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SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE $L^2$ CONVERGENCE OF THE ADDITIVE SCHWARZ PRECONDITIONED GMRES METHOD

XIAO-CHUAN CAI* AND JUN ZOU†

Abstract. Additive Schwarz preconditioned GMRES is a powerful method for solving large sparse linear systems of equations on parallel computers. The algorithm is often implemented in the Euclidean norm, or the discrete $L^2$ norm, however, the optimal convergence theory is available only in the energy norm (or the equivalent Sobolev $H^1$ norm). Very little progress has been made in the theoretical understanding of the $L^2$ behavior of this very successful algorithm. To add to the difficulty in developing a full $L^2$ theory, in this note, we construct explicit examples and show that the optimal convergence of additive Schwarz preconditioned GMRES in $L^2$ can not be obtained using the existing GMRES theory. More precisely speaking, we show that the symmetric part of the preconditioned matrix, which plays a role in the Eisenstat-Elman-Schultz theory [11], has at least one negative eigenvalue, and we show that the condition number of the best possible eigenmatrix that diagonalizes the preconditioned matrix, key to the Saad-Schultz theory [18], is bounded from both above and below by constants multiplied by $h^{-1/2}$. Here $h$ is the finite element mesh size. The results presented in this paper are mostly negative, but we believe that the techniques used in our proofs may have wide applications in the further development of the $L^2$ convergence theory and in other areas of domain decomposition methods.
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1. Introduction. Additive Schwarz (AS) preconditioned generalized minimum residual (GMRES) method is a powerful method for solving large sparse nonsymmetric linear system of equations arising from discretizations of boundary value problems of partial differential equations, especially on parallel computers with large number of processors. AS/GMRES has been implemented in several large software packages for solving partial differential equations or general sparse linear systems, such as PETSc ([1]) and PSPARSLIB ([17]). The Euclidean norm ($L^2$) has been used in all the implementations as far as we know. However, the convergence theory is available only in the energy norm (or the equivalent Sobolev $H^1$ norm). For example, the theory for symmetric positive definite problems can be found in [6, 7, 9, 10, 19] and for nonsymmetric and indefinite problems in [5]. Very little progress has been made toward the theoretical understanding of the optimal convergence of AS/GMRES in $L^2$. As customary in the domain decomposition literature ([6, 19]), “optimal” refers to the fact that the convergence rate is independent of the finite element mesh size and the number of subdomains. In the past ten years, many numerical experiments have been carried out, using AS/GMRES, for solving linear systems obtained from the discretization of
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scalar and systems of linear and nonlinear partial differential equations, see for examples [2, 3, 4, 12, 14] and all seem to indicate that the method is optimal in \( l^2 \); i.e., the convergence rate has no or very little dependence on the mesh size, however, none of the existing AS/GMRES theory confirms this even for the one dimensional case. In this paper, we show constructively that the \( l^2 \) optimal convergence theory can not be obtained by using any of the two existing GMRES theories.

We now briefly summerize the main findings of the paper. First, the Eisenstat-Elman-Schultz theory ([11]) for the convergence of GMRES requires that the symmetric part of the preconditioned system to be positive definite. Using a simple example, we show that this condition cannot be satisfied with AS/GMRES. At least one of the eigenvalues of the symmetric part is negative. Second, the Saad-Schultz theory ([18]) assumes that the preconditioned system is diagonalizable by a certain eigenmatrix \( X \), and the convergence rate is bounded by the condition number of \( X \) in \( l^2 \) and the distribution of the eigenvalues. The theory is not very useful in practice because the estimate of the condition number of \( X \) is often too hard to obtain. Using the same example, we are able to estimate the condition number of \( X \) and show that it has a \( h^{-1/2} \) dependence on the mesh size.

In the rest of this section, we recall some of the key components of the Eisenstat-Elman-Schultz theory and the Saad-Schultz theory. We consider a nonsingular linear system of equations of size \( n \times n \)

\[
Au = f
\]

and let \( M^{-1} \) be a preconditioner for \( A \). The solution of (1) is often obtained by solving iteratively the preconditioned system

\[
Tu = g,
\]

where \( T = M^{-1}A \) and \( g = M^{-1}f \). For generality, we do not assume that \( T \) is symmetric and we use GMRES ([16]) as the iterative solver. We shall use \( (\cdot, \cdot) \) and \( \| \cdot \|_2 \) to denote the usual Euclidean inner product and norm in \( R^n \), respectively. The main result of the paper concerns the optimal \( l^2 \) convergence rate of GMRES for solving (2) with additive Schwarz as the preconditioner.

Two types of convergence theory are available for the convergence of GMRES. One theory, due to Eisenstat, Elman and Schultz [11], is for the case when the symmetric part of the matrix \( T \) is positive definite. More precisely, let us assume that there exist two positive constants \( c_0 \) and \( C_0 \), such that

\[
(Tx, x) \geq c_0 \| x \|_2^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \| Tx \|_2 \leq C_0 \| x \|_2,
\]

for any \( x \in R^n \). Then the residuals satisfy

\[
\| r_k \|_2 \leq \left( 1 - \frac{c_0^2}{C_0^2} \right)^{k/2} \| r_0 \|_2.
\]

Unfortunately, with the additive Schwarz preconditioner, the symmetric part of \( T \) with respect to the \( l^2 \) inner product is generally not positive definite, i.e., \( c_0 < 0 \). An example
will be given later to illustrate the case. Another theory due to Saad and Schultz [18] assumes that the matrix \( T \) is diagonalizable, i.e., there exists a matrix \( X \) such that \( T = X \Lambda X^{-1} \), where \( \Lambda = \{ \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \} \) is a diagonal matrix of eigenvalues. Let \( \Pi_k \) be the space of polynomials of degree less than or equal to \( k \), and

\[
(3) \quad \epsilon^{(k)} = \min_{p \in \Pi_k} \max_{i=1,\ldots,n} |p(\lambda_i)|.
\]

Then the residuals of GMRES satisfy

\[
(4) \quad \|r_k\|_2 \leq \kappa_2(X) \epsilon^{(k)} \|r_0\|_2.
\]

Here \( \kappa_2(X) = \|X\|_2 \|X^{-1}\|_2 \) is the condition number of the eigenmatrix. Later in this paper, we prove that the additive Schwarz preconditioned linear operator is indeed diagonalizable, and also estimate \( \kappa_2(X) \). The choice of \( X \) is not unique, however, we show, using an interesting result of Demmel ([8]), that even with the best possible eigenmatrix \( X \), \( \kappa_2(X) \) has a bound depending on the finite element mesh size from both above and below regardless the size of the overlap. Therefore we cannot claim that the method is optimal.

Other techniques have also been used to study the convergence of the preconditioned GMRES method, such as the method based on the field-of-values analysis in [15, 20]. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the classical additive Schwarz method. Section 3 is devoted to the Eisenstat-Elman-Schultz theory, and Section 4 to the Saad-Schultz theory.

### 2. A brief review of the additive Schwarz method.

Although the method we study is mainly for nonsymmetric linear systems, we shall focus on a simple symmetric elliptic Dirichlet boundary value problem: Find \( u \in H^1_0(\Omega) \) such that

\[
(5) \quad a(u, v) = (f, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall v \in H^1_0(\Omega),
\]

where \((\cdot, \cdot)_{L^2(\Omega)}\) is the continuous \( L^2 \) inner product, the bilinear form \( a(u, v) \) is defined by \( a(u, v) = \int_\Omega \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, d\Omega \) and \( f(x) \in L^2(\Omega) \) is given. Here \( \Omega \) is an open bounded polygon with boundary \( \partial \Omega \). We assume that the diameter of \( \Omega \) is of order 1. To introduce the finite element discretization and the finite element space \( V_h \), we let \( T^h = \{ \tau_i \} \) be a standard quasi-uniform finite element triangulation of \( \Omega \) with interior nodal points denoted as \( W = \{ x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \} \) and the standard basis functions as \( \{ \phi_{x_i}(x) \} \), i.e. \( \phi_{x_i}(x_j) = \delta_{ij} \). The finite element problem reads as follows: Find \( u^* \in V_h \subset H^1_0(\Omega) \) such that

\[
(6) \quad a(u^*, v) = (f, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \forall v \in V_h.
\]

To discuss the overlapping additive Schwarz methods, we introduce the partition of \( \Omega \) into \( \{ \Omega_i \} \), such that no \( \partial \Omega_i \) cuts through any elements \( \tau_i \), and \( \bar{\Omega} = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \bar{\Omega}_i \). We assume \( \Omega_i \) is an open domain. We extend each \( \Omega_i \) to a larger subdomain \( \Omega'_i \supset \Omega_i \), which is also assumed not to cut any fine mesh triangles. For each \( \Omega'_i \), we define a finite element space \( V_i \equiv V_h \cap H^1_0(\Omega'_i) \) extended by zero outside \( \Omega'_i \). Let \( n_i \) be the dimension
of $V_i$, that equals the number of interior nodes in $\Omega_i$. We now define the subdomain mapping operator $T_i : V_h \rightarrow V_i$ as

$$a(T_i u, v) = a(u, v), \ \forall u \in V_h \text{ and } \forall v \in V_i$$

and

$$T = T_1 + \cdots + T_N.$$ 

Since $g = T u^*$ can be pre-calculated without knowing $u^*$, we define the additive Schwarz preconditioned GMRES as follows:

**Algorithm 2.1 (AS/GMRES).** Solve

$$T u^* = g$$

by GMRES with any initial guess.

The focus of this paper is to understand the $L^2$ convergence of AS/GMRES. We first make a simple observation about the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the operator $T$. We define $W_T$ as a subset of $W$ consisting of all the mesh points on the internal boundaries, i.e.,

$$W_T \equiv \{ x_i \mid x_i \in W, x_i \in (\cup \partial \Omega_i) \cap \Omega \}.$$ 

For each $x_i \in W \setminus W_T$, using the definition of $T_i$, we have

$$T \phi_{x_i}(x) = \sigma_i \phi_{x_i}(x),$$

where $\sigma_i \geq 1$ is an integer which equals the number of subdomains that $x_i$ belongs to. This implies that $\phi_{x_i}(x) (x_i \in W \setminus W_T)$ are the eigenvectors of $T$ and the corresponding eigenvalues are integers. Note that this is not true for the nodal points on the internal boundaries. Much of the rest of the paper is devoted to the explicit calculation of the eigenvalues and eigenvectors associated with the nodes on the internal boundaries. It turns out that the convergence rate of AS/GMRES is determined almost exclusively by the eigen pairs associated with the internal boundaries.

To simplify the notations, we shall mix up the notions of operators and matrices, finite element functions and vectors. The mix-up is always understood in the sense of the standard basis functions. For example in the vector sense, we have

$$(\phi_i, \phi_j) = \delta_{ij}.$$ 

This may not be true in the continuous inner produce $(\cdot, \cdot)_{L^2(\Omega)}$.

3. **Analysis using the Eisenstat-Elman-Schultz theory.** In this section we study the optimal convergence of AS/GMRES using the Eisenstat-Elman-Schultz theory. In other words, we calculate the smallest eigenvalue of the symmetric part of $T$. We work on a simple one dimensional problem, and show, sadly, that the smallest eigenvalue is negative. Therefore, we conclude that the Eisenstat-Elman-Schultz theory is
We define the overlapping subdomains divided into two overlapping subdomains. As in Fig.1, we divide the unit interval into $n+1$ subintervals with length $h = 1/(n+1)$ and mesh points $x_i = i h, i = 0, \ldots, n+1$. We define the overlapping subdomains $\Omega_1' = (0, l_2)$ and $\Omega_2' = (l_1, 1.0)$. $n$ is the total number of interior mesh points. For simplicity, we assume that

\begin{equation}
(11) \quad l_1 = 1 - l_2.
\end{equation}

Let $n_{l1}^0$ be the number of mesh points in $(0, l_1)$, $n_{l2}^0$ the number of mesh points in $(l_2, 1.0)$, and $n_{l12}$ the number of mesh points in the overlapping region $(l_1, l_2)$. Note that $n_{l1}^0 + n_{l2}^0 + n_{l12} = n - 2$.

Let $V_h \subset H_0^1(0,1)$ be the piecewise linear continuous finite element space and $\{\phi_{x_i}, i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ the collection of the usual basis functions; i.e., $\phi_{x_i} \in V_h$, $\phi_{x_i}(x_j) = 1$ if $i = j$ and $\phi_{x_i}(x_j) = 0$ if $i \neq j$. We define the subspaces $V_i = V_h \cap H_0^1(\Omega_i')$ whose dimension is $n_i$. We denote the two special mesh points $l_1$ and $l_2$ as $x_{m_1}$ and $x_{m_2}$ with $m_1$ and $m_2$ being two positive integers, and the corresponding basis functions as $\phi_{m_1}$ and $\phi_{m_2}$.

To define the matrix form of $T_1$, we need to introduce an interpolation matrix $I_i$ from $V_i$ to $V_h$ and a restriction operator from $V_h$ to $V_i$. For any $v_h \in V_i$, let $v_i$ and $v$ be the coefficient vectors of $v_h$ in terms of the basis of $V_i$ and $V_h$ respectively, i.e., $v_i = (v_h(x_j))_{x_j \in \Omega_i'}$, $v = (v_h(x_j))_{x_j \in \Omega}$, then $I_i$ is defined by $I_i v_i = v$, and $I_i$ is a $n \times n_i$ matrix with all entries being either 0 or 1. The restriction matrix from $V_h$ to $V_i$ is defined to be the transpose of $I_i$, i.e., $I_i^t$. Let $A$ and $A_i$ be the stiffness matrices corresponding to the discretizations of the Poisson’s problem on $\Omega$ and $\Omega_i'$ with zero Dirichlet boundary condition, respectively, then we have

\begin{equation}
(12) \quad T_i = I_i A_i^{-1} I_i^t A.
\end{equation}

Obviously, the transpose of $T_i$ is $T_i^t = A_i A_i^{-1} I_i^t$. The Eisenstat-Elman-Schultz theory depends on the smallest eigenvalue of the symmetric part of $T$. We consider the following eigenvalue problem:

\begin{equation}
(13) \quad (T + T^t)u = \lambda u.
\end{equation}

We start the analysis with several lemmas.

**Lemma 3.1.**

\begin{equation}
(14) \quad T_1 \phi_{m_2} = - \frac{l_2 - h}{l_2} \phi_{m_2-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad T_2 \phi_{m_1} = - \frac{1 - l_1 - h}{1 - l_1} \phi_{m_1+1}.
\end{equation}
where the piecewise linear continuous functions \( \tilde{\phi}_{m_2-1} \) and \( \tilde{\phi}_{m_1+1} \) are given below (Fig. 2)

\[
\tilde{\phi}_{m_1+1}(x) = \begin{cases} 
0 & x \leq l_1 \\
\text{linear} & x \in (l_1, l_1 + h) \\
1 & x = l_1 + h \\
\text{linear} & x \in (l_1 + h, 1.0) \\
0 & x = 1.0
\end{cases} \\
\tilde{\phi}_{m_2-1}(x) = \begin{cases} 
0 & x = 0, \\
\text{linear} & x \in (0, l_2 - h) \\
1 & x = l_2 - h \\
\text{linear} & x \in (l_2 - h, l_2) \\
0 & x \geq l_2.
\end{cases}
\]

**Proof.** Using the definition of \( T_1 \), we have

\[
a(T_1 \phi_{m_2}, v_1) = a(\phi_{m_2}, v_1) \quad \forall v_1 \in V_1.
\]

We first observe that \( a(\phi_{m_2}, v_1) = 0 \) if \( v_1(x) \) is any of the interior nodal basis functions in \((0, l_2 - h)\). Therefore, we claim that \( T_1 \phi_{m_2} \) is a discrete harmonic function in the interval \((0, l_2 - h)\). This implies that \( T_1 \phi_{m_2} \) is a linear function in this interval. Since \( T_1 \phi_{m_2} \) must be linear in \((l_2 - h, l_2)\), we hence have \( T_1 \phi_{m_2} = \alpha \tilde{\phi}_{m_2-1} \) for some constant \( \alpha \). And \( \alpha \) can be calculated by taking \( v_1 = \phi_{m_2-1} \) in (15), i.e.,

\[
\alpha = \frac{a(\phi_{m_2}, \phi_{m_2-1})}{a(\phi_{m_2-1}, \phi_{m_2-1})} = \frac{l_2 - h}{l_2}.
\]

The result for \( T_2 \) can be proved similarly. \( \square \)

**Lemma 3.2.** For the adjoint operators \( T_i^l, i = 1, 2 \), we have

\[
T_1^l \phi_k = \phi_k - \frac{x_k}{l_2} \phi_{m_2} \quad \forall x_k \in (0, l_2); \quad T_1^l \phi_k = 0 \quad \forall x_k \in [l_2, 1),
\]

\[
T_2^l \phi_k = \phi_k - \frac{1 - \frac{x_k}{l_1}}{1 - \frac{l_2}{l_1}} \phi_{m_1} \quad \forall x_k \in (l_1, 1); \quad T_2^l \phi_k = 0 \quad \forall x_k \in (0, l_1].
\]

**Proof.** By definition, for any nodal point \( x_k \in (0, l_2) \), we have

\[
(T_1^l \phi_k, v) = (\phi_k, T_1 v) \quad \forall v \in V.
\]

Since \( T_1 \phi_j = \phi_j \) if \( x_j < l_2 \) and \( T_1 \phi_j = 0 \) if \( x_j > l_2 \), and also \((\phi_k, \phi_j) = \delta_{kj}\), we have

\[
(T_1^l \phi_k, \phi_j) = \begin{cases} 
\delta_{kj} & x_j < l_2 \\
0 & x_j > l_2
\end{cases}
\]

Hence \( T_1^l \phi_k \) must have the following expression

\[
T_1^l \phi_k = \phi_k + \alpha \phi_{m_2}
\]

for some constant \( \alpha \) to be determined below. To calculate \( \alpha \), we substitute (17) into (16) and take \( v = \phi_{m_2} \),

\[
\alpha (\phi_{m_2}, \phi_{m_2}) + (\phi_k, \phi_{m_2}) = (\phi_k, T_1 \phi_{m_2}),
\]
combining with (14) we obtain $\alpha = -x_k/l_2$. The fact that $T_1^t \phi_k = 0$ for $x_k \in [l_2, 1)$ follows immediately from (16) by taking $v = \phi_j$ for all $x_j \in (0, 1)$. The result for $T_2^t$ can be proved in a similar way.

We next show that the operator $(T + T^t)$ has at least one negative eigenvalue. To do so, we introduce the following four special piecewise linear continuous functions as shown in Fig. 3.

$$
\Psi_{m^{-1}}(x) = \begin{cases} 
0 & x = 0 \\
\phi_{m^{-1}} & x \in [l_1 - h, l_1] \\
\text{linear} & x \in (0, l_1 - h) 
\end{cases}
$$

$$
\Psi_{m^+1}(x) = \begin{cases} 
\phi_{m^+1} & x \in [l_1, l_1 + h) \\
\text{linear} & x \in [l_1 + h, l_2 - h) \\
0 & x = l_2 - h 
\end{cases}
$$

$$
\Psi_{m^{-2}}(x) = \begin{cases} 
0 & x = l_1 + h \\
\phi_{m^{-2}} & x \in (l_1 + h, l_2 - h) \\
\text{linear} & x \in [l_2 - h, l_2] 
\end{cases}
$$

$$
\Psi_{m^+2}(x) = \begin{cases} 
\phi_{m^+2} & x \in [l_2, l_2 + h) \\
\text{linear} & x \in [l_2 + h, 1) \\
0 & x = 1 
\end{cases}
$$
Let λ be the possible negative eigenvalue that we are looking for and \( \Psi(x) \) be the corresponding eigenfunction of the following form

\[
\Psi = \alpha_1 \Psi_{m_1-1} + \alpha_2 \phi_{m_1} + \alpha_3 \Psi_{m_1+1} + \alpha_4 \Psi_{m_2-1} + \alpha_5 \phi_{m_2} + \alpha_6 \Psi_{m_2+1}.
\]

Here \( \alpha_i \) (\( i = 1, \ldots, 6 \)) are real parameters to be determined. By the definition of \( T_i \), we have immediately

\[
\begin{align*}
T_1 \ddot{\Psi} &= \ddot{\Psi} \quad \text{for } \ddot{\Psi} = \Psi_{m_1-1}, \phi_{m_1}, \Psi_{m_1+1}, \Psi_{m_2-1} \\
T_1 \Psi_{m_2+1} &= 0 \\
T_2 \ddot{\Psi} &= \ddot{\Psi} \quad \text{for } \ddot{\Psi} = \Psi_{m_1+1}, \phi_{m_2}, \Psi_{m_2-1}, \Psi_{m_2+1} \\
T_2 \Psi_{m_1-1} &= 0.
\end{align*}
\]

Following Lemma 3.2, we also have that

\[
\begin{align*}
T_1 \Psi_{m_2+1} &= 0, \\
T_2 \phi_{m_2} &= 0.
\end{align*}
\]

(18)

and

(19)

To simplify the notation, we denote the four coefficients (without the minus sign) of \( \phi_{m_2} \) in (18) and of \( \phi_{m_1} \) in (19) by \( \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4 \) and \( \theta_3, \theta_4, \theta_5, \theta_6 \), respectively. Substituting these relations into

\[
(T + T^t) \Psi = \lambda \Psi,
\]

then equating the coefficients in both sides and using the fact that

\[
\begin{align*}
\ddot{\phi}_{m_2-1} &= \frac{l_1 - h}{l_2 - h} \phi_{m_1-1} + \frac{l_1}{l_2 - h} \phi_{m_1} + \frac{l_1 + h}{l_2 - h} \phi_{m_1+1} + \phi_{m_2-1}, \\
\ddot{\phi}_{m_1+1} &= \frac{1 - l_2 + h}{1 - l_1 - h} \phi_{m_1-1} + \frac{1}{1 - l_1 - h} \phi_{m_1} + \frac{1 - l_2 - h}{1 - l_1 - h} \phi_{m_2+1}, \\
\end{align*}
\]

we obtain a reduced eigenvalue problem with six variables

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda \alpha_1 &= 2 \alpha_1 - \frac{l_1 - h}{l_2} \alpha_5, \\
\lambda \alpha_2 &= 2 \alpha_2 - \frac{l_1}{l_2} \alpha_5 - \tilde{\mu}_3 \alpha_3 - \tilde{\mu}_4 \alpha_4 - \tilde{\mu}_5 \alpha_5 - \tilde{\mu}_6 \alpha_6, \\
\lambda \alpha_3 &= 4 \alpha_3 - \frac{l_1 - h}{l_2} \alpha_5 - \frac{1 - l_1 - h}{1 - l_1} \alpha_2, \\
\lambda \alpha_4 &= 4 \alpha_4 - \frac{l_2 - h}{l_2} \alpha_5 - \frac{1 - l_2 + h}{1 - l_1} \alpha_2, \\
\lambda \alpha_5 &= 2 \alpha_5 - \frac{1 - l_2}{1 - l_1} \alpha_2 - \mu_1 \alpha_1 - \mu_2 \alpha_2 - \mu_3 \alpha_3 - \mu_4 \alpha_4, \\
\lambda \alpha_6 &= 2 \alpha_6 - \frac{1 - l_2 - h}{1 - l_1} \alpha_2.
\end{align*}
\]
Although there are only six variables, it seems not easy to solve it explicitly by hand. Since \( l_1 = 1 - l_2 \), the subdomain partition is symmetric. We tend to believe that the eigenfunctions are either symmetric or anti-symmetric with respect to the center point of the domain. Let us first work on the symmetric eigenfunctions case, namely we assume

\[
\alpha_1 = \alpha_6, \quad \alpha_2 = \alpha_5, \quad \alpha_3 = \alpha_4.
\]

It is easy to verify from (20)–(25) that \( \lambda \neq 2 \) and \( \lambda \neq 4 \). Then the following holds from (20), (22) and (24) by using the above assumption:

\[
(\lambda - 2)\alpha_1 = -\frac{l_1 - h}{l_2} \alpha_5,
\]

\[
(\lambda - 4)\alpha_3 = -\frac{l_1 + h}{l_2} \alpha_5 - \frac{1 - l_1 - h}{1-l_1} \alpha_5,
\]

\[
(\lambda - 2)\alpha_5 = -\frac{1 - l_2}{1 - l_1} \alpha_5 - \mu_1 \alpha_1 - \mu_2 \alpha_5 - (\mu_3 + \mu_4)\alpha_3.
\]

Multiplying (28) by \((\lambda - 2)(\lambda - 4)\) and using (26) and (27) and the fact that \( \mu_2 = l_1/l_2 \), we have

\[
(\lambda - 2)(\lambda - 4) \left( (\lambda - 2) + 2 \frac{l_1}{l_2} \right) - \mu_1 \frac{l_1 - h}{l_2} (\lambda - 4) - \frac{1}{l_2} (\mu_3 + \mu_4)(\lambda - 2) = 0.
\]

Note that all the eigenvalues of \((T + T^t)\) must be real (since it is symmetric) and three of them are given by the roots of (29). With three eigenvalues obtained from (29), we can immediately get three symmetric eigenfunctions from (26)–(28).

To prove that \((T + T^t)\) has at least one negative eigenvalue is equivalent to the fact that the constant term in (29) is positive\(^1\). Now let us calculate the constant term in (29):

\[
C_1 = -16 + 16 \frac{l_1}{l_2} + 4 \frac{l_1 - h}{l_2} \mu_1 + \frac{2}{l_2} (\mu_3 + \mu_4).
\]

We next calculate \(\mu_1\) and \(\mu_3 + \mu_4\) explicitly. Recall that

\[
\mu_1 = \frac{1}{l_2} (\Psi_{m_1-1}, x) = \frac{1}{l_2} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{m_1-1} \frac{x_j^2}{l_1 - h} \right) = \frac{l_1 (2l_1 - h)}{6l_1 h},
\]

and

\[
\mu_3 + \mu_4 = \frac{1}{l_2} (\Psi_{m_1+1}(x) + \Psi_{m_2-1}(x), x).
\]

\(^1\) Note that if we write (29) as \((\lambda - \lambda_1)(\lambda - \lambda_2)(\lambda - \lambda_3) = 0\), then the constant term is \(-\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3\). If this term is positive, then there is at least one negative eigenvalue.
Noting that $\Psi_{m_1+1}(x) + \Psi_{m_2-1}(x) \equiv 1$ for $x \in [l_1 + h, l_2 - h]$, so

$$\mu_3 + \mu_4 = \frac{1}{l_2} \left( \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2-1} x_j \right) = \frac{l_2 - l_1 - 2h}{2l_2h}. \quad (32)$$

Substituting (31) and (32) into (30) gives

$$C_1 = \frac{16(l_1 - l_2)}{l_2} + \frac{2l_1(l_1 - h)(2l_1 - h)}{3l_2^2h} + \frac{(l_2 - l_1 - h)(l_1 + l_2)}{2l_2^2h}. \quad (33)$$

Clearly $C_1$ is indeed always positive when $h$ is sufficiently small. For example, let $\bar{x} = 1/2$, $m = 1/(2h)$ or $mh = \bar{x}$. And $l_1 = \bar{x} - h$, $l_2 = \bar{x} + h$, then $C_1 > 0$ for all $h \leq 1/15$. Therefore we have proved that there is at least one eigenvalue from (29) is negative.

In order to find the three remaining eigenvalues corresponding to some anti-symmetric eigenfunctions, we assume

$$\alpha_1 = -\alpha_6, \quad \alpha_2 = -\alpha_5, \quad \alpha_3 = -\alpha_4.$$ 

Then the following holds from (20), (22) and (24):

$$\begin{align*}
(\lambda - 2)\alpha_1 &= \frac{l_1 - h}{l_2} \alpha_5, \quad (33) \\
(\lambda - 4)\alpha_3 &= \frac{l_1 + h}{l_2} \alpha_5 + \frac{1 - l_1 - h}{1 - l_1} \alpha_5, \quad (34) \\
(\lambda - 2)\alpha_5 &= \frac{1}{1 - l_1} \alpha_5 - \mu_1 \alpha_1 + \mu_2 \alpha_5 + (\mu_4 - \mu_3) \alpha_3. \quad (35)
\end{align*}$$

Multiplying (35) by $(\lambda - 2)(\lambda - 4)$ and using (33) and (34) and the fact that $\mu_2 = l_1/l_2$, we have

$$\begin{align*}
(\lambda - 2)^2(\lambda - 4) - 2 &\frac{l_1}{l_2}(\lambda - 2)(\lambda - 4) - \frac{1}{l_2}(\lambda - 4) \\
&- (\mu_4 - \mu_3) \frac{1 - 2l_1 - 2h}{l_2}(\lambda - 2) = 0. \quad (36)
\end{align*}$$

The three roots of equation (36) are the three eigenvalues of $(T + T^t)$. The three anti-symmetric eigenfunctions can then be calculated from (33)-(35). The eigenfunctions are of no interest to us. Of the three eigenvalues, we prove that there is at least one which is negative. As before, we need to show that the constant term

$$C_2 = \frac{16}{l_2} + \frac{4}{l_2} \mu_1 + 2(\mu_4 - \mu_3) \frac{1 - 2l_1 - 2h}{l_2}. \quad (37)$$

of (36) is positive. Our calculation shows that

$$\mu_4 - \mu_3 = \frac{1}{l_2 - l_1 - 2h} \left( \frac{(l_2 - h)l_2(2l_2 - h)}{3} - \frac{l_1(l_1 + h)(2l_1 + h)}{3} - \frac{(l_2 - l_1 - h)}{2} \right).$$
Table 1

A list of all the negative eigenvalue(s) of the symmetric part of the additive Schwarz preconditioned matrix. $h$ is the mesh size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$h^{-1}$</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>128</th>
<th>256</th>
<th>512</th>
<th>1024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1$</td>
<td>-0.1872</td>
<td>-0.6687</td>
<td>-1.3561</td>
<td>-2.3386</td>
<td>-0.4738</td>
<td>-1.2216</td>
<td>-2.2828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_2$</td>
<td>-3.7390</td>
<td>-5.7292</td>
<td>-8.5515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together with $\mu_1$ given in (31), we have that

$$C_2 = -\frac{16}{l_2} + \frac{2l_1(l_1 - h)(2l_1 - h)}{3l_2^2 h} + \frac{2(1 - 2l_1 - 2h)}{l_2(l_2 - l_1 - 2h)} \left( \frac{l_2(l_2 - h)(2l_2 - h)}{3} - \frac{l_1(l_1 + h)(2l_1 + h)}{3} - \frac{(l_2 - l_1 - h)}{2} \right).$$

(38)

Therefore, when $h$ is small enough, $C_2$ is positive. We then conclude that at least one of the three eigenvalues is negative.

We summarize the results in the following theorem

**Theorem 3.3.** When the mesh size $h$ is sufficiently small, the symmetric part of the additive Schwarz preconditioned system has at least two negative eigenvalues, one corresponding to a symmetric eigenfunction and the other corresponding to an anti-symmetric eigenfunction.

**Remark 3.1.** To make $C_2$ positive $h$ has to be much smaller than what is required for making $C_1$ positive. This implies that as the mesh gets finer, the first negative eigenvalue shows up much earlier than the second negative eigenvalue.

**Remark 3.2.** The theorem requires that the mesh size is sufficiently small. This does not mean $h$ is smaller than any of the practically useful sizes. For example, in the one dimensional space, a uniform mesh with 16 nodes would have one negative eigenvalue. The second negative eigenvalue shows up when the mesh is as fine as having 256 nodes. To be more clear, we present a numerical calculation. Here the domain is $(0, 1)$ divided into two subdomains $(0, 0.625)$ and $(0.375, 1)$. The overlap is fixed at 25% of the size of the un-extended subdomains. All the negative eigenvalue(s) are listed in Table 1.

4. **Analysis using the Saad-Schultz theory.** In this section, we investigate the convergence of AS/GMRES using the Saad-Schultz theory. We shall use the same one dimensional example as in the previous section. We need to define two functions $\psi_i(x) \in V_h$, $i = 1, 2$, as follows
It is easy to see that the functions $\psi_i(x)$ have the following properties that are useful later,

$$
\int_0^1 \psi_i^2(x)dx = l_2/3, \quad \int_0^1 \psi_j^2(x)dx = (1 - l_1)/3, \quad \int_0^1 \psi_i(x)\psi_j(x)dx = (l_2 - l_1)/3.
$$

We first prove the following lemma

**Lemma 4.1.** The operator $T$ has four distinct eigenvalues

$$
\lambda_1 = 1, \quad \lambda_2 = 2, \quad \lambda_3 = 1 - \left(\frac{l_1 - l_2}{l_2 - l_1}\right)^{1/2}, \quad \lambda_4 = 1 + \left(\frac{l_1 - l_2}{l_2 - l_1}\right)^{1/2}
$$

with a total multiplicity $n$ ($n = n_1^0 + n_2^0 + n_{12} + 2$) and we have

$$
\begin{align*}
T\phi_{x_i} &= \lambda_1 \phi_{x_i} \quad \text{for} \quad x_i \in (0, l_1) \cup (l_2, 1), \quad T\psi_3 = \lambda_3 \psi_3, \\
T\phi_{x_i} &= \lambda_2 \phi_{x_i} \quad \text{for} \quad x_i \in (l_1, l_2), \quad T\psi_4 = \lambda_4 \psi_4
\end{align*}
$$

where $\psi_3$ and $\psi_4$ are given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\psi_3(x) &= \alpha_3 \left( \sqrt{l_1(1 - l_1)} \psi_1(x) + \sqrt{l_2(1 - l_2)} \psi_2(x) \right), \\
\psi_4(x) &= \alpha_4 \left( \sqrt{l_1(1 - l_1)} \psi_1(x) - \sqrt{l_2(1 - l_2)} \psi_2(x) \right).
\end{align*}
$$

Moreover, all the eigenfunctions listed in (39)-(40) are linearly independent and therefore form a complete basis of $V_h$. We choose the constants $\alpha_3$ and $\alpha_4$ so that $\|\psi_3\| = \|\psi_4\| = 1$. 
Proof. The eigen-relations for $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ in (39) and (40) follow immediately from the definition of $T_i$, and their proofs are omitted here.

We next prove the eigen-relation for $\lambda_3$. The proof for $\lambda_4$ is similar. To derive the expressions of the eigenvalue and eigenfunction $\lambda_3$ and $\psi_3$, we first see that for each eigenfunction $\phi_{x_i}$ related to $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$, there exists always a basis function $\phi_{x_j}$ with $x_j \neq l_1, l_2$ such that

$$a(\phi_{x_i}, \phi_{x_j}) \neq 0.$$  

Now assume that $\psi_3$ is another eigenfunction which violates this condition, namely

$$a(\psi_3, \phi_{x_j}) = 0 \quad \forall x_j \neq l_1, l_2.$$  

This implies $\psi_3$ is discrete harmonic in $(0, l_1)$, $(l_1, l_2)$ and $(l_2, 1)$ respectively, hence it is linear in each of these subintervals and can then be expressed as

$$(41) \quad \psi_3(x) = \psi_3(l_1)\psi_1(x) + \psi_3(l_2)\psi_2(x).$$

It is easy to verify that

$$a(T_1\psi_2, \psi_{x_i}) = a(\psi_{x_i}, \psi_{x_i}) = 0 \quad \forall x_i \in (0, l_1) \cup (l_1, l_2),$$

so $T_1\psi_2$ is also discrete harmonic in $(0, l_1)$ and $(l_1, l_2)$ respectively, this indicates $T_1\psi_2 = \alpha \psi_{l_1}$ for some constant $\alpha$. To obtain this $\alpha$, we have by definition

$$a(T_1\psi_2, \psi_{l_1}) = a(\psi_{l_2}, \psi_{l_1}),$$

or $\alpha a(\psi_{l_1}, \psi_{l_1}) = a(\psi_{l_2}, \psi_{l_1})$. Then by a simple computation we derive $\alpha = -l_1/l_2$.

Similarly we have $T_2\psi_{l_1} = \beta \psi_{l_2}$ for some constant $\beta$ and $\beta = -(1 - l_2)/(1 - l_1)$. Substituting these relations along with $T_1\psi_{l_1} = \psi_{l_1}$ and $T_1\psi_{l_2} = \psi_{l_2}$ into $T\psi_3 = \lambda_3\psi_3$ gives

$$(\psi_3(l_1) + \alpha \psi_3(l_2))\psi_1(x) + (\beta \psi_3(l_1) + \psi_3(l_2))\psi_2(x) = \lambda_3 (\psi_3(l_1)\psi_1(x) + \psi_3(l_2)\psi_2(x)).$$

This implies

$$(42) \quad (\lambda_3 - 1)\psi_3(l_1) = \alpha \psi_3(l_2), \quad (\lambda_3 - 1)\psi_3(l_2) = \beta \psi_3(l_1).$$

We easily get $$(\lambda_3 - 1)^2 = \alpha \beta$$, or equivalently

$$\lambda_3 = 1 - \left(\frac{l_1 1 - l_2}{l_2 1 - l_1}\right)^{1/2}.$$  

Note that we take only one root here, the other is for $\lambda_4$. Using (42), we have

$$\psi_3(l_1) = \frac{\alpha}{\lambda_3 - 1} \psi_3(l_2) = \left(\frac{l_1 1 - l_2}{l_2 1 - l_1}\right)^{1/2} \psi_3(l_2).$$
The expression of $\psi_3$ follows now from this and (41). \[\square\]

**Remark 4.1.** The lemma says that $T$ has only 4 different eigenvalues, and according to (3) and (4), we know immediately that there exists a polynomial of degree three such that

$$\epsilon^{(3)} = 0.$$  

This implies that at most three GMRES iterations are needed regardless the mesh size, the overlapping size, the starting vector and the stopping condition. Therefore the condition number of the eigenmatrix does not affect the convergence at all. However, this type of eigen distribution rarely happen in practice, and the condition number of the eigenmatrix does play a role. Hence, we will spend the rest of the section on estimating $\kappa_2(X)$.

**Remark 4.2.** If the points $x = l_1$ and $x = l_2$ are symmetric with respect to the center of the interval $(0,1)$, then the two eigenfunctions $\psi_3$ and $\psi_4$ are orthogonal in $(\cdot,\cdot)$, i.e., $(\psi_3, \psi_4) = 0$. Otherwise $\psi_3$ and $\psi_4$ are orthogonal only in the inner product $a(\cdot,\cdot)$.

We next consider the conditioning of the eigenmatrix $X$ consisting all eigenvectors. Let $e_i$ be the $i$th unit column vector of length $n$. Let $1 < m_i < n$ be the integer corresponding to the node $l_i$, see Fig. 1. The eigenmatrix has the form

$$X = [e_1, \ldots, u, \ldots, w, \ldots, e_n].$$

Here

$$u \equiv (u_1 \ldots u_{m_1} \ldots u_{m_2} \ldots, u_n)^T \equiv (\psi_3(x_1) \ldots \psi_3(x_{m_1}) \ldots \psi_3(x_{m_2}) \ldots \psi_3(x_n))^T$$

and

$$w \equiv (w_1 \ldots w_{m_1} \ldots w_{m_2} \ldots, w_n)^T \equiv (\psi_4(x_1) \ldots \psi_4(x_{m_1}) \ldots \psi_4(x_{m_2}) \ldots \psi_4(x_n))^T.$$  

The constants $\alpha_3$ and $\alpha_4$ in the expressions of $\Psi_3$ and $\Psi_4$ are so chosen that

$$(43) \quad \|u\| = 1, \text{ and } \|w\| = 1.$$  

We shall estimate $\|X\|$ and $\|X^{-1}\|$ separately. To bound $\|X\|$, we note that

$$\|X\| = \sup_{y \neq 0} \frac{\|Xy\|}{\|y\|}.$$  

Let $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$Xy = \sum_{j \neq m_1, m_2} y_j e_j + y_{m_1} u + y_{m_2} w,$$

therefore

$$\|Xy\|^2 \leq 3 \left( \| \sum_{j \neq m_1, m_2} y_j e_j \|^2 + y_{m_1}^2 \|u\|^2 + y_{m_2}^2 \|w\|^2 \right) = 3 \|y\|^2.$$
That is sup \( \|Xy\|/\|y\| \leq \sqrt{3} \). On the other hand, by taking a vector \( y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n \) such that \( y_{m_1} = y_{m_2} = 0 \), we get
\[
\|Xy\|^2 = \sum_{j \neq m_1, m_2} y_j^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n y_j^2 = \|y\|^2,
\]
which implies that sup \( \|Xy\|/\|y\| \geq 1 \). Thus we have proved that
\[
(44) \quad 1 \leq \|X\| \leq \sqrt{3}.
\]
We next turn to \( \|X^{-1}\| \). It is important to have estimates of the values \( u_{m_1}, u_{m_2}, w_{m_1}, w_{m_2} \) and the corresponding determinant
\[
(45) \quad D \equiv u_{m_1} w_{m_2} - u_{m_2} w_{m_1}
\]
in terms of the mesh size \( h \).

**Lemma 4.2.** There exists two positive constants \( C_0 \) and \( C_1 \) independent of \( h \), such that
\[
(46) \quad C_0 h \leq u_{m_1}^2, u_{m_2}^2, w_{m_1}^2, w_{m_2}^2, D \leq C_1 h.
\]

**Proof.** We need to make several observations below. From the expressions of \( \psi_3 \) and \( \psi_4 \), we know
\[
(47) \quad u_{m_1} = \mu_0 u_{m_2}, \quad w_{m_1} = -\mu_0 w_{m_2},
\]
for some positive constant \( \mu_0 \), independent of \( h \). By a straightforward calculation, we obtain
\[
(48) \quad \frac{h}{3} \leq \|\psi_i(x)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq h, \quad \text{for } i = 3, 4.
\]
Using the linearity of \( \psi_3 \) and \( \psi_4 \) in the subintervals \((0, l_1), (l_1, l_2)\) and \((l_2, 1)\) and the identity \( \|\psi_i\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{l_1}^{l_2} \psi_i^2(x) \, dx + \int_{l_2}^1 \psi_i^2(x) \, dx \), for \( i = 3, 4 \), we obtain
\[
(49) \quad \beta_1 (u_{m_1}^2 + u_{m_2}^2) \leq \|\psi_3\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \beta_2 (u_{m_1}^2 + u_{m_2}^2),
\]
\[
(50) \quad \beta_1 (w_{m_1}^2 + w_{m_2}^2) \leq \|\psi_4\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \beta_2 (w_{m_1}^2 + w_{m_2}^2),
\]
where \( \beta_1 \) and \( \beta_2 \) are two positive constants given by
\[
\beta_1 = \frac{1}{12} \min\{l_1 + l_2, 2 - l_1 - l_2\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_2 = \frac{1}{4} \max\{l_1 + l_2, 2 - l_1 - l_2\}.
\]
The desired proof follows immediately from (48), (47), (49), and (50). \( \square \)

To estimate the norm \( \|X^{-1}\| = \sup_{y \neq 0} \|X^{-1}y\|/\|y\| \), we need to form the inverse of \( X \) explicitly. We note that \( X \) has the form
\[
X = I + (u - e_{m_1} \quad w - e_{m_2}) \left( \begin{array}{c} e_{m_1}^t \\ e_{m_2}^t \end{array} \right) \equiv I + UV.
\]
Using an inverse formula given in [13], we have

$$X^{-1} = I - U(I + VU)^{-1}V.$$ 

A simple calculation shows that

$$(I + VU)^{-1} = \left( \begin{array}{cc} u_{m_1} & w_{m_1} \\ u_{m_2} & w_{m_2} \end{array} \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{D} \left( \begin{array}{cc} w_{m_2} & -w_{m_1} \\ -u_{m_2} & u_{m_1} \end{array} \right).$$

Using this relation we get

$$X^{-1} = I - \frac{1}{D} U \left( \begin{array}{c} w_{m_2} \epsilon_{m_{-1}} - w_{m_1} \epsilon_{m_2} \\ -u_{m_2} \epsilon_{m_1} + u_{m_1} \epsilon_{m_2} \end{array} \right)$$

$$= I - \frac{1}{D} \left( (w_{m_2}(u - e_{m_1}) - u_{m_2}(w - e_{m_2})) e_{m_1} \\ + (-w_{m_1}(u - e_{m_1}) + u_{m_1}(w - e_{m_2})) e_{m_2} \right)$$

$$= I - \frac{1}{D}(z_{m_1} e_{m_1} + z_{m_2} e_{m_2}).$$

Here the vectors $z_{m_1}$ and $z_{m_2}$ are defined in the second and third lines of the above formula. Then for any $y = (y_1 \ldots y_{m_1} \ldots y_{m_2} \ldots y_n)^T \in R^n$ and $y \neq 0$, we have

$$X^{-1} y = y - \frac{1}{D}(y_{m_1} z_{m_{-1}} + y_{m_2} z_{m_2}),$$

which implies that

$$\|X^{-1} y\|^2 \leq 3 \left( \|y\|^2 + \frac{y_{m_1}^2}{D^2} \|z_{m_1}\|^2 + \frac{y_{m_2}^2}{D^2} \|z_{m_2}\|^2 \right).$$

We easily see that

$$\|z_{m_1}\|^2 = \sum_{j \neq m_1, m_2} (w_{m_2} u_j - u_{m_2} w_j)^2 + (D - w_{m_2})^2 + u_{m_2}^2,$$

$$\|z_{m_2}\|^2 = \sum_{j \neq m_1, m_2} (-w_{m_1} u_j + u_{m_1} w_j)^2 + w_{m_1}^2 + (D - u_{m_1})^2.$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we further obtain

$$\|z_{m_1}\|^2 \leq 4 (w_{m_2}^2 + u_{m_2}^2) (u_j^2 + w_j^2) + 2 (D^2 + w_{m_2}^2) + u_{m_2}^2$$

$$\leq 4 (w_{m_2}^2 + u_{m_2}^2) + 2 D^2.$$

Similarly, $\|z_{m_2}\|^2 \leq 4 (u_{m_1}^2 + w_{m_1}^2) + 2 D^2$. According to Lemma 4.2, we know that $\|z_{m_i}\|^2$ is of order $h$, i.e.,

$$\|z_{m_i}\|^2 \leq C h, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$
Substituting these bounds into (51) and using the bound for $D$ from Lemma 4.2, yields

$$\|X^{-1}y\|^2 \leq C \left( \|y\|^2 + \frac{1}{D} y_{m1}^2 + \frac{1}{D} y_{m2}^2 \right) \leq C \frac{1}{h} \|y\|^2,$$

that is $\sup_{y \neq 0} \|X^{-1}y\|/\|y\| \leq C h^{-1/2}$. On the other hand, to get the lower bound, we take a vector $\tilde{y}$ such that $\tilde{y}_i = 0$ for all $i \neq m_1$, then, we have $X^{-1}\tilde{y} = \tilde{y}_{m1} z_{m1}/D$, and

$$\|X^{-1}\tilde{y}\|^2 = \frac{\tilde{y}_{m1}^2}{D^2} \|z_{m1}\|^2 \geq \frac{\tilde{y}_{m1}^2}{D^2} u_{m2}^2 \geq C \frac{1}{h} \|\tilde{y}\|^2.$$

Therefore $\sup_{y \neq 0} \|X^{-1}y\| \geq \|X^{-1}\tilde{y}\|/\|\tilde{y}\| \geq C h^{-1/2}$ and we have proved that

$$\tilde{C} h^{-1/2} \leq \|X^{-1}\| \leq C h^{-1/2} \tag{52}$$

Before giving our main result of this section, we need the following beautiful Lemma due to Demmel [8].

**Lemma 4.3 (Demmel).** Let $S$ be a nonsingular matrix and of the form

$$S = [S_1 \ S_2 \ \cdots \ S_b],$$

where each $S_i$ consists of a certain number of columns of $S$ and these columns are orthonormal to each other. Then

$$\kappa(S) \leq \sqrt{b} \kappa(S_{optimal}),$$

where $S_{optimal}$ stands for a matrix $\tilde{S}$ which is a scaled matrix of $S$ (i.e. multiplying each column by a real number) and has the smallest condition number among all the scaled matrices of $S$.

By definition, the eigenmatrix $X$ can be re-organized to have the form

$$X = [X_1 \ u \ w],$$

where $X_1$ consists of all the eigenvectors $\phi_{x_i}$ with $i \neq m_1, m_2$. Clearly, this $X$ satisfies the condition of Lemma 4.3. Let $X_{optimal}$ be the best possible eigenmatrix associated with the additive Schwarz preconditioned matrix $T$, we have, by combining (44) and (52), the following result

**Theorem 4.4.**

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \kappa(X) \leq \kappa(X_{optimal}) \leq \kappa(X),$$

and

$$\tilde{C} h^{-1/2} \leq \kappa(X) \leq C h^{-1/2}$$

for some positive constants $\tilde{C}$ and $C$ independent of the mesh size $h$.

**Remark 4.3.** This theorem indicates that one of the factors in (4) that controls the convergence of GMRES grows at a rate like $h^{-1/2}$ as one refines the finite element mesh.
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