

2D Eigenvalue Problem III: Convergence Analysis of the 2D Rayleigh Quotient Iteration *

Tianyi Lu[†]Yangfeng Su[†]Zhaojun Bai[‡]

March 10, 2023

Abstract

In Part I of this paper, we introduced a two dimensional eigenvalue problem (2DEVP) of a matrix pair and investigated its fundamental theory such as existence, variational characterization and number of 2D-eigenvalues. In Part II, we proposed a Rayleigh quotient iteration (RQI)-like algorithm (2DRQI) for computing a 2D-eigen triplet of the 2DEVP near a prescribed point, and discussed applications of 2DEVP and 2DRQI for solving the minimax problem of Rayleigh quotients, and computing the distance to instability. In this third part, we present convergence analysis of the 2DRQI. We show that under some mild conditions, the 2DRQI is locally quadratically convergent for computing a nonsingular 2D-eigen triplet.

Key words. 2D eigenvalue problem; 2D Rayleigh quotient iteration; quadratic convergence.

AMS subject classifications. 65K10, 65F15

1 Introduction

Given Hermitian matrices $A, C \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ and C is indefinite, the 2D eigenvalue problem (2DEVP) is to find scalars $\mu, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and nonzero vectors $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that

$$\begin{cases} (A - \mu C)x = \lambda x, & (1.1a) \\ x^H C x = 0, & (1.1b) \\ x^H x = 1, & (1.1c) \end{cases}$$

The pair (μ, λ) is called a *2D-eigenvalue*, x is called the corresponding *2D-eigenvector*, and the triplet (μ, λ, x) is called a *2D-eigen triplet*. We use the term “2D” based on the fact that an eigenvalue has two components, which is a point in the two dimensional (μ, λ) -plane.

In Part I of this work [8], we presented fundamental properties of the 2DEVP such as the existence, variational characterizations, and the necessary and sufficient conditions for the finite number of 2D-eigenvalues. We also discussed the applications of the 2DEVP on the minimax problem of Rayleigh quotients and the computation of distance to instability. In Part II [6], we proposed a Rayleigh quotient iteration (RQI)-like algorithm (2DRQI) for computing an eigen triplet of the 2DEVP near a prescribed point. Numerical experiments show its promising performance

*version dated March 10, 2023.

[†]School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China (tylu17@fudan.edu.cn, yfsu@fudan.edu.cn).

[‡]Department of Computer Science and Department of Mathematics, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA (zbai@ucdavis.edu)

compared with eigenvalue optimization algorithms for finding the minimax of Rayleigh quotients and computing distance to instability.

In this part, we present the convergence analysis of the 2DRQI. We will prove that the 2DRQI is locally quadratically convergent for computing a nonsingular 2D-eigen triplet (see the definition of the term nonsingular in Section 2.2).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the concepts of non-singularity of a 2D-eigen triplet and its characterizations, and simple and multiple 2D-eigen triplets and their properties. In Section 3, we recap the essential steps of the 2DRQI presented in [6]. In Section 4, we recall several known results on matrix perturbation analysis and derive a couple of new results that will be used for the convergence analysis of the 2DRQI. Sections 5 and 6 provide convergence analysis of the 2DRQI. Conclusion remarks are in Section 7.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Analytical eigencurves and derivatives

In Section 4 of Part I [8], we showed that equations (1.1a) and (1.1c) of the 2DEVp (1.1) constitute the parameter eigenvalue problem of $H(\mu) = A - \mu C$. For $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist n real eigenvalues $\lambda_i(\mu)$ and corresponding orthonormal eigenvectors of $H(\mu)$. If these eigenvalues $\lambda_i(\mu)$ are sorted such that $\lambda_1(\mu) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(\mu)$, then we have n sorted eigencurves $\lambda_i(\mu)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Sorted eigencurves $\lambda_i(\mu)$ might not be differentiable. In Part I, we introduced *analyticalyzed eigencurves* and *analyticalyzed eigenvector functions* such that they are real analytic [5, p. 3] on \mathbb{R} . The following theorem, which is built on Theorem 4.2 of Part I, shows that analyticalyzed eigenvectors enjoy some appealing properties.

Theorem 2.1. *For Hermitian matrices A and C , there exist scalar functions $\tilde{\lambda}_1(\mu), \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n(\mu)$ and matrix-valued functions $X(\mu) = [x_1(\mu), \dots, x_n(\mu)]$ of $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} A - \mu C &= X(\mu) \text{Diag} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_1(\mu), \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n(\mu) \right) X^H(\mu), \\ X^H(\mu)X(\mu) &= I. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Furthermore, $\tilde{\lambda}_i(\mu)$ and $x_i(\mu)$ are real analytic on $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, and $x_i(\mu)$ satisfies

$$x_i^H(\mu)x_i'(\mu) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \tag{2.2}$$

Proof. In Part I, we have shown that by [3, Theorem S6.3], there exist real analytic scalar functions $\tilde{\lambda}_1(\mu), \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n(\mu)$ and real analytic matrix-valued functions $\tilde{X}(\mu) = [\tilde{x}_1(\mu), \dots, \tilde{x}_n(\mu)]$ of $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} A - \mu C &= \tilde{X}(\mu) \text{Diag} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_1(\mu), \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n(\mu) \right) \tilde{X}^H(\mu), \\ \tilde{X}^H(\mu)\tilde{X}(\mu) &= I. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Therefore, we only need to show that there exists a real-valued real analytic function $\theta_i(\mu)$ such that $x_i(\mu) = \tilde{x}_i(\mu)e^{i\theta_i(\mu)}$ satisfies (2.2) for $i = 1, \dots, n$. In fact, if we find such $\theta_i(\mu)$, then according to the properties [5, pp. 4, 19] of real analytic functions, $x_i(\mu)$ is also real analytic. Equation (2.1) holds by defining $X(\mu) = [x_1(\mu), \dots, x_n(\mu)]$. For brevity, the subindex i of $x_i(\mu)$ will be dropped in the analysis below.

Since $\tilde{x}(\mu)$ is real analytic, we can take derivatives of $\tilde{x}^H(\mu)\tilde{x}(\mu) = 1$ and have

$$\text{Re}(\tilde{x}^H(\mu)\tilde{x}'(\mu)) = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

On the other hand, equation (2.2) is equivalent to

$$\tilde{x}^H(\mu)e^{-i\theta(\mu)} \left[\tilde{x}'(\mu)e^{i\theta(\mu)} + \tilde{x}(\mu)e^{i\theta(\mu)} i\theta'(\mu) \right] = \tilde{x}(\mu)^H \tilde{x}'(\mu) + i\theta'(\mu) = 0. \quad (2.5)$$

Equation (2.5) gives a natural definition for $\theta(\mu)$:

$$\theta(\mu) \equiv \int_0^\mu i \tilde{x}^H(s) \tilde{x}'(s) ds, \quad \forall \mu \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.6)$$

We now prove $\theta(\mu)$ satisfies the desired properties. First, by (2.4), $\tilde{x}^H(\mu)\tilde{x}'(\mu)$ is purely imaginary and thus $\theta(\mu)$ is a real-valued function. Furthermore, $\theta'(\mu) = i\tilde{x}^H(\mu)\tilde{x}'(\mu)$. Hence (2.5) holds and we further have (2.2).

To complete the proof, we only need to prove that $\theta(\mu)$ is real analytic. In fact, a function f defined on \mathbb{R} is called real analytic [5, p.3] if and only if for any $\mu_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, f has power series

$$f(\mu) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f^{(i)}(\mu_0)(\mu - \mu_0)^i$$

with nonzero convergent radius. By separating the real and imaginary parts of $f^{(i)}(\mu_0)$, we can see that the real and imaginary parts of f are both real analytic. Thus $\tilde{x}^H(\mu)$ is still real analytic, which by properties of real analytic function [5, pp.4,11] implies $\theta(\mu)$ is real analytic. \square

The next lemma presents the derivatives formula for $\lambda(\mu)$ and $x(\mu)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) be a 2D-eigen triplet with λ_* being a simple eigenvalue of $A - \mu_*C$. Let $\lambda(\mu)$ be an analyticalzied eigencurve and $x(\mu)$ be the corresponding analyticalzied eigenvector function defined in Theorem 2.1 such that $\lambda_* = \lambda(\mu_*)$ and $x_* = x(\mu_*)$. Then we have*

$$(A - \mu_*C - \lambda_*I)x'(\mu_*) = Cx_*, \quad (2.7)$$

$$\lambda''(\mu_*) = -2x_*^H C x'(\mu_*). \quad (2.8)$$

Equation (2.7) can be further written as

$$x'(\mu_*) = (A - \mu_*C - \lambda_*I)^\dagger Cx_*, \quad (2.9)$$

where \cdot^\dagger is the Moore-Penrose generalized inverse.

Proof. Consider the parameter eigenvalue problem

$$(A - \mu C)x(\mu) = \lambda(\mu)x(\mu). \quad (2.10)$$

By taking the derivative with respect to μ , we have

$$(A - \mu C - \lambda(\mu)I)x'(\mu) = (C + \lambda'(\mu)I)x(\mu). \quad (2.11)$$

Multiplying (2.11) by $x^H(\mu)$ from left and combining with (2.10), we have

$$\lambda'(\mu) = -x^H(\mu)Cx(\mu). \quad (2.12)$$

At $\mu = \mu_*$, the derivative becomes

$$\lambda'(\mu_*) = -x_*^H C x_* = 0. \quad (2.13)$$

Combined with (2.11), we have

$$(A - \mu_*C - \lambda_*I)x'(\mu_*) = Cx_*. \quad (2.14)$$

This proves the equation (2.7).

To prove the identity (2.8), we take the derivative of (2.11) with respect to μ and obtain

$$(A - \mu C - \lambda(\mu)I)x''(\mu) = 2(C + \lambda'(\mu)I)x'(\mu) + \lambda''(\mu)x(\mu). \quad (2.15)$$

Multiplying (2.15) by $x^H(\mu)$ from left, by (2.10), we have

$$\lambda''(\mu) = -2x^H(\mu)(C + \lambda'(\mu)I)x'(\mu). \quad (2.16)$$

The equation (2.8) is derived by taking $\mu = \mu_*$ and the equation (2.13).

To prove the equation (2.9), we notice that since the multiplicity of λ_* is 1, the null subspace of $A - \mu_*C - \lambda_*I$ is spanned by x_* . Since $(x'(\mu_*))^H x_* = 0$ by (2.2), equation (2.7) implies the equation (2.9). □

2.2 Singularity of 2D-eigen triplets and characterizations

In Part II [6], we indicated that the 2DEVP (1.1) can be viewed as the problem of finding the root of the following system of nonlinear equations

$$F(\mu, \lambda, x) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} (A - \mu C - \lambda I)x \\ -x^H C x / 2 \\ -x^H x / 2 + 1/2 \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

The Jacobian of F is defined as

$$J(\mu, \lambda, x) = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} A - \mu C - \lambda I & -Cx & -x \\ \hline -x^H C & 0 & 0 \\ -x^H & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right]. \quad (2.17)$$

The following definition introduces the notion of singularity of a 2D-eigen triplet.

Definition 2.1. A 2D-eigen triplet (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) of (A, C) is called nonsingular if the Jacobian $J(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)$ is nonsingular. Otherwise, it is called singular.

The following theorem provides characterizations of the singularity. By these characterizations, we see that the singularity of a 2D-eigen triplet (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) does not explicitly depend on x_* . Therefore, we will also call (μ_*, λ_*) a nonsingular (singular) 2D-eigenvalue.

Theorem 2.2. Let (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) be a 2D-eigen triplet of the 2DEVP (1.1) and k be the multiplicity of λ_* for being an eigenvalue of $A - \mu_*C$.

- (i) If $k = 1$, then the 2D-eigen triplet (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) is nonsingular if and only if $\lambda''(\mu_*) \neq 0$, where $\lambda(\cdot)$ is an analyticalized eigencurve satisfying $\lambda(\mu_*) = \lambda_*$.
- (ii) If $k = 2$, then the 2D-eigen triplet (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) is nonsingular if and only if $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ is invertible, where \tilde{V}_* is an orthonormal basis of the eigenspace associated with eigenvalue λ_* of $A - \mu_*C$.
- (iii) If $k \geq 3$, then the 2D-eigen triplet (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) is singular.

Proof. We first note that by $x_*^H C x_* = 0$, x_* is orthogonal to Cx_* . Let Q be an $n \times n$ orthogonal matrix with the first column x_* and the second column q_2 satisfy $Cx_* = \alpha q_2$. Denote $\tilde{Q} = \text{Diag}(Q, I_2)$. Then

$$\tilde{Q}^H J_* \tilde{Q} \equiv \tilde{Q}^H J(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*) \tilde{Q} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|cc} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & a_{22} & a_{23} & -\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & a_{23}^H & A_{33} & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -\bar{\alpha} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right], \quad (2.18)$$

where A_{33} is $n-2$ by $n-2$. Let $x(\mu)$ be an analyticalized eigenvector function defined in Theorem 2.1. Writing

$$x'(\mu_*) = Q[y_1, y_2, y_3^T]^T, \quad (2.19)$$

where y_1 and y_2 are scalars. Then by (2.8),

$$\lambda''(\mu_*) = -2(Cx_*)^H x'(\mu_*) = -2\bar{\alpha}y_2. \quad (2.20)$$

Now let us consider the result (i). By equations (2.18) and (2.20), the result (i) is equivalent to prove that $J(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)$ is singular if and only if $\lambda''(\mu_*) = 0$.

Let us assume $\lambda''(\mu_*) = 0$. By (2.20), it implies $\alpha = 0$ or $y_2 = 0$. If $\alpha = 0$, then by (2.18), J_* is singular since it has a zero column. If $\alpha \neq 0$ and $y_2 = 0$, we have by (2.7)

$$Q^H(A - \mu_*C - \lambda_*I)x'(\mu_*) = Q^H Cx_*$$

which implies that

$$a_{23}y_3 = \alpha (\neq 0), \quad (2.21)$$

$$A_{33}y_3 = 0. \quad (2.22)$$

Equation (2.21) says $y_3 \neq 0$, and thus (2.22) admits a nonzero y_3 . This implies A_{33} is singular. By elementary transformation and noting $\alpha \neq 0$, $\tilde{Q}^H J_* \tilde{Q}$ can be transformed to

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|cc} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & A_{33} & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -\bar{\alpha} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right], \quad (2.23)$$

which further implies $Q^H J_* Q$ is singular since A_{33} is singular. Therefore J_* is singular.

On the other hand, assume J_* is singular. If $\alpha = 0$, then by (2.20), $\lambda''(\mu_*) = 0$ and we reach the conclusion. If $\alpha \neq 0$, by transforming $\tilde{Q}^H J_* \tilde{Q}$ to (2.23) and noting J_* is singular, we have A_{33} is singular. By (2.7) and (2.19), we have

$$a_{22}y_2 + a_{23}y_3 = \alpha (\neq 0), \quad (2.24)$$

$$a_{23}^H y_2 + A_{33}y_3 = 0. \quad (2.25)$$

Note that since the multiplicity of λ_* is 1, Matrices $\begin{bmatrix} a_{23} \\ A_{33} \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{23}^H & A_{33} \end{bmatrix}$ are of full rank. Consider the equations

$$a_{23}z = \alpha, \quad A_{33}z = 0. \quad (2.26)$$

Since A_{33} is singular, $A_{33}z = 0$ admits nonzero solution. We further have $a_{23}z \neq 0$ since $\begin{bmatrix} a_{23} \\ A_{33} \end{bmatrix}$ is of full rank. Thus (2.26) admits a solution, which we denote by z_* . Then

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{23}^H & A_{33} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z_* \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $\begin{bmatrix} a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{23}^H & A_{33} \end{bmatrix}$ is of full rank, $[0, z_*^T]^T$ must equal to $[y_2, y_3^T]^T$ according to (2.24)(2.25) and thus $y_2 = 0$. By (2.20), $\lambda''(\mu_*) = 0$. This completes the proof of the result (i).

For the result (ii), we prove that J_* is singular if and only if $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ is singular. Let Q be the orthogonal matrix with its first two columns \tilde{V}_* and $\tilde{Q} = \text{Diag}(Q, I_2)$. Then

$$\tilde{Q}^H J_* \tilde{Q} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} O & & -\tilde{V}_*^H [Cx_*, x_*] & \\ & A_{33} & \times & \\ \hline -[Cx_*, x_*]^H \tilde{V}_* & \times & & O \end{array} \right],$$

where O is a 2-by-2 zero block, A_{33} is nonsingular and \times stands for some submatrices. Obviously,

$$J_* \text{ is singular} \Leftrightarrow \tilde{V}_*^H [Cx_*, x_*] \text{ is singular.} \quad (2.27)$$

Now for the sake of convenience, we further assume the first column of \tilde{V}_* is x_* , otherwise \tilde{V}_* will differ from an orthogonal transformation and the conclusion still holds. Then from $x_*^H C x_* = 0$, we have

$$\tilde{V}_*^H [Cx_*, x_*] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \hat{x}^H C x_* & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_* = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x_*^H C \hat{x} \\ \hat{x}^H C x_* & \hat{x}^H C \hat{x} \end{bmatrix},$$

where \hat{x} is the second column of \tilde{V}_* . Hence $\tilde{V}_*^H [Cx_*, x_*]$ is singular if and only if $\hat{x}^H C x_* = 0$, which is equivalent to $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ is singular. Together with (2.27), the result (ii) is proved.

For the result (iii), since the multiplicity of λ_* is k , there exists orthogonal $\tilde{Q} = \text{Diag}(Q, I_2)$ such that

$$\tilde{Q}^H J_* \tilde{Q} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} O^{k \times k} & & -Q^H C x_* & -Q^H x_* \\ & D & & \\ \hline -(C x_*)^H Q & & & \\ -x_*^H Q & & & \end{array} \right].$$

Since $k \geq 3$, J_* is obviously singular. This completes the proof of the result (iii). \square

The following theorem provides alternative characterizations for the case where the multiplicity of λ_* is 2.

Theorem 2.3. *Consider Theorem 2.2(ii), denote $\tilde{\lambda}_i(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_{i+1}(\cdot)$ as the two analyticalized eigenvalues of $A - \mu C$ that satisfy $\tilde{\lambda}_i(\mu_*) = \tilde{\lambda}_{i+1}(\mu_*) = \lambda_*$. Then*

(i) (μ_*, λ_*) is nonsingular if and only if $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ is indefinite.

(ii) (μ_*, λ_*) is nonsingular if and only if $\tilde{\lambda}'_i(\mu_*) \tilde{\lambda}'_{i+1}(\mu_*) < 0$.

Proof. We first prove the equivalence of nonsingularity and indefiniteness of $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$. Note that $x_* \in \text{span}\{\tilde{V}_*\}$ and $x_*^H C x_* = 0$. Thus $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ is not a definite matrix. Therefore, if $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ is nonsingular, then $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ is indefinite. On the other hand, if $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ is indefinite, since the matrix size is 2, $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ must have one positive and one negative eigenvalue, which implies $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ is nonsingularity.

Now let us consider the statement (i). By Theorem 2.2(ii), (μ_*, λ_*) is nonsingular if and only if $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ is nonsingular. By the equivalence of nonsingularity and indefiniteness of $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$, we reach the statement (i).

For the statement (ii), we note that according to Part I [8, Thm 4.4], the eigenvalues of $-\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ are $\tilde{\lambda}'_i(\mu_*)$ and $\tilde{\lambda}'_{i+1}(\mu_*)$. Thus (μ_*, λ_*) is nonsingular if and only if $\tilde{\lambda}'_i(\mu_*) \tilde{\lambda}'_{i+1}(\mu_*) \neq 0$. Since $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ is not a definite matrix, $\tilde{\lambda}'_i(\mu_*) \tilde{\lambda}'_{i+1}(\mu_*) \neq 0$ is equivalent to $\tilde{\lambda}'_i(\mu_*) \tilde{\lambda}'_{i+1}(\mu_*) < 0$. \square

We end the discussion of singularity by the following corollary from Theorem 2.2 and equations (2.8) and (2.27).

Corollary 2.1.

(i) If (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) is a nonsingular 2D-eigenvalue, then $C x_* \neq 0$.

(ii) If (μ_*, λ_*) is a nonsingular 2D-eigenvalue, λ_* is an eigenvalue of $A - \mu_* C$ with multiplicity 1, and $x(\mu)$ is the corresponding eigenvector function defined in Lemma 2.1, then $x'(\mu_*) \neq 0$.

2.3 Simple and multiple 2D-eigen triplets

Theorems 2.2 and 2.3 indicate that a 2D-eigenvalue (μ_*, λ_*) is nonsingular if and only if one of the following two cases happen:

- I: λ_* is a simple 2D-eigenvalue and the corresponding analytic eigencurve $\lambda(\mu)$ satisfies $\lambda''(\mu_*) \neq 0$.
- II: λ_* is a multiple 2D-eigenvalue with the multiplicity two and the corresponding two real analytic eigencurves $\tilde{\lambda}_1(\mu)$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_2(\mu)$ satisfy $\tilde{\lambda}'_1(\mu_*)\tilde{\lambda}'_2(\mu_*) < 0$.

Cases I and II are the cases of practical interests as we have encountered. In the rest of this paper, we will concentrate on the convergence analysis of the 2DRQI for these two cases. We note that the idea for analyzing Case II can be used for treating singular multiple 2D-eigenvalues with corresponding analyticalyzed eigencurves having both negative and positive derivatives. For more general cases of singular 2D-eigenvalues, the 2DRQI needs to be revised to recover second-order convergence rate. It is a subject of future study.

2.3.1 Properties of nonsingular simple 2D-eigen triplets

Let us consider Case I, namely (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) be a nonsingular simple 2D-eigen triplet. Since it is simple, the set of 2D-eigen vectors is of the form

$$\mathcal{X}_* = \{\gamma x_* \mid \gamma \in \mathbb{C}, |\gamma| = 1\}. \quad (2.28)$$

Furthermore, for the Jacobian $J(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)$ and its leading n -row matrix $\hat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*) = [A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I, -Cx_* - x_*]$, $\sigma_{\min}(J(\mu_*, \lambda_*, \gamma x_*))$ and $\sigma_n(\hat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, \gamma x_*))$ are independent of γ for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$ and $|\gamma| = 1$ due to the facts that

$$J(\mu_*, \lambda_*, \gamma x_*) = \text{Diag}(I_n, \bar{\gamma}I_2)J(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)\text{Diag}(I_n, \gamma I_2)$$

and

$$\hat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, \gamma x_*) = \hat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)\text{Diag}(I_n, \gamma I_2).$$

On the other hand, by the definition of nonsingularity, $\hat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)$ is of full row rank and has a nullspace of dimension 2. By Lemma 2.1, a basis matrix of the nullspace of $\hat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)$ is given by:

$$\hat{V}_* = \begin{bmatrix} x_* & x'_*/\sqrt{\|x'_*\|^2 + 1} \\ 0 & 1/\sqrt{\|x'_*\|^2 + 1} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2.29)$$

where $x'_* = x'(\mu_*)$, and $x(\mu)$ is the analyticalyzed eigenvector function defined in Theorem 2.1 corresponding to (μ_*, λ_*) and satisfies $x(\mu_*) = x_*$. By Corollary 2.1, $x'_* \neq 0$. Let $\tilde{V}_* = [x_*, x'_*/\|x'_*\|]$, then \tilde{V}_* is well defined, and has orthonormal columns by the orthogonality condition (2.2). Let $V_* = \tilde{V}_* S$, where $S \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ is a unitary matrix such that

$$C_* = V_*^H C V_* = \text{Diag}(c_{1,*}, c_{2,*}) \quad \text{with} \quad c_{1,*} \geq c_{2,*}.$$

The following lemma presents the properties of the 2×2 2DRQ $(A_*, C_*) = (V_*^H A V_*, V_*^H C V_*)$ induced by V_* .

Lemma 2.2. *Let (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) be a nonsingular simple 2D-eigen triplet, then*

- (i) C_* is indefinite.
- (ii) The (1,2)-element $(A_*)_{1,2} \neq 0$.

Therefore, the 2×2 2DRQ (A_*, C_*) has two simple 2D eigenvalues.

Proof. For the result (i), it is sufficient to show that $\tilde{C}_* = \tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ is indefinite. Since $x_*^H C x_* = 0$, and $-2x_*^H C x'_* = \lambda''(\mu_*)$ from (2.8), we have

$$\tilde{C}_* = \tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_* = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda''(\mu_*)/(-2\|x'_*\|) \\ \lambda''(\mu_*)/(-2\|x'_*\|) & (x'_*)^H C x'_*/\|x'_*\|^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Consequently,

$$\det(\tilde{C}_*) = -(\lambda''(\mu_*)/(2\|x'_*\|))^2 < 0,$$

which implies \tilde{C}_* is indefinite.

For the result(ii), we use the proof by contradiction. For brevity, we use $x, x', x'', \mu, \lambda, \lambda', \lambda''$ to denote $x_*, x'(\mu_*), x''(\mu_*), \mu_*, \lambda_*, \lambda'(\mu_*), \lambda''(\mu_*)$. Assume that $(A_*)_{1,2} = (V_*^H A V_*)_{1,2} = 0$. By the assumption, $V_*^H A V_*$ and $V_*^H C V_*$ are both diagonal. Therefore, $\tilde{V}_*^H A \tilde{V}_*$ and $\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*$ are simultaneously diagonalized, and then commute:

$$(\tilde{V}_*^H A \tilde{V}_*)(\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*) = (\tilde{V}_*^H C \tilde{V}_*)(\tilde{V}_*^H A \tilde{V}_*),$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{x^H A x' \lambda''}{-2\|x'\|^2} & \frac{\lambda \lambda''}{-2\|x'\|} + \frac{x^H A x' x'^H C x'}{\|x'\|^3} \\ \frac{x'^H A x \lambda''}{-2\|x'\|^3} & \frac{x'^H A x \lambda''}{-2\|x'\|^2} + \frac{x'^H A x' x'^H C x'}{\|x'\|^4} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\lambda'' x'^H A x}{-2\|x'\|^2} & \frac{x'^H A x' \lambda''}{-2\|x'\|^3} \\ \frac{\lambda \lambda''}{-2\|x'\|} + \frac{x'^H A x x'^H C x'}{\|x'\|^3} & \frac{\lambda'' x^H A x'}{-2\|x'\|^2} + \frac{x'^H A x' x'^H C x'}{\|x'\|^4} \end{bmatrix}.$$

where we use (2.8). By Theorem 2.2(i), $\lambda'' \neq 0$. Thus the above equation can be simplified as:

$$\begin{cases} x^H A x' \text{ is real,} & (2.30a) \\ \frac{\lambda'' x'^H A x'}{-2\|x'\|^3} = \frac{\lambda \lambda''}{-2\|x'\|} + \frac{x'^H C x' x'^H A x}{\|x'\|^3}. & (2.30b) \end{cases}$$

We now show that equation(2.30b) implies $\lambda'' = 0$, which contradicts Theorem 2.2(i).

By $(A - \mu C - \lambda(\mu)I)x(\mu) = 0$ and the orthogonality (2.2), we have

$$x'(\mu)^H A x(\mu) = \mu x'(\mu)^H C x(\mu). \quad (2.31)$$

By taking the derivative of the identity (2.31) and setting $\mu = \mu_*$, we have

$$x'^H A x' + x''^H A x = x'^H C x + \mu x''^H C x + \mu x'^H C x'.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} x'^H A x' &= -x''^H (\lambda x + \mu C x) + x'^H C x + \mu x''^H C x + \mu x'^H C x' \\ &= -\lambda x''^H x + x'^H C x + \mu x'^H C x' \\ &= \lambda \|x'\|^2 + x'^H C x + \mu x'^H C x', \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

where for the last equality, we use the fact that $x''^H x = -\|x'\|^2$, which is derived from taking the derivative of the orthogonality condition (2.2) and setting $\mu = \mu_*$.

Thus by (2.8), (2.31) and (2.32), equation (2.30b) is equivalent to

$$\frac{(\lambda \|x'\|^2 + x'^H C x + \mu x'^H C x') \lambda''}{-2\|x'\|^3} = \frac{\lambda \lambda''}{-2\|x'\|} + \frac{\mu x'^H C x' \lambda''}{-2\|x'\|^3}.$$

By eliminating the common terms on the both side of the equation, we have $x'^H C x = 0$. By (2.8), $\lambda'' = 0$. This completes the proof by contradiction.

By the results (i) and (ii), and [8, Sec.3], we conclude that the 2DRQ (A_*, C_*) has two simple 2D-eigenvalues. \square

2.3.2 Properties of nonsingular multiple 2D-eigen triplets

Now let us consider Case II, namely (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) be a nonsingular multiple 2D-eigen triplet. Here by Theorem 2.2, the nonsingularity implies the multiplicity of λ_* for being an eigenvalue of $A - \mu_* C$ is 2. By the definition of nonsingularity, the matrix $\hat{J}_* = [A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I, -Cx_*, -x_*]$ has full row rank and the dimension of the nullspace of \hat{J}_* is 2. If we denote \tilde{V}_* as an orthonormal basis of the eigenspace associated with λ_* , a basis matrix of the nullspace of \hat{J}_* is given by $[\tilde{V}_*^T, 0, 0]^T$. Let $V_* = \tilde{V}_* S$, where $S \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ is an unitary matrix, such that

$$C_* \equiv V_*^H C V_* = \text{Diag}(c_{1,*}, c_{2,*}) \quad \text{with} \quad c_{1,*} \geq c_{2,*}. \quad (2.33)$$

Then the set of 2D-eigenvectors is of the form

$$\mathcal{X}_* = \{\gamma_1 t_* v_{1,*} + \gamma_2 s_* v_{2,*} \mid \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{C}, |\gamma_1| = |\gamma_2| = 1\}, \quad (2.34)$$

where $V_* = [v_{1,*}, v_{2,*}]$, $t_* = \sqrt{-c_{2,*}/(c_{1,*} - c_{2,*})}$, $s_* = \sqrt{c_{1,*}/(c_{1,*} - c_{2,*})}$.

By Theorem 2.2, for any $x_* \in \mathcal{X}_*$, $J(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)$ and $\hat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)$ have full rank. Thus

$$\sigma_{\min}(J(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_n(\hat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)) > 0.$$

Since \mathcal{X}_* is compact, $\sigma_{\min}(J(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*))$ and $\sigma_n(\hat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*))$ are continuous functions with respect to x according to Weyl's theorem [2, p.198], we conclude that

$$\sigma_{\min, J_*} = \inf_{x_* \in \mathcal{X}_*} \sigma_{\min}(J(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{n, \hat{J}_*} = \inf_{x_* \in \mathcal{X}_*} \sigma_n(\hat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)) > 0.$$

The following lemma presents the properties of the 2×2 2DRQ $(A_*, C_*) = (V_*^H A V_*, V_*^H C V_*)$ induced by V_* .

Lemma 2.3. *Let (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) be a nonsingular multiple 2D-eigenvalue, then*

(i) C_* is indefinite;

(ii) The $(1, 2)$ -element $(A_*)_{1,2} = 0$.

Therefore, there are exactly one multiple 2D-eigenvalue of (A_*, C_*) . In addition, we have

$$\sigma_{1, C_*} \equiv \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}_*} \|Cx\| > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{1, V C_*} \equiv \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}_*} \|V_*^H Cx\| = \sqrt{-c_{1,*} c_{2,*}} > 0. \quad (2.35)$$

Proof. The result (i) is concluded from Theorem 2.3(i).

For result(ii), note that

$$A V_* = \mu_* C V_* + \lambda_* V_*.$$

Multiplying V_*^H on the left and we obtain

$$V_*^H A V_* = \mu_* \text{Diag}(c_{1,*}, c_{2,*}) + \lambda_* I.$$

Thus $V_*^H A V_*$ is diagonal and $(V_*^H A V_*)_{1,2} = 0$.

By the results (i) and (ii), and Section 3 in Part I [8], we conclude that the 2DRQ (A_*, C_*) has one multiple 2D-eigenvalue.

For the two identities in (2.35), since $\|V_*^H Cx\| \leq \|V_*^H\| \|Cx\| = \|Cx\|$, we only need to prove the second identity. Note that $x \in \mathcal{X}_*$ implies there exists $z \in \mathbb{C}^2$ satisfying $x = V_* z$, $\|z\| = 1$ and $z^H C_* z = 0$. Denote $z = [z_1, z_2]^T$. Straight calculation shows

$$\begin{bmatrix} |z_1| \\ |z_2| \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_{1,*} - c_{2,*}}} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{-c_{2,*}} \\ \sqrt{c_{1,*}} \end{bmatrix},$$

and thus

$$\|V_*^H Cx\| = \|C_* z\| = \sqrt{-c_{1,*} c_{2,*}} > 0.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Compare the result (ii) in Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3, we foresee that the convergence behavior of the 2DRQI is different for simple and multiple 2D-eigenvalues. This leads to different treatments of the convergence analysis of the 2DRQI in Sections 5 and 6.

3 Recap of the 2D Rayleigh quotient iteration

In this section, we recap the key steps of the 2DRQI presented in Section 3 of Part II [6]. Let (μ_k, λ_k, x_k) be the k th approximation of a 2D-eigen triplet (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) . Assume that the Jacobian $J_k \equiv J(\mu_k, \lambda_k, x_k)$ is nonsingular, see the justification in Lemmas 5.1 and 6.1 when (μ_k, λ_k, x_k) is sufficiently close to (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) .

Let $\widehat{J}_k = \widehat{J}(\mu_k, \lambda_k, x_k) = [A - \mu_k C - \lambda_k I, -C x_k, -x_k]$ be the first n rows of J_k , and $\begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{V}_k \\ R \end{bmatrix}$ be a basis matrix of the nullspace of \widehat{J}_k . Then the projection matrix V_k of the 2DRQI is defined as

$$V_k = \text{orth}(\widetilde{V}_k) \quad (3.1)$$

and

$$V_k^H C V_k = \text{Diag}(c_{1,k}, c_{2,k}) \quad \text{with} \quad c_{1,k} \geq c_{2,k}. \quad (3.2)$$

Correspondingly, we have the 2DRQ:

$$(A_k, C_k) \equiv (V_k^H A V_k, V_k^H C V_k). \quad (3.3)$$

In Lemmas 5.4 and 6.3, it will be shown that when (μ_k, λ_k, x_k) is sufficiently close to (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) , C_k is indefinite. Consequently, by Section 3 of Part I [8], if $a_{12,k} \neq 0$, where $a_{ij,k}$ is the (i, j) element of A_k , the 2×2 2DEVP of 2DRQ (A_k, C_k) :

$$\begin{cases} (A_k - \nu C_k - \theta I)z = 0, & (3.4a) \\ z^H C_k z = 0, & (3.4b) \\ z^H z = 1, & (3.4c) \end{cases}$$

has two distinct 2D-eigen triplets

$$(\nu(\alpha_{k,i}), \theta(\alpha_{k,i}), z(\alpha_{k,i})) \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (3.5)$$

where $\alpha_{k,i} = \pm |a_{12,k}| / a_{12,k}$, and

$$\nu(\alpha) = \frac{z(\alpha)^H C_k A_k z(\alpha)}{\|C_k z(\alpha)\|^2}, \quad \theta(\alpha) = z(\alpha)^H A_k z(\alpha), \quad z(\alpha) = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{-c_{2,k}}{c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}}} \\ \alpha \sqrt{\frac{c_{1,k}}{c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.6)$$

Otherwise, if $a_{12,k} = 0$, the 2D-eigen triplet of the 2×2 2DEVP (3.4) is

$$(\nu_1, \theta_1, z(\alpha)) \equiv \left(\frac{a_{11,k} - a_{22,k}}{c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}}, \frac{a_{22,k} c_{1,k} - a_{11,k} c_{2,k}}{c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}}, z(\alpha) \right), \quad (3.7)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $|\alpha| = 1$.

From the 2D-eigen triplets (3.5) and (3.7) of the 2DRQ (A_k, C_k) , when $a_{12,k} \neq 0$, by (3.5) the following 2D Ritz triplet defines the $k + 1$ st approximate 2D-eigen triplet of (A, C) :

$$\mu_{k+1} = \nu(\alpha_{k,j}), \quad \lambda_{k+1} = \theta(\alpha_{k,j}) \quad \text{and} \quad x_{k+1} = V_k z(\alpha_{k,j}), \quad (3.8)$$

where the index j is the one such that $|\mu_k - \nu(\alpha_{k,j})| + |\lambda_k - \theta(\alpha_{k,j})|$ is smaller for $j = 1, 2$. Otherwise, when $a_{12,k} = 0$, by (3.7), the $k + 1$ st approximate 2D-eigen triplet of (A, C) is given by

$$\mu_{k+1} = \nu_1, \quad \lambda_{k+1} = \theta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad x_{k+1} = V_k z(1), \quad (3.9)$$

where for brevity, we choose $\alpha = 1$.

4 Results from matrix perturbation analysis

In this section, we recall several known results on matrix perturbation analysis and derive a couple of new results that will be used for the convergence analysis of the 2DRQI.

The canonical angles provide a useful tool to measure the distance between two subspaces, see e.g., [7, Sec 4.2.1]. Let $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times k}$ and have orthonormal columns, $k \leq n$. Then the k canonical angles $\theta_j(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ between the range spaces of $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{R}(X)$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{R}(Y)$ are defined by

$$0 \leq \theta_j(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) := \arccos \sigma_j \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq k, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_k$ are singular values of the matrix $Y^H X$, and are in ascending order

$$\theta_1(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \leq \dots \leq \theta_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}).$$

Let

$$\Theta(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \text{Diag}(\theta_1(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}), \dots, \theta_k(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})). \quad (4.2)$$

It is well-known that for any unitarily invariant norm $\|\cdot\|_{\text{UI}}$, it holds that both $\|\Theta(X, Y)\|_{\text{UI}}$ and $\|\sin \Theta(X, Y)\|_{\text{UI}}$ are unitarily invariant metrics on the Grassmann manifold $\mathbf{Gr}(k, \mathbb{C}^n)$ (see e.g., [7, Thm.4.10,p.93]). Note that since the canonical angles are independent of the basis matrices X and Y , for convenience, we use the notation $\Theta(X, Y)$ interchangeably with $\Theta(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$.

The following result from [7, p. 92, Thm 4.5] expresses the metric $\|\sin \Theta(U, V)\|$ in terms of the distance between a vector x and a closed set Y :

$$\text{dist}(x, Y) = \min\{\|x - y\| \mid y \in Y\}.$$

Theorem 4.1 ([7]). *Assume $U, V \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times \ell}$ are of full column rank, then*

$$\|\sin \Theta(U, V)\| = \max \left\{ \max_{u \in \text{span}\{U\}, \|u\|=1} \text{dist}(u, \text{span}\{V\}), \max_{v \in \text{span}\{V\}, \|v\|=1} \text{dist}(v, \text{span}\{U\}) \right\}.$$

By Theorem 4.1, we have the following result.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume $u, v \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $\|u\| = \|v\| = 1$, then*

$$\|\sin \Theta(u, v)\| = \sqrt{1 - |u^H v|^2}.$$

Proof. We only need to note that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{z \in \text{span}\{u\}, \|z\|=1} \text{dist}(z, \text{span}\{v\}) &= \max_{\|\gamma\|=1} \text{dist}(\gamma u, \text{span}\{v\}) \\ &= \text{dist}(u, \text{span}\{v\}) = \|(I - vv^H)u\| = \sqrt{1 - |u^H v|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

The next theorem shows that for two matrices U, V such that $\|U - V\|$ is small, when one of them has orthonormal columns, $\|\sin \Theta(U, V)\|$ will also be small.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $U, V \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times l}$. Assume U has orthonormal columns, and $\|U - V\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then $\|\sin \Theta(U, V)\| \leq 2\|U - V\|$.*

Proof. Since U has orthonormal columns, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{u \in \text{span}\{U\}, \|u\|=1} \text{dist}(u, \text{span}\{V\}) &= \max_{\|z\|=1} \text{dist}(Uz, \text{span}\{V\}) \\ &\leq \max_{\|z\|=1} \|(U - V)z\| = \epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where $\epsilon = \|U - V\|$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{v \in \text{span}\{V\}, \|v\|=1} \text{dist}(v, \text{span}\{U\}) &= \max_{\|Vz\|=1} \text{dist}(Vz, \text{span}\{U\}) \\ &\leq \max_{\|Vz\|=1} \|(U - V)z\| \leq \max_{\|Vz\|=1} \epsilon \|z\|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Denote $E = V - U$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \|Uz + Ez\|^2 = \|z\|^2 + \|Ez\|^2 + 2 \text{Re}(z^H U^H Ez) \\ &\geq \|z\|^2 + \|Ez\|^2 - 2\|z\| \|Ez\| = (\|z\| - \|Ez\|)^2 \geq (1 - \epsilon)^2 \|z\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\|z\| \leq \frac{1}{1-\epsilon}$, which implies

$$\max_{\|Vz\|=1} \epsilon \|z\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} \leq 2\epsilon. \quad (4.5)$$

The proof is completed by combining (4.3), (4.4), (4.5) and Theorem 4.1. \square

The following result [9, lemma 4.1] relates $\|\sin \Theta\|$ metric and usual $\|\cdot\|$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let U, V be $n \times \ell$ matrices with orthonormal columns, then there exists a unitary matrix $Z \in \mathbb{C}^{\ell \times \ell}$, such that*

$$\|\sin \Theta(U, V)\| \leq \|U - VZ\| \leq \sqrt{2} \|\sin \Theta(U, V)\|.$$

The following is the well-known $\sin \Theta$ theorem due to Davis and Kahan [1].

Theorem 4.3 ([1]). *Let A and $A + H$ satisfy*

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_1^H \\ X_2^H \end{bmatrix} A \begin{bmatrix} X_1 & X_2 \end{bmatrix} = \text{Diag}(A_1, A_2), \quad \begin{bmatrix} Y_1^H \\ Y_2^H \end{bmatrix} (A + H) \begin{bmatrix} Y_1 & Y_2 \end{bmatrix} = \text{Diag}(L_1, L_2),$$

where $[X_1, X_2]$ and $[Y_1, Y_2]$ are unitary with $X_1, Y_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times k}$. Let

$$R = (A + H)X_1 - X_1A_1,$$

where $A_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times k}$. If there exists $\delta > 0$ and an interval $[\alpha, \beta]$, such that

$$\Lambda(A_1) \subseteq [\alpha, \beta], \quad \Lambda(L_2) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \setminus (\alpha - \delta, \beta + \delta),$$

where $\Lambda(X)$ denotes the set of eigenvalues of the matrix X , then

$$\|\sin \Theta(X_1, Y_1)\| \leq \frac{\|R\|}{\delta}.$$

Next we present a couple of results derived from the above classical results. We begin from the following perturbation theorem for the nullspace of a matrix based on Theorem 4.3).

Theorem 4.4. *Let $J, \tilde{J} \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times n}$ be of full row rank, $k < n$, and X_1 and \tilde{X}_1 be the orthonormal bases of the nullspaces of J and \tilde{J} , respectively, Assume $\epsilon = \|J - \tilde{J}\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\min}(J)$, where $\sigma_{\min}(J)$ is the smallest singular value of J . Then*

$$\|\sin \Theta(X_1, \tilde{X}_1)\| \leq \frac{8\|J\|}{\sigma_{\min}^2(J)} \epsilon. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. Note that $Jx = 0$ if and only if $J^H Jx = 0$. Thus X_1 and \tilde{X}_1 are also the orthonormal bases of eigen-subspace corresponding to the eigenvalue 0 of $J^H J$ and $\tilde{J}^H \tilde{J}$, respectively.

By Weyl's theorem [2, p.198], $\sigma_{\min}(J) \geq \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{\min}(J)$. To apply Theorem 4.3, let \tilde{X}_2 be the $n \times (n - k)$ matrix such that $[\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2]$ is a unitary matrix, and let A_1 be a $k \times k$ zero matrix, then we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_1^H \\ X_2^H \end{bmatrix} J^H J \begin{bmatrix} X_1 & X_2 \end{bmatrix} = \text{Diag}(A_1, A_2), \quad \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{X}_1^H \\ \tilde{X}_2^H \end{bmatrix} \tilde{J}^H \tilde{J} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{X}_1 & \tilde{X}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \text{Diag}(0, L_2),$$

$$\Lambda(A_1) \subseteq [0, 0], \quad \Lambda(L_2) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \setminus \left(-\frac{1}{4}\sigma_{\min}^2(J), \frac{1}{4}\sigma_{\min}^2(J) \right).$$

Let $R \equiv \tilde{J}^H \tilde{J} X_1 - X_1 A_1$. Then by a straightforward calculation we have

$$\|R\| = \|\tilde{J}^H (\tilde{J} - J) X_1\| \leq \epsilon(\epsilon + \|J\|) \leq 2\|J\|\epsilon,$$

where the last inequality results from the fact that $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{\min}(J) \leq \|J\|$. Then the bound (4.6) is directly derived from Theorem 4.3. \square

The following theorem shows that for matrices with two orthonormal columns, if they simultaneously diagonalize a Hermitian matrix C and their $\|\sin \Theta\|$ metric is small, then their 2-norm difference could also be small under a column scaling. It will be used in Lemmas 5.3 and 6.2 for proving the approximation properties of 2DRQs.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $C \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be Hermitian. Assume $U = [u_1, u_2]$ and $V = [v_1, v_2]$ have orthonormal columns such that $U^H C U = \text{Diag}(c_{1,u}, c_{2,u})$ with $c_{1,u} > c_{2,u}$, and $V^H C V = \text{Diag}(c_{1,v}, c_{2,v})$ with $c_{1,v} \geq c_{2,v}$. Then there exist positive constants t_0 and κ_0 depending on $(C, c_{1,u} - c_{2,u})$, such that when $\|\sin \Theta(U, V)\| \leq t_0$,*

$$\left\| U - V \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 & \\ & \gamma_2 \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \kappa_0 \|\sin \Theta(U, V)\|.$$

where $\gamma_i = \text{sign}(v_i^H u_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.2, there exists unitary matrices Z such that

$$\|U - VZ\| \leq \sqrt{2}t,$$

where $t = \|\sin \Theta(U, V)\|$. Denote $\Delta U = U - VZ$, then we have

$$\|U^H C U - Z^H V^H C V Z\| = \|\Delta U^H C U + Z^H V^H C \Delta U\| \leq 2\sqrt{2}\|C\|t. \quad (4.7)$$

Note that $c_{1,v}$ and $c_{2,v}$ are eigenvalues of $Z^H V^H C V Z$. By Weyl's theorem [2, p.198], for $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$|c_{i,u} - c_{i,v}| \leq 2\sqrt{2}\|C\|t.$$

Let $W = [w_1, w_2] \equiv Z^H$, consider the eigenvalue decomposition of $U^H C U$ and $Z^H V^H C V Z$:

$$U^H C U = \text{Diag}(c_{1,u}, c_{2,u}), \quad Z^H V^H C V Z = W \text{Diag}(c_{1,v}, c_{2,v}) W^H.$$

Let $R = (Z^H V^H C V Z - U^H C U)e_1$. Utilizing (4.7), we have

$$\|R\| \leq 2\sqrt{2}\|C\|t.$$

Note that when $t \leq \frac{c_{1,u} - c_{2,u}}{4\sqrt{2}\|C\|}$, $c_{2,v} \leq c_{2,u} + \frac{c_{1,u} - c_{2,u}}{2} = \frac{c_{1,u} + c_{2,u}}{2}$. Denote $\delta = \frac{c_{1,u} - c_{2,u}}{2}$, we have

$$c_{1,u} \subseteq [c_{1,u}, c_{1,u}] \quad \text{and} \quad c_{2,v} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \setminus (c_{1,u} - \delta, c_{1,u} + \delta).$$

Thus by Theorem 4.3,

$$\|\sin \Theta(e_1, w_1)\| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}\|C\|t}{\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\sin \Theta(e_2, w_2)\| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}\|C\|t}{\delta}. \quad (4.8)$$

On the other hand, according to Lemma 4.1, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\|\sin \Theta(e_i, w_i)\| = \sqrt{1 - |e_i^H w_i|^2}. \quad (4.9)$$

By (4.8) and (4.9),

$$1 - |e_i^H w_i| \leq 1 - |e_i^H w_i|^2 \leq \frac{8\|C\|^2}{\delta^2} t^2. \quad (4.10)$$

Now define $\tilde{\gamma}_i = \text{sign}(w_i^H e_i)$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{|\hat{\gamma}_1|=|\hat{\gamma}_2|=1} \|U - V \text{Diag}(\hat{\gamma}_1, \hat{\gamma}_2)\|_F &\leq \|U - V \text{Diag}(\tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2)\|_F \\ &\leq \|U - VZ\|_F + \|VZ - VZW \text{Diag}(\tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2)\|_F \\ &\leq 2t + \|I - W \text{Diag}(\tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2)\|_F \\ &= 2t + \sqrt{4 - 2|e_1^H w_1| - 2|e_2^H w_2|} \\ &\leq 2t + \sqrt{\frac{32\|C\|^2}{\delta^2} t^2} = 2t + \frac{4\sqrt{2}\|C\|}{\delta} t. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

where in the third inequality we use the fact that $\|X\|_F = \sqrt{\|X(:, 1)\|^2 + \|X(:, 2)\|^2} \leq \sqrt{2}\|X\|$ for a $n \times 2$ matrix.

On the other hand, for $|\hat{\gamma}_1| = |\hat{\gamma}_2| = 1$, $\|U - V \text{Diag}(\hat{\gamma}_1, \hat{\gamma}_2)\|_F^2 = 4 - 2 \text{Re}(u_1^H v_1 \hat{\gamma}_1) - 2 \text{Re}(u_2^H v_2 \hat{\gamma}_2)$ reach minimum when $\hat{\gamma}_i = \text{sign}(v_i^H u_i)$. Since $\gamma_i = \text{sign}(v_i^H u_i)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|U - V \text{Diag}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)\| &\leq \|U - V \text{Diag}(\hat{\gamma}_1, \hat{\gamma}_2)\|_F = \min_{|\hat{\gamma}_1|=|\hat{\gamma}_2|=1} \|U - V \text{Diag}(\hat{\gamma}_1, \hat{\gamma}_2)\|_F \\ &\leq \left(2 + \frac{4\sqrt{2}\|C\|}{\delta}\right) t. \end{aligned}$$

Let $t_0 = \frac{c_{1,u} - c_{2,u}}{4\sqrt{2}\|C\|}$ and $\kappa_0 = 2 + \frac{4\sqrt{2}\|C\|}{\delta}$, then we reach the conclusion. \square

To end this section, we present a simple estimate on a second-order approximation of λ_* from an approximate 2D-eigenvector. It will be used in Lemmas 5.7 and 6.5 for the error bounds of 2D-Ritz values.

Theorem 4.6. *Let (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) be a 2D-eigen triplet of the 2DEV (1.1), Assume \tilde{x} is an approximate 2D-eigenvector satisfying $\tilde{x}^H C \tilde{x} = 0$ and $\tilde{x}^H \tilde{x} = 1$. Let $\epsilon = \|x_* - \tilde{x}\|$, then*

$$|\tilde{x}^H A \tilde{x} - \lambda_*| \leq \|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\| \epsilon^2. \quad (4.12)$$

Proof. Denote $\Delta x = x_* - \tilde{x}$, by straightforward calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{x}^H A \tilde{x} - \lambda_*| &= |(x_* - \Delta x)^H A (x_* - \Delta x) - \lambda_*| \\ &= |-2 \text{Re}(\Delta x^H A x_*) + \Delta x^H A \Delta x| \\ &= |-2 \text{Re}(\Delta x^H (\mu_* C x_* + \lambda_* x_*)) + \Delta x^H A \Delta x|, \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

where in the second inequality we use the fact $\lambda_* = x_*^H A x_*$. By $\tilde{x}^H C \tilde{x} = 0$ and $\tilde{x}^H \tilde{x} = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (x_* - \Delta x)^H C (x_* - \Delta x) = -2 \text{Re}(\Delta x^H C x_*) + \Delta x^H C \Delta x, \\ 1 &= (x_* - \Delta x)^H (x_* - \Delta x) = 1 - 2 \text{Re}(\Delta x^H x_*) + \Delta x^H \Delta x, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$2 \text{Re}(\Delta x^H C x_*) = \Delta x^H C \Delta x \quad \text{and} \quad 2 \text{Re}(\Delta x^H x_*) = \Delta x^H \Delta x. \quad (4.14)$$

The desired bound (4.12) is then derived by combining (4.13) and (4.14). \square

5 Convergence analysis for simple-2D eigenvalues

In this section, we prove that the 2DRQI is locally quadratically convergent for computing a nonsingular simple 2D-eigen triplet.

5.1 Properties of Jacobian J_k

Let (μ_k, λ_k, x_k) be the k -th iterate to a nonsingular simple 2D-eigen triplet (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) , where x_* is the vector in \mathcal{X}_* closest to x_k and \mathcal{X}_* is the set of 2D eigenvectors defined in (2.28). The following lemma shows that when (μ_k, λ_k, x_k) is sufficiently close to $(\mu_*, \lambda_*, \mathcal{X}_*)$, Jacobian $J_k = J(\mu_k, \lambda_k, x_k)$ is nonsingular.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\epsilon = \max\{|\mu_k - \mu_*|, |\lambda_k - \lambda_*|, \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}_*)\}$. Then there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , such that if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$, the following statements hold:*

(i) J_k is nonsingular.

(ii) $\sigma_n(\widehat{J}_k) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*)$.

Proof. Note that

$$\|J_k - J_*\| = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} (\mu_* - \mu_k)C + (\lambda_* - \lambda_k)I & C(x_* - x_k) & x_* - x_k \\ (x_* - x_k)^H C & 0 & 0 \\ (x_* - x_k)^H & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq 3(\|C\| + 1)\epsilon, \quad (5.1)$$

and

$$\|\widehat{J}_k - \widehat{J}_*\| = \left\| [(\mu_* - \mu_k)C + (\lambda_* - \lambda_k)I \quad C(x_* - x_k) \quad x_* - x_k] \right\| \leq \sqrt{3}(\|C\| + 1)\epsilon. \quad (5.2)$$

Here the last inequalities in (5.1) and (5.2) are from the following matrix norm inequality [4, Lemma 3.5]:

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & \cdots & A_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{m1} & \cdots & A_{mn} \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \sqrt{mn} \max_{i,j} \|A_{ij}\|. \quad (5.3)$$

Let

$$\epsilon_1 = \frac{\min\{\sigma_{\min}(J_*), \sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*)\}}{6(\|C\| + 1)} > 0, \quad (5.4)$$

Then when $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$, by Weyl's theorem[2, p.198], we have

$$|\sigma_{\min}(J_k) - \sigma_{\min}(J_*)| \leq \frac{\sigma_{\min}(J_*)}{2} \quad (5.5)$$

and

$$|\sigma_n(\widehat{J}_k) - \sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*)| \leq \frac{\sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*)}{2}. \quad (5.6)$$

By (5.5) and (5.6), we have the results (i) and (ii). \square

5.2 Approximation of V_k to V_*

Next we show that the approximation of V_k to V_* when (μ_k, λ_k, x_k) is sufficiently close to $(\mu_*, \lambda_*, \mathcal{X}_*)$. Recall that V_k is defined in (3.1) and (3.2) and V_* is defined in Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\epsilon = \max\{|\mu_k - \mu_*|, |\lambda_k - \lambda_*|, \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}_*)\}$. There exists positive scalars ϵ_t, κ_t depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , such that if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_t$, we have*

$$\|\sin \Theta(V_k, V_*)\| \leq \kappa_t \epsilon. \quad (5.7)$$

Proof. Consider the nullspace of \widehat{J}_k . According to Lemma 5.1, there exists positive constants ϵ_1 depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , such that if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$, we have

$$\sigma_n(\widehat{J}_k) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*) > 0.$$

Thus the nullspace of \widehat{J}_k has dimension 2. Denote \widehat{V}_k as an orthonormal basis of the nullspace of \widehat{J}_k .

On the other hand, in Section 2.3.1, we know that

$$\widehat{V}_* \equiv \begin{bmatrix} x_* & x'_*/\sqrt{\|x'_*\|^2 + 1} \\ 0 & 1/\sqrt{\|x'_*\|^2 + 1} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

is an orthonormal basis of the nullspace of $\widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)$. Note that by (5.2),

$$\|\widehat{J}_* - \widehat{J}_k\| \leq \sqrt{3}(\|C\| + 1)\epsilon.$$

Since $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$, by the definition (5.4) of ϵ_1 , we have

$$\sqrt{3}(\|C\| + 1)\epsilon \leq \frac{\sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*)}{2}.$$

By Theorem 4.4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sin \Theta(\widehat{V}_*, \widehat{V}_k)\| &\leq \frac{8\sqrt{3}(\|C\| + 1)\|\widehat{J}_*\|\epsilon}{\sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{8\sqrt{3}(\|C\| + 1)(\|A - \mu_*C - \lambda_*I\| + \|C\| + 1)}{\sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*)^2} \epsilon \equiv \widetilde{\alpha}_1 \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

By Lemma 4.2, the inequality (5.8) implies there exists a unitary matrix \widehat{Z} such that

$$\|\widehat{V}_* - \widehat{V}_k \widehat{Z}\| \leq \sqrt{2} \|\sin \Theta(\widehat{V}_k, \widehat{V}_*)\| = \sqrt{2} \widetilde{\alpha}_1 \epsilon.$$

Therefore, for the first n rows of $\widehat{V}_* - \widehat{V}_k \widehat{Z}$, we have

$$\left\| V_* \text{Diag}\left(1, \frac{\|x'_*\|}{\sqrt{\|x'_*\|^2 + 1}}\right) - \widehat{V}_k(1:n, :)\widehat{Z} \right\| \leq \sqrt{2} \widetilde{\alpha}_1 \epsilon,$$

or equivalently,

$$\left\| V_* - \widehat{V}_k(1:n, :)\widehat{Z} \text{Diag}\left(1, \frac{\sqrt{\|x'_*\|^2 + 1}}{\|x'_*\|}\right) \right\| \leq \sqrt{2} \frac{\sqrt{\|x'_*\|^2 + 1}}{\|x'_*\|} \widetilde{\alpha}_1 \epsilon.$$

By Theorem 4.2, when $\epsilon \leq \frac{\|x'_*\|}{2\sqrt{2}\widetilde{\alpha}_1\sqrt{\|x'_*\|^2 + 1}}$, we have

$$\|\sin \Theta(V_*, V_k)\| \leq 2\sqrt{2} \frac{\sqrt{\|x'_*\|^2 + 1}}{\|x'_*\|} \widetilde{\alpha}_1 \epsilon. \quad (5.9)$$

Let $\epsilon_t = \min\left\{\epsilon_1, \frac{\|x'_*\|}{2\sqrt{2}\widetilde{\alpha}_1\sqrt{\|x'_*\|^2 + 1}}\right\}$ and $\kappa_t = 2\sqrt{2} \frac{\sqrt{\|x'_*\|^2 + 1}}{\|x'_*\|} \widetilde{\alpha}_1$. Then we reach the bound (5.7). \square

5.3 Properties of the 2DRQ

We now investigate the properties of the 2×2 2DRQ (A_k, C_k) . We show that C_k is an indefinite matrix and the 2D-eigenvalues of (A_k, C_k) defined in (3.3) are simple.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\epsilon = \max\{|\mu_k - \mu_*|, |\lambda_k - \lambda_*|, \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}_*)\}$. There exists $\epsilon_2 > 0$ depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) such that if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_2$,*

$$|a_{12,k}| \geq \frac{1}{2}|a_{12,*}|, \quad (5.10)$$

where $a_{ij,k}$ and $a_{ij,*}$ denote the (i, j) -elements of A_k and A_* respectively.

Proof. By Lemma 5.2, there exists positive constants ϵ_t and κ_t depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , such that if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_t$, we have

$$\|\sin \Theta(V_*, V_k)\| \leq \kappa_t \epsilon. \quad (5.11)$$

Since $V_*^H C V_* = \text{Diag}(c_{1,*}, c_{2,*})$ and $V_k^H C V_k = \text{Diag}(c_{1,k}, c_{2,k})$, by Theorem 4.5, there exists positive constants t_0, κ_0 depending on $(C, c_{1,*}, c_{2,*})$ such that if $\kappa_t \epsilon \leq t_0$, i.e., $\epsilon \leq \frac{t_0}{\kappa_t}$, there exists γ_1, γ_2 with absolute value 1, satisfying

$$\|V_* - V_k \text{Diag}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)\| \leq \kappa_0 \|\sin \Theta(V_*, V_k)\| \leq \kappa_0 \kappa_t \epsilon, \quad (5.12)$$

where t_0, κ_0 are constants defined in Theorem 4.5 and only depend on $(C, c_{1,*} - c_{2,*})$.

Denote $E = \begin{bmatrix} E_1 & E_2 \end{bmatrix} \equiv V_* - V_k \text{Diag}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$, and write $V_k = \begin{bmatrix} v_1 & v_2 \end{bmatrix}$. Utilizing (5.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |a_{12,k}| &= |v_1^H A v_2| = |\bar{\gamma}_1 v_1^H A v_2 \gamma_2| = |(v_{1,*} - E_1)^H A (v_{2,*} - E_2)| \\ &\geq |v_{1,*}^H A v_{2,*}| - |v_{1,*}^H A E_2| - |E_1^H A v_2| \geq |a_{12,*}| - 2\|E\| \|A\| \geq |a_{12,*}| - 2\kappa_0 \kappa_t \|A\| \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_2 \equiv \min\left\{\epsilon_t, \frac{t_0}{\kappa_t}, \frac{|a_{12,*}|}{4\kappa_0 \kappa_t \|A\|}\right\}$, we have $|a_{12,k}| \geq \frac{|a_{12,*}|}{2}$. Since ϵ_2 only depends on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , we reach the inequality (5.10). \square

Next we show that $C_k = V_k^H C V_k$ is an indefinite matrix, and its eigenvalues are bounded away from 0.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\epsilon = \max\{|\mu_k - \mu_*|, |\lambda_k - \lambda_*|, \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}_*)\}$. There exists $\epsilon_T > 0$ depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , such that if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_T$,*

(i) C_k is indefinite.

(ii) $\frac{1}{2}c_{1,*} \leq c_{1,k} \leq \frac{3}{2}c_{1,*}$ and $\frac{3}{2}c_{2,*} \leq c_{2,k} \leq \frac{1}{2}c_{2,*}$.

Proof. In Lemma 2.2, we have proven that $C_* = V_*^H C V_* = \text{Diag}(c_{1,*}, c_{2,*})$ is indefinite with $c_{1,*} > 0 > c_{2,*}$.

For V_k defined in (3.1) and (3.2), by Lemma 4.2, there exists a unitary matrix U_k , such that

$$\|V_* - V_k U_k\| \leq \sqrt{2} \|\sin \Theta(V_k, V_*)\|.$$

According to Weyl's theorem [2, p. 198], and the fact that $c_{1,k} \geq c_{2,k}$ are eigenvalues of C_k , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |c_{i,*} - c_{i,k}| &\leq \|V_*^H C V_* - U_k^H V_k^H C V_k U_k\| \\ &\leq \|(V_* - V_k U_k)^H C V_*\| + \|U_k^H V_k^H C (V_* - V_k U_k)\| \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{2} \|C\| \|\sin \Theta(V_k, V_*)\| \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

Now by Lemma 5.2, there exists positive constants ϵ_t, κ_t depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , such that if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_t$,

$$\|\sin \Theta(V_k, V_*)\| \leq \kappa_t \epsilon.$$

Therefore, if

$$\epsilon \leq \epsilon_T \equiv \min \left\{ \epsilon_t, \frac{\min\{|c_{1,*}|, |c_{2,*}|\}}{4\sqrt{2}\kappa_t\|C\|} \right\},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{|c_{1,*} - c_{1,k}|, |c_{2,*} - c_{2,k}|\} &\leq 2\sqrt{2}\|C\|\|\sin \Theta(V_k, V_*)\| \\ &\leq \frac{\min\{|c_{1,*}|, |c_{2,*}|\}}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2,k} = c_{2,*} - (c_{2,*} - c_{2,k}) &\leq c_{2,*} + |c_{2,*} - c_{2,k}| \leq c_{2,*} + \frac{\min\{|c_{1,*}|, |c_{2,*}|\}}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2}c_{2,*}; \\ c_{2,k} = c_{2,*} - (c_{2,*} - c_{2,k}) &\geq c_{2,*} - |c_{2,*} - c_{2,k}| \geq c_{2,*} - \frac{\min\{|c_{1,*}|, |c_{2,*}|\}}{2} \geq \frac{3}{2}c_{2,*}. \end{aligned}$$

By similar argument, we have $\frac{1}{2}c_{1,*} \leq c_{1,k} \leq \frac{3}{2}c_{1,*}$. This completes the proof. \square

5.4 Main result

The following is the main result on the quadratic convergence of the 2DRQI to compute a nonsingular simple 2D-eigenvalue.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\epsilon = \max\{|\mu_k - \mu_*|, |\lambda_k - \lambda_*|, \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}_*)\}$. There exists a constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$ depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , such that if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$,*

(i) $k + 1$ approximate 2D-eigen triplet $(\mu_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}, x_{k+1})$ is determined as in (3.8).

(ii) The 2DRQI has locally quadratic convergence rate, i.e.,

$$|\mu_{k+1} - \mu_*| \leq \kappa_1 \epsilon^2, \quad |\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_*| \leq \kappa_2 \epsilon^4 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dist}(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_*) \leq \kappa_3 \epsilon^2, \quad (5.13)$$

where κ_1, κ_2 and κ_3 are constants depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) .

The proof of Theorem 5.1 is split into the following three lemmas. The first lemma shows that $\text{span}\{V_k\}$ contains a second-order approximate vector to \mathcal{X}_* .

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\epsilon = \max\{|\mu_k - \mu_*|, |\lambda_k - \lambda_*|, \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}_*)\}$. If $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$, where ϵ_1 is defined in Lemma 5.1, there exists $x_{k+1}^{(p)} \in \text{span}\{V_k\}$, such that $\|x_{k+1}^{(p)}\| = 1$ and*

$$\text{dist}(x_{k+1}^{(p)}, \mathcal{X}_*) \leq \frac{4(\|C\| + 1)}{\sigma_n(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_*)} \epsilon^2. \quad (5.14)$$

Proof. Denote $\Delta\mu_k = \mu_* - \mu_k$, $\Delta\lambda_k = \lambda_* - \lambda_k$ and $\Delta x_k = x_* - x_k$. Then

$$|\Delta\mu_k| \leq \epsilon, \quad |\Delta\lambda_k| \leq \epsilon, \quad \|\Delta x_k\| \leq \epsilon,$$

and

$$(A - \mu_k C - \lambda_k I)x_* - \Delta\mu_k C(x_k + \Delta x_k) - \Delta\lambda_k(x_k + \Delta x_k) = 0. \quad (5.15)$$

Write (5.15) as

$$\widehat{J}_k \begin{bmatrix} x_* \\ \Delta\mu_k \\ \Delta\lambda_k \end{bmatrix} = \Delta\mu_k C \Delta x_k + \Delta\lambda_k \Delta x_k. \quad (5.16)$$

Then the minimum norm solution of (5.16) is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta x^{(p)} \\ \Delta\mu^{(p)} \\ \Delta\lambda^{(p)} \end{bmatrix} = V_k^{(J)} (\Sigma_k^{(J)})^{-1} (U_k^{(J)})^H (\Delta\mu_k C \Delta x_k + \Delta\lambda_k \Delta x_k),$$

where $\widehat{J}_k = U_k^{(J)} \Sigma_k^{(J)} (V_k^{(J)})^H$ is the SVD of \widehat{J}_k , $U_k^{(J)} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, $\Sigma_k^{(J)} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ and $V_k^{(J)} \in \mathbb{C}^{(n+2) \times n}$. Let

$$\widehat{x}_{k+1}^{(p)} = x_* - \Delta x^{(p)}, \quad \Delta\mu_{k+1}^{(p)} = \Delta\mu_k - \Delta\mu^{(p)}, \quad \Delta\lambda_{k+1}^{(p)} = \Delta\lambda_k - \Delta\lambda^{(p)}. \quad (5.17)$$

Then

$$\widehat{J}_k \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{x}_{k+1}^{(p)} \\ \Delta\mu_{k+1}^{(p)} \\ \Delta\lambda_{k+1}^{(p)} \end{bmatrix} = 0, \quad (5.18)$$

and the vector $\begin{bmatrix} \widehat{x}_{k+1}^{(p)} \\ \Delta\mu_{k+1}^{(p)} \\ \Delta\lambda_{k+1}^{(p)} \end{bmatrix}$ belongs to the nullspace of \widehat{J}_k and thus $\widehat{x}_{k+1}^{(p)} \in \text{span}\{V_k\}$. The desired vector $x_{k+1}^{(p)}$ is then given by

$$x_{k+1}^{(p)} = \widehat{x}_{k+1}^{(p)} / \|\widehat{x}_{k+1}^{(p)}\|.$$

Obviously, $x_{k+1}^{(p)} \in \text{span}\{V_k\}$ and $\|x_{k+1}^{(p)}\| = 1$. The approximation error satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_* - x_{k+1}^{(p)}\| &\leq \|x_* - \widehat{x}_{k+1}^{(p)}\| + \|\widehat{x}_{k+1}^{(p)} - x_{k+1}^{(p)}\| \\ &= \|\Delta x^{(p)}\| + \left| \|\widehat{x}_{k+1}^{(p)}\| - 1 \right| \\ &\leq 2\|\Delta x^{(p)}\| \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

$$\leq \frac{4(\|C\| + 1)}{\sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*)} \epsilon^2, \quad (5.20)$$

where in (5.19), we use the definition $\widehat{x}_{k+1}^{(p)} = x_* - \Delta x^{(p)}$ and the following fact:

$$1 - \|\Delta x^{(p)}\| \leq \|x_* - \Delta x^{(p)}\| \leq 1 + \|\Delta x^{(p)}\|.$$

For the inequality (5.20), we use the fact that the minimum norm solution of (5.16) satisfies

$$\|\Delta x^{(p)}\| \leq \frac{(\|C\| + 1)}{\sigma_n(\widehat{J}_k)} \epsilon^2 \leq \frac{2(\|C\| + 1)}{\sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*)} \epsilon^2, \quad (5.21)$$

where the second inequality is due to Lemma 5.1. This completes the proof. \square

We call the vector $x_{k+1}^{(p)}$ in Lemma 5.5 a “pre-optimal” solution since $x_{k+1}^{(p)H} C x_{k+1}^{(p)}$ does not necessarily vanish and is thus generally not the $k + 1$ -th iterate x_{k+1} . The next lemma shows that based on this pre-optimal solution, we can construct a vector \tilde{x}_{k+1} in $\text{span}\{V_k\}$ satisfying (1.1b).

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\epsilon = \max\{|\mu_k - \mu_*|, |\lambda_k - \lambda_*|, \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}_*)\}$. If $\epsilon \leq \min\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_T\}$, where ϵ_1, ϵ_T are defined in Lemmas 5.1 and 5.4, then there exists*

$$\tilde{x}_{k+1} \in \mathcal{X}_k \equiv \{x \mid x \in \text{span}\{V_k\}, x^H C x = 0, x^H x = 1\}, \quad (5.22)$$

such that

$$\text{dist}(\tilde{x}_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_*) \leq \left(\frac{16\|C\|}{\sqrt{-c_{1,*}c_{2,*}}} + 4 \right) \frac{\|C\| + 1}{\sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*)} \epsilon^2, \quad (5.23)$$

Proof. We prove by construction. First, for $x_{k+1}^{(p)}$ determined in Lemma 5.5, we have $x_{k+1}^{(p)} \in \text{span}\{V_k\}$. Write $x_{k+1}^{(p)} = t_p v_1 + s_p v_2$ with $|t_p|^2 + |s_p|^2 = 1$, where $V_k = [v_1 \ v_2]$.

Let \tilde{x}_* be the vector in \mathcal{X}_* closest to $x_{k+1}^{(p)}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x_{k+1}^{(p)H} C x_{k+1}^{(p)}| &= |(x_{k+1}^{(p)} - \tilde{x}_*)^H C x_{k+1}^{(p)} + \tilde{x}_*^H C (x_{k+1}^{(p)} - \tilde{x}_*) + \tilde{x}_*^H C \tilde{x}_*| \\ &= |(x_{k+1}^{(p)} - \tilde{x}_*)^H C x_{k+1}^{(p)} + \tilde{x}_*^H C (x_{k+1}^{(p)} - \tilde{x}_*)| \\ &\leq 2\|C\| \|x_{k+1}^{(p)} - \tilde{x}_*\|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

Define

$$\tilde{x}_{k+1} = t v_1 + s v_2, \quad (5.25)$$

where

$$t = \text{sign}(t_p) \sqrt{\frac{-c_{2,k}}{c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}}}, \quad s = \text{sign}(s_p) \sqrt{\frac{c_{1,k}}{c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}}}. \quad (5.26)$$

Obviously, $\|\tilde{x}_{k+1}\| = 1$ and $\tilde{x}_{k+1}^H C \tilde{x}_{k+1} = 0$. This implies $\tilde{x}_{k+1} \in \mathcal{X}_k$, and

$$\|\tilde{x}_{k+1} - x_{k+1}^{(p)}\| = \|(t - t_p)v_1 + (s - s_p)v_2\| = \sqrt{||t| - |t_p||^2 + ||s| - |s_p||^2}. \quad (5.27)$$

where the last equality results from $v_1 \perp v_2$ and the sign of t, s .

Next we derive an upper bound of the right-hand-side of equation (5.27). Note that

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1}^{(p)H} C x_{k+1}^{(p)} &= |t_p|^2 c_{1,k} + (1 - |t_p|^2) c_{2,k}, \\ 0 = \tilde{x}_{k+1}^H C \tilde{x}_{k+1} &= |t|^2 c_{1,k} + (1 - |t|^2) c_{2,k}; \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting the previous two equations, we have

$$-x_{k+1}^{(p)H} C x_{k+1}^{(p)} = (|t|^2 - |t_p|^2)(c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}) = (|t| - |t_p|)(|t| + |t_p|)(c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}).$$

Similarly, in terms of s ,

$$x_{k+1}^{(p)H} C x_{k+1}^{(p)} = (|s| - |s_p|)(|s| + |s_p|)(c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{||t| - |t_p||^2 + ||s| - |s_p||^2} &= \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{|t| + |t_p|} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{|s| + |s_p|} \right)^2} \frac{|x_{k+1}^{(p)H} C x_{k+1}^{(p)}|}{c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{|t|^2} + \frac{1}{|s|^2}} \frac{|x_{k+1}^{(p)H} C x_{k+1}^{(p)}|}{c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}}{-c_{2,k}} + \frac{c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}}{c_{1,k}}} \frac{|x_{k+1}^{(p)H} C x_{k+1}^{(p)}|}{c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}} \\ &= \frac{|x_{k+1}^{(p)H} C x_{k+1}^{(p)}|}{\sqrt{-c_{1,k}c_{2,k}}} \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

By Lemma 5.4,

$$\sqrt{-c_{1,k}c_{2,k}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{-c_{1,*}c_{2,*}}. \quad (5.29)$$

Thus from (5.24) and (5.29), we have

$$\sqrt{||t| - |t_p||^2 + ||s| - |s_p||^2} \leq \frac{4\|C\| \|x_{k+1}^{(p)} - \tilde{x}_*\|}{\sqrt{-c_{1,*}c_{2,*}}}. \quad (5.30)$$

Finally, by Lemma 5.5, we have

$$\text{dist}(\tilde{x}_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_*) \leq \|\tilde{x}_{k+1} - x_{k+1}^{(p)}\| + \text{dist}(x_{k+1}^{(p)}, \mathcal{X}_*) \leq \left(\frac{16\|C\|}{\sqrt{-c_{1,*}c_{2,*}}} + 4 \right) \frac{\|C\| + 1}{\sigma_n(\hat{J}_*)} \epsilon^2. \quad (5.31)$$

This completes the proof. \square

The next result shows there exists a 2D-Ritz triplet sufficiently close to the target 2D-eigen triplet.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\epsilon = \max\{|\mu_k - \mu_*|, |\lambda_k - \lambda_*|, \text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}_*)\}$. Then if $\epsilon \leq \min\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_T\}$, where $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_T$ are defined in Lemmas 5.1, 5.3, and 5.4, respectively, we have*

(i) *2DRQ (A_k, C_k) has two 2D Ritz values $(\nu_{k,j}, \theta_{k,j})$ for $j = 1, 2$.*

(ii) *2DRQ (A_k, C_k) has at least one of 2D Ritz triplets $(\nu_{k,j}, \theta_{k,j}, x_{k,j})$ for $j = 1, 2$ satisfying*

$$|\nu_{k,j} - \mu_*| \leq \kappa_1 \epsilon^2, \quad |\theta_{k,j} - \lambda_*| \leq \kappa_2 \epsilon^4, \quad \text{dist}(x_{k,j}, \mathcal{X}_*) \leq \kappa_3 \epsilon^2, \quad (5.32)$$

where $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3 > 0$ are constants depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) .

Proof. Let $\epsilon \leq \min\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_T\}$. By Lemma 5.3, $a_{12,k} \equiv (V_k^H A V_k)_{1,2} \neq 0$. Thus the 2×2 2DEVP (3.4) has two 2D-eigen triplets (see Section 3):

$$(\nu(\alpha_{k,j}), \theta(\alpha_{k,j}), z(\alpha_{k,j})), \quad j = 1, 2,$$

where $\nu(\cdot), \theta(\cdot), z(\cdot)$ are defined in (3.6), and

$$\alpha_{k,1} = \frac{\bar{a}_{12,k}}{|a_{12,k}|}, \quad \alpha_{k,2} = -\frac{\bar{a}_{12,k}}{|a_{12,k}|}.$$

This proves the result(i).

We now consider the result (ii). First, since $\epsilon \leq \min\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_T\}$, by Lemma 5.6, $\tilde{x}_{k+1} = \frac{tv_1 + sv_2}{\|tv_1 + sv_2\|} \in \mathcal{X}_k$ is well defined with t, s defined by (5.25) and $V_k = [v_1 \ v_2]$. For brevity, let $\tilde{x}_{k+1} := \text{sign}(t)\tilde{x}_{k+1}$. Then $\text{dist}(\tilde{x}_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_*)$ is invariant. By equations (5.26) and (3.6), \tilde{x}_{k+1} can be further written as

$$\tilde{x}_{k+1} = V_k z(\tilde{\alpha}), \quad |\tilde{\alpha}| = 1. \quad (5.33)$$

Note that the 2D Ritz triplets are given by

$$(\nu_{k,i}, \theta_{k,i}, x_{k,i}) = (\nu(\alpha_{k,i}), \theta(\alpha_{k,i}), V_k z(\alpha_{k,i})) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

We next prove that one of $\alpha_{k,i}$ is a good approximation to $\tilde{\alpha}$. We begin by showing that the imaginary part of $\nu(\tilde{\alpha})$ is small by utilizing \tilde{x}_{k+1} is close to \mathcal{X}_* . Let $\Delta x = \tilde{x}_* - \tilde{x}_{k+1}$, where \tilde{x}_* is the vector in \mathcal{X}_* closest to \tilde{x}_{k+1} . Starting with (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\tilde{\alpha}) &= \tilde{x}_{k+1}^H C V_k V_k^H A \tilde{x}_{k+1} / \|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|^2 \quad (\text{due to (5.33)}) \\ &= \tilde{x}_{k+1}^H C V_k V_k^H A (\tilde{x}_* - \Delta x) / \|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|^2 \\ &= \tilde{x}_{k+1}^H C V_k V_k^H A \tilde{x}_* / \|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|^2 + h_1 \quad (h_1 \text{ denotes remaining terms}) \\ &= \mu_* \tilde{x}_{k+1}^H C V_k V_k^H C \tilde{x}_* / \|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|^2 + \lambda_* \tilde{x}_{k+1}^H C V_k V_k^H \tilde{x}_* / \|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|^2 + h_1 \\ &= \mu_* \tilde{x}_{k+1}^H C V_k V_k^H C \tilde{x}_{k+1} / \|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|^2 + \lambda_* \tilde{x}_{k+1}^H C V_k V_k^H \tilde{x}_{k+1} / \|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|^2 + h_2 \\ &= \mu_* \tilde{x}_{k+1}^H C V_k V_k^H C \tilde{x}_{k+1} / \|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|^2 + \lambda_* \tilde{x}_{k+1}^H C \tilde{x}_{k+1} / \|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|^2 + h_2 \\ &= \mu_* \tilde{x}_{k+1}^H C V_k V_k^H C \tilde{x}_{k+1} / \|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|^2 + h_2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.34)$$

where

$$h_2 = -\frac{\tilde{x}_{k+1}^H CV_k V_k^H A \Delta x}{\|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|^2} + \frac{\mu_* \tilde{x}_{k+1}^H CV_k V_k^H C \Delta x}{\|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|^2} + \frac{\lambda_* \tilde{x}_{k+1}^H CV_k V_k^H \Delta x}{\|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|^2}$$

and the 6-th equality comes from $\tilde{x}_{k+1} \in \text{span}\{V_k\}$. To estimate h_2 , note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{x}_{k+1}^H CV_k\| &= \|z(\tilde{\alpha})^H V_k^H CV_k\| = \|z(\tilde{\alpha})^H C_k\| \\ \|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\| &= \sqrt{-c_{1,k} c_{2,k}}, \quad \forall \alpha : |\alpha| = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (5.35)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |h_2| &= \left| -\frac{\tilde{x}_{k+1}^H CV_k V_k^H (A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I) \Delta x}{\|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|^2} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{\|C_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\|} \|\Delta x\| = \frac{\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{\sqrt{-c_{1,k} c_{2,k}}} \|\Delta x\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu_* \tilde{x}_{k+1}^H CV_k V_k^H C \tilde{x}_{k+1} / \|C_k z(\alpha)\|^2$ is real, (5.34) implies

$$|\text{Imag } \nu(\tilde{\alpha})| \leq \frac{\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{\sqrt{-c_{1,k} c_{2,k}}} \|\Delta x\|. \quad (5.36)$$

On the other hand, by (3.6), straight calculation shows

$$\text{Imag } \nu(\tilde{\alpha}) = \text{Imag } \frac{c_{1,k} \tilde{\alpha} a_{12,k} + c_{2,k} \overline{\tilde{\alpha} a_{12,k}}}{(c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}) \sqrt{-c_{1,k} c_{2,k}}} = \text{Imag } \frac{\tilde{\alpha} a_{12,k}}{\sqrt{-c_{1,k} c_{2,k}}}. \quad (5.37)$$

By (5.36) and (5.37), $\tilde{\alpha}$ satisfies

$$|\text{Imag}(\tilde{\alpha} a_{12,k})| \leq \|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\| \|\Delta x\|. \quad (5.38)$$

Let $e^{i\theta_0} = \frac{\tilde{\alpha} a_{12,k}}{|a_{12,k}|}$ and $\tilde{\alpha} = e^{i\tilde{\theta}} e^{i\theta_0}$, where $\theta_0, \tilde{\theta} \in (-\pi, \pi]$. Then (5.38) turns to

$$|\sin \tilde{\theta}| |a_{12,k}| \leq \|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\| \|\Delta x\|.$$

Therefore,

$$|\sin \tilde{\theta}| \leq \frac{\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{|a_{12,k}|} \|\Delta x\|. \quad (5.39)$$

When $\cos \tilde{\theta} > 0$, we let $j = 1$; otherwise we let $j = 2$. Utilizing expressions $\alpha_{k,i} = \pm e^{i\theta_0}, i = 1, 2$, $\tilde{\alpha} = e^{i\tilde{\theta}} e^{i\theta_0}$ and (5.39), for the chosen j , we have

$$|\alpha_{k,j} - \tilde{\alpha}| = \left| |\cos \tilde{\theta}| - 1 + i \sin \tilde{\theta} \right| \quad (5.40)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{2 - 2|\cos \tilde{\theta}|} \leq \sqrt{2 - 2\cos^2 \tilde{\theta}} \quad (5.41)$$

$$= \sqrt{2} |\sin \tilde{\theta}| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2} \|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{|a_{12,k}|} \|\Delta x\|. \quad (5.42)$$

This implies $\alpha_{k,j}$ is a good approximation to $\tilde{\alpha}$.

We now consider the distance between $(\nu_{k,j}, \theta_{k,j}, x_{k,j})$ and $(\mu_*, \lambda_*, \mathcal{X}_*)$ for the chosen j . Straight calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{k,j} - \tilde{x}_{k+1}\| &= \|V_k z(\alpha_{k,j}) - V_k z(\tilde{\alpha})\| \\ &= \|z(\alpha_{k,j}) - z(\tilde{\alpha})\| \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{c_{1,k}}}{\sqrt{c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}}} |\alpha_{k,j} - \tilde{\alpha}| \\ &\leq |\alpha_{k,j} - \tilde{\alpha}| \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \frac{\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{|a_{12,k}|} \|\Delta x\|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.43)$$

Then according to (5.43), Lemmas 5.4 and 5.6, we immediately have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(x_{k,j}, \mathcal{X}_*) &\leq \|x_{k,j} - \tilde{x}_{k+1}\| + \text{dist}(\tilde{x}_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_*) \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \frac{\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{|a_{12,k}|} \|\Delta x\| + \|\Delta x\| \end{aligned} \quad (5.44)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq 2\sqrt{2} \frac{\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{|a_{12,*}|} \|\Delta x\| + \|\Delta x\| \\ &= \left(2\sqrt{2} \frac{\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{|a_{12,*}|} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{16\|C\|}{\sqrt{-c_{1,*}c_{2,*}}} + 4 \right) \frac{\|C\| + 1}{\sigma_n(\hat{J}_*)} \epsilon^2 := \kappa_3 \epsilon^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.45)$$

Thus we have proved the result for approximate 2D-eigenvector $x_{k,j}$.

Now denote \hat{x}_* as the vector in \mathcal{X}_* closest to $x_{k,j}$. The equation $(A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I)\hat{x}_* = 0$ can be rewritten as

$$(A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I)x_{k,j} = (A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I)(x_{k,j} - \hat{x}_*).$$

Multiplying V_k^H on the left and utilizing $x_{k,j} = V_k z(\alpha_{k,j})$, we have

$$(A_k - \mu_* C_k - \lambda_* I)z(\alpha_{k,j}) = V_k^H (A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I)(x_{k,j} - \hat{x}_*) \equiv r. \quad (5.46)$$

and

$$\|r\| \leq \|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\| \|x_{k,j} - \hat{x}_*\| \leq \|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\| \kappa_3 \epsilon^2. \quad (5.47)$$

We now show that $\nu_{k,j}$ is a good approximation to μ_* . Multiplying $z(\alpha_{k,j})^H C_k$ on the left of (5.46) and using $z(\alpha_{k,j})^H C_k z(\alpha_{k,j}) = 0$, we have

$$\mu_* = \frac{z(\alpha_{k,j})^H C_k A_k z(\alpha_{k,j}) - z(\alpha_{k,j})^H C_k r}{\|C_k z(\alpha_{k,j})\|^2} = \nu_{k,j} - \frac{z(\alpha_{k,j})^H C_k r}{\|C_k z(\alpha_{k,j})\|^2}. \quad (5.48)$$

By Lemma 5.4, (5.35) and (5.47),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|z(\alpha_{k,j})^H C_k r\|}{\|C_k z(\alpha_{k,j})\|^2} &\leq \frac{\|r\|}{\|C_k z(\alpha_{k,j})\|} = \frac{\|r\|}{\sqrt{-c_{1,k}c_{2,k}}} \\ &\leq \frac{2\|r\|}{\sqrt{-c_{1,*}c_{2,*}}} \leq \frac{2\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\| \kappa_3 \epsilon^2}{\sqrt{-c_{1,*}c_{2,*}}} \equiv \kappa_1 \epsilon^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.49)$$

Thus we have proved the desired error bound for $\nu_{k,j}$:

$$|\nu_{k,j} - \mu_*| \leq \kappa_1 \epsilon^2. \quad (5.50)$$

Finally, we show $\theta_{k,j} = \theta(\alpha_{k,j})$ is a good approximation to λ_* . By the definition of $\theta(\alpha)$,

$$\theta_{k,j} = \theta(\alpha_{k,j}) = z^H(\alpha_{k,j}) A_k z(\alpha_{k,j}) = x_{k,j}^H A x_{k,j}.$$

Since $x_{k,j}^H C x_{k,j} = 0$ and $x_{k,j}^H x_{k,j} = 1$, by Theorem 4.6, we have

$$|\theta_{k,j} - \lambda_*| \leq \|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\| \|\hat{x}_* - x_{k,j}\|^2 \leq \|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\| \kappa_3^2 \epsilon^4. \quad (5.51)$$

In summary, by (5.45), (5.50) and (5.51), we have the bounds (5.32) when $\epsilon \leq \min\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_T\}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.1. With Lemma 5.7, the $k+1$ approximate 2D-eigen triplet $(\mu_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}, x_{k+1})$ will be determined as in (3.8). We only need to prove we will choose the desired 2D-Ritz triplet. Without loss of generality, we assume $j = 1$ in Lemma 5.7.

Let $\epsilon \leq \min\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_T\}$, where $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_T$ are defined in Lemmas 5.1, 5.3, and 5.4, respectively. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nu_{k,1} - \mu_k| &\leq |\nu_{k,1} - \mu_*| + |\mu_* - \mu_k| \leq \epsilon + \kappa_1 \epsilon^2, \\ |\theta_{k,1} - \lambda_k| &\leq |\theta_{k,1} - \lambda_*| + |\lambda_* - \lambda_k| \leq \epsilon + \kappa_2 \epsilon^4, \end{aligned} \quad (5.52)$$

On the other hand, straight calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} |\theta_{k,1} - \theta_{k,2}| &= |z(\alpha_{k,1})^H A_k z(\alpha_{k,1}) - z(\alpha_{k,2})^H A_k z(\alpha_{k,2})| \\ &= \frac{4|a_{12,k}| \sqrt{-c_{1,k} c_{2,k}}}{c_{1,k} - c_{2,k}} \geq \frac{2|a_{12,*}| \sqrt{-c_{1,*} c_{2,*}}}{3(c_{1,*} - c_{2,*})}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.53)$$

Therefore,

$$|\nu_{k,1} - \mu_k| + |\theta_{k,1} - \lambda_k| \leq 2\epsilon + (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 \epsilon^2) \epsilon^2$$

and

$$|\nu_{k,2} - \mu_k| + |\theta_{k,2} - \lambda_k| \geq |\theta_{k,2} - \theta_{k,1}| - |\theta_{k,1} - \lambda_k| \geq \frac{2|a_{12,*}| \sqrt{-c_{1,*} c_{2,*}}}{3(c_{1,*} - c_{2,*})} - \epsilon - \kappa_2 \epsilon^4.$$

Denote $T \equiv \frac{2|a_{12,*}| \sqrt{-c_{1,*} c_{2,*}}}{3(c_{1,*} - c_{2,*})}$. When

$$2\epsilon + (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 \epsilon^2) \epsilon^2 \leq \frac{T}{2} - \epsilon - \kappa_2 \epsilon^4,$$

for example, let $\epsilon \leq \min\left\{\frac{T}{8}, \sqrt{\frac{T}{8(\kappa_1 + 2\kappa_2)}}, 1\right\}$, the following strict inequality holds

$$|\nu_{k,1} - \mu_k| + |\theta_{k,1} - \lambda_k| < |\nu_{k,2} - \mu_k| + |\theta_{k,2} - \lambda_k|.$$

Thus we will choose $(\nu_{k,1}, \theta_{k,1}, x_{k,1})$ as the next update $(\mu_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}, x_{k+1})$.

Combining with Lemma 5.7, the theorem is proven by letting $\epsilon_0 = \min\left\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_T, \frac{T}{8}, \sqrt{\frac{T}{8(\kappa_1 + 2\kappa_2)}}, 1\right\}$.

□

6 Convergence analysis for nonsingular multiple 2D-eigen triplets

In this section, we prove that the 2DRQI is locally quadratically convergent for computing a nonsingular multiple 2D-eigen triplet.

6.1 Properties of J_k

Let (μ_k, λ_k, x_k) be the k -th iterate to a nonsingular multiple 2D-eigen triplet (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) , where x_* is the vector in \mathcal{X}_* closest to x_k and \mathcal{X}_* is the set of 2D eigenvectors defined in (2.34). The following lemma shows that when (μ_k, λ_k, x_k) is sufficiently close to $(\mu_*, \lambda_*, \mathcal{X}_*)$, Jacobian $J_k = J(\mu_k, \lambda_k, x_k)$ is nonsingular.

Lemma 6.1. *Assume $|\mu_k - \mu_*| \leq \epsilon^2$, $|\lambda_k - \lambda_*| \leq \epsilon^2$, and $\text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}_*) \leq \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon \leq 1$. There exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , such that if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$,*

$$(i) \quad \sigma_{\min}(J_k) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\min, J_*},$$

$$(ii) \quad \sigma_n(\hat{J}_k) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{n, \hat{J}_*},$$

$$(iii) \sigma_n(\widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k)) \geq \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{n, \widehat{J}_*},$$

where σ_{\min, J_*} and $\sigma_{n, \widehat{J}_*}$ are defined in Section 2.3.2.

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 5.1. Note that x_* is the vector in \mathcal{X}_* closest to x_k . Denote $\widehat{J}_* = \widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)$. Then we have

$$\|\widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k) - \widehat{J}_*\| \leq \|\widehat{J}_k - \widehat{J}_*\| \leq \|J_k - J(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)\| \leq 3(\|C\| + 1)\epsilon,$$

Let

$$\epsilon_1 = \frac{\min\{\sigma_{\min, J_*}, \sigma_{n, \widehat{J}_*}\}}{6(\|C\| + 1)}.$$

Then if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$, by Weyl's theorem [2, p. 198], we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma_{\min}(J_k) - \sigma_{\min}(J(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*))| &\leq \frac{\sigma_{\min, J_*}}{2}, \\ |\sigma_n(\widehat{J}_k) - \sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*)| &\leq \frac{\sigma_{n, \widehat{J}_*}}{2}, \\ |\sigma_n(\widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k)) - \sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*)| &\leq \frac{\sigma_{n, \widehat{J}_*}}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\sigma_{\min}(J_k) \geq \sigma_{\min}(J(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_*)) - \frac{\sigma_{\min, J_*}}{2} \geq \frac{\sigma_{\min, J_*}}{2} > 0,$$

$$\sigma_n(\widehat{J}_k) \geq \sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*) - \frac{\sigma_{n, \widehat{J}_*}}{2} \geq \frac{\sigma_{n, \widehat{J}_*}}{2} > 0,$$

and

$$\sigma_n(\widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k)) \geq \sigma_n(\widehat{J}_*) - \frac{\sigma_{n, \widehat{J}_*}}{2} \geq \frac{\sigma_{n, \widehat{J}_*}}{2} > 0.$$

This completes the proof. \square

6.2 Approximation of V_k to V_* and nonsingularity of C_k

Next we show the approximation of V_k to V_* and nonsingularity of $C_k = V_k^H C V_k$, where V_k is defined in (3.1) and (3.2) and V_* is defined in Section 2.3.2. In this section, for brevity, we write $V_k = [v_1, v_2]$ and $V_* = [v_{1,*}, v_{2,*}]$.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $|\mu_k - \mu_*| \leq \epsilon^2$, $|\lambda_k - \lambda_*| \leq \epsilon^2$, and $\text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}_*) \leq \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon \leq 1$. Then there exist $\epsilon_2 > 0$ and $\kappa_4 > 0$ depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , such that if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_2$, we have*

$$\left\| V_* - V_k \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 & \\ & \gamma_2 \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \kappa_4 \epsilon^2, \quad (6.1)$$

where $\gamma_i = \text{sign}(v_i^H v_{i,*})$.

Proof. Consider the nullspace of \widehat{J}_k and $\widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k)$. If $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$, where ϵ_1 is defined in Lemma 6.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_n(\widehat{J}_k) &\geq \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{n, \widehat{J}_*} > 0, \\ \sigma_n(\widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k)) &\geq \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{n, \widehat{J}_*} > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

Thus their nullspace has dimension 2. The nullspace of $\widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k)$ is spanned by $\widehat{V}_* = \begin{bmatrix} V_* \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$.

Now denote \widehat{V}_k as an orthonormal basis of the nullspace of \widehat{J}_k . According to Theorem 4.4, if $\|\widehat{J}_k - \widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k)\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\sigma_n(\widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k))$, we have

$$\|\sin \Theta(\widehat{V}_k, \widehat{V}_*)\| \leq \frac{8\|\widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k)\|}{\sigma_n^2(\widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k))} \|\widehat{J}_k - \widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k)\|. \quad (6.3)$$

Straight calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{J}_k - \widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k)\| &\leq (\|C\| + 1)\epsilon^2 \\ \|\widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k)\| &\leq \|A - \mu_*C - \lambda_*I\| + \|C\| + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\epsilon \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_1 \equiv \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{n, \widehat{J}_*}}{4(\|C\| + 1)}}$,

$$\|\widehat{J}_k - \widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k)\| \leq (\|C\| + 1)\epsilon^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\sigma_n(\widehat{J}(\mu_*, \lambda_*, x_k)),$$

where we use (6.2). Thus the inequality (6.3) holds. Furthermore, we have

$$\|\sin \Theta(\widehat{V}_k, \widehat{V}_*)\| \leq \frac{32(\|A - \mu_*C - \lambda_*I\| + \|C\| + 1)}{\sigma_{n, \widehat{J}_*}^2} (\|C\| + 1)\epsilon^2 \equiv T\epsilon^2. \quad (6.4)$$

According to Lemma 4.2, there exists unitary matrix \widehat{Z} , such that

$$\|\widehat{V}_* - \widehat{V}_k \widehat{Z}\| \leq \sqrt{2} \|\sin \Theta(\widehat{V}_k, \widehat{V}_*)\| \leq \sqrt{2}T\epsilon^2.$$

Comparing the first n rows of $\widehat{V}_* - \widehat{V}_k \widehat{Z}$, we obtain

$$\|V_* - \widehat{V}_k(1:n, :)\widehat{Z}\| \leq \sqrt{2}T\epsilon^2.$$

According to Theorem 4.2, if $\sqrt{2}T\epsilon^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, i.e., $\epsilon \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_2 \equiv \frac{1}{8\sqrt{2}T}$, we have

$$\|\sin \Theta(V_*, V_k)\| = \|\sin \Theta(V_*, \widehat{V}_k(1:n, :)\widehat{Z})\| \leq 2\sqrt{2}T\epsilon^2.$$

Note that $V_*^H C V_* = \text{Diag}(c_{1,*}, c_{2,*})$, $V_k^H C V_k = \text{Diag}(c_{1,k}, c_{2,k})$. Thus according to Theorem 4.5, there exist positive constants t_0, κ_0 depending on $C, c_{1,*}, c_{2,*}$, such that if $2\sqrt{2}T\epsilon^2 \leq t_0$, i.e., $\epsilon \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_3 \equiv \sqrt{\frac{t_0}{2\sqrt{2}T}}$, for $\gamma_i = \text{sign}(v_i^H v_{i,*})$, we have

$$\|V_* - V_k \text{Diag}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)\| \leq \kappa_0 \|\sin \Theta(V_*, V_k)\| \leq 2\sqrt{2}\kappa_0 T\epsilon^2.$$

Let $\kappa_4 = 2\sqrt{2}\kappa_0 T$ and $\epsilon_2 = \min\{1, \epsilon_1, \tilde{\epsilon}_1, \tilde{\epsilon}_2, \tilde{\epsilon}_3\}$. Then we reach the conclusion. \square

The next lemma shows the the matrix C_k is nonsingular.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $|\mu_k - \mu_*| \leq \epsilon^2$, $|\lambda_k - \lambda_*| \leq \epsilon^2$, and $\text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}_*) \leq \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon \leq 1$. There exists $\epsilon_3 > 0$ depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , such that if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_3$, then C_k is indefinite and*

$$c_{1,k} \geq \frac{c_{1,*}}{2} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad c_{2,k} \leq \frac{c_{2,*}}{2} < 0. \quad (6.5)$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_2$, where ϵ_2 is defined in Lemma 6.2. Then (6.1) holds. Note that

$$c_{i,*} = v_{i,*}^H C v_{i,*}, \quad c_{i,k} = (v_i \gamma_i)^H C (v_i \gamma_i).$$

Therefore with simple analysis we can find ϵ_3 depending on A, C, μ_*, λ_* , such that if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_3$, the inequality (6.5) holds. \square

6.3 Main result

We now present the main result on the quadratic convergence rate of the 2DRQI to compute a nonsingular multiple 2D eigenvalue.

Theorem 6.1. *Assume $|\mu_k - \mu_*| \leq \epsilon^2$, $|\lambda_k - \lambda_*| \leq \epsilon^2$, and $\text{dist}(x_k, \mathcal{X}_*) \leq \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon \leq 1$. There exist positive constants $\epsilon_0, \kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3$ depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , such that*

$$|\mu_{k+1} - \mu_*| \leq \kappa_1 \epsilon^4, \quad |\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_*| = \kappa_2 \epsilon^4 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dist}(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_*) \leq \kappa_3 \epsilon^2.$$

For brevity, we assume in the below that we have multiplied the diagonal scaling matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 & \\ & \gamma_2 \end{bmatrix}$ on the right of V_k defined in Lemma 6.2 such that

$$\|V_* - V_k\| \leq \kappa_4 \epsilon^2,$$

and

$$v_{i,*}^H v_i = |v_{i,*}^H v_i|, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (6.6)$$

where κ_4 is defined in Lemma 6.2.

We first prove the convergence of the 2D eigenvector.

Lemma 6.4. *Under the assumption of Theorem 6.1, there exists positive constants $\kappa_3, \epsilon_4 > 0$ depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , such that if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_4$, then*

(i) x_{k+1} will be determined as in (3.8) or (3.9).

(ii) $\text{dist}(x_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_*) \leq \kappa_3 \epsilon^2$.

Proof. We first assume $\epsilon \leq \min\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3\}$, where ϵ_1, ϵ_2 and ϵ_3 are defined in Lemmas 6.1 to 6.3. Then C_k is indefinite. Therefore, x_{k+1} is computed by (3.8) or (3.9), and satisfies

$$x_{k+1} \in \text{span}\{V_k\}, \quad x_{k+1}^H C x_{k+1} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad x_{k+1}^H x_{k+1} = 1. \quad (6.7)$$

This reaches the result (i).

For the result (ii), first note that the equation (6.7) implies there exist $\gamma_i^{(k+1)}$ with $|\gamma_i^{(k+1)}| = 1$ for $i = 1, 2$ such that

$$x_{k+1} = \gamma_1^{(k+1)} t v_1 + \gamma_2^{(k+1)} s v_2, \quad (6.8)$$

where

$$t = \sqrt{\frac{-v_2^H C v_2}{v_1^H C v_1 - v_2^H C v_2}} \quad \text{and} \quad s = \sqrt{\frac{v_1^H C v_1}{v_1^H C v_1 - v_2^H C v_2}}.$$

On the other hand, by the definition of \mathcal{X}_* in (2.34), the vector

$$\gamma_1^{(k+1)} t_* v_{1,*} + \gamma_2^{(k+1)} s_* v_{2,*} \in \mathcal{X}_*,$$

where

$$t_* = \sqrt{\frac{-c_{2,*}}{c_{1,*} - c_{2,*}}} = \sqrt{\frac{-v_{2,*}^H C v_{2,*}}{v_{1,*}^H C v_{1,*} - v_{2,*}^H C v_{2,*}}}, \quad s_* = \sqrt{\frac{c_{1,*}}{c_{1,*} - c_{2,*}}} = \sqrt{\frac{v_{1,*}^H C v_{1,*}}{v_{1,*}^H C v_{1,*} - v_{2,*}^H C v_{2,*}}}.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{k+1} - (t_* v_{1,*} \gamma_1^{(k+1)} + s_* v_{2,*} \gamma_2^{(k+1)})\| &= \|(\gamma_1^{(k+1)} t v_1 + \gamma_2^{(k+1)} s v_2) - (\gamma_1^{(k+1)} t_* v_{1,*} + \gamma_2^{(k+1)} s_* v_{2,*})\| \\ &\leq \|(t - t_*) v_1\| + |t_*| \|v_1 - v_{1,*}\| + \|(s - s_*) v_2\| + |s_*| \|v_2 - v_{2,*}\| \\ &\leq |t - t_*| + |s - s_*| + 2\kappa_4 \epsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

We next estimate $|t - t_*|$ and $|s - s_*|$. Let $\Delta v_i = v_{i,*} - v_i$, we have

$$t = \sqrt{\frac{-v_2^H C v_2}{v_1^H C v_1 - v_2^H C v_2}} = \sqrt{\frac{-c_{2,*} + \Delta v_2^H C v_2 + v_{2,*}^H C \Delta v_2}{c_{1,*} - c_{2,*} - \Delta v_1^H C v_1 - v_{1,*}^H C \Delta v_1 + \Delta v_2^H C v_2 + v_{2,*}^H C \Delta v_2}}$$

and

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{v_1^H C v_1}{v_1^H C v_1 - v_2^H C v_2}} = \sqrt{\frac{c_{1,*} - \Delta v_1^H C v_1 - v_{1,*}^H C \Delta v_1}{c_{1,*} - c_{2,*} - \Delta v_1^H C v_1 - v_{1,*}^H C \Delta v_1 + \Delta v_2^H C v_2 + v_{2,*}^H C \Delta v_2}}.$$

Utilizing Lemma B.1(i), there exist positive constants $\tilde{\kappa}_t, \tilde{\kappa}_s, \tilde{\epsilon}_0 > 0$ depending on $(A, C, \mu_*, \lambda_*, c_{1,*}, c_{2,*})$, such that when $\epsilon \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0$, we have

$$|t - t_*| \leq \tilde{\kappa}_t \epsilon^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |s - s_*| \leq \tilde{\kappa}_s \epsilon^2.$$

Therefore

$$\|x_{k+1} - (t_* v_{1,*} \gamma_1^{(k+1)} + s_* v_{2,*} \gamma_2^{(k+1)})\| \leq (\tilde{\kappa}_t + \tilde{\kappa}_s + 2\kappa_4) \epsilon^2.$$

Since $c_{1,*}, c_{2,*}$ are uniquely determined by (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , $\tilde{\kappa}_t, \tilde{\kappa}_s, \tilde{\epsilon}_0$ only depend on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) . Let $\kappa_3 = \tilde{\kappa}_t + \tilde{\kappa}_s + 2\kappa_4$, $\epsilon_4 = \min\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3, \tilde{\epsilon}_0\}$, then we have the result (ii). \square

In the following, for brevity, we assume $\gamma_1^{(k+1)} = \gamma_2^{(k+1)} = 1$ in (6.8), and thus

$$x_{k+1} = t v_1 + s v_2. \tag{6.9}$$

Recall that from the proof of Lemma 6.4,

$$\tilde{x}_* \equiv t_* v_{1,*} + s_* v_{2,*} \tag{6.10}$$

satisfies

$$\|x_{k+1} - \tilde{x}_*\| \leq \kappa_3 \epsilon^2.$$

The following lemma gives out the approximation property of 2D Ritz values.

Lemma 6.5. *Under the assumption of Theorem 6.1, there exist positive constants $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \epsilon_0$ depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , where ϵ_0 is no larger than ϵ_3 defined in Lemma 6.4, such that if $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, then*

(i) $(\mu_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}, x_{k+1})$ will be determined as in (3.8) or (3.9), and

(ii) $|\mu_{k+1} - \mu_*| \leq \kappa_1 \epsilon^4$ and $|\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_*| \leq \kappa_2 \epsilon^4$.

Proof. Let $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_4$, where ϵ_4 is defined in Lemma 6.4. Then C_k is indefinite and $(\mu_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}, x_{k+1})$ will be computed by (3.8) or (3.9). This is the result (i).

Now we consider the result (ii), by the expressions $(\mu_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1})$ in (3.8) or (3.9),

$$\mu_{k+1} = \frac{\text{Re}(x_{k+1}^H C V_k V_k^H A x_{k+1})}{\|V_k^H C x_{k+1}\|^2}, \quad \lambda_{k+1} = x_{k+1}^H A x_{k+1}. \tag{6.11}$$

Note that $x_{k+1}^H C x_{k+1} = 0$ and $x_{k+1}^H x_{k+1} = 1$. By the second-order estimate in Theorem 4.6, we obtain the desired error bound for λ_{k+1} :

$$|\lambda_{k+1} - \lambda_*| \leq \|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\| \kappa_3^2 \epsilon^4. \tag{6.12}$$

For the rest, we only need to estimate the bound of the approximation $|\mu_{k+1} - \mu_*|$. Let start with an alternative expression of μ_* :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H A \tilde{x}_*}{\|V_*^H C \tilde{x}_*\|^2} &= \frac{\tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H (\mu_* C \tilde{x}_* + \lambda_* \tilde{x}_*)}{\|V_*^H C \tilde{x}_*\|^2} \\ &= \frac{\mu_* \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H C \tilde{x}_*}{\|V_*^H C \tilde{x}_*\|^2} + \frac{\lambda_* \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H \tilde{x}_*}{\|V_*^H C \tilde{x}_*\|^2} \\ &= \mu_* + \frac{\lambda_* \tilde{x}_*^H C \tilde{x}_*}{\|V_*^H C \tilde{x}_*\|^2} = \mu_*. \end{aligned}$$

Next let $\Delta x_{k+1} = \tilde{x}_* - x_{k+1}$, $\Delta V_k = V_* - V_k$, where \tilde{x}_* is defined in (6.10). Then

$$\|\Delta x_{k+1}\| \leq \kappa_3 \epsilon^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Delta V_k\| \leq \kappa_4 \epsilon^2,$$

where κ_3, κ_4 are defined in Lemmas 6.2 and 6.4, respectively. Using Lemma B.1, by the definition (6.11) of μ_{k+1} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{k+1} &= \frac{\operatorname{Re}(x_{k+1}^H C V_k V_k^H A x_{k+1})}{\|V_k^H C x_{k+1}\|^2} \\ &= \frac{\operatorname{Re}((\tilde{x}_* - \Delta x_{k+1})^H C (V_* - \Delta V_k) (V_* - \Delta V_k)^H A (\tilde{x}_* - \Delta x_{k+1}))}{\|(V_* - \Delta V_k)^H C (\tilde{x}_* - \Delta x_{k+1})\|^2} \\ &= \frac{\operatorname{Re}((\tilde{x}_* - \Delta x_{k+1})^H C (V_* - \Delta V_k) (V_* - \Delta V_k)^H A (\tilde{x}_* - \Delta x_{k+1}))}{(\tilde{x}_*^H C V_* - \tilde{x}_*^H C \Delta V_k - \Delta x_{k+1}^H C V_*) (V_*^H C \tilde{x}_* - \Delta V_k^H C \tilde{x}_* - V_*^H C \Delta x_{k+1}) + O(\epsilon^4)} \\ &= \frac{\tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H A \tilde{x}_* - \operatorname{Re}(\Delta x_{k+1}^H C V_* V_*^H A \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C \Delta V_k V_*^H A \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* \Delta V_k^H A \tilde{x}_*)}{\|V_*^H C \tilde{x}_*\|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{x}_*^H C V_* \Delta V_k^H C \tilde{x}_*) - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H C \Delta x_{k+1}) + O(\epsilon^4)} \\ &\quad - \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H A \Delta x_{k+1}) + O(\epsilon^4)}{\|V_*^H C \tilde{x}_*\|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{x}_*^H C V_* \Delta V_k^H C \tilde{x}_*) - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H C \Delta x_{k+1}) + O(\epsilon^4)} \\ &= \mu_* - \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\Delta x_{k+1}^H C V_* V_*^H A \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C \Delta V_k V_*^H A \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* \Delta V_k^H A \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H A \Delta x_{k+1})}{\|V_*^H C \tilde{x}_*\|^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{2\mu_* \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{x}_*^H C V_* \Delta V_k^H C \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H C \Delta x_{k+1})}{\|V_*^H C \tilde{x}_*\|^2} + O(\epsilon^4), \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

where in the third and fourth equalities, constants in $O(\epsilon^4)$ only depend on $(\|A\|, \|C\|, \kappa_3, \kappa_4)$; in the fifth equality, we use Lemma B.1(ii) and note that

$$\tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H A \tilde{x}_* = \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H (\lambda_* \tilde{x}_* + \mu_* C \tilde{x}_*) = \mu_* \|V_*^H C \tilde{x}_*\|^2.$$

The corresponding constants in $O(\epsilon^4)$ depend on $(\|A\|, \|C\|, \kappa_3, \kappa_4, \sigma_{1,VC_*})$, where σ_{1,VC_*} is defined in Lemma 2.3. $\kappa_3, \kappa_4, \sigma_{1,VC_*}$ only depend on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) . Note that $A \tilde{x}_* = \mu_* C \tilde{x}_* + \lambda_* \tilde{x}_*$ and $V_*^H A = V_*^H (\mu_* C + \lambda_* I)$.

After a simple reorganization of (6.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mu_{k+1} - \mu_*) \|V_*^H C \tilde{x}_*\|^2 \\ &= -\lambda_* \operatorname{Re}(\Delta x_{k+1}^H C V_* V_*^H \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C \Delta V_k V_*^H \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* \Delta V_k^H \tilde{x}_*) \\ &\quad - \mu_* \operatorname{Re}(-\Delta x_{k+1}^H C V_* V_*^H C \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C \Delta V_k V_*^H C \tilde{x}_* - \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* \Delta V_k^H C \tilde{x}_*) \\ &\quad - \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{x}_*^H C V_* (\mu_* V_*^H C + \lambda_* V_*^H) \Delta x_{k+1}) + O(\epsilon^4) \\ &= O(\epsilon^4) - \lambda_* \operatorname{Re}(\Delta x_{k+1}^H C \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C \Delta V_k V_*^H \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* \Delta V_k^H \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H \Delta x_{k+1}) \\ &\quad - \mu_* \operatorname{Re}(-\Delta x_{k+1}^H C V_* V_*^H C \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C \Delta V_k V_*^H C \tilde{x}_* - \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* \Delta V_k^H C \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H C \Delta x_{k+1}) \\ &= -\lambda_* \operatorname{Re}(T_{11} + T_{12}) - \mu_* \operatorname{Re}(T_{21} + T_{22}) + O(\epsilon^4), \end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_{11} &= \Delta x_{k+1}^H C \tilde{x}_*, \\ T_{12} &= \tilde{x}_*^H C \Delta V_k V_*^H \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* \Delta V_k^H \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H \Delta x_{k+1}, \\ T_{21} &= -\Delta x_{k+1}^H C V_* V_*^H C \tilde{x}_* + \tilde{x}_*^H C V_* V_*^H C \Delta x_{k+1}, \\ T_{22} &= \tilde{x}_*^H C \Delta V_k V_*^H C \tilde{x}_* - \tilde{x}_*^H C V \Delta V_k^H C \tilde{x}_*. \end{aligned}$$

Note that T_{21} and T_{22} are pure imaginary scalars. Therefore,

$$\operatorname{Re}(T_{21} + T_{22}) = 0. \quad (6.15)$$

Meanwhile,

$$0 = x_{k+1}^H C x_{k+1} = (\tilde{x}_* - \Delta x_{k+1})^H C (\tilde{x}_* - \Delta x_{k+1}) = -2 \operatorname{Re}(\Delta x_{k+1}^H C \tilde{x}_*) + \Delta x_{k+1}^H C \Delta x_{k+1}.$$

Therefore,

$$|\operatorname{Re}(T_{11})| = |\operatorname{Re}(\Delta x_{k+1}^H C \tilde{x}_*)| \leq \frac{\|C\|}{2} \kappa_3^2 \epsilon^4,$$

and we have

$$\mu_{k+1} - \mu_* = -\lambda_* \frac{\operatorname{Re}(T_{12})}{\|V_*^H C \tilde{x}_*\|^2} + O(\epsilon^4), \quad (6.16)$$

where the constants in $O(\epsilon^4)$ terms only depend on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) . Consequently, we only need to prove that

$$\operatorname{Re}(T_{12}) = O(\epsilon^4).$$

We begin by decomposing v_i :

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= E_{11} v_{1,*} + E_{12} v_{2,*} + r_1, \\ v_2 &= E_{21} v_{1,*} + E_{22} v_{2,*} + r_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $r_i \perp v_{j,*}$, $i, j = 1, 2$. We first derive estimates on E_{ij} . According to (6.6), $E_{11} = v_{1,*}^H v_1$ and $E_{22} = v_{2,*}^H v_2$ are nonnegative real scalars. Since $\|V_k - V_*\| \leq \kappa_4 \epsilon^2$, we have

$$|E_{11} - 1|^2 + |E_{12}|^2 + \|r_1\|^2 \leq \kappa_4^2 \epsilon^4 \quad \text{and} \quad |E_{21}|^2 + |E_{22} - 1|^2 + \|r_2\|^2 \leq \kappa_4^2 \epsilon^4. \quad (6.17)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |E_{11} - 1| &\leq \kappa_4 \epsilon^2, & |E_{12}| &\leq \kappa_4 \epsilon^2, & \|r_1\| &\leq \kappa_4 \epsilon^2, & |E_{12}|^2 + \|r_1\|^2 &\leq \kappa_4^2 \epsilon^4, \\ |E_{22} - 1| &\leq \kappa_4 \epsilon^2, & |E_{21}| &\leq \kappa_4 \epsilon^2, & \|r_2\| &\leq \kappa_4 \epsilon^2, & |E_{21}|^2 + \|r_2\|^2 &\leq \kappa_4^2 \epsilon^4. \end{aligned} \quad (6.18)$$

Note that $|E_{11}|^2 + E_{12}^2 + \|r_1\|^2 = 1$. Since E_{11}, E_{22} are nonnegative real scalars, we have

$$(E_{11} - 1)(E_{11} + 1) = E_{11}^2 - 1 = -E_{12}^2 - \|r_1\|^2.$$

Similarly, in terms of E_{12}, E_{22} and r_2 , we have

$$(E_{22} - 1)(E_{22} + 1) = E_{22}^2 - 1 = -E_{12}^2 - \|r_2\|^2.$$

Combined with (6.18), this implies

$$|E_{11} - 1| \leq \kappa_4^2 \epsilon^4, \quad |E_{22} - 1| \leq \kappa_4^2 \epsilon^4 \quad (6.19)$$

Utilizing $v_1^H v_2 = 0$, we have

$$E_{11} E_{21} + \overline{E_{12}} E_{22} + r_1^H r_2 = 0,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
|E_{21} + \overline{E}_{12}| &\leq |(1 - E_{11})E_{21} + \overline{E}_{12}(1 - E_{22})| + |E_{11}E_{21} + \overline{E}_{12}E_{22}| \\
&\leq \kappa_4^2 \epsilon^4 (|E_{21}| + |E_{12}|) + |r_1^H r_2| \\
&\leq 2\kappa_4^3 \epsilon^6 + \kappa_4^2 \epsilon^4.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.20}$$

With these calculations, we can give a more detailed description of Δx_{k+1} . Recall (6.9) and (6.10):

$$x_{k+1} = tv_1 + sv_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{x}_* = t_*v_{1,*} + s_*v_{2,*}. \tag{6.21}$$

We will perform further analysis between t and t_* , s and s_* . To simplify the expressions, we introduce the following notations

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{11} &= v_{1,*}^H C r_1, & \rho_{12} &= v_{1,*}^H C r_2, \\
\rho_{21} &= v_{2,*}^H C r_1, & \rho_{22} &= v_{2,*}^H C r_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Utilizing Lemma B.1 and equations (6.18) and (6.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
t &= \sqrt{\frac{-v_2^H C v_2}{v_1^H C v_1 - v_2^H C v_2}} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{-v_{2,*}^H C v_{2,*} - 2 \operatorname{Re}(v_{2,*}^H C (r_2 + E_{21}v_{1,*})) + O(\epsilon^4)}{v_{1,*}^H C v_{1,*} - v_{2,*}^H C v_{2,*} + 2 \operatorname{Re}(v_{1,*}^H C (r_1 + E_{12}v_{2,*})) - 2 \operatorname{Re}(v_{2,*}^H C (r_2 + E_{21}v_{1,*})) + O(\epsilon^4)}} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{-c_{2,*} - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\rho_{22}) + O(\epsilon^4)}{c_{1,*} - c_{2,*} + 2 \operatorname{Re}(\rho_{11}) - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\rho_{22}) + O(\epsilon^4)}} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{-c_{2,*}}{c_{1,*} - c_{2,*}} + \frac{-2 \operatorname{Re}(\rho_{22})}{c_{1,*} - c_{2,*}} - \frac{-2c_{2,*} \operatorname{Re}(\rho_{11} - \rho_{22})}{(c_{1,*} - c_{2,*})^2} + O(\epsilon^4)} \\
&= \sqrt{t_*^2 + \frac{-2 \operatorname{Re}(\rho_{22})c_{1,*} + 2c_{2,*} \operatorname{Re}(\rho_{11})}{(c_{1,*} - c_{2,*})^2} + O(\epsilon^4)} \\
&= t_* + \frac{-\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{22})c_{1,*} + c_{2,*} \operatorname{Re}(\rho_{11})}{t_*(c_{1,*} - c_{2,*})^2} + O(\epsilon^4)
\end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

where the constants in $O(\epsilon^4)$ of the second and third equalities only depend on $\kappa_4, \|C\|$; and we use Lemma B.1(ii) in the fourth equality; in the last equality, we use Lemma B.1(iii), with the corresponding constants in $O(\epsilon^4)$ only depending on $(\kappa_4, \|C\|, c_{1,*}, c_{2,*})$. These constants can be in turn viewed as only depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) . By a similar calculation, we have

$$s = s_* + \frac{-\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{11})c_{2,*} + c_{1,*} \operatorname{Re}(\rho_{22})}{s_*(c_{1,*} - c_{2,*})^2} + O(\epsilon^4). \tag{6.23}$$

Now let us back to the term T_{12} . Denote $\Delta v_i = v_{i,*} - v_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Using (6.18), (6.19) and (6.20), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{12} &= \tilde{x}_*^H C \left[\begin{bmatrix} \Delta v_1 & \Delta v_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_{1,*}^H \\ v_{2,*}^H \end{bmatrix} (t_*v_{1,*} + s_*v_{2,*}) + \begin{bmatrix} v_{1,*} & v_{2,*} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta v_1^H \\ \Delta v_2^H \end{bmatrix} (t_*v_{1,*} + s_*v_{2,*}) \right] \\
&\quad + \tilde{x}_*^H C \left[\begin{bmatrix} v_{1,*} & v_{2,*} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_{1,*}^H \\ v_{2,*}^H \end{bmatrix} (t_*v_{1,*} + s_*v_{2,*} - tv_1 - sv_2) \right] \\
&= \tilde{x}_*^H C \left[t_*\Delta v_1 + s_*\Delta v_2 + \begin{bmatrix} v_{1,*} & v_{2,*} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -s_*\overline{E}_{12} \\ -t_*\overline{E}_{21} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} v_{1,*} & v_{2,*} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} t_* - t - sE_{21} \\ s_* - s - tE_{12} \end{bmatrix} \right] + O(\epsilon^4)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \tilde{x}_*^H C \left[t_* \Delta v_1 + s_* \Delta v_2 + [v_{1,*} \quad v_{2,*}] \begin{bmatrix} t_* - t - s_* \bar{E}_{12} - s E_{21} \\ s_* - s - t_* \bar{E}_{21} - t E_{12} \end{bmatrix} \right] + O(\epsilon^4) \\
&= \tilde{x}_*^H C \left[t_* \Delta v_1 + s_* \Delta v_2 + [v_{1,*} \quad v_{2,*}] \begin{bmatrix} t_* - t + s_* E_{21} - s E_{21} \\ s_* - s + t_* E_{12} - t E_{12} \end{bmatrix} \right] + O(\epsilon^4) \\
&= \tilde{x}_*^H C [t_* \Delta v_1 + s_* \Delta v_2 + v_{1,*}(t_* - t) + v_{2,*}(s_* - s)] + O(\epsilon^4) \\
&= \tilde{x}_*^H C [-t_* r_1 - s_* r_2 - t_* E_{12} v_{2,*} - s_* E_{21} v_{1,*} + v_{1,*}(t_* - t) + v_{2,*}(s_* - s)] + O(\epsilon^4).
\end{aligned}$$

where all constants in $O(\epsilon^4)$ terms only depend on A, C, μ_*, λ_* .

According to (6.22) and (6.23), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{12} &= O(\epsilon^4) + [t_* \quad s_*] V_*^H C \left[-t_* r_1 - s_* r_2 + V_* \begin{bmatrix} t_* - t - s_* E_{21} \\ s_* - s - t_* E_{12} \end{bmatrix} \right] \\
&= O(\epsilon^4) - t_*^2 v_{1,*}^H C r_1 - t_* s_* v_{1,*}^H C r_2 - s_* v_{2,*}^H C t_* r_1 - s_*^2 v_{2,*}^H C r_2 \\
&\quad + t_*(t_* - t - s_* E_{21}) c_{1,*} + s_*(s_* - s - t_* E_{12}) c_{2,*} \\
&= O(\epsilon^4) - t_*^2 \rho_{11} - t_* s_* \rho_{12} - t_* s_* \rho_{21} - s_*^2 \rho_{22} - t_* s_* E_{21} c_{1,*} - t_* s_* E_{12} c_{2,*} \\
&\quad + c_{1,*} \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{22}) c_{1,*} - c_{2,*} \operatorname{Re}(\rho_{11})}{(c_{1,*} - c_{2,*})^2} + c_{2,*} \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{11}) c_{2,*} - c_{1,*} \operatorname{Re}(\rho_{22})}{(c_{1,*} - c_{2,*})^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Re}(T_{12}) &= \operatorname{Re} \left(\frac{c_{2,*} \rho_{11}}{c_{1,*} - c_{2,*}} + c_{1,*} \frac{\rho_{22} c_{1,*} - c_{2,*} \rho_{11}}{(c_{1,*} - c_{2,*})^2} - \frac{c_{1,*} \rho_{22}}{c_{1,*} - c_{2,*}} + c_{2,*} \frac{\rho_{11} c_{2,*} - c_{1,*} \rho_{22}}{(c_{1,*} - c_{2,*})^2} \right) \\
&\quad - \operatorname{Re}(t_* s_* \rho_{12} + t_* s_* \rho_{21} + t_* s_* E_{21} c_{1,*} + t_* s_* E_{12} c_{2,*}) + O(\epsilon^4) \\
&= -t_* s_* \operatorname{Re}(\rho_{12} + \rho_{21} + E_{21} c_{1,*} + E_{12} c_{2,*}) + O(\epsilon^4). \tag{6.24}
\end{aligned}$$

Further note that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= v_1^H C v_2 = (v_{1,*} + E_{12} v_{2,*} + r_1)^H C (v_{2,*} + E_{21} v_{1,*} + r_2) + O(\epsilon^4) \\
&= E_{21} c_{1,*} + \bar{E}_{12} c_{2,*} + \rho_{12} + \bar{\rho}_{21} + O(\epsilon^4).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain

$$\operatorname{Re}(\rho_{12} + \rho_{21} + E_{21} c_{1,*} + E_{12} c_{2,*}) = O(\epsilon^4) \tag{6.25}$$

and

$$\operatorname{Re}(T_{12}) = O(\epsilon^4).$$

Combine with (6.16), (6.24) and (6.25), we find positive constants $\tilde{\epsilon}_0, \kappa_1$ depending on (A, C, μ_*, λ_*) , such that if $\epsilon \leq \tilde{\epsilon}_0$, we have

$$|\mu_{k+1} - \mu_*| \leq \kappa_1 \epsilon^4. \tag{6.26}$$

Combine the bounds (6.12) and (6.26), we reach the result (ii) by letting $\epsilon_0 = \min\{\epsilon_4, \tilde{\epsilon}_0\}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.1. The theorem is a direct consequence of Lemmas 6.4 and 6.5. \square

7 Conclusions

In this part, we presented a rigorous convergence analysis of the proposed 2DRQI, and showed that the 2DRQI is locally quadratically convergent when the target 2D-eigentriplet is nonsingular. The quadratical convergence of the 2DRQI is verified by numerical examples presented in Part II of this work [6, Sec.6].

A Proof of Theorem 2.1 in Part II

The following theorem shows that if a 2D-eigenvector is near the subspace spanned by an $n \times 2$ orthonormal matrix V , then the 2D Ritz triplets of the 2D Rayleigh quotient $(V^H AV, V^H CV)$ induced by V will contain a good approximation to a 2D-eigen triplet.

Theorem A.1. *Let (μ_*, λ_*, x_*) be a 2D-eigen triplet of (A, C) . For $\gamma > 0$, denote \mathcal{V}_γ as the set of $n \times 2$ orthonormal matrices V satisfying*

1. $V^H CV$ is indefinite and diagonal,
2. $|(V^H AV)_{12}| \geq \gamma$,
3. $|\det(V^H CV)| \geq \gamma$.

Then there exist positive constants α_1, α_2 and α_3 only depending on (A, C, μ_, λ_*) and γ , such that for any $V \in \mathcal{V}_\gamma$, let*

$$\epsilon = \text{dist}(x_*, \text{span}\{V\}) \equiv \min\{\|x_* - v\| \mid v \in \text{span}\{V\}\}$$

and assume $\epsilon < 1$, there exists a 2D Ritz triplet (ν, θ, Vz) satisfying

$$|\nu - \mu_*| \leq \alpha_1 \epsilon, \quad |\theta - \lambda_*| \leq \alpha_2 \epsilon^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|Vz - x_*\| \leq \alpha_3 \epsilon.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of the quadratic convergence of the 2DRQI for computing a nonsingular simple 2D eigen triplet presented in Section 6.

Let

$$V^H AV = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad V^H CV = \text{Diag}(c_1, c_2) \text{ with } c_1 > 0 > c_2$$

and

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \mid x \in \text{span}\{V\}, x^H Cx = 0, x^H x = 1\}.$$

Assume $\hat{x}^{(p)} \in \text{span}\{V\}$ satisfies $\|x_* - \hat{x}^{(p)}\| = \epsilon$. Then since $\hat{x}^{(p)}$ is the closest vector to x_* in $\text{span}\{V\}$, $\hat{x}^{(p)H}(x_* - \hat{x}^{(p)}) = 0$ and thus,

$$1 = \|x_*\| = \sqrt{\|\hat{x}^{(p)}\|^2 + \|x_* - \hat{x}^{(p)}\|^2} = \sqrt{\|\hat{x}^{(p)}\|^2 + \epsilon^2}.$$

Since $\epsilon < 1$, we have $\hat{x}^{(p)} \neq 0$. Define $\hat{x} = \hat{x}^{(p)} / \|\hat{x}^{(p)}\|$. Then $\|\hat{x}\| = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{x} - x_*\| &= \sqrt{2 - 2 \text{Re}(x_*^H \hat{x}^{(p)}) / \|\hat{x}^{(p)}\|} \\ &= \sqrt{2 - 2\|\hat{x}^{(p)}\|} = \sqrt{2 - 2\sqrt{1 - \epsilon^2}} \leq \sqrt{2}\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, we denote $\mathcal{X}_{x_*} = \{\gamma x_* \mid \gamma \in \mathbb{C}, \|\gamma\| = 1\}$.

Recall that in Lemma 5.6, we proved that (c.f., (5.24), (5.27), (5.28), (5.31)), if $V_k^H C V_k$ is indefinite, then for any unit vector $x \in \text{span}\{V_k\}$, we can find

$$\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}_k \equiv \{y \mid y \in \text{span}\{V_k\}, y^H y = 1, y^H C y = 0\},$$

such that

$$\text{dist}(\tilde{x}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*}) \leq \left(\frac{2\|C\|}{\sqrt{-c_{1,k}c_{2,k}}} + 1 \right) \text{dist}(x, \mathcal{X}_{x_*}), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $c_{1,k}, c_{2,k}$ are eigenvalues of $V_k^H C V_k$.

Since under the assumption, $V^H CV$ is indefinite. Therefore, after substituting V , \mathcal{X} for V_k , \mathcal{X}_k , respectively, we can also prove that for the unit vector \hat{x} in $\text{span}\{V\}$, there exists $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, such that

$$\text{dist}(\tilde{x}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*}) \leq \left(\frac{2\|C\|}{\sqrt{-c_1 c_2}} + 1 \right) \text{dist}(\hat{x}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*}) \leq \left(\frac{2\sqrt{2}\|C\|}{\sqrt{-c_1 c_2}} + \sqrt{2} \right) \epsilon. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Now we prove the approximation property of 2D Ritz teiplets. In the proof of Lemma 5.7, we only use the following conditions.

- When $\epsilon \leq \min\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_T\}$, $\tilde{x}_{k+1}^{(p)}$ is well defined and thus we can find $\tilde{x}_{k+1} \in \mathcal{X}_k$ such that $\text{dist}(\tilde{x}_{k+1}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*})$ is sufficiently small, i.e., (5.31).
- When $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_2$, $|a_{12,k}| \geq \frac{|a_{12,*}|}{2} > 0$.
- When $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_T$, $c_{1,k} > 0, c_{2,k} < 0, \sqrt{-c_{1,k} c_{2,k}} \geq \frac{\sqrt{-c_{1,*} c_{2,*}}}{2} > 0$.

Under these conditions, we prove that there exists a 2D Ritz triplet $(\nu_{k,j}, \theta_{k,j}, x_{k,j})$ such that (c.f., (5.39)(5.44)(5.47)(5.48)(5.49)(5.51)):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(x_{k,j}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*}) &\leq \left(\sqrt{2} \frac{\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{|a_{12,k}|} + 1 \right) \text{dist}(\tilde{x}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*}) \\ |\nu_{k,j} - \mu_*| &\leq \frac{\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{\sqrt{-c_{1,k} c_{2,k}}} \text{dist}(x_{k,j}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*}), \\ |\theta_{k,j} - \lambda_*| &\leq \|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\| \text{dist}(x_{k,j}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*})^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Note that we have now found $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that

$$\text{dist}(\tilde{x}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*}) \leq \left(\frac{2\sqrt{2}\|C\|}{\sqrt{-c_1 c_2}} + \sqrt{2} \right) \epsilon.$$

Furthermore, we have $|(V^H AV)_{12}| \geq \gamma > 0$ and $-c_1 c_2 = -\det(V^H CV) \geq \gamma > 0$. Therefore, we can follow the same argument without adding requirements to ϵ , and finally prove that $(V^H AV, V^H CV)$ has two 2D Ritz triplets with one $(\nu, \theta, V\hat{z})$ of them satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(V\hat{z}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*}) &\leq \left(\sqrt{2} \frac{\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{|a_{12}|} + 1 \right) \text{dist}(\tilde{x}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*}) \\ |\nu - \mu_*| &\leq \frac{\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{\sqrt{-c_1 c_2}} \text{dist}(V\hat{z}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*}), \\ |\theta - \lambda_*| &\leq \|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\| \text{dist}(V\hat{z}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*})^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Using (A.2) and the assumptions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(V\hat{z}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*}) &\leq \left(\sqrt{2} \frac{\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{\gamma} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{2\sqrt{2}\|C\|}{\sqrt{\gamma}} + \sqrt{2} \right) \epsilon \equiv \alpha_1 \epsilon \\ |\nu - \mu_*| &\leq \frac{\|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\|}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \alpha_1 \epsilon \equiv \alpha_2 \epsilon, \\ |\theta - \lambda_*| &\leq \|A - \mu_* C - \lambda_* I\| \alpha_1^2 \epsilon^2 \equiv \alpha_3 \epsilon^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Let γ satisfy $|\gamma| = 1$ and $\|V\hat{z} - \gamma x_*\| = \text{dist}(V\hat{z}, \mathcal{X}_{x_*})$. Then $\|\bar{\gamma} V\hat{z} - x_*\| \leq \alpha_1 \epsilon$. Let $z = \bar{\gamma} \hat{z}$, then we reach the conclusion. \square

B Basic inequalities

We present three basic inequalities that are used in the convergence analysis.

Lemma B.1. *Let $g_1, g_2, r_1, r_2, \epsilon$ be functions of $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$, where ϵ can be viewed as a parameter related to x , e.g., the distance between x to some fixed point x_* . Assume there exist positive constants $\epsilon_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta, \bar{g}_1, \underline{g}_2$, such that when $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, we have*

$$|g_1(x)| \leq \bar{g}_1; \quad |g_2(x)| \geq \underline{g}_2; \quad |r_i(x)| \leq \alpha_i \epsilon^\beta \text{ for } i = 1, 2. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

(i) *Assume when $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, there exists positive constants $\underline{g}_1, \bar{g}_2$, such that $f(x)$ and $g_1(x)$ further satisfy*

$$\frac{g_1(x)}{g_2(x)} \geq 0, \quad \frac{g_1(x) + r_1(x)}{g_2(x) + r_2(x)} \geq 0, \quad |g_1(x)| \geq \underline{g}_1, \quad |g_2(x)| \leq \bar{g}_2, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

then there exists positive constants $\epsilon_1, \kappa_1^{(b)}$ depending on constants $\epsilon_0, \underline{g}_1, \underline{g}_2, \bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta$ such that when $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$,

$$\left| \sqrt{\frac{g_1(x) + r_1(x)}{g_2(x) + r_2(x)}} - \sqrt{\frac{g_1(x)}{g_2(x)}} \right| \leq \kappa_1^{(b)} \epsilon^\beta. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

(ii) *Assume there exists functions $s_1(x)$ and $s_2(x)$ satisfying $|s_1(x)| \leq \alpha_3 \epsilon^{2\beta}$ and $|s_2(x)| \leq \alpha_4 \epsilon^{2\beta}$ when $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$. Then there exists positive constants $\epsilon_2, \kappa_2^{(b)}$ depending on $\epsilon_0, \bar{g}_1, \underline{g}_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \beta$, such that when $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_2$,*

$$\left| \frac{g_1 + r_1 + s_1}{g_2 + r_2 + s_2} - \frac{g_1}{g_2} - \frac{r_1}{g_2} + \frac{g_1 r_2}{g_2^2} \right| \leq \kappa_2^{(b)} \epsilon^{2\beta}.$$

(iii) *Let $s_1(x), s_2(x), \underline{g}_1$ be defined as in (i) and (ii). Assume $g_1(x) \geq 0$ and $g_1(x) + r_1(x) + s_1(x) \geq 0$ when $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$. Then there exists positive constants $\epsilon_3, \kappa_3^{(b)}$ depending on $\epsilon_0, \underline{g}_1, \alpha_1, \alpha_3, \beta$ such that when $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_3$,*

$$\left| \sqrt{g_1(x) + r_1(x) + s_1(x)} - \sqrt{g_1(x)} - \frac{r_1(x)}{2\sqrt{g_1(x)}} \right| \leq \kappa_3^{(b)} \epsilon^{2\beta}.$$

Proof. For the first inequality, note that when $|g_1(x)| \geq |r_1(x)|$ and $|g_2(x)| \geq |r_2(x)|$,

$$\left| \sqrt{\frac{g_1(x) + r_1(x)}{g_2(x) + r_2(x)}} - \sqrt{\frac{g_1(x)}{g_2(x)}} \right| \leq \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{|g_1(x)| + |r_1(x)|}{|g_2(x)| - |r_2(x)|}} - \sqrt{\frac{|g_1(x)|}{|g_2(x)|}}, \sqrt{\frac{|g_1(x)|}{|g_2(x)|}} - \sqrt{\frac{|g_1(x)| - |r_1(x)|}{|g_2(x)| + |r_2(x)|}} \right\}.$$

Thus we only need to prove both $\sqrt{\frac{|g_1| + |r_1|}{|g_2| - |r_2|}} - \sqrt{\frac{|g_1|}{|g_2|}}$ and $\sqrt{\frac{|g_1|}{|g_2|}} - \sqrt{\frac{|g_1| - |r_1|}{|g_2| + |r_2|}}$ can be controlled by a term of the form in (B.3). We only prove the case for $\sqrt{\frac{|g_1| + |r_1|}{|g_2| - |r_2|}} - \sqrt{\frac{|g_1|}{|g_2|}}$. The proof for the second case is similar.

Assume $\epsilon \leq \min \left\{ \left(\frac{g_1}{2\alpha_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}, \left(\frac{g_2}{2\alpha_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right\}$, we have $|g_1(x)| \geq |r_1(x)|, |g_2(x)| \geq |r_2(x)|$, and

$$\sqrt{\frac{|g_1| + |r_1|}{|g_2| - |r_2|}} - \sqrt{\frac{|g_1|}{|g_2|}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{|g_1| + \alpha_1 \epsilon^\beta}{|g_2| - \alpha_2 \epsilon^\beta}} - \sqrt{\frac{|g_1|}{|g_2|}}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Let $t = \epsilon^\beta$ and consider $\tilde{h}(t) = \sqrt{\frac{|g_1| + \alpha_1 t}{|g_2| - \alpha_2 t}}$. By the middle-value theorem, there exists $\xi \in (0, t)$, such that

$$\tilde{h}(t) = \tilde{h}(0) + \tilde{h}'(\xi)t = \sqrt{\frac{|g_1|}{|g_2|}} + \frac{\alpha_1 g_2 + \alpha_2 g_1}{2\sqrt{g_1 + \alpha_1 \xi} (g_2 - \alpha_2 \xi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} t.$$

Since $\epsilon \leq \min \left\{ \left(\frac{g_1}{2\alpha_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}, \left(\frac{g_2}{2\alpha_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right\}$, we have

$$|g_1 + \alpha_1 \xi| \geq \frac{1}{2} g_1, \quad |g_2 - \alpha_2 \xi| \geq \frac{1}{2} g_2,$$

Thus

$$\left| \tilde{h}(t) - \sqrt{\frac{|g_1|}{|g_2|}} \right| \leq 2 \frac{\alpha_1 \bar{g}_2 + \alpha_2 \bar{g}_1}{\sqrt{g_1 g_2^3}} t.$$

Using the definition of t and \tilde{h} , we obtain the result.

For the second inequality, we only need to note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{g_1 + r_1 + s_1}{g_2 + r_2 + s_2} - \frac{g_1}{g_2} - \frac{r_1}{g_2} + \frac{g_1 r_2}{g_2^2} \right| \\ & \leq \left| \frac{s_1}{g_2 + r_2 + s_2} \right| + \left| \frac{-g_1 s_2 - r_1 r_2 - r_1 s_2}{(g_2 + r_2 + s_2) g_2} \right| + \left| \frac{g_1 r_2^2 + g_1 r_2 s_2}{(g_2 + r_2 + s_2) g_2^2} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The result comes from straight calculation.

For the last inequality, consider $f(t) = \sqrt{g_1(x) + t}$ for $t > -g_1(x)$, which satisfies:

$$f(t) = \sqrt{g_1(x)} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{g_1(x)}} t - \frac{1}{8} (g_1(x) + \xi)^{-\frac{3}{2}} t^2,$$

where ξ is between 0 and t . Now let $t = r_1(x) + s_1(x)$. When $\epsilon \leq \min \left\{ \epsilon_0, 1, \left(\frac{|g_{\inf,1}|}{4\alpha_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}, \left(\frac{|g_{\inf,1}|}{4\alpha_3} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\beta}} \right\}$, $|t| \leq \frac{|g_{\inf,1}|}{2}$. Thus we have

$$\sqrt{g_1 + r_1 + s_1} = \sqrt{g_1} + \frac{r_1 + s_1}{2\sqrt{g_1}} - \frac{1}{8} (g_1 + \xi)^{-\frac{3}{2}} (r_1 + s_1)^2,$$

where ξ is between 0 and $r_1(x) + s_1(x)$. Therefore

$$\left| \sqrt{g_1 + r_1 + s_1} - \sqrt{g_1} - \frac{r_1}{2\sqrt{g_1}} \right| \leq \frac{\alpha_3 \epsilon^{2\beta}}{2\sqrt{g_{\inf,1}}} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4g_{\inf,1}^{\frac{3}{2}}} (\alpha_1 + \alpha_3)^2 \epsilon^{2\beta}$$

□

References

- [1] C. DAVIS AND W. M. KAHAN, *The rotation of eigenvectors by a perturbation. III*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 7 (1970), pp. 1–46, <https://doi.org/10.1137/0707001>.
- [2] J. W. DEMMEL, *Applied Numerical Linear Algebra*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1997, <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611971446>.
- [3] I. GOHBERG, P. LANCASTER, AND L. RODMAN, *Matrix Polynomials*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA., 2009, <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9780898719024>.
- [4] N. J. HIGHAM, R.-C. LI, AND F. TISSEUR, *Backward error of polynomial eigenproblems solved by linearization*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 29 (2007), pp. 1218–1241, <https://doi.org/10.1137/060663738>.

- [5] H. R. P. KRANTZ, S. G., *A Primer of Real Analytic Functions*, Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 2 ed., 2002.
- [6] T. LU, Y. SU, AND Z. BAI, *2D Eigenvalue Problem II: Rayleigh Quotient Iteration and Applications*, 2022, <https://arxiv.org/abs/arXiv:2209.12040>.
- [7] G. W. STEWART AND J.-G. SUN, *Matrix Perturbation Theory*, Academic Press, New York, 1990.
- [8] Y. SU, T. LU, AND Z. BAI, *2D Eigenvalue Problem I: Existence and Number of Solutions*, 2022, <https://arxiv.org/abs/arXiv:1911.08109v3>.
- [9] L.-H. ZHANG AND R.-C. LI, *Maximization of the sum of the trace ratio on the Stiefel manifold, II: Computation*, *Sci. China Math.*, 58 (2015), pp. 1549–1566, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11425-014-4825-z>.