Karel Najzar Stability of the method of least squares for finding the eigenvalues of a symmetric operator

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 11 (1970), No. 4, 641--655

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/105305

## Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1970

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* http://project.dml.cz

## Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae 11,4 (1970)

## STABILITY OF THE METHOD OF LEAST SQUARES FOR FINDING THE EIGENVALUES OF A SYMMETRIC OPERATOR

K. NAJZAR, Praha

In [1,2,3], we studied the method of least sugares for approximating the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of a DS-operator. In this paper, we shall deal with the stability of this method for finding the eigenvalues.

Let A be a DS-operator whose domain  $\mathcal{D}(A)$  is dense in the separable Hilbert space H, i.e., A is a symmetric operator in H such that the set of its eigenvalues is of the first category on the real axis and the spectrum  $\mathcal{O}(A)$ of A is the closure of this set. Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a real number such that the following conditions be satisfied:

(1) 1) u ē o(A).

2) There exists an eigenvalue  $\lambda_{j}$  of A such that

$$\inf_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{A})}} |\lambda - \mu| = |\lambda_{j} - \mu|.$$

For the sake of brevity we shall sometimes write  $A_{\mu}$ instead of  $A - \mu I$ , where I denotes the identity operator in H. The principle of finding  $A_{j}$  by using the method of least squares can be outlined as follows.

By Theorem 3 of [1] we have

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} q_m = (\lambda_j - \mu l),$$

where

- 641 -

(2) 
$$q_{m} = \min_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{L}\{\mathcal{U}_{i}\}_{i=1}^{n} \\ u \neq 0}} \frac{\|Au - uu\|^{2}}{\|u\|^{2}}$$

and thus  $\mu + q_m$  or  $\mu - q_m$  is the approximation to  $\lambda_{j'}$ (cf.[1],[2] and [3]). The number  $q_m^2$  is the smallest eigenvalue of the algebraic eigenvalue problem

 $(3) \qquad (\mathcal{A}_m - \mathcal{O}\mathcal{B}_m)\mathcal{U} = 0,$ 

where  $\mathcal{A}_{n}$  and  $\mathcal{B}_{n}$  are symmetric matrices

$$\mathcal{A}_{m} = \{ (A_{u}, \Psi_{i}, A_{u}, \Psi_{j}) \}_{i,j=1}^{m},$$
  
$$\mathcal{B}_{m} = \{ (\Psi_{i}, \Psi_{j}) \}_{i,j=1}^{m}.$$

The matrix  $\mathcal{B}_m$  is known as the Gram matrix of  $\mathcal{Y}_q, ...$ ...,  $\mathcal{Y}_m$ . Since  $\mathcal{Y}_q, ..., \mathcal{Y}_m$  are linearly independent,  $\mathcal{B}_m$  is positive definite. On the basis of the assumptions relative to  $\alpha$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{A}_m$  (as the Gram matrix of linearly independent vectors) is a positive definite matrix.

Let  $\delta_1^{(n)} \leq \delta_2^{(n)} \leq \ldots \leq \delta_m^{(n)}$  be the eigenvalues of (1). Then  $q_m^2 = \delta_1^{(n)}$ . Since  $q_{n+1} \leq q_m$ , the sequence  $\{\delta_1^{(m)}\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$  is monotone decreasing. It follows that

(4)  $\inf_{m=1}^{n} 6_{1}^{(m)} = \lim_{m \to \infty} 6_{1}^{(m)} = (\mu - \lambda_{j})^{2}$ .

In numerical work, it is usually impossible to carry out all required calculations with unlimited precision. Thus, the actual results  $\widetilde{\sigma}_{Ac}^{(m)}$  one obtains, do not satisfy (3), but rather

(5) 
$$[(\mathcal{A}_{m}+\Gamma_{n})-(\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B}_{m}+\mathcal{A}_{m})]\mathcal{V}=0,$$

where  $\Gamma_m$  and  $\Delta_m$  are symmetric matrices.

If  $\|\Gamma_m\|$  is small, one expects that  $\tilde{G}_{\mu}^{(m)}$  will also differ only slightly from  $\tilde{G}_{\mu}^{(m)}$  for  $m \ge m_0$ . Regarding (5) as a perturbation of (3), one may then say, loosely speaking, that the method for finding  $A_j$  defined by (2) and (3) is stable if  $\tilde{G}_{\eta}^{(m)}$  is not very sensitive to small perturbances  $\Gamma_m$  and  $A_m$ .

In Section 1, we shall define the stability of the method of least squares for finding  $\lambda_j$  defined by (2) and (3). We shall formulate a necessary and sufficient condition for the stability. In Section 2, we give conditions which guarantee that the method of least squares for finding  $\lambda_j$ is stable in the sense of Michlin [4].

1. Let  $\mu_1^{(m)} \leq \mu_2^{(m)} \leq \ldots \leq \mu_m^{(m)}$  be an enumeration of eigenvalues of the problem (5). Denote the smallest eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{A}_m$  and  $\mathcal{B}_m$  by  $\mathcal{A}_1^{(m)}$  and  $t_1^{(m)}$ , respectively. Since  $\mathcal{A}_m$  and  $\mathcal{B}_m$  are positive definite matrices, it follows that  $\mathcal{A}_1^{(m)} > 0$  and  $t_1^{(m)} > 0$  for any positive integer m.

The definition of the stability of the method of least squares for finding the eigenvalues is as follows.

Definition 1. Let  $\Gamma_{n}$  and  $\Delta_{n}$  be symmetric matrices. Let  $(u_{1}^{(n)})$  and  $\sigma_{1}^{(n)}$  be the smallest eigenvalues of (3) and (5), respectively. The method of least squares for finding  $\Lambda_{j}$  defined by (2) and (3) will be said to be stable, if there exist positive constants  $p, \kappa, \kappa, q$  which do not depend on m such that

- 643 -

 $|\mathcal{G}_{1}^{(m)} - \mu_{1}^{(m)}| \leq p \cdot \|\mathcal{\Gamma}_{m}\| + q \cdot \|\mathcal{\Delta}_{m}\|$ 

for every  $\Gamma_n$ ,  $\Delta_n$  satisfying the following inequalities  $\|\Gamma_n\| \le \kappa$ ,  $\|\Delta_n\| \le \beta$ ,

where  $\| \prod_{m} \|$  denotes the Euclidean norm of  $\prod_{m}$  .

Let us now recall from [4] the terminology about the strongly minimal system in  $\mathcal H$ .

<u>Definition 2</u> (cf. Michlin [4], p.20). Let there be given a linearly independent system  $\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ . Denote the smallest eigenvalue of the Gram matrix of  $\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m$  by  $c_1^{(m)}$ . This system  $\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  will be said strongly minimal in  $\mathcal{H}$  if  $\inf_{n=1}^{\infty} c_1^{(m)} > 0$ .

<u>Remark 1</u>. Let  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  be an orthonormal system. Then  $\inf_{m} c_1^{(m)} = 1$  and consequently  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is a strongly minimal system in H.

The following theorem is needed.

<u>Theorem 1</u>. Let there be given two Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_2$  with the following properties:

a) ue H, => ue H, .

b) There exists a constant K such that

$$\begin{split} \| \boldsymbol{u} \|_2 & \leq \mathbf{K} \cdot \| \boldsymbol{u} \|_1 \quad \text{for any } \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{H}_1 \ , \\ \text{where } \| \boldsymbol{u} \|_1 \quad \text{and } \| \boldsymbol{u} \|_2 \quad \text{are norms on } \mathcal{H}_1 \quad \text{and } \mathcal{H}_2 \ , \\ \text{respectively.} \end{split}$$

Let  $\{\Psi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ ,  $\Psi_i \in \mathcal{H}_1$  be a strongly minimal system in  $\mathcal{H}_2$ . Then the system  $\{\Psi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is also strongly minimal in  $\mathcal{H}_1$ . If we denote the smallest eigenvalue of the matrices  $\{(\Psi_i, \Psi_j)_{i,j=1}^{m}$  and  $\{(\Psi_i, \Psi_j)_{2}\}_{i,j=1}^{\infty}$  by  $\mathcal{H}_1^{(m)}$ and  $t_1^{(m)}$ , respectively, then we have

- 644 -

$$\kappa_1^{(m)} \geq \frac{1}{k^2} s_1^{(m)}$$

Proof: Michlin [4],p.25.

Since  $\mu \in \mathcal{O}(A)$ , we see that  $(A_{\mu}u, A_{\mu}v)$  is a scalar product on  $\mathcal{D}(A)$ . Consequently,  $\|u\|_{1}^{2} = (A_{\mu}u, A_{\mu}u)$  is a norm on  $\mathcal{D}(A)$ . The complete hull of  $\mathcal{D}(A)$  with the norm  $\|u\|_{1}$  will be denoted by  $H_{1}$ . From the definition of  $A_{i}$ , it follows that

 $\|u\|_{1} = \|A_{\mu}u\| \ge |\mu - \lambda_{1}| \cdot \|u\|.$ If we apply Theorem 1 with H in place of  $\mathcal{H}_{2}$  and  $H_{1}$  in place of  $\mathcal{H}_{2}$ , we obtain the following

Lemma 1. Let  $\{\Psi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ ,  $\Psi_i \in \mathcal{D}(A)$  be a strongly minimal system in H. Then the system  $\{A_{\ell i}, \Psi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is strongly minimal in H and the smallest eigenvalues  $\mathcal{A}_1^{(m)}$  and  $t_1^{(m)}$  satisfy the following relation

$$\lambda_1^{(n)} \geq ((\mu - \lambda_j)^2 \cdot t_1^{(n)})$$

As an application of the result of Theorem 1, we have

Lemma 2. Let  $\{\Psi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ ,  $\Psi_i \in \mathcal{D}(A)$  be a linearly independent system such that the system  $\{A_{\mu_0}, \Psi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is strongly minimal in H for some  $\mu_i \in \mathcal{O}(A)$ . Then the system  $\{A_{\mu_i}, \Psi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is strongly minimal in H for every  $\mu \in \mathcal{O}(A)$ .

<u>Proof</u>: Choose any  $\mu \in \mathcal{E}(A)$ . Let  $\|\mu\|_{q} = \|A_{\mu}\mu\|$ and  $\|\mu\|_{2} = \|A_{\mu}\mu\|$ . Since  $\mu_{0} \in \mathcal{E}(A)$ ,  $\|\mu\|_{q}$  and  $\|\mu\|_{2}$  are the norms on  $\mathcal{D}(A)$ . The complete hull of  $\mathcal{D}(A)$ with  $\|\mu\|_{q}$  and  $\|\mu\|_{2}$  will be denoted by  $\mathcal{H}_{q}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{2}$ , respectively. Obviously

- 645 -

$$A_{\mu\nu} u = A_{\mu} u + (\mu - \mu_{\circ}) \cdot A_{\mu}^{-1} A_{\mu} u$$

and hence

 $\|u\|_{2} \leq (1+|\mu-\mu_{0}|\cdot\|A_{\mu}^{-1}\|)\cdot\|u\|_{1} .$ From this it follows that  $\mathcal{H}_{1} \subset \mathcal{H}_{2}$ . The conclusion of this lemma now follows from Theorem 1.

The following fundamental result gives us a necessary and sufficient condition for the stability.

<u>Theorem 2</u>. Let A be a DS-operator in Hilbert space H and let  $\{\Psi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  be a totally complete system. Then, with the assumptions of (1) the method of least squares for finding  $\Lambda_j$  defined by (2) and (3) is stable if and only if the system  $\{\Psi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is strongly minimal in H. When this condition is fulfilled, we can choose  $n, q, \kappa, s$ in Definition 1 as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 n = \frac{1}{t - 5} , \\
 Q = \frac{1}{t - 5} \cdot \frac{\|A_{cc} \Psi_{T}\|^{2}}{\|\Psi_{T}\|^{2}}
 \end{array}$$

where  $\kappa$  and  $\delta$  are arbitrary numbers in  $(0, (\lambda_j - \mu)^2, t)$ and (0, t), respectively,  $t = \inf_{m \in T} t_1^{(m)}$ .

<u>Proof</u>: Suppose that the method of least squares for finding  $\lambda_j$  is stable but that the system  $\{\Psi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is not strongly minimal in H. Then, by Definition 1, there exist positive constants  $p, q, \kappa, \delta$  such that (6)  $\|S_1^{(m)} - u_1^{(m)}\| \le p \cdot \|\Gamma_m\| + q \cdot \|\Delta_m\|$ for symmetric matrices  $\Gamma_m$  and  $\Delta_m$  satisfying  $\|\Gamma_m\| \le \kappa$ ,  $\|\Delta_m\| \le \delta$ .

- 646 -

Since  $\inf_{m} t_{1}^{(m)} = 0$ , there is an infinite set M of positive integers such that  $\inf_{m \in M} t_{1}^{(m)} = 0$  and  $h > 2 t_{1}^{(m)} > 0$  for  $m \in M$ . Choose  $\prod_{m} = 0$  and  $\Delta_{m} = -2 t_{1}^{(m)}$ .  $E_{m}$  for every  $m \in M$ , where  $E_{m}$  is the identity matrix. In this case it follows from (6) that

 $| \mathcal{G}_{1}^{(m)} - (u_{1}^{(m)}) | \leq 2 q \cdot t_{1}^{(m)}, \quad m \in M .$ Hence, since  $\lim_{m \to \infty} \mathcal{G}_{1}^{(m)} = (\mu - \lambda_{j})^{2} > 0$  and  $\inf_{m \in M} t_{1}^{(m)} = 0,$ 

there exists some  $m_{o} \in M$  such that

$$(u_1^{(m_y)} > \frac{1}{2} (u - \lambda_j)^2 > 0$$
.

This last inequality shows that the eigenvalues of the problem

(7) 
$$A_{m_o}u - (u (B_{m_o} + A_{m_o})u = 0)$$

are positive.

Since the  $\mathcal{A}_{m_o}$  is a positive definite matrix, we see that every eigenvalue of the problem (1C) is one of the problem

$$v - \mu \mathcal{A}_{m_o}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathcal{B}_{m_o} + \Delta_{m_o}) \mathcal{A}_{m_o}^{-\frac{1}{2}} v = 0$$

and conversely.

Note that

$$\mathcal{Q}_{m_o} = \mathcal{A}_{m_o}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathcal{B}_{m_o} + \mathcal{A}_{m_o} \right) \mathcal{A}_{m_o}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

is a symmetric matrix. Consequently,  $\mathcal{Q}_{m_o}$  is positive definite. It follows that

(8) 
$$f(u) = (Q_{m_o}u, u) > 0$$

for every  $\mu \neq 0$ .

We know that  $t_1^{(m_p)}$  is the smallest eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{B}_{m_p}$ . If we denote a normalized eigenfunction of  $\mathcal{B}_{m_p}$  corresponding to  $t_1^{(m_p)}$  by v, we have

- 647 -

$$(\mathcal{B}_{m_{0}} + \Delta_{m_{0}})v = -t_{1}^{(m_{0})}v .$$
  
Let  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{A}_{m_{0}}^{\frac{1}{2}}v$ . Then  
 $\mathcal{Q}_{m}\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{A}_{m_{0}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{B}_{m_{0}} + \Delta_{m_{0}})v = -t_{1}^{(m_{0})}\mathcal{A}_{m_{0}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}v$ .

Therefore it follows

$$f(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = (\boldsymbol{Q}_{m_0}\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = -t_1^{(m_0)} \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|^2 < 0 .$$
  
This contradicts the inequality of (8).

Conversely, suppose now that  $\{\mathcal{U}_{i}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is a strongly minimal system in H. For the sake of simplicity, we shall use the notation

$$F(C, D, u) = \frac{(Cu, u)}{(Du, u)} ,$$

where C, D are  $(m \times m)$  real matrices and  $\mu$  is a vector. It follows from Lemma 1 that

(9)  $\inf \lambda_{j}^{(n)} \ge (\alpha - \lambda_{j})^{2} \cdot t$ , where  $t = \inf_{m} t_{j}^{(n)} > 0$ . Choose  $\kappa$  and  $\beta$  so that

$$(10) \quad 0 < \kappa < (\mu - \lambda_j)^{-} \cdot t, \quad 0 < \kappa < t$$

Suppose that  $\Gamma_n$  and  $\varDelta_n$  are symmetric matrices such that

(11) 
$$\|\Gamma_{m}\| \leq \kappa, \|\Delta_{m}\| \leq 5$$

From (9),(10) and (11) it is easy to see that  $(\prod_{m} + A_{m})$  and  $(B_{m} + \Delta_{m})$  are positive definite matrices. Consequently,

$$\mathcal{G}_{1}^{(n)} = \min_{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|=1} \mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{A}_{n}, \boldsymbol{B}_{n}, \boldsymbol{u}) ,$$

- 648 -

(12) 
$$(u_1^{(m)} = \min_{\substack{\mu \in \mu = 1 }} F(\mathcal{A}_n + \Gamma_n, \mathcal{B}_n + \Delta_n, u) .$$

Choose v and w such that |v| = 1, ||w| = 1 and

$$\begin{split} & \boldsymbol{\mathcal{G}}_{1}^{(n)} = \mathbf{F} \left( \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{n}^{}, \, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}_{n}^{}, \, \boldsymbol{v} \right) \;, \\ & \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_{1}^{(n)} = \mathbf{F} \left( \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_{n}^{} + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{n}^{}, \, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}_{n}^{} + \boldsymbol{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{n}^{}, \, \boldsymbol{v} \right) \;. \end{split}$$

Hence, by (12)

$$\mu_{1}^{(m)} - \tilde{6}_{1}^{(m)} \leq \frac{(\tilde{A}_{m} v; v) + \|\Gamma_{m}\|}{(\tilde{B}_{m} v; v) - \|\Delta_{m}\|} - \tilde{6}_{1}^{(m)},$$

whence

$$\mu_{1}^{(n)} - \delta_{1}^{(n)} \leq \frac{\|\Gamma_{n}\| + \delta_{1}^{(n)} \cdot \|\Delta_{n}\|}{(\beta_{n} v, v) - \|\Delta_{n}\|}$$

Since  $(\mathcal{B}_n, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}) \ge t_1^{(m)} > t$  and  $\mathcal{G}_1^{(m)} \le \mathcal{G}_1^{(1)}$ , it follows from (10) and (11) that

. ...

(13) 
$$(u_1^{(n)} - \sigma_1^{(n)}) \leq \frac{\|\Gamma_n\| + \sigma_1^{(1)} \cdot \|A_n\|}{t - s}$$

It is easily verified that

$$\mu_{1}^{(n)} = \frac{F(\mathcal{A}_{m}, \mathcal{B}_{n}, w) + F(\Gamma_{n}, \mathcal{B}_{n}, w)}{1 + F(\mathcal{A}_{n}, \mathcal{B}_{n}, w)}$$

Since

and

$$\begin{split} F(\mathcal{A}_{m}, \mathcal{B}_{n}, w) &\geq \sigma_{1}^{(n)} , \\ F(\Gamma_{n}, \mathcal{B}_{n}, w) &\geq -\frac{\|\Gamma_{n}\|}{t^{(m)}} , \\ |F(\Delta_{n}, \mathcal{B}_{n}, w)| &\leq \frac{\|\Delta_{n}\|}{t^{(m)}_{1}} < \frac{s}{t} < 1 \\ \|\Gamma_{n}\| &< (\mu - \lambda_{j})^{2} \cdot t_{j} \leq \sigma_{1}^{(n)} \cdot t_{1}^{(n)} , \end{split}$$

we find that

$$|u_{1}^{(n)} \geq \frac{\sigma_{1}^{(n)} t_{1}^{(n)} - \| \Gamma_{n} \|}{t_{1}^{(n)} + \| \Delta_{n} \|} > 0 .$$

- 649 -

Therefore

$$(14) \quad \tilde{G}_{1}^{(n)} - \mu_{1}^{(n)} \leq \frac{\tilde{G}_{1}^{(n)} \| \Delta_{n} \| + \| \Gamma_{n} \|}{t_{1}^{(n)} + \| \Delta_{n} \|} \leq \frac{\tilde{G}_{1}^{(1)} \| \Delta_{n} \| + \| \Gamma_{n} \|}{t - s}$$

This, together with (13), leads to the second assertion of the theorem.

2. In this section we shall investigate the stability of the method of least squares in the sense of Michlin. As to the mathematical formulation and to some assumptions we shall use the book of S.G. Michlin [4].

For each m = 1, 2, ... let  $H_m$  be a separable complex Hilbert space with the scalar product (x, y), x, bert space  $H_m$  with the following properties:

 $\alpha$ )  $A_m$  and  $B_m$  are self-adjoint and positive defini-

te operators on  $H_m$  into  $H_m$ . (3)  $A_m^{-1}$  and  $\overline{B}_n = A_m^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_m A_m^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  are compact operators.

Since the operator  $A_n^{-1} \mathbb{B}_n$  is compact on  $\mathbb{H}_n$  , we can arrange the eigenvalues  $\{ \sigma_{k}^{(n)} \}_{k=1,2,...}$  of the problem

$$(15) \qquad (A_n - \delta B_n)_X = 0$$

in an increasing order

$$0 < \sigma_1^{(m)} \leq \sigma_2^{(m)} \leq \dots$$

We will consider "the approximation eigenvalue problem"

(16) 
$$\left[ \left( A_{m} + \prod_{n} \right) - \mu \left( B_{m} + \Delta_{m} \right) \right] x = 0 ,$$

where  $\prod_{m}$  and  $\Delta_{m}$  are bounded and self-adjoint operators on  $H_m$ . Let  $u_1^{(m)} \leq u_2^{(m)} \leq \dots$  be an enumeration of

- 650 -

eigenvalues of (16). S.G. Michlin defines the stability of the processes for finding the k-th eigenvalue of (15) as follows:

<u>Definition 3</u> (Michlin [4],p.260). Let  $\Gamma_n$  and  $\mathcal{A}_n$  be bounded and self-adjoint operators on  $H_n$  with the following properties:

1)  $\Delta_n + B_n$  and  $A_n + \Gamma_n$  are positive definite operators on  $H_n$ .

2) 
$$T_m = (I + \overline{f_n})^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{B}_n + \overline{A}_n) (I_n + \overline{f_n})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

is compact on  $H_m$ , where  $I_m$  is the identity operator on  $H_m$  and

$$\overline{\Gamma}_{m} = A_{m}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma_{m} A_{m}^{-\frac{1}{2}} , \quad \overline{\Delta}_{m} = A_{m}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_{m} A_{m}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

Then the process for finding the k-th eigenvalue of (15) will be said to be stable, if there exist three positive numbers  $n, q, \kappa$  which do not depend on *m* such that, if  $\|\Gamma_n\| \leq \leq \kappa, n = 1, 2, ...$ , then  $\leq m$ .

$$\frac{\partial u}{(\mu_{n}^{(m)})} - 1 \le p \cdot \|\Gamma_{n}\| + q \cdot \|\Delta_{n}\|, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots$$

We now state - without proof - the following basic result.

<u>Theorem 3</u> (Michlin [4], p.260). Let  $C_1$ ,  $C_2$ ,  $C_3$  be constants (which do not depend on n ) such that

1)  $\|A_m^{-1}\| \leq C_1$ , 2)  $\frac{(B_m u, u)}{(A_m u, u)} \leq C_3$  for  $u \in H_m$ ,  $u \neq 0$ , 3)  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{R}}^{(n)} \leq C_2$ .

Then the process for finding the k-th eigenvalue  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{k}}^{(m)}$  of the problem (15) is stable. The first condition is necessary for the stability.

- 651 -

<u>Remark 2</u>. It follows from the proof of Theorem 3 (in [4], p.263) that

$$\kappa = \frac{\beta}{C_1}, \ n = \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2 \cdot C_3}{1 - \beta}, \ q = \frac{C_1 \cdot C_3}{1 - \beta},$$

where  $\beta$  is an arbitrary real number in (0,1).

Let the assumptions of Section 1 be satisfied. In the case that  $H_m$  is an n-dimensional Euclidean space we can represent  $A_m$  and  $B_m$  by  $(n \times m)$  matrices  $\mathcal{A}_m$  and  $\mathcal{B}_m$ , respectively. Thus, we can consider the problems (3) and (5) in place of (15) and (16), respectively. It is now easily verified that the above conditions  $\infty$ ) and  $\beta$  are satisfied. Then the method of least squares for finding  $\mathcal{A}_{j}$  defined by (2) and (3) will be said to be stable in the sense of Michlin, if the process for finding the first eigenvalue  $\sigma_1^{(m)}$  of (15) is stable in the sense of Definition 3.

From Theorem 3 we obtain the following result.

<u>Theorem 4</u>. Under the hypotheses of Theorem 2 the method of least squares for finding  $\mathcal{A}_{\sigma}$  defined by (3) and (5) is stable in the sense of Michlin, if and only if the system  $\{A_{\mu\nu}, \mathcal{Y}_{i}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is strongly minimal in  $\mathcal{H}$  for some real  $\mu_{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ .

<u>Proof</u>: Firstly, we verify that the conditions of Theorem 3 are satisfied for  $\mathcal{H} = 1$ . Then, it follows that the condition 1) of Theorem 3 is necessary and sufficient for the stability.

Since  $\mathfrak{S}_1^{(m)} = \mathfrak{Q}_m^2$ , the sequence  $\{\mathfrak{S}_1^{(m)}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is monotone decreasing. Consequently,

- 652 -

$$\sup_{m} \mathfrak{G}_{1}^{(n)} = \mathfrak{G}_{1}^{(1)} = \frac{\|A_{\mu} \Psi_{1}\|^{2}}{\|\Psi_{1}\|^{2}}$$

and Letting

$$C_{2} = \frac{\|A_{\alpha} \Psi_{1}\|^{2}}{\|\Psi_{1}\|^{2}} ,$$

 $\inf_{m} G_{1}^{(m)} = \lim_{m \to \infty} G_{1}^{(m)} = (\mu - \lambda_{j})^{2} .$ 

we see that the condition of 3) is fulfilled.

Now,  $\mathcal{A}_n$  and  $\mathcal{B}_n$  are positive definite matrices. Therefore it is easily verified that

(17) 
$$\frac{(\mathcal{B}_{n} u, u)}{(\mathcal{A}_{n} u, u)} = \frac{(\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{n} v, v)}{(v, v)}$$
 for  $u \in \mathcal{H}_{n}, u \neq 0$ ,  
where  $v = \mathcal{A}_{n}^{\frac{1}{2}} u$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_{n} = \mathcal{A}_{n}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{B}_{n} \mathcal{A}_{n}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ .  
It follows from 3) that  $\frac{1}{5(n)}$  is the largest eigenva-

lue of  $\overline{3}_{m}$  . Hence, by (17)

$$\frac{(\mathcal{B}_{m}u,u)}{(\mathcal{A}_{m}u,u)} \leq \frac{1}{\frac{1}{6_{1}}} \text{ for } u \in \mathcal{H}_{m}, u \neq 0.$$

Since  $\inf_{\alpha} \mathcal{G}_{1}^{(m)} = (\mu - \lambda_{j})^{2} > 0$ , the condition 2) of Theorem 3 is satisfied with

$$C_3 = \frac{1}{(\mu - \lambda_j)^2}$$

Now,  $\|\mathcal{A}_m^{-1}\| = \frac{1}{\mathcal{A}_n^{(m)}}$ , where  $\mathcal{A}_n^{(m)}$  is the smallest eigenvalue of the symmetric and positive definite matrix  $\mathcal{A}_m$ . The assertion of our Theorem follows at once from Lemma 2.

As a consequence of Theorem 4, Lemma 1 and Remark 2 we have

<u>Remark 3</u>. With the assumptions of Theorem 4, let  $\{\mathcal{U}_{i}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  be a strongly minimal system in **H**. Then the method of least

squares for finding  $\mathcal{X}_{j}$  defined by (3) and (5) is stable in the sense of Michlin. In this case we can choose  $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q},$  $\mathcal{K}$  as follows:

$$n = \frac{1}{(\mu - \lambda_{j})^{4}} \cdot \frac{1}{t} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \beta} \cdot \frac{\|A_{\mu} \cdot \Psi_{f}\|^{2}}{\|\Psi_{f}\|^{2}} ,$$

$$q = (\mu - \lambda_{j})^{2} \cdot \mu ,$$

 $\kappa = t \cdot \beta$ ,

where  $t = \inf_{m} t_{1}^{(m)}$  and  $\beta$  is an arbitrary number in (0,1).

<u>Remark 4</u>. From the assumptions  $\infty$ ),  $\beta$ ) and 2) of Theorem 3 it follows that  $\mathfrak{D}(A_m) = H_m$  and  $A_m$  is a selfadjoint and bounded operator on  $H_m$ . Since  $A_m^{-1}$  is a compact operator on  $H_m$ , it follows that the eigenvalues of  $A_m$ form a finite set. Consequently,  $H_m$  is finite dimensional.

## References

- K. NAJZAR: On the method of least squares of finding eigenvalues of some symmetric operators, Comm. Math.Univ.Carolinae 9(1968),311-323.
- [2] K. NAJZAR: On the method of least squares of finding eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of some symmetric operators, Comm.Math.Univ.Carolinae 11 (1970),449-462.
- [3] K. NAJZAR: Error-estimates for the method of least squares of finding eigenvalues and eigenfunctions, Comm.Math.Univ.Caroling e 11(1970),463-479.
- [4] S.G. MICHLIN: Čislennaja realizacija variacionnych metodov, 1966.

```
    [5] N.I. ACHIEZER - I.M. GLASMANN: Theorie der linearen
Operatoren in Hilbert-Raum, 1960.
    [6] A.E. TAYLOR: Introduction to functional analysis,1958.
```

Matematicko-fyzikální fakulta Karlova universita Malestranské nám. 25 Praha l Československo

(Oblatum 15.4.1970)