

On an eigenvalue property of Summation-By-Parts operators

Viktor Linders^a

^a*Center for Mathematical Sciences, Lund University, Lund, Sweden*

Abstract

Summation-By-Parts (SBP) methods provide a systematic way of constructing provably stable numerical schemes. However, many proofs of convergence and accuracy rely on the assumption that the SBP operator possesses a particular eigenvalue property. In this note, three results pertaining to this property are proven. Firstly, the eigenvalue property does not hold for all nullspace consistent SBP operators. Secondly, this issue can be addressed without affecting the accuracy of the method by adding a specially designed, arbitrarily small perturbation term to the SBP operator. Thirdly, all pseudospectral methods satisfy the eigenvalue property.

Keywords: Summation-By-Parts; eigenvalues; pseudospectral methods

1. Introduction

The Summation-By-Parts (SBP) methodology [8, 30] and its extensions (generalized SBP [7] and upwind SBP [20]) constitute an algebraic framework for designing provably stable discretizations of partial differential equations. SBP operators can be designed within essentially every family of spatial discretizations, including finite difference methods [13, 28], finite volume methods [22], finite element methods [1, 2], pseudospectral methods [5] and the related discontinuous Galerkin [10] and Flux Reconstruction methods [26], as well as more specialized discretizations such as WENO [32, 9] and DRP schemes [15, 16]. Further, they can be used as time marching schemes akin to implicit Runge-Kutta methods [24, 19, 3], in which case they satisfy an assortment of desirable stability and convergence properties [18, 23]. All such

Email address: viktor.linders@math.lu.se (Viktor Linders)

methods share certain algebraic similarities that can be exploited to obtain stable and accurate discretizations.

This paper addresses a difficulty pertaining to an eigenvalue property that frequently arises in SBP theory. Much of what is known about the convergence of SBP methods relies on this property. It is known that there are methods that lack the property, essentially due to the existence of SBP operators with "bad" null-spaces. Here, we consider SBP operators that do not suffer from bad nullspaces; so called nullspace consistent methods.

Three new results will be presented: After introducing nullspace consistent SBP operators in Section 2, it is shown that not every such operator satisfies the eigenvalue property. In Section 3 it is established that for each SBP operator that lacks the property, another SBP operator of the same order can be found that possesses it, and that differs from the first one by an arbitrarily small perturbation. Section 4 discusses pseudospectral methods, all of which are shown to satisfy the eigenvalue property. This generalizes an earlier result on the topic [27]. A summary is given in Section 5.

2. SBP operators and the eigenvalue property

This section introduces the notion of nullspace consistent SBP operators as well as the eigenvalue property. Let $[a, b]$ be an interval with $b > a$.

Definition 1. *The matrices $D_+, D_- \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$ are said to form a pair of SBP operators of order $q \geq 1$ on the interval $[a, b]$ if there exist matrices $H, S \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$ and vectors $\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_n, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ such that the following relations hold:*

$$(A) \quad D_{\pm} \mathbf{x}^j = j \mathbf{x}^{j-1}, \quad \mathbf{p}_0^{\top} \mathbf{x}^j = a^j, \quad \mathbf{p}_n^{\top} \mathbf{x}^j = b^j, \quad j = 0, \dots, q,$$

$$(B) \quad H = H^{\top} > 0,$$

$$(C) \quad HD_+ + D_+^{\top} H = -\mathbf{p}_0 \mathbf{p}_0^{\top} + \mathbf{p}_n \mathbf{p}_n^{\top} + S, \quad S = S^{\top} \geq 0,$$

$$(D) \quad HD_+ + D_-^{\top} H = -\mathbf{p}_0 \mathbf{p}_0^{\top} + \mathbf{p}_n \mathbf{p}_n^{\top},$$

$$(E) \quad \mathbf{x} = (x_0, \dots, x_s)^{\top}, \quad x_i \neq x_j \forall i \neq j.$$

Here and elsewhere the notation \mathbf{x}^j should be understood as the elementwise exponentiation of \mathbf{x} . The convention $\mathbf{x}^0 = \mathbf{1} := (1, \dots, 1)^{\top}$ is used throughout. Definition 1 incorporates classical ($S = 0, \mathbf{p}_0 \equiv \mathbf{e}_0 :=$

$(1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$, $\mathbf{p}_n \equiv \mathbf{e}_n := (0, \dots, 0, 1)^\top$), generalized ($S = 0$) and upwind SBP methods ($S \neq 0$, $\mathbf{p}_0 = \mathbf{e}_0$, $\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{e}_n$) as special cases.

From (A) it is seen that D_+ and D_- approximate derivative operators and that \mathbf{p}_0 and \mathbf{p}_n interpolate grid functions to the domain boundaries. Further, H defines a quadrature rule [12, 17]. The role of S is somewhat obfuscated in Definition 1, which warrants a comment: Subtracting (D) from (C), transposing and multiplying by H^{-1} shows that $D_- = D_+ - H^{-1}S$. From (A) and (B) it can then be deduced that

$$S\mathbf{x}^j = \mathbf{0}, \quad j = 0, \dots, q. \quad (1)$$

Together with positive semi-definiteness, this reveals that S contributes with artificial dissipation to the operator; see e.g. [20, 21].

SBP operators are frequently used in combination with *simultaneous approximation terms* (SATs) that weakly impose initial, boundary or interface conditions [6]. Suppose that an inflow-outflow problem on $[a, b]$ is described by the the scalar differential equation

$$u' = f, \quad u(a) = u_0, \quad (2)$$

where f and u_0 are given. An SBP-SAT discretization takes the form

$$D_+\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f} + \sigma H^{-1}\mathbf{p}_0(u_0 - \mathbf{p}_0^\top \mathbf{u}), \quad (3)$$

where the second term on the right-hand side is the SAT. In (3), σ is a scalar parameter that is chosen to ensure stability. The choice $\sigma = 1$ is almost exclusively used in practice, hence we focus on this case here.

Remark 1. *If the flow in (2) is reversed, then D_- is used and the boundary condition is imposed at b using \mathbf{p}_n and $\sigma = -1$.*

Collecting terms that multiply the solution u , (3) may be rewritten as

$$\tilde{D}_+\mathbf{u} \equiv (D_+ + H^{-1}\mathbf{p}_0\mathbf{p}_0^\top)\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f} + H^{-1}\mathbf{p}_0u_0. \quad (4)$$

A necessary condition for the existence of a unique solution to (4) is that the matrix \tilde{D}_+ is invertible. SBP operators that have this property can be characterized in terms of *nullspace consistency*, a concept introduced in [31]:

Definition 2. *An SBP operator is said to be nullspace consistent if*

$$\ker(D_+) = \text{span}(\{\mathbf{1}\}).$$

For a proof of the following lemma, see [18, Lemma 2].

Lemma 1. *For any SBP operator D_+ , the matrix $\tilde{D}_+ := (D_+ + H^{-1}\mathbf{p}_0\mathbf{p}_0^\top)$ is invertible if and only if D_+ is null-space consistent.*

Unfortunately, nullspace consistency does not follow from Definition 1; counterexamples are given in [25, 18]. Yet, an even stronger condition is frequently needed:

Definition 3. *An SBP operator is said to have the eigenvalue property if each eigenvalue of \tilde{D}_+ has positive real part.*

Many important results in the theory of SBP operators rely on the eigenvalue property. The following list is by no means complete.

- The proof that spatial discretizations using (classical) finite difference SBP methods converge with order $q + 1$ for hyperbolic problems and order $q + 2$ for parabolic problems assumes the eigenvalue property [29].
- The proof that functional estimates from SBP methods in two or more dimensions are superconvergent requires the eigenvalue property [11].
- SBP methods used for time discretization of partial differential equations need the eigenvalue property to ensure uniqueness of solutions [24]. Proofs of convergence for linear and certain nonlinear problems also rely on the property; see [18] for an overview.

The eigenvalue property is evidently very important and it is therefore of interest to know which SBP operators possess it. Nullspace consistency is of course necessary. This bids the question: Is nullspace consistency sufficient for the eigenvalue property? Unfortunately, this is not the case.

Theorem 1. *There are nullspace consistent SBP operators that lack the eigenvalue property.*

Proof. Consider

$$D_+ = \frac{1}{5} \begin{pmatrix} -5 & 4 & 2 & 0 & -2 & 1 \\ -2 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -2 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 2 \\ -1 & 2 & 0 & -2 & -4 & 5 \end{pmatrix},$$

defined on the nodes $\mathbf{x}^\top = (-5, -3, -1, 1, 3, 5)/2$. This is an SBP operator of order $q = 1$ with $S = 0$, $\mathbf{p}_0 = \mathbf{e}_0$, $\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{e}_n$ and $H = \text{diag}(1/2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1/2)$. The matrix $\tilde{D}_+ = D_+ + H^{-1}\mathbf{p}_0\mathbf{p}_0^\top$ is invertible, hence the operator is nullspace consistent by Lemma 1. However, two of the eigenvalues of \tilde{D}_+ and their corresponding eigenvectors are

$$\lambda_{\pm} = \pm \frac{i}{\sqrt{5}},$$

$$\mathbf{w}_{\pm} = (0, 1, -3, 3, -1, 0)^\top \pm i\sqrt{5}(0, 1, -1, -1, 1, 0)^\top.$$

The real parts of these eigenvalues are non-positive, hence the SBP operator does not have the eigenvalue property. \square

3. Perturbed SBP operators

In this section we consider an SBP operator D_+ that is nullspace consistent but lack the eigenvalue property, i.e. it satisfies Definition 2 but not Definition 3. It will be shown that the eigenvalue property can be reclaimed by adding an appropriately designed perturbation S' to D_+ . More precisely, the eigenvalue property is enforced by constructing a new operator $D'_+ = D_+ + \frac{1}{2}H^{-1}S'$, which adheres to Definition 1 so long as S' is symmetric positive semi-definite and satisfies (1). In this case, S is replaced by $S + S'$ in Definition 1. The purpose of S' is to push problematic eigenvalues into the right half-plane while leaving the remaining eigenvalues untouched. Furthermore, the matrix H and the vectors \mathbf{p}_0 and \mathbf{p}_n are left unperturbed. To achieve this, it is first necessary to establish certain properties of the problematic eigenvalues and eigenvectors.

The starting point is the following simple result. For a proof, see e.g. [18, Lemma 1]:

Lemma 2. *Consider the SBP operator D_+ and let (λ, \mathbf{w}) be an eigenpair of $\tilde{D}_+ = D_+ + H^{-1}\mathbf{p}_0\mathbf{p}_0^\top$, i.e. $\tilde{D}_+\mathbf{w} = \lambda\mathbf{w}$. Then $\text{Re}(\lambda) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $\mathbf{p}_0^\top\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{p}_n^\top\mathbf{w} = 0$ and $S\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{0}$.*

Lemma 2 shows that \tilde{D}_+ has an imaginary eigenvalue. By Lemma 1 this eigenvalue is non-zero since D_+ is nullspace consistent by assumption. In fact, \tilde{D}_+ has an even number of non-zero imaginary eigenvalues since the conjugate $(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mathbf{w}})$ is also an eigenpair of \tilde{D}_+ .

At this point, two lemmas will be established that are key to the construction of S' . Recall that an eigenvalue λ of \tilde{D}_+ is *normal* if

- (a) every eigenvector of \tilde{D}_+ corresponding to λ is orthogonal to every eigenvector of \tilde{D}_+ corresponding to each eigenvalue different from λ , and
- (b) the algebraic and geometric multiplicities of λ are equal.

Remark 2. *Herein, the inner product of two vectors \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} are taken to be $\langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} \rangle_H = \mathbf{f}^* H \mathbf{g}$, where the superscript $*$ indicates conjugate transposition. Orthogonality should thus be understood with this inner product in mind. The norm $\|\mathbf{f}\|_H := \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{f} \rangle_H^{\frac{1}{2}}$ will also be used.*

Lemma 3. *Let (λ, \mathbf{w}) be an eigenpair of \tilde{D}_+ with $\text{Re}(\lambda) = 0$. Then λ is a normal eigenvalue with respect to the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H$.*

Proof. The two properties (a) and (b) must be established. For (a), let (μ, \mathbf{v}) be any eigenpair of \tilde{D}_+ with $\mu \neq \lambda$ and note that $\mu \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_H = \mathbf{w}^* H \tilde{D}_+ \mathbf{v}$. Using (C) from Definition 1 and the definition of \tilde{D}_+ in (4) it follows that

$$H \tilde{D}_+ = \mathbf{p}_0 \mathbf{p}_0^\top + \mathbf{p}_n \mathbf{p}_n^\top + S - \tilde{D}_+^\top H. \quad (5)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_H &= \underbrace{(\mathbf{p}_0^\top \mathbf{w})^* \mathbf{p}_0^\top \mathbf{v} + (\mathbf{p}_n^\top \mathbf{w})^* \mathbf{p}_n^\top \mathbf{v} + (S \mathbf{w})^* \mathbf{v}}_{=0 \text{ by Lemma 2}} - (\tilde{D}_+ \mathbf{w})^* H \mathbf{v} \\ &= -\bar{\lambda} \mathbf{w}^* H \mathbf{v} = \lambda \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_H. \end{aligned}$$

In the final equality, $\bar{\lambda} = -\lambda$ has been used, which holds since λ is imaginary. Consequently, $(\mu - \lambda) \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_H = 0$, however since $\mu \neq \lambda$ by assumption, the sought orthogonality follows.

For (b), consider the following problem: Find a symmetric positive definite matrix $X \in \mathbf{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$ such that $X \tilde{D}_+ + \tilde{D}_+^\top X \geq 0$. From (5) it is seen that $X = H$ solves this problem. However, the existence of a solution implies that all elementary divisors of imaginary eigenvalues of \tilde{D}_+ are linear [4, Corollary 2], which is equivalent to the stated assertion on the algebraic and geometric multiplicities [14, Chapter 7]. \square

Lemma 4. *Let (λ, \mathbf{w}) be an eigenpair of \tilde{D}_+ with $\text{Re}(\lambda) = 0$. Then $\langle \mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w} \rangle_H = 0$ for $j = 0, \dots, q$.*

Proof. Consider first the case $j = 0$, for which we have $\mathbf{x}^0 = \mathbf{1}$, and note that $\lambda \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{w} \rangle_H = \mathbf{1}^\top H \tilde{D}_+ \mathbf{w}$. From Definition 1 and (4) it follows that

$$H \tilde{D}_+ = \mathbf{p}_n \mathbf{p}_n^\top - D_-^\top H. \quad (6)$$

Thus,

$$\lambda \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{w} \rangle_H = \underbrace{\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{p}_n (\mathbf{p}_n^\top \mathbf{w})}_{=0 \text{ by Lemma 2}} - \underbrace{(D_- \mathbf{1})^\top H \mathbf{w}}_{=0 \text{ by Definition 1}} = 0.$$

Since D_+ is nullspace consistent by assumption, Lemma 1 ensures that $\lambda \neq 0$. It follows that $\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{w} \rangle_H = 0$, hence the claim holds when $j = 0$.

Next, suppose that the claim holds for some $j - 1 < q$. Then, similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \langle \mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w} \rangle_H &= \underbrace{(\mathbf{x}^j)^\top \mathbf{p}_n (\mathbf{p}_n^\top \mathbf{w})}_{=0 \text{ by Lemma 2}} - (D_- \mathbf{x}^j)^\top H \mathbf{w} \\ &= -j (\mathbf{x}^{j-1})^\top H \mathbf{w} = -j \langle \mathbf{x}^{j-1}, \mathbf{w} \rangle_H = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the induction hypothesis implies the final equality. From nullspace consistency it follows that $\langle \mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w} \rangle_H = 0$, and the claim holds by induction. \square

Using Lemmas 3 and 4, the main result of this section can be proven:

Theorem 2. *For any SBP operator D_+ of order q that satisfies Definition 2 but not Definition 3, there is another SBP operator $D'_+ = D_+ + \frac{1}{2}H^{-1}S'$ of order q that satisfies both definitions. Further, D'_+ can be constructed such that $\|D'_+ - D_+\| \leq \varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, where the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is arbitrary.*

Proof. Suppose that \tilde{D}_+ has precisely $2m$ imaginary eigenvalues, including multiplicity, and denote these $\lambda_1, \bar{\lambda}_1, \dots, \lambda_m, \bar{\lambda}_m$. Select corresponding eigenvectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \bar{\mathbf{w}}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m, \bar{\mathbf{w}}_m$. By Lemma 3 each of these eigenvectors are orthogonal to any eigenvector corresponding to another eigenvalue. Since the algebraic and geometric multiplicities equal for each imaginary eigenvalue, their respective eigenspaces are complete. An orthogonal basis can be found for each space and these basis vectors can be taken as one of the listed eigenvectors. Thus, mutual orthogonality can be ensured among the eigenvectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \bar{\mathbf{w}}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m, \bar{\mathbf{w}}_m$ even if some of them correspond to the same eigenvalue.

Choose m positive numbers $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_m$ and construct the matrix

$$S' = \sum_{k=1}^m \epsilon_k ((H \mathbf{w}_k)(H \mathbf{w}_k)^* + (H \bar{\mathbf{w}}_k)(H \bar{\mathbf{w}}_k)^*).$$

Then S' is real since $(H \bar{\mathbf{w}}_k)(H \bar{\mathbf{w}}_k)^* = \overline{(H \mathbf{w}_k)(H \mathbf{w}_k)^*}$. Further, S' is symmetric positive semi-definite.

At this point, construct $D'_+ = D_+ + \frac{1}{2}H^{-1}S'$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} S'\mathbf{x}^j &= \sum_{k=1}^m \epsilon_k ((H\mathbf{w}_k)(H\mathbf{w}_k)^* + (H\bar{\mathbf{w}}_k)(H\bar{\mathbf{w}}_k)^*) \mathbf{x}^j \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^m \epsilon_k ((H\mathbf{w}_k)\langle \mathbf{w}_k, \mathbf{x}^j \rangle_H + (H\bar{\mathbf{w}}_k)\langle \bar{\mathbf{w}}_k, \mathbf{x}^j \rangle_H) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

for each $j = 0, \dots, q$. Here, Lemma 4 has been used in the final equality. Consequently, S' satisfies (1) such that D'_+ is an SBP operator of order q .

Consider an eigenvalue λ of \tilde{D}_+ . If $\text{Re}(\lambda) \neq 0$, then pick any eigenvector \mathbf{v} corresponding to λ and note that $\tilde{D}'_+\mathbf{v} = \tilde{D}_+\mathbf{v} = \lambda\mathbf{v}$ by the orthogonality property in Lemma 3. Thus, the eigenpair (λ, \mathbf{v}) is unaltered by S' whenever $\text{Re}(\lambda) \neq 0$. However, if $\text{Re}(\lambda) = 0$ so that $\lambda = \lambda_i$ for some i , then pick the appropriate eigenvector $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{w}_i$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}'_+\mathbf{w}_i &= \tilde{D}_+\mathbf{w}_i + \frac{1}{2}H^{-1}S'\mathbf{w}_i \\ &= \lambda_i\mathbf{w}_i + \frac{\epsilon_i}{2}H^{-1}(H\mathbf{w}_i)(H\mathbf{w}_i)^*\mathbf{w}_i \\ &= \left(\lambda_i + \frac{\epsilon_i}{2}\|\mathbf{w}_i\|_H^2\right)\mathbf{w}_i, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the orthogonality of the eigenvectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \bar{\mathbf{w}}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m, \bar{\mathbf{w}}_m$. Thus, \tilde{D}'_+ has an eigenpair $(\lambda'_i, \mathbf{w}_i)$, where $\text{Re}(\lambda'_i) = \frac{\epsilon_i}{2}\|\mathbf{w}_i\|_H^2 > 0$. By repeating this procedure for each λ_i and $\bar{\lambda}_i$, every eigenvalue of \tilde{D}'_+ is accounted for. Consequently, the SBP operator D'_+ has the eigenvalue property.

Finally, note that the eigenvectors \mathbf{w}_k and $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_k$ may be normalized as desired and that the constants ϵ_k can be chosen arbitrarily small. Thus, for any norm it is possible to find S' such that for any ε ,

$$\|D'_+ - D_+\| = \frac{1}{2}\|H^{-1}S'\| \leq \varepsilon.$$

□

4. Pseudospectral methods

An important family of SBP operators consists of the pseudospectral methods. They all satisfy Definition 1 with order $q = n$; see [5, 7]. These

operators are also used in discontinuous Galerkin and flux reconstruction methods [10, 26]. Given \mathbf{x} , the pseudospectral SBP operator D_+ is uniquely defined. To see this, note that the accuracy conditions (A) in Definition 1 imply that the elements $d_{i,j}$ in the i th row of D_+ satisfy

$$\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \dots & 1 \\ x_0 & \dots & x_n \\ \vdots & & \\ x_0^n & \dots & x_n^n \end{pmatrix}}_{V^\top} \begin{bmatrix} d_{i,0} \\ d_{i,1} \\ \vdots \\ d_{i,n} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ nx_i^{n-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that V is a Vandermonde matrix and that the numbers x_0, \dots, x_n are distinct. Thus, V^\top is invertible and $d_{i,0}, \dots, d_{i,n}$ are unique. The same of course holds for each row $i = 0, \dots, n$, hence D_+ is uniquely defined.

Remark 3. *This argument does not imply uniqueness of H , \mathbf{p}_0 , \mathbf{p}_n and S .*

The goal of this section is to demonstrate that pseudospectral methods defined on arbitrary grids satisfy the eigenvalue property. In [27] it was shown that this is the case if H defines a quadrature rule that is exact for polynomials of degree $2n - 1$ or higher, i.e. if $k\mathbf{1}^\top H\mathbf{x}^k = b^{k+1} - a^{k+1}$ for $k = 0, \dots, 2n - 1$. This holds in particular if the grid \mathbf{x} is chosen to be the Legendre-Gauss, Legendre-Gauss-Radau or Legendre-Gauss-Lobatto nodes (mapped to the interval $[a, b]$) and H is a diagonal matrix containing the corresponding Gaussian quadrature weights. However, for general grids \mathbf{x} , the resulting quadrature rule is exact only for polynomials of degree $n - 1$ [7]. A different approach is thus necessary to generalize the result from [27].

The starting point here is to show that pseudospectral methods on arbitrary grids are nullspace consistent.

Lemma 5. *Every pseudospectral SBP operator is null-space consistent.*

Proof. The columns of the Vandermonde matrix V form a basis for \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . Thus, if $D_+\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$ and \mathbf{v} is expanded in terms of this basis as $\mathbf{v} = \sum_{k=0}^n v_k \mathbf{x}^k$, then

$$\mathbf{0} = D_+\mathbf{v} = D_+ \sum_{k=0}^n v_k \mathbf{x}^k = \sum_{k=0}^n v_k D_+ \mathbf{x}^k = \sum_{k=1}^n v_k k \mathbf{x}^{k-1}.$$

By linear independence of the basis vectors it follows that $v_k = 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$ and consequently that $\mathbf{v} = v_0 \mathbf{1}$. Thus, $\ker(D_+) = \text{span}(\{\mathbf{1}\})$ and D_+ is consequently null-space consistent. \square

With Lemma 5 in place, the results from Section 3 can be used to establish the eigenvalue property.

Theorem 3. *Every pseudospectral SBP operator has the eigenvalue property.*

Proof. Suppose that there is a pseudospectral method D_+ that does not have the eigenvalue property. Then, by Theorem 2, another operator D'_+ of the same order of accuracy can be found that operates on the same grid and that is distinctly different from D_+ . However, this violates the uniqueness of pseudospectral methods.

Alternatively, suppose that there is a pseudospectral method D_+ that does not have the eigenvalue property and denote by \mathbf{v} one of the eigenvectors of \tilde{D}_+ that corresponds to an imaginary eigenvalue. It follows from Lemma 4 that $V^\top H\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$. But both V and H are invertible, so $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$ and can therefore not be an eigenvector, which contradicts its definition. \square

5. Summary

Three results on the eigenvalues of SBP operators have been proven. Firstly, the eigenvalue property, which is essential in many important accuracy and convergence proofs, does not hold for all nullspace consistent SBP operators. Secondly, this problem can be addressed by carefully constructing an arbitrarily small artificial dissipation term that pushes each problematic eigenvalue into the right half-plane without affecting the other eigenvalues or the order of accuracy of the method. Thirdly, all pseudospectral methods satisfy the eigenvalue property. Thus, SBP operators used within the discontinuous Galerkin and flux reconstruction frameworks are free from the nuisance of problematic eigenvalues.

References

- [1] R. Abgrall, J. Nordström, P. Öffner, S. Tokareva, Analysis of the SBP–SAT stabilization for finite element methods part I: Linear problems, *J. Sci. Comput.* 85 (2020) 1–29.
- [2] R. Abgrall, J. Nordström, P. Öffner, S. Tokareva, Analysis of the SBP–SAT stabilization for finite element methods part II: Entropy stability, *Commun. Appl. Math. Comput.* (2021) 1–23.

- [3] P.D. Boom, D.W. Zingg, High-order implicit time-marching methods based on generalized summation-by-parts operators, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 37 (2015) A2682–A2709.
- [4] D. Carlson, H. Schneider, Inertia theorems for matrices: The semidefinite case, *J. Math. Anal. Appl* 6 (1963) 430–446.
- [5] M.H. Carpenter, D. Gottlieb, Spectral methods on arbitrary grids, *J. Comput. Phys.* 129 (1996) 74–86.
- [6] M.H. Carpenter, D. Gottlieb, S. Abarbanel, Time-stable boundary conditions for finite-difference schemes solving hyperbolic systems: Methodology and application to high-order compact schemes, *J. Comput. Phys.* 111 (1994) 220–236.
- [7] D.C.D.R. Fernández, P.D. Boom, D.W. Zingg, A generalized framework for nodal first derivative Summation-By-Parts operators, *J. Comput. Phys.* 266 (2014) 214–239.
- [8] D.C.D.R. Fernández, J.E. Hicken, D.W. Zingg, Review of Summation-By-Parts operators with simultaneous approximation terms for the numerical solution of partial differential equations, *Comput. Fluids* 95 (2014) 171–196.
- [9] T.C. Fisher, M.H. Carpenter, N.K. Yamaleev, S.H. Frankel, Boundary closures for fourth-order energy stable weighted essentially non-oscillatory finite-difference schemes, *J. Comput. Phys.* 230 (2011) 3727–3752.
- [10] G.J. Gassner, A skew-symmetric discontinuous Galerkin spectral element discretization and its relation to SBP–SAT finite difference methods, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 35 (2013) A1233–A1253.
- [11] J.E. Hicken, D.W. Zingg, Superconvergent functional estimates from Summation-By-Parts finite-difference discretizations, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 33 (2011) 893–922.
- [12] J.E. Hicken, D.W. Zingg, Summation-By-Parts operators and high-order quadrature, *J. Comput. Anal. Appl.* 237 (2013) 111–125.

- [13] H.O. Kreiss, G. Scherer, Finite element and finite difference methods for hyperbolic partial differential equations, in: *Mathematical aspects of finite elements in partial differential equations*, Elsevier, 1974, pp. 195–212.
- [14] P. Lancaster, M. Tismenetsky, *The theory of matrices: with applications*, Elsevier, 1985.
- [15] V. Linders, M. Kupiainen, S.H. Frankel, Y. Delorme, J. Nordstrom, Summation-by-Parts operators with minimal dispersion error for accurate and efficient flow calculations, in: *54th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting*, 2016, p. 1329.
- [16] V. Linders, M. Kupiainen, J. Nordström, Summation-by-Parts operators with minimal dispersion error for coarse grid flow calculations, *J. Comput. Phys.* 340 (2017) 160–176.
- [17] V. Linders, T. Lundquist, J. Nordström, On the order of accuracy of finite difference operators on diagonal norm based Summation-By-Parts form, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 56 (2018) 1048–1063.
- [18] V. Linders, J. Nordström, S.H. Frankel, Properties of Runge-Kutta-Summation-By-Parts methods, *J. Comput. Phys.* 419 (2020) 109684.
- [19] T. Lundquist, J. Nordström, The SBP-SAT technique for initial value problems, *J. Comput. Phys.* 270 (2014) 86–104.
- [20] K. Mattsson, Diagonal-norm upwind SBP operators, *J. Comput. Phys.* 335 (2017) 283–310.
- [21] K. Mattsson, M. Svärd, J. Nordström, Stable and accurate artificial dissipation, *J. Sci. Comput.* 21 (2004) 57–79.
- [22] J. Nordström, M. Björck, Finite volume approximations and strict stability for hyperbolic problems, *Appl. Numer. Math.* 38 (2001) 237–255.
- [23] J. Nordström, V. Linders, Well-posed and stable transmission problems, *J. Comput. Phys.* 364 (2018) 95–110.
- [24] J. Nordström, T. Lundquist, Summation-By-Parts in time, *J. Comput. Phys.* 251 (2013) 487–499.

- [25] H. Ranocha, Some notes on Summation-By-Parts time integration methods, *Results Appl. Math.* 1 (2019) 100004.
- [26] H. Ranocha, P. Öffner, T. Sonar, Summation-By-Parts operators for correction procedure via reconstruction, *J. Comput. Phys.* 311 (2016) 299–328.
- [27] A.A. Ruggiu, J. Nordström, On pseudo-spectral time discretizations in Summation-By-Parts form, *J. Comput. Phys.* 360 (2018) 192–201.
- [28] B. Strand, Summation-By-Parts for finite difference approximations for d/dx , *J. Comput. Phys.* 110 (1994) 47–67.
- [29] M. Svärd, J. Nordström, On the order of accuracy for difference approximations of initial-boundary value problems, *J. Comput. Phys.* 218 (2006) 333–352.
- [30] M. Svärd, J. Nordström, Review of Summation-By-Parts schemes for initial-boundary-value problems, *J. Comput. Phys.* 268 (2014) 17–38.
- [31] M. Svärd, J. Nordström, On the convergence rates of energy-stable finite-difference schemes, *J. Comput. Phys.* 397 (2019) 108819.
- [32] N.K. Yamaleev, M.H. Carpenter, A systematic methodology for constructing high-order energy stable WENO schemes, *J. Comput. Phys.* 228 (2009) 4248–4272.