left(x_* - \frac{(I - P_{\mathcal{W}})x_*}{\|(I - P_{\mathcal{W}})x_*\|} \varepsilon \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}} (\|T(\mu)x_*\| + \|T(\mu)\|\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $T(\lambda)$ is analytic with respect to $\lambda \in \Omega$, for a converging Ritz value μ , by the Taylor expansion we obtain

$$(3.12) \quad T(\mu) = T(\lambda_*) + T'(\lambda_*)(\mu - \lambda_*) + (\mu - \lambda_*)^2 R_2(\mu, \lambda_*),$$

where $R_2(\mu, \lambda_*)$ is a matrix whose norm is uniformly bounded, i.e., $\|R_2(\mu, \lambda_*)\| \leq \gamma$ with $\gamma > 0$ uniformly. From $T(\lambda_*)x_* = 0$ and (3.12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\mu)x_*\| &= \|(T(\mu) - T(\lambda_*))x_*\| \\ &\leq |\mu - \lambda_*| \|T'(\lambda_*)\| + O(|\mu - \lambda_*|^2), \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by definition (1.6) of the refined Ritz vector \hat{x} , we obtain

$$\|T(\mu)\hat{x}\| \leq \left\| T(\mu) \frac{P_{\mathcal{W}}x_*}{\|P_{\mathcal{W}}x_*\|} \right\| \leq \frac{\|T(\mu)\|\varepsilon + \|T'(\lambda_*)\||\mu - \lambda_*|}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}} + O(|\mu - \lambda_*|^2),$$

which proves (3.10).

From (3.8), by the standard perturbation theory of singular values, we obtain

$$\sigma_{\min}(L(\mu)) \geq \sigma_{\min}(L(\lambda_*)) - \|L'(\lambda_*)\| |\mu - \lambda_*| - \beta|\mu - \lambda_*|^2.$$

As a result, under assumption (3.9), applying Theorem 3.1 to $\|T(\mu)\hat{x}\|$, from (3.10) we obtain

$$\sin \angle(x_*, \hat{x}) \leq \frac{\|T(\mu)\|\varepsilon + \|T'(\lambda_*)\||\mu - \lambda_*|}{\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}\sigma_{\min}(L(\mu))} + O(|\mu - \lambda_*|^2),$$

which is (3.11). \square

Theorem 3.3 indicates that the residual norm $\|T(\mu)\hat{x}\| \rightarrow 0$ and $\hat{x} \rightarrow x_*$ provided that $\mu \rightarrow \lambda_*$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Recall from Theorem 3.2 that the convergence of the Ritz vector \tilde{x} requires that $\sigma_{\min}(C(\lambda_*))$ be uniformly bounded away from zero, which can be arbitrarily small whenever μ is a multiple Ritz value or is close to some other Ritz values. In contrast, the situation is fundamentally different for the refined Ritz vector \hat{x} since $\sigma_{\min}(L(\mu))$ must be uniformly positive for a simple λ_* as $\sigma_{\min}(L(\mu)) \rightarrow \sigma_{\min}(L(\lambda_*)) > 0$ when $\mu \rightarrow \lambda_*$.

Next we further compare the Ritz vector and the refined Ritz vector, and get more insight into them.

For the simple λ_* , the following result shows that $\sigma_{\min}(T(\mu))$ is a simple singular value of $T(\mu)$ when μ is close enough to λ_* , which will be exploited to establish the uniqueness of the refined Ritz vector \hat{x} .

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that λ_* is a simple eigenvalue of $T(\lambda)x = 0$. If μ is sufficiently close to λ_* such that*

$$(3.13) \quad \|T'(\lambda_*)\| |\mu - \lambda_*| + \gamma|\mu - \lambda_*|^2 < \frac{1}{2}\sigma_2(T(\lambda_*)),$$

where $\sigma_2(T(\lambda_*))$ is the second smallest singular value of $T(\lambda_*)$, then $\sigma_{\min}(T(\mu))$ is simple.

Proof. Under the assumption, $\sigma_{\min}(T(\lambda_*)) = 0$ is a simple singular value of $T(\lambda_*)$, meaning that

$$\sigma_2(T(\lambda_*)) > \sigma_{\min}(T(\lambda_*)) = 0.$$

From (3.12), we obtain

$$\|T(\mu) - T(\lambda_*)\| \leq \|T'(\lambda_*)\| |\mu - \lambda_*| + \gamma|\mu - \lambda_*|^2.$$

Therefore, by the standard perturbation theory, the errors of the i th smallest singular values $\sigma_i(\cdot)$ of $T(\mu)$ and $T(\lambda_*)$ satisfy

$$|\sigma_i(T(\mu)) - \sigma_i(T(\lambda_*))| \leq \|T'(\lambda_*)\| |\mu - \lambda_*| + \gamma|\mu - \lambda_*|^2,$$

from which it follows that

$$(3.14) \quad \sigma_2(T(\mu)) \geq \sigma_2(T(\lambda_*)) - \|T'(\lambda_*)\| |\mu - \lambda_*| - \gamma|\mu - \lambda_*|^2$$

and

$$(3.15) \quad \sigma_{\min}(T(\mu)) = \sigma_1(T(\mu)) \leq \|T'(\lambda_*)\| |\mu - \lambda_*| + \gamma|\mu - \lambda_*|^2 < \frac{1}{2}\sigma_2(T(\lambda_*)).$$

On the other hand, from (3.13) and (3.14) we obtain

$$\sigma_2(T(\mu)) > \frac{1}{2}\sigma_2(T(\lambda_*)),$$

which, together with (3.15), shows that $\sigma_{\min}(T(\mu))$ is a simple singular value of $T(\mu)$. \square

Based on Lemma 3.4, we can prove that, unlike the Ritz vector, the refined Ritz vector is unique, provided that $\mu \rightarrow \lambda_*$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $\hat{\sigma}_1 \leq \hat{\sigma}_2 \leq \dots \leq \hat{\sigma}_m$ be the singular values of $T(\mu)W$ with m the number of columns of W , and assume that λ_* is a simple eigenvalue of $T(\lambda)x = 0$ and that μ is sufficiently close to λ_* such that $\hat{\sigma}_1 < \frac{1}{2}\sigma_2(T(\lambda_*)) - \|T'(\lambda_*)\| |\mu - \lambda_*|$ and $\sigma_2(T(\lambda_*)) > 2\gamma|\mu - \lambda_*|^2$. Then $\hat{\sigma}_1$ is simple, and \hat{x} is unique.*

Proof. In terms of the eigenvalue interlacing property of the Hermitian matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} W^H \\ W_\perp^H \end{pmatrix} T^H(\mu)T(\mu) \begin{pmatrix} W & W_\perp \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} W^H T(\mu)^H T(\mu) W & W^H T(\mu)^H T(\mu) W_\perp \\ W_\perp^H T(\mu)^H T(\mu) W & W_\perp^H T(\mu)^H T(\mu) W_\perp \end{pmatrix},$$

we have $\hat{\sigma}_2 \geq \sigma_2(T(\mu))$. Then from (3.14) and the assumptions we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_2 - \hat{\sigma}_1 &\geq \sigma_2(T(\mu)) - \hat{\sigma}_1 \\ &\geq \sigma_2(T(\lambda_*)) - \|T'(\lambda_*)\| |\mu - \lambda_*| - \gamma|\mu - \lambda_*|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}\sigma_2(T(\lambda_*)) + \|T'(\lambda_*)\| |\mu - \lambda_*| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\sigma_2(T(\lambda_*)) - \gamma|\mu - \lambda_*|^2 > 0 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\hat{\sigma}_1$ is simple, and \hat{x} is unique. \square

Notice that, by definition, $\hat{\sigma}_1 = \|T(\mu)\hat{x}\|$. Relation (3.10) shows that $\hat{\sigma}_1 \rightarrow 0$ as $\mu \rightarrow \lambda_*$. Therefore, the conditions for $\hat{\sigma}_1$ and $\sigma_2(T(\lambda_*))$ are definitely met for μ sufficiently close to the simple eigenvalue λ_* . This theorem generalizes Theorem 2.2 of [19] to the NEP case.

We now construct an example to illustrate our results on the Ritz and refined Ritz vectors.

Example 3.6. Consider the REP $T(\lambda)x = 0$ with

$$T(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ 1 & \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\det(T(\lambda)) = \lambda(\lambda + 1)$, it has two eigenvalues -1 and 0 , each of which has algebraic and geometric multiplicities one (cf. [8] for the definition of algebraic and geometric multiplicities of an eigenvalue). Suppose that we want to compute the

eigenvalue $\lambda_* = 0$ and the associated eigenvector $x_* = e_3 = (0, 0, 1)^T$. We generate the subspace \mathcal{W} by the orthonormal matrix

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which contains the desired x_* exactly, i.e., $\varepsilon = 0$. The resulting projected matrix-valued function

$$B(\lambda) = W^H T(\lambda) W = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1} & 0 \\ \lambda^2 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\det(B(\lambda)) = \frac{\lambda^2}{\lambda-1}$, its eigenvalues, i.e., the Ritz values, are $\mu = 0$, whose algebraic and geometric multiplicities are two. Clearly, μ equals the desired simple eigenvalue $\lambda_* = 0$ of $T(\cdot)$. However, observe that any nonzero vector z satisfies $B(0)z = 0$, meaning that any nonzero vector is an eigenvector of $B(0)$. Therefore, the Ritz vector $\tilde{x} = Wz$ is not unique, and there are two linearly independent ones, each of which is formally an approximation to $x_* = e_3$, causing the failure of the Rayleigh–Ritz method because $B(0)$ itself does not give us any clue to which vector should be chosen. For instance, we might choose $z = (\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})^T$, in which case we get a Ritz vector $\tilde{x} = (\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})^T$, a completely meaningless approximation to e_3 , and the residual norm $\|T(0)\tilde{x}\| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$.

In contrast, the matrix

$$T(0)W = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

is column rank deficient has rank one. It is easily justified that its right singular vector with the smallest singular value zero is uniquely $y^T = (1, 0)^T$. Therefore, the refined Ritz vector $\hat{x} = Wy$ is unique and precisely equals the desired eigenvector e_3 . Naturally, the residual norm $\|T(0)\hat{x}\| = 0$. This example demonstrates that the superiority of the refined Ritz vector to the Ritz vector.

4. BOUNDS FOR THE ERROR OF THE RITZ VECTOR AND THE REFINED RITZ VECTOR

In this section, we continue to explore the Ritz vector and the refined Ritz vector, derive lower and upper bounds for $\sin \angle(\tilde{x}, \hat{x})$, and shed more light on these two vectors and the implications of the bounds on the residual norms obtained by the Rayleigh–Ritz method and the refined Rayleigh–Ritz method.

Recall that the refined Ritz vector $\hat{x} = Wy$ with y being the right singular vector of $T(\mu)W$ associated with its smallest singular value $\hat{\sigma}_1$, and keep in mind the Ritz vector $\tilde{x} = Wz$ and (3.6). We can establish the following results.

Theorem 4.1. *With decomposition (3.6), if $\sigma_{\min}(C(\mu)) > 0$, i.e., μ is a simple eigenvalue of $B(\cdot)$, then*

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{\hat{\sigma}_1 \|(WZ_\perp)^H s\|}{\sigma_{\max}(C(\mu))} \leq \sin \angle(\tilde{x}, \hat{x}) \leq \frac{\hat{\sigma}_1 \|W^H s\|}{\sigma_{\min}(C(\mu))},$$

where $\sigma_{\max}(C(\mu))$ is the largest singular value of $C(\mu)$ and s is the left singular vector of $T(\mu)W$ associated with its smallest singular value $\hat{\sigma}_1$.

Proof. Since $\hat{\sigma}_1$ is the smallest singular value of $T(\mu)W$, we have

$$(4.2) \quad B(\mu)y = W^H T(\mu)W y = \hat{\sigma}_1 W^H s.$$

By (3.6) and (4.2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} z^H \\ Z_\perp^H \end{pmatrix} B(\mu) \begin{pmatrix} z & Z_\perp \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z^H \\ Z_\perp^H \end{pmatrix} y &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & z^H B(\mu) Z_\perp \\ 0 & C(\mu) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z^H \\ Z_\perp^H \end{pmatrix} y \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} z^H B(\mu) Z_\perp Z_\perp^H y \\ C(\mu) Z_\perp^H y \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_1 z^H W^H s \\ \hat{\sigma}_1 Z_\perp^H W^H s \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (4.2). Therefore,

$$C(\mu) Z_\perp^H y = \hat{\sigma}_1 Z_\perp^H W^H s.$$

By the orthonormality of W and the above relation, we obtain

$$(4.3) \quad \sin \angle(\tilde{x}, \hat{x}) = \sin \angle(z, y) = \|Z_\perp^H y\| = \hat{\sigma}_1 \|C^{-1}(\mu)(W Z_\perp)^H s\|,$$

from which it follows that

$$(4.4) \quad \frac{\hat{\sigma}_1 \|(W Z_\perp)^H s\|}{\sigma_{\max}(C(\mu))} \leq \sin \angle(\tilde{x}, \hat{x}) \leq \frac{\hat{\sigma}_1 \|(W Z_\perp)^H s\|}{\sigma_{\min}(C(\mu))} \leq \frac{\hat{\sigma}_1 \|W^H s\|}{\sigma_{\min}(C(\mu))}.$$

□

Since $\hat{\sigma}_1 \rightarrow 0$ as $\mu \rightarrow \lambda_*$ for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the upper bound in (4.1) shows that $\sigma_{\min}(C(\mu)) > 0$ uniformly is a sufficient condition for $\tilde{x} \rightarrow \hat{x}$. This uniform condition is essentially in accordance with that in Theorem 3.2, which ensures the convergence of \tilde{x} . The lower bound tends to zero provided that $\hat{\sigma}_1 \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, generally $\sin \angle(\tilde{x}, \hat{x}) = 0$ if and only if $\hat{\sigma}_1 = 0$; in other words, if $\hat{x} \neq x$, then $\tilde{x} \neq \hat{x}$ generally. This theorem is an extension of Theorem 3.1 in [19].

Denote $\tilde{r} = T(\mu)\tilde{x}$ and $\hat{r} = T(\mu)\hat{x}$, respectively. By definition, we trivially have $\|\hat{r}\| \leq \|\tilde{r}\|$. The following theorem gives more insightful relationships between them.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\hat{\sigma}_1$ and $\hat{\sigma}_m$ be the smallest and largest singular values of $T(\mu)W$. The following results hold:*

$$(4.5) \quad \cos^2 \angle(\tilde{x}, \hat{x}) + \left(\frac{\hat{\sigma}_2}{\hat{\sigma}_1}\right)^2 \sin^2 \angle(\tilde{x}, \hat{x}) \leq \frac{\|\tilde{r}\|^2}{\|\hat{r}\|^2} \leq \cos^2 \angle(\tilde{x}, \hat{x}) + \left(\frac{\hat{\sigma}_m}{\hat{\sigma}_1}\right)^2 \sin^2 \angle(\tilde{x}, \hat{x}).$$

Proof. Note $\|\hat{r}\| = \hat{\sigma}_1$. The proof is completely similar to that of Theorem 4.1 in [19] and is thus omitted. □

By Theorem 4.2, we may have $\|\hat{r}\| \ll \|\tilde{r}\|$ because the upper bound for $\frac{\|\tilde{r}\|}{\|\hat{r}\|}$ in (4.5) may be much bigger than one, as our previous example has illustrated. This is because $\sin \angle(\tilde{x}, \hat{x})$ may tend to zero much more slowly than $\hat{\sigma}_1$ and it may be not small and even can be arbitrarily close to one, as Theorem 4.1 indicates.

In practice it is rare that the subspace \mathcal{W} contains the desired eigenvector exactly. Let us further investigate Example 1 and show that the Rayleigh–Ritz method may fail and $\frac{\|\tilde{r}\|}{\|\hat{r}\|} \gg 1$ for ε sufficiently small.

Example 4.3. In Example ??, perturb W by a random normal deviation matrix with standard deviation of 10^{-4} and orthonormalize W . Then $\varepsilon = O(10^{-4})$, and the projected matrix-valued function

$$B(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda - 1} \begin{pmatrix} b_{11}(\lambda) & b_{12}(\lambda) \\ b_{21}(\lambda) & b_{22}(\lambda) \end{pmatrix}$$

with $b_{11}(\lambda) = (8.8849e - 05)\lambda^3 - (8.8828e - 05)\lambda^2 + \lambda + 2.0385e - 08$, $b_{12}(\lambda) = (7.8972e - 09)\lambda^3 - (8.8891e - 05)\lambda^2 + (2.9251e - 04)\lambda - 1.1475e - 04$, $b_{21}(\lambda) = -\lambda^3 + \lambda^2 + (2.9251e - 04)\lambda - 1.1475e - 04$, and $b_{22}(\lambda) = -(8.8883e - 05)\lambda^3 + 1.0001\lambda^2 - 1.0006\lambda + 5.8885e - 04$.

Notice that, in the numerator of $\det(B(\lambda)) = 0$, the coefficients of λ^6 and λ^5 are exactly zero. The eigenvalues of $B(\lambda)$ are $7.3993e + 03$, $-4.0016e + 03$, $5.6570e - 04$, $2.3256e - 05$. According to Algorithm 1, we take the smallest $2.3256e - 05$ in magnitude to approximate the desired eigenvalue zero. Then the associated Ritz vector is

$$\tilde{x} = (1.9873e - 01, 5.3892e - 05, -9.8005e - 01)^T,$$

which is an approximation to the desired $x_* = e_3$ with little accuracy as $\sin \angle(\tilde{x}, e_3) = 1.9873e - 01 = O(1)$, and the corresponding residual norm is $\|\tilde{r}\| = \|T(\mu)\tilde{x}\| = 1.9873e - 01 = O(1)$.

In contrast, the refined Ritz vector is

$$\hat{x} = (-2.8435e - 08, -1.1469e - 04, 1)^T,$$

which is an excellent approximation to the eigenvector e_3 with accuracy $\sin \angle(\hat{x}, e_3) = 1.1469e - 04 = O(\varepsilon)$, and the residual norm is $\|\hat{r}\| = \|T(\mu)\hat{x}\| = 1.1703e - 04 = O(\varepsilon)$.

Based on the above results, we have $\sin \angle(\tilde{x}, \hat{x}) = 1.9872e - 01$ and the ratio

$$\frac{\|\hat{r}\|}{\|\tilde{r}\|} = 5.8887e - 04 = O(\varepsilon).$$

Note that $\hat{\sigma}_1 = 1.1703e - 04$. Then we see that the lower and upper bounds in (4.4) are very close and they estimate the ratio very accurately.

As a matter of fact, for this example, if we perturb W by a random normal deviation matrix with standard deviation of an arbitrarily small ε , then we always have $\sin \angle(\tilde{x}, e_3) = O(1)$ and $\|\tilde{r}\| = O(1)$ but $\sin \angle(\hat{x}, e_3) = O(\varepsilon)$ and $\|\hat{r}\| = O(\varepsilon)$. These demonstrate that the refined Rayleigh–Ritz method may work much better than the Rayleigh–Ritz method and the latter may produce very poor approximate eigenvectors.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have studied the Rayleigh–Ritz method and the refined Rayleigh–Ritz method for computing a simple eigepair of (1.1). We have established a priori error bounds for the Ritz value, the Ritz vector and the refined Ritz vector, and given sufficient conditions for their convergence, respectively. We have also derived lower and upper bounds for the error of the Ritz vector and the refined Ritz vector as well as for the ratio of the residual norms obtained by the two methods. We have constructed a few examples to illustrate the theoretical results and the merit of the refined Ritz vector. These results have nontrivially extended those in [19, 20, 21] for the linear eigenvalue problem to the NEP. They have shown that the refined Ritz vector is unique and can be much more accurately than the Ritz

vector; consequently, the residual norm by the refined Rayleigh–Ritz method can be much smaller than that by the Rayleigh–Ritz method.

The results provide necessary theoretical supports for these two kinds of projection methods for numerical solutions of large NEPs.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. M. Betcke and H. Voss, *Stationary Schrödinger equations governing electronic states of quantum dots in the presence of spin-orbit splitting*, Appl. Math. **52** (2007), 267–284.
- [2] T. Betcke, N. J. Higham, V. Mehrmann, C. Schröder, and F. Tisseur, *NLEVP: A collection of nonlinear eigenvalue problems*, ACM Trans. Math. Software **39** (2013), no. 2, 1–28.
- [3] T. Betcke and H. Voss, *A Jacobi-Davidson-type projection method for nonlinear eigenvalue problems*, Future Gen. Comp. Syst. **20** (2004), 363–372.
- [4] J. S. Bramely and S. C. R. Dannis, *The calculation of eigenvalues for the stationary perturbation of poiseuille flow*, J. Comput. Phys. **47** (1982), 179–198.
- [5] D. M. Day and T. F. Walsh, *Quadratic eigenvalue problems*, Sandia Report SAND2007-2072, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87185 and Livermore, California 94550 (2007).
- [6] F. M. Dopico, S. Marcaida, M. C. Quintana, and P. Van Dooren, *Local linearizations of rational matrices with application to rational approximations of nonlinear eigenvalue problems*, Linear Algebra Appl. **604** (2020), 441–475.
- [7] S. Güttel, G. M. N. Porzio, and F. Tisseur, *Robust rational approximations of nonlinear eigenvalue problems*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **44** (2022), A2439–A2463.
- [8] S. Güttel and F. Tisseur, *The nonlinear eigenvalue problem*, Acta Numer. **26** (2017), 1–94.
- [9] N. J. Higham, G. M. Negri Porzio, and F. Tisseur, *An updated set of nonlinear eigenvalue problems*, MIMS EPrint 2019.5, Manchester Institute for Mathematical Sciences, The University of Manchester, UK, March 2019.
- [10] A. Hilliges, C. Mehl, and V. Mehrmann, *On the solution of palindromic eigenvalue problems*, In Proceedings of the 4th European Congress on Computational Methods in Applied Sciences and Engineering (ECCOMAS), Jyväskylä, Finland, 2004.
- [11] M. E. Hochstenbach and G. L. G. Sleijpen, *Harmonic and refined Rayleigh–Ritz for the polynomial eigenvalue problem*, Numer. Linear Algebra Appl. **15** (2008), 35–54.
- [12] H. Y. Hu and Z. H. Wang, *Dynamics of Controlled Mechanical Systems with Delayed Feedback*, 2nd ed., Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2002.
- [13] T. M. Huang, Z. Jia, and W. W. Lin, *On the convergence of Ritz pairs and refined Ritz vectors for quadratic eigenvalue problems*, BIT Numer. Math. **53** (2013), 941–958.
- [14] N. K. Jain and K. Singhal, *On Kublanovskaya’s approach to the solution of the generalized latent value problem for functional λ -matrices*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **20** (1983), 1062–1070.
- [15] Z. Jia, *The convergence of generalized Lanczos methods for large unsymmetric eigenproblems*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **16** (1995), 843–862.
- [16] ———, *Refined iterative algorithms based on Arnoldi’s process for large unsymmetric eigenproblems*, Linear Algebra Appl. **259** (1997), 1–23.
- [17] ———, *Polynomial characterizations of the approximate eigenvectors by the refined Arnoldi method and an implicitly restarted refined Arnoldi algorithm*, Linear Algebra Appl. **287** (1999), 191–214.
- [18] ———, *A refined subspace iteration algorithm for large sparse eigenproblems*, Applied Numer. Math. **32** (2000), 35–52.
- [19] ———, *Some theoretical comparisons of refined Ritz vectors and Ritz vectors*, Science in China Ser. A Mathematics **47** (2004), 222–233.
- [20] Z. Jia and G. W. Stewart, *On the convergence of Ritz values, Ritz vectors, and refined Ritz vectors*, TR-99-08, Institute for Advanced Computer Studies and TR-3986, Department of Computer Science, University of Maryland, College Park (1999).
- [21] ———, *An analysis of the Rayleigh–Ritz method for approximating eigenspaces*, Math. Comput. **70** (2001), 637–647.
- [22] C. W. Kim and J. K. Bennighof, *Fast frequency response analysis of large-scale structures with non-proportional damping*, Int. J. Numer. Methods Eng. **69** (2007), 978–992.
- [23] V. N. Kublanovskaya, *On an approach to the solution of the generalized latent value problem for λ -matrices*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **7** (1970), 532–537.

- [24] P. Lancaster, *Lambda-matrices and vibrating systems*, 2nd ed., Dover Publications, Mineola, New York, 2002.
- [25] D. Leguillon and E. Sanchez-Palencia, *On 3d cracks intersecting a free surface in laminated composites*, Int. J. Fracture **99** (1999), 25–40.
- [26] B. S. Liao, Z. J. Bai, L. Q. Lee, and K. Ko, *Nonlinear Rayleigh–Ritz iterative method for solving large scale nonlinear eigenvalue problems*, Taiwanese J. Math. **14** (2010), 869–883.
- [27] D. S. Mackey, N. Mackey, C. Mehl, and V. Mehrmann, *Palindromic polynomial eigenvalue problems: Good vibrations from good linearizations*, Technical Report, TU Berlin, Inst. f. Mathematik, Berlin, Germany, 2004.
- [28] K. Meerbergen, W. Michiels, R. V. Beeumeny, and E. Mengi, *Computation of pseudospectral abscissa for large-scale nonlinear eigenvalue problems*, IMA J. Numer. Anal. **37** (2017), 1831–1863.
- [29] V. Mehrmann and H. Voss, *Nonlinear eigenvalue problems: a challenge for modern eigenvalue methods*, GAMM Mitt. Ges. Angew. Math. Mech. **27** (2004), 121–152.
- [30] V. Mehrmann and D. Watkins, *Structure-preserving methods for computing eigenpairs of large sparse skew-Hamiltonian/Hamiltonian pencils*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **22** (2001), 1905–1925.
- [31] G. M. Negri Porzio, *Nonlinear eigenvalue problems: theory and algorithms*, Ph.D thesis, The University of Manchester (United Kingdom) (2021).
- [32] A. Neumaier, *Residual inverse iteration for the nonlinear eigenvalue problem*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **22** (1985), 914–923.
- [33] J. S. Przemieniecki, *Theory of Matrix Structural Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968.
- [34] M. A. Qazi, *The mean value theorem and analytic functions of a complex variable*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **324** (2006), 30–38.
- [35] K. Rothe, *Least squares element method for boundary eigenvalue problems*, Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg. **33** (1992), 2129–2143.
- [36] A. Ruhe, *Algorithms for the nonlinear eigenvalue problem*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **10** (1973), 674–689.
- [37] Y. Saad, M. El-Guide, and A. Midelar, *A rational approximation method for the nonlinear eigenvalue problem*.
- [38] H. Schwetlick and K. Schreiber, *Nonlinear Rayleigh functionals*, Linear Algebra Appl. **436** (2012), 3991–4016.
- [39] G. W. Stewart, *Matrix algorithms, vol. ii: Eigensystems*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2001.
- [40] W. Sun and K. M. Liu, *Iterative algorithms for nonlinear ordinary differential eigenvalue problems*, Appl. Numer. Math. **38** (2001), 361–376.
- [41] F. Tisseur and K. Meerbergen, *The quadratic eigenvalue problem*, SIAM Rev. **43** (2002), 235–286.
- [42] P. Van Dooren, *The computation of Kronecker’s canonical form of a singular pencil*, Linear Algebra Appl. **27** (1979), 103–140.
- [43] H. Vandervorst, *Computational Methods for Large Eigenvalue Problems*, Handbook of Numerical Analysis **8** (2002), 3–179.
- [44] H. Voss, *Free vibration analysis by finite dynamic element methods*, Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Numerical Analysis (Prague, 1987), pp. 295–298, Teubner-Texte Math., 107, Teubner, Leipzig, 1988.
- [45] ———, *An Arnoldi method for nonlinear eigenvalue problems*, BIT Numer. Math. **44** (2004), 387–401.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, 100084 BEIJING, CHINA
 Email address: jiazx@tsinghua.edu.cn

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, CHINA UNIVERSITY OF PETROLEUM, BEIJING 102249, CHINA
 Email address: zhengqq@cup.edu.cn